

6 5 6 1
2

Appendix II: "Two Worlds" Columns by Raya Dunayevskaya,
1955-1981

6561

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

TWO WORLDS COLUMN INDEX

Volume and number	Date	Title
I, 1	6-24-55	Letter Writing and New Passions
I, 2	7-8-55	The Revolts in the Slave Labor Camps in Vorkuta
I, 3	7-22-55	New Stage of Struggle Against Labor Bureaucracy
I, 4	8-5-55	"Socialism or Barbarism" On the Problem of a Workers' Paper
I, 5	8-19-55	New Turn To The "Popular Front"
8/19/55		Lead: Conflict Behind Peace Talks
I, 6	9-7-55	No title. On Cochran
I, 7	9-21-55	Tensions within Soviet Union
I, 8	10-5-55	"Underground Ways"
I, 9	10-26-55	Tensions in the Russian Army
I, 10	11-11-55	Attitudes to Automation
I, 11	12-9-55	Eugene Victor Debs; American Socialist
I, 12	12-23-55	The Great Divide Between Thinking and Doing
I, 13	1-6-56	Towards a New Unity of Theory and Practice
I, 14	1-31-56	A Little Bit Mad
I, 15	2-29-56	"The Fransy of Self-Conceit"
I, 16	3-30-56	Without a Past and Without a Future
3/30/56		Lead: Where is Russia Going? (on China)
I, 17	5-15-56	Three Datelines
II, 1	9-18-56	A second Look at Khrushchev
II, 2	10-2-56	Negro Struggle and Labor Bureaucracy
II, 3	10-16-56	Life Magazine Rewrites American History
II, 4	10-30-56	The Absence of a Mass Labor Party in the U.S.
II, 5	11-13-56	Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary
II, 6	11-27-56	Death, Freedom and the Disintegration of Communism
II, 7	12-11-56	Italian Communist Party Faces Revolt Dec. 8
II, 8	12-25-56	Automation and Brain-Washing

6 5 6 3

II, 9	1-8-57	Hungary and Kenya: Two Fights for Freedom
II, 10	1-22-57	Youth and Workers in Present Revolts
II, 11	2-5-57	The Confidence Man in Literature and Life
II, 12	2-19-57	The Terrible Split in the Scientist's Personality
II, 13	3-5-57	Exclusion of Negroes Warps Mind of Whites
II, 14	3-19-57	New Passions and New Forces
II, 15	4-2-57	On Both Sides of the Iron Curtain
II, 16	4-16-57	New Crisis in Russia
II, 17	4-30-57	The Shorter Workweek, Productivity and Profits
II, 18	5-14-57	"We Need a Clean Sweep"
II, 19	6-18-57	Scientists, Civil Rights, War and Peace
II, 20	7- ⁶ -57	Only Freedom Can Solve the Crisis
II, 21	8-57	"Let 100 Flowers Bloom, Let One Party Rule"
II, 22	9-57	A Challenge and a Promise
II, 23	10-57	Djilas' New Class
	<hr/> 10/57	<hr/> Editorial: Outer Space or Total War
II, 24	11-57	Russia's Internal Crisis
II, 25	12-57	An American in Paris
III, 1	1- 58	(Bankruptcy of Russian Thoughts and the Sputnik)
III, 2	³ -58	Unemployment and Organizations to Fight it
III, 3	⁴ -58	One-half Hour from Total Destruction
III, 4	7-58	Whither Paris?
	<hr/> 7/58	<hr/> Lead: France at Crossroads
III, 5	8-58	Responsibility of Intellectuals
III, 6	9-58	Colonial Revolts and the Creativity of People
	9/58	Edit: On War
	9/58	Lead: War Clouds over China
III, 7	10-58	"The Confederacy, The Confederacy"
III, 8	11-58	American Socialism and Eugene V. Debs
IV, 1	1-59	The African Revolution I
IV, 2	2-59	Role of the Negro in the Populist Movement

IV, 3	3-59	Conditions of Labor in Russia
IV, 4	4-59	Khrushchev Talks On and-On
IV, 5	5-59	May I, and the Shorter Work Day
IV, 7	8,9-59	Nuclear "Personal" Diplomacy
IV, 8	10-59	Eisenhower-Khrushchev Spectacular
IV, 9	11-59	Exclusion of Negroes Warps Minds of Whites
V, 1	1-60	Stagnation of US Economy
V, 2	2-60	Roots of Anti-Semitism
	2/60	Lead: War (Khrushchev, Eisenhower, DeGaulle)
	2/60	Edit: Tragedy of France
V, 3	3-60	Automation and the Dialectic
V, 4	4-60	Revolution and Counter Revolution in South Africa
V, 5	5-60	African Socialism
	5/60	Editorial: Summit to War?
	5/60	Freedom Fighters of South USA
V, 6	6,7-60	Sacco-Vanzetti! Speak to Millions
V, 7	8,9-60	Automation Special
V, 8	10-60	War and Automation
V, 9	11-60	Russia's Changing Role in Africa
V, 10	12-60	The Cuban Revolution One Year After
VI, 1	1-61	The New Russian Communist Manifesto
	1/61	Lead: Belgian Workers Show Way
VI, 2	2-61	Negro Intellectuals in Dilemma
VI, 3	3-61	The Three Faces of N. Khrushchev
VI, 6	6,7-61	Intellectuals in the Age of State Capitalism
VI, 7	8,9-61	Intellectuals in the Age of State Capitalism (cont.)
VI, 8	10-61	Tito's Turnabout
VI, 9	11-61	If This Isn't Madness What Is It?
VI, 10	12-61	Marxist Humanism in New Books and Reviews

VII, 2	2-62	In Memoriam: Natalia Sedova, Trotsky
	2/62	Natalia Sedova Trotsky's Break with the SWP
VII, 3	3-62	Kennedy's Nuclear Spectacular: Testing, Blackmailing, Brainwashing
VII, 4	4-62	The Algerian Revolution Enters a New State
VII, 5	5-62	The Evolution of a Social Type
VII, 6	6,7-62	Grand Illusion of Our Times: Disarmament
VII, 7	8,9-62	Our Underdeveloped Intellectuals
	8-9/62	Editorial: On Freedom Now (Meredith)
VII, 8	10-62	The Automation Battlefield and the Philosophical Battles
VII, 9	11-62	Ideology and Revolutions A Study in What Happens After...
	11/62	Editorial: On Cuban Missile Crisis
VII, 10	12-62	Protests Report From the Gambia
	1/63	Author's Introduction to new Italian edition of <u>Marxism and Freedom</u>
VIII, 3	3-63	The New Franco-German Axis
VIII, 4	4-63	Marxist-Humanism: African, American Why Not a New International
VIII, 5	5-63	Freedom Occupies Consciousness
VIII, 6	6,7-63	DeStalinization -- 10 Years after East German and Vorkuta Revolts
VIII,7	8,9-63	Special Editorial on The Freedom Now Movement
	8-9/63	Lead: On Sino-Soviet Conflict
VIII, 8	10-63	Sartre's Search for a Method to Undermine Marxism
VIII, 9	11-63	The Standstill of Nehru's India
VIII, 10	12-63	Special Editorial on The Tragic Assassination of President Kennedy, and the Urgency for Freedom Now
IX, 1	1-64 (1-63 incorrect)	Western Intellectuals Help K. Inc. Rebury Lenin's Philosophic Legacy
IX, 2	2-64	" " " (Part 2)
	2/54	New Introduction to Paperback Edition of <u>Marxism and Freedom</u>
IX, 3	3-64	Negro in the Populist Movement

	4/64	Lead: On U.S. Support of Brzilian military
IX, 4	4-64	Malcom X and the 'Old Radicals'
IX, 5	5-64	Guerrill Tactics in Ideological Struggles: Study of Mao's Thought
IX, 6	6.7-64	Sino-Indian War Reveals Relationship of Ideology to State-Capitalist: Imperialism
IX, 7	8,9-64	Introduction to New Japanese Edition of M&F
IX, 8 (10, 8 incorrect)	10-64	Mao's Bomb and Khrushchev's Fall
	11/64	China's Entry into Nuclear Age (by Peter Mallory)
IX, 9	11-64	Conglomerate Mergers -- or Big Business Gets Bigger
IX, 10	12-64	Special Editorial Article J. Edgar Hoover and Civil Rights
X, 1	1-65	Special Editorial Article The Free Speech Movement and the 'Community of Scholars'
X, 2	2-65	" " " (Part 2)
	2/65	Editorial: On Bombing of North Vietnam
	3/65	Special Letter on Selma March
X, 3	4-65	Theory of Alienation: Marx's Debt to Hegel
X, 4	5-65	Mao Sides With Nasser on Israel
X, 5	6,7-65	Special Editorial Article The Intimacy of the U.S. Occupation of Dominican Republic
X, 6	8,9-65	Ramifications of the Watts Revolt
	8-9/65	Editorial: On China and the India-Pakistan War
	8-9/65	Lead: On the Revolt in Indonesia
X, 7	10-65	Indonesian Communists: A Case of World Communism's Decomposition
X, 8	11-65	" " " (Part 2)
X, 9	12-65	Why Philosophy? Why Now?
XI, 1	1-66	The Humanism of Marx Is the Basic Foundation for Anti-Stalinism Today
	1/66	Our Life and Times: French Elections
	2/66	Editorial: On Johnson-Ky Summit
XI, 3	3-66	Early Marxist-Humanist Analysis of Viet Nam Predicted War Moves
XI, 4	5-66	Special Editorial Article Are the US and China Headed Toward War?
XI, 5	6,7-66	Alienation and Revolution. A Hong Kong Interview
	8-9/66	Editorial: American Civilization on Trial
XI, 6	8,9-66	One Again -- Theory and Practice
XI, 7	10-66	China's Self-Created Turmoil (lead)
	10/66	Editorial: Shame of a Nation-- White Racism

6 5 6 7

XI, 8	11-66	China Has Missile -- and Red Guard (TW) Manila Conclave Exposes Imperialist Shift from Europe to Asia. (Editorial)
XII, 1	1-67	"Black Power," Race and Class (TW) Resurgence of Nazism? (Editorial)
XII, 2	2-67	Is China Preparing for "A Great Leap Forward" or for World War III? (Editorial Article) Youth, Philosophy and Revolution (A Review of the <u>Revolutionary Internationals</u>) (TW)
XII, 3	3-67	Youth, Philosophy and Revolution -- concluded. Also: Schurmann on Mao's China (Letter to NY)
	3/67	Editorial: <u>White Congressional Line</u>
XII, 4	4-67	A.J. Muste, Labor and Marxist Page
XII, 5	5-67	The Role of the Intellectual; a Look Back Illuminates Today (reprinted from July, 1958)
XII, 6	8-9, 67	Law and Order from Barral of Gun (Editorial) Victor Serge, Revolution's Author (TW)
XII, 7	10, 67	Instant Vulgar Materialism vs. Marxist Humanism
XII, 8	11, 67	Che Geuvara, Revolutionary (Editorial) Black Mass Revolt: Where to Now? (TW)
XII, 9	12, 67	The Mouse that Roared (Editorial) Excerpts from <u>Marxism and Freedom</u> (TW)
XIII, 1	1, 68	Nigeria, A Retreat, Not a Victory
XIII, 2	2, 68	U.S. Bombs Devastate South Vietnam as Civil War Rages in the Cities (Editorial Article)
XIII, 3	3, 68	Shortcut to Revolution or Long Road to Tragedy -- Review of <u>Revolution in the Revolution?</u>
XIII, 4	4, 68	Shortcut to Revolution...(concluded)
XIII, 5	5, 68	These Uncivilized United States: Murder of Rev. King, Vietnam War (Editorial Article)
XIII, 6	6-7, 68	Who Arrested the French Revolution?
XIII, 7	8-9, 68	All Eyes on Czechoslovakia, All Hands Off! (Editorial Statement)

6 5 6 8

XIII, 8	10, 68	(The Current Crisis, by Ivan Svitak)
XIII, 9	11, 68	Czechoslovakia, Revolution and Counter-Revolution -- cosigned by Raya Dunayevskaya and Harry McShane
XIII, 10	12, 68	Kolakowski on Alienation
XIV, 1	1, 69	Nixon, New, Old and Napoleonic (Lead)
XIV, 2	2, 69	U.S. and Russia Enter the Middle East Cockpit (Editorial Article)
XIV, 4	4, 69	Hegel vs. Mao: From Culture to Philosophy to Revolution
XIV, 5	5, 69	Humanism and Marxism, Excerpts from a Lecture
XIV, 6	6-7, 69	75 Communist Parties Meet

(7)

6568

<u>Vol. and No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Title</u>
XIV, 7	8-9/69	Splintered World Communism, Part 2
XIV, 8	10/69	Critique of Althusser's anti-Hegelianism (letter of 1/29/68)
XIV, 9	11/69	The Needed American Revolution (excerpts from '69 Perspectives)
XIV, 10	12/69	Footnote on the Detractors of Lenin
XV, 1	1/70	Economism vs. Marx's Humanism
XV, 2	2/70	'Two Worlds' are in Every Country
XV, 3	3/70	African Revolutions at the Crossroads
XV, 4	4/70	Totalitarianism: U.S. Style
XV, 5	5/70	'True Rebirth' or Wholesale Revision of Marxism?
XV, 6	6-7/70	" " " (Part 2)
		Nixon's Wars at Home and Abroad (lead editorial)
XV, 7	8-9/70	British Racism, Powellism and the Workers
XV, 8	10/70	Philosophy, 'Life-style' and U.S. Workers (excerpts from a letter)
XV, 9	11/70	Marx, Lenin and their Detractors (by H. McShane)
XV, 10	12/70	History Rewrite Degrades Lenin, Black Masses (review of <u>Lenin's Impact on the U.S.</u>)
XVI, 1	1/71	reprint of special introduction to French edition of <u>Marxism and Freedom</u>
XVI, 2	2/71	Polish uprising, protests against Russian anti- Semitism, reveal state-capitalist crises (lead)
XVI, 3	4/71	What is theory? 'History and its process' (excerpts from '70 Perspectives)
XVI, 4	5/71	'Culture', Science and State-Capitalism
XVI, 5	6-7/71	" " " (Part 2)
XVI, 6	8-9/71	Nixon to Peking: 'journey to peace' or to new alliance for world war? (lead editorial)
		Scotland, England, France--and Marxist-Humanism (letter from Europe-TW)
XVI, 7	10/71	Slandorous book review nailed by author's reply
XVI, 8	11/71	The 'ground' for the Nixon-Mao meeting (excerpts from '71 Perspectives)
XVI, 9	12/71	Women's Liberation: Reason and revolutionary force (excerpts from article in <u>NOWL</u>)

XVII, 1	1/72	Super powers line up as new war explodes between India, W. Pakistan (lead)
XVII, 2	2/72	Letter exchange blasts Marxist slander
XVII, 3	3/72	Two forgotten pages of Ralph Bunche's life story
XVII, 4	4/72	Nixon-Mao extravaganza: new 'peaceful co-existence'—with whom? for what? (lead editorial)
XVII, 5	5/72	Women's liberation and the search for philosophy (excerpts from 2/71 N&L WL conference)
XVII, 6	6-7/72	Nixon's global politicking: phase II (lead)
XVII, 7	8-9/72	Ways to combat 'pax americana' (excerpts from '72 draft Perspectives)
XVII, 8	10/72	Lord Nixon and state-capitalist crisis (excerpts from '72 Perspectives)
XVII, 9	11/72	Pittinix 'human nature' against Marx's humanism
	11/72	China-Japan Treaty (by Peter Mallory)
XVII, 10	12/72	What has happened to the Cuban Revolution? (letter of 12/60)
XVIII, 1	1/73	Russia, China bring pressure on Hanoi to accept Pax Americana (lead)
XVIII, 2	2/73	Lukacs' philosophic dimension (Part 1)
XVIII, 3	3/73	" " " (Parts 2, 3)
XVIII, 4	4/73	Mao and Nixon move closer together (lead)
XVIII, 5	5/73	Gang lawyer for the establishment (2/20/54 TW)
XVIII, 6	6-7/73	Politics of Counter-Revolution: Watergate and Nixon-Kissinger's "Year of Europe" (lead editorial)
XVIII, 7	8-9/73	The New in Women's Liberation: In Fact and in Philosophy (Women's Week, UCLA, 4/73)

<u>Vol. and No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Title</u>
XVIII, 8	10/73	Economics phase-out, global politics phase-in (excerpts from '73 Draft Perspectives)
XVIII, 9	11/73 11/73	New introduction distorts Marx's 'Grundrisse' Lead: The Middle East Erupts
XVIII, 10	12/73	The U.S.; global politics and the Mideast war (lead)
XIX, 1	1-2/74	War and practicing war by other means (excerpts from '73 Perspectives)
XIX, 2	3/74	Only miners' control of safety will reduce deaths (by A. Phillips)
XIX, 3	4/74	...Confucius who?
XIX, 4	5/74	The non-conversion of Jean-Paul Sartre
XIX, 5	6/74	Negritude as revolution and counter-revolution (by Rene Depestre)
XIX, 6	7/74	Nixon-Kissinger journey to save 'the Presidency' (lead)
XIX, 7	8-9/74	Why Hegel? Why Now?--a critique (by P.B.)
XIX, 8	10/74	U.S. instigations increase danger of global minefield (lead editorial)
XIX, 9	11/74	Answer given to 'Why Hegel? Why Now?'
XIX, 10	12/74	Dialectics of liberation: Hegel and Adorno (excerpts from paper given to Hegel Society of America)
XX, 1	1-2/75	Deep U.S. recession and the myriad global crises (lead editorial)
XX, 2	3/75	How new is China's new constitution? (Part 1)
XX, 3	4/75	" " " (Part 2)
XX, 4	5/75	State-capitalism and the dialectic (excerpts of speech at New School for Social Research, NY)
XX, 5	6/75	Socialist feminism and Marxist-Humanism (by Molly Jackson)
XX, 6	7/75	Instant Marxism and the Black intellectual
XX, 8	10/75	Counter-revolution and revolution: what can we do? (excerpts from '75 Perspectives)
XX, 9	11/75	Youth ID cards vs. youth passion for freedom
XX, 10	12/75	Marxism and the Black Dimension (excerpts from 1944 letter)

6 5 7 7

XXI, 1	1-2/76	Under the whip of the counter-revolution: will the revolution in Portugal advance?
XXI, 2	3/76	Middle East, UN, OAU--and ideological obfuscation (excerpts from Political-Philosophic Letter #1)
XXI, 3	4/76	The Black dimension in Women's Liberation (excerpts from speeches on national lecture tour)
XXI, 4	5/76	Chicano culture, Marxism and revolution (excerpts from speech at Cal. State College, Los Angeles)
XXI, 5	6/76	'Women as thinkers and as revolutionaries' (excerpts from Appendix to <u>Working Women For Freedom</u>)
XXI, 7	8-9/76	Special Introduction to Spanish edition of <u>Marxism and Freedom</u>
XXI, 8	10/76	Death of Mao Tse-tung: the Thought of Mao
XXI, 9	11/76	Workers' self-emancipation crucial to Marx (excerpts from article in <u>Punch</u> , May '76)
XXI, 10	12/76	Post-Mao China: what now? (excerpts from Political-Philosophic Letter #8)

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

TWO WORLDS COLUMN INDEX

<u>Vol. & No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Title</u>
XXII, 1	1-2/77	Is a new world recession coming? (lead editorial)
XXII, 2	3/77	Notes from a diary: Roots, errors, and dialectics
XXII, 3	4/77	New Essays: new unity of theory and practice (letter from a colleague, Michael Connolly)
XXII, 4	5/77	Tony Cliff degrades Lenin as theoretician
XXII, 5	6/77	Carter recreates sedative for nuclear proliferation and economic crises (editorial)
XXII, 6	7/77	Chiang Ch'ing, Hua Kuo-feng in post-Mao China
XXII, 7	8-9/77	Chiang Ch'ing, Hua Kuo-feng in post-Mao China, Part II (TW)
XXII, 8	10/77	World perspectives -- 1977-1978 (excerpts from 1977 Perspectives Report)
XXII, 9	11/77	Gramsci's "philosophy of praxis"
	12/77	International Women's Year: Where to Now?
XXII, 10	12/77	State-plan fetishism and George Novack's philosophy
XXIII, 1	1-2/78	War, peace or revolution: Shifting alliances in the Middle East (lead editorial) Eisdolsky's methodology and Lance's re- visionism (TW)
XXIII, 2	3/78	Adorno, Kosik, and the movement from practice
XXIII, 3	4/78	'Battle of Ideas': a syllabus for study
XXIII, 4	5/78	Introduction to <u>Frantz Fanon, Soweto and Ameri- can Black Thought</u> , by Charles Denby and Raya Dunayevskaya
XXIII, 5	6/78	The Latin American revolutions: where to next? (excerpts from Political-Philosophic Letter)
XXIII, 7	8-9/78	Reflections on Notes from a Diary: Lenin's <u>Philosophic Notebooks</u> and the State-Capitalist Tendency (excerpts)

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

TWO WORLDS COLUMN INDEX

<u>Vol. & No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Title</u>
XXIII, 8	10/78	Camp David Summit: Peace in Middle East -- or extension of U.S. imperialism? (Our Life and Times) N&L Convention: Philosophy and Organization (TW, letter from Eugene Walker)
XXIII, 9	11/78	The dialectic of today's crises and revolts (excerpts from Perspectives Thesis 1978-79)
XXIII, 10	12/78	Iran's revolutionary past -- and present (translated into Farsi, January 1979)
XXIV, 1	1-2/79	Marx's and Engels' Studies Contrasted: Relationship of Philosophy and Revolution to Women's Liberation (draft chapter of book-in-progress)
XXIV, 2	3/79	Philosophy and Revolution: critique vs. attack (critique of P&R by G. A. Kelly vs. deceitful review by Howard Parsons)
XXIV, 3	4/79	Chinese invasion of Vietnam: global implications (Our Life and Times) What revolutionary ground for women's movement? (TW, excerpts from presentation on draft chapter of book-in-progress, by Eugene Walker)
XXIV, 4	5/79	Russia and China share global nuclear insanity (TW reprints from Nov. '61 and Oct. '64) Iran: Unfoldment of, and Contradictions in, Revolution (excerpts from Political-Philosophic Letter; translated into Farsi Aug. '79)
XXIV, 5	6/79	A. Philip Randolph and Black labor's future (editorial) Draper's narrow view of Marx's political theory (TW by Andy Philips)
XXIV, 7	8-9/79	Herbert Marcuse, Marxist philosopher (in memoriam) A review of 'The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg' (TW)

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

TWO WORLDS COLUMN INDEX

<u>Vol. & No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Title</u>
XXIV, 8	10/79	On the threshold of the 1980s (excerpts from Perspectives Thesis, 1979-80)
XXIV, 9	11/79	Leon Trotsky: a critique (excerpts from a Political-Philosophic Letter; later translated into Farsi)
XXIV, 10	12/79	Grave contradictions in the Iranian revolution
XXV, 1	1-2/80	Before and after the 1905 revolution: two turning points in Rosa Luxemburg's life -- 1898-99, and 1905-07 (draft chapter from book-in-progress) Dunayevskaya's response to an Iranian revolutionary (letter)
XXV, 2	3/80	Reason and revolution vs. conformism and technology (review of Herbert Marcuse's <u>One Dimensional Man</u> , originally published in the <u>Activist</u> , Fall 1964) Carter's drive to war (lead editorial)
XXV, 3	4/80	The break with Kautsky, 1910-1911: from mass strike theory to crisis over Morocco -- and hushed-up 'Woman Question' (draft chapter from book-in-progress) Eric Fromm, Socialist Humanist (in memoriam)
XXV, 5	6/80	Carter's intrusion, Khomeini's 'Holy War' (excerpts from a Political-Philosophic Letter)
	7/80	Alicune Diop (in memoriam)

(14)

6575

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

TWO WORLDS (THEORY/PRACTICE) COLUMN INDEX

<u>Vol. & No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Title</u>
XXVI, 1	1-2/81	China's 'Gang of four' trial charade and the so-called Cultural Revolution; media and the global crises (Theory/Practice)
XXVI, 2	3/81	China's 'Gang of four' trial charade and the so-called Cultural Revolution; media and the global crises (Part II)
XXVI, 3	4/81	What is philosophy? What is revolution? (excerpts from Political-Philosophic Letter of Dec. 1979)
XXVI, 4	5/81	Preface to Iranian edition of Marx's 1844 essays

6576

Notes from a Diary

TWO WORLDS

LETTER WRITING AND NEW PASSIONS

As we were preparing to go to press with this, our first issue, I was asked why I had placed so much emphasis on letters to and from news committees as well as to and from workers outside these news committees. The daily press is so well-known for its being the voice, not of the people, but of big business, that we have all but forgotten the part the press played in the making of this nation.

The worker who put the question to me, said: "All I read the papers for are the sports and the comics." Were this indifference to all other sections of the paper a mere question of forgetting history, nothing much would be lost. But it is not a question of history. It is a matter of new passions as they are expressed in the daily lives of ordinary people. It is these that need to be heard. When fundamental changes are shaking society to its depths, the need for communication forces its way up, finds all sorts of unique ways of realization. One of these is letter writing.

The world over, each stage of freedom first announced its coming in the intimate expression of the common people to each other. But it is especially characteristic of this country's development at every great turn in history. Here it was largely in the form of letters that the passions of the struggle for independence of this country from Great Britain was first formulated.

THE PRESS AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST SLAVERY

Or take the question of slavery which divided the nation into two. On January 1, 1831 William Lloyd Garrison almost single-handedly published the weekly LIBERATOR. This paper, which seemed so small, was an active force which brought about the final abolition of slavery.

I do not mean to put the press above the actual activity of the people. Quite the contrary. That same year a much more world-shaking event occurred than the publication of this organ of emancipation. A slave revolt, led by Nat Turner, shook the very foundations of the solid South which were being undermined daily by the runaway slaves. What I do mean to say is that the LIBERATOR was the expression of these new passions and forces for freedom which brought on the Civil War.

THE UN-SPOKEN CONVERSATION THAT NEEDS TO BE HEARD

The American working people, with their great capacity for free association in industry and in politics, have in the press created an almost unique form of communica-

tion and inter-communication. Where an intellectual would, at best, consider letter writing a matter of "raw material," a sort of "unspoken conversation," the worker considers letters the oft-spoken conversation that has finally been written down to be heard.

It seldom is nowadays. At this critical stage in American democracy, which seems to be in such contrast to the Communist totalitarian regime of Russia, the simple truth is that the working people have no press of their own. The daily press is in such disrepute because it reflects the views of the very people—the political leaders, the big industrialists, the labor bureaucrats—who have brought the world into the state of total, never-ending crisis in which it now finds itself, while the rank and file people are not heard at all. Yet it is only in their workaday world that you will find the elements of a new society, a new human being to whom his relations with his fellow workers, his acts against the labor bureaucrats as well as against the boss, his relations with his family and his neighbors mean more to him than the fact that he can buy a car and a television.

What is needed above all is a workers paper, one written, edited and circulated by workers themselves.

It is not that we reject the middle class—intellectuals, housewives, technicians. They are welcome, as is any and every part of the population that has nothing whatever to do with the two gigantic bureaucracies struggling for world domination, American as well as Russian. But the first necessity is that the rank and file have the paper in their hands to say what they want to, how they want to.

It is in the expression of the working people, on whose backs the total weight of state capitalism rests, that we will find the new passions and forces for a new society. All the others may desire as total a change but they are not so strategically placed in production that they can stop its wheels or change its course.

TODAY'S READERS AND TOMORROW'S

Old radicals, in starting a paper, used to say that. But their fear of being captured by the "outside" was so strong that they felt the need for all sorts of controls and hence special privileges for those on the "inside."

We feel no such need. Hence the emphasis on letters from those outside the news committees that are leaving this paper now. In truth, the only way this paper can be established is if the readers take matters into their own hands—they themselves write and edit and circulate this paper. Today's readers and tomorrow's.

Friday, June 24, 1955

6577

*Notes from a Diary***TWO WORLDS****THE REVOLT IN THE SLAVE LABOR CAMPS IN VORKUTA**

Today marks the second anniversary of the most unprecedented strike in the world — the revolt in Russian slave labor camps in Vorkuta. The outstanding part of the strike is that it ever took place at all. No one on inside or outside of the Kremlin, the seat of Russian Government in Moscow—nor even the prisoners themselves who were to organize this strike—thought such a thing possible in their wildest dreams. Yet, a few short weeks after the East German revolt on June 17, 1953, these same prisoners were inspired to strike out on their own.

MYTH OF INVINCIBILITY DESTROYED

Nothing so shows the uncertainty and insecurity of these totalitarian rulers, armed to the teeth and with all the power and terror in their hands, as the caution with which the Government at first dealt with the strike. They sent a commission, headed by General Derevianko, to fly down to the camp. When he tried to harangue the prisoners and failed, the commission returned to Moscow with the demands of the prisoners for a review of all their cases and the removal of the barbed wires. In the end, the Kremlin did what the Tsar had done back in 1912: they opened fire on the unarmed strikers and killed some 200. But they could not put up what the strikers had destroyed: the myth of invincibility.

These prisoners without any rights had dared to strike. They held out for weeks, shaking the Kremlin to its very foundations. Despite total censorship, the workers in Leningrad knew at once of the strike. A few months after, students from the Leningrad Mining Institute, working in the pits in Vorkuta, told the prisoners how everyone had talked of the strike in Leningrad: "We soon got to know you were on strike. The drop in coal was noticeable at once. We don't have any reserves. There's just the plan, that's all. And everyone knows how vulnerable plans are. It destroyed the myth that the system was unassailable."

THE SILENCE OF "THE WEST"

A meeting "at the summit" is being ballyhooed now and a meeting of the Big Four Ministers, took place then. The upshot of it was, that they achieved as total a silence on the question of the revolt during that conference in West Berlin as in Moscow. Dr. Joseph Scholmer tells us that story in a most remarkable book called Vorkuta.

Dr. Scholmer was one of thousands of slave laborers released during the Big Four Ministers Conference in 1953. He has this to say of the Western "experts" on Russia:

"When I first mentioned the word, 'civil war' to these people they were appalled. The possibility of a rising lay outside their realm of comprehension. They had no idea that there were resistance groups in the camps."

"I talked to all sorts of people in the first few weeks after my return from the Soviet Union. It seemed to me that the man in the street had the best idea of what was going on. The 'experts' seemed to understand nothing."

ON BOTH SIDES OF THE IRON CURTAIN

It was not for lack of understanding that the Western rulers acted as they did. Quite the contrary. I remember that when Stalin died, one worker in Flint said: "What is the use of all this talk against Russia when Eisenhower sends the Russian leaders his sympathy?"

Over at the other end of the world from Flint, in the Russian slave labor camps, the same disgust with Western leaders swept the Russian resistance movement. For years there have been underground resistance groups, mainly Ukrainian. Prior to June 17th, all the preparations for resistance to the totalitarian rulers were based on the eventuality of war and looked to the Western rulers. When Stalin died in March, 1953, hope spread through the camps. But all that came from the Eisenhowers and Churchills were condolences to the Russian leaders who continued the Stalin regime. Gloom spread throughout the slave labor camps until the June 17th revolt in East Germany showed that liberation can be achieved only by the workers themselves. The Russian political prisoners followed up with their revolt.

The strike in July, 1953, could not have occurred without the previous underground formation of resistance groups within the camps. But the strike as it occurred was entirely different from the action planned when they looked to "the West." June 17th had changed all that.

The sabotage and treachery of the West seemed to astound some. But one of the Russian resistance leaders put it in a nutshell:

"Those radio stations are controlled by the various governments, aren't they? Well, on June 17 they had to ask the government officials what they were to do. And the government officials have a professed dislike of popular uprisings, wherever they take place."

6578

July 6, 1955

Notes from a Diary

TWO WORLDS

NEW STAGE OF STRUGGLE AGAINST LABOR BUREAUCRACY

The series of wildcat strikes, right on the heels of the new contracts in auto negotiated by Reuther, was a strike against the labor bureaucracy. Pure and simple: profound and new. Never before had the opposition to the labor leadership been so total. Without understanding this, it is impossible to understand "the politics" of the American working people.

Judging, no doubt, by the fact that their thirst for leadership remained unquenched, certain intellectuals who fancy themselves as workers' leaders were talking at one and the same time about the "political backwardness" of the American worker while they themselves were accepting Reuther's self-declared victory as "the fulfillment of the workers' dream." The auto workers, on the other hand, took to the picket lines.

Their talk on the picket lines revealed a new attitude to Reuther. His name was never singled out at all. "The international" — the labor leadership — was seen as a unit. Everyone from the lowest committeeman to Reuther was referred to as "a representative of management." The workers would have nothing to do with any of them. They listened only to those who were with them in the strike.

NEW FORMATIONS

New groupings arose on the basis of that activity. In one local, the rank and file simply walked to the back of the hall while the leadership sat on the platform. When they had come to a decision, they then confronted the tops on the platform with it. In another shop where the production workers were all women, while the foremen and the union leadership were men, the struggle assumed the form of a woman's fight against the inhumanity of man. In several shops they no sooner returned to work than they wanted to go out again. That is how the hunger for the unity of purpose and action, gotten on the picket line, expressed itself.

The self-confidence they gained in taking matters into their own hands is first now evolving into new group formations.

Where, a decade ago, Reuther could still place himself at the head of the strike wave following the conclusion of World War II, this time he had from the start to come out against the strike. Where, a few years ago, he could fight the wildcats by red-baiting, this present walkout was so leaderless, so spontaneous, that Reuther had no other weapon left but to shout that the long-accumulated workers' grievances were "personal."

In contrast to this, the workers' impersonal attitude toward their leadership showed how far they had gone beyond the stage of replacing one set of leaders by another as in the days when union caucuses were so popular. This type of politics they leave to the politicians. Distinctively, workers politics concerns itself instead with relations at the point of production itself. That is why this time they were so little interested in personalities, Reuther's and Stollato's included.

WHY DO THEY BEHAVE LIKE THEY DO

"Just why was it necessary for Reuther to bring all of those professors in, and turn the class struggle upside down?"

A production worker with many years of trade union ex-

perience asked me this question, and then continued, "Why did he turn to those guys to carry out his objectives? I know he always used intellectuals, but there is something new this time. It seems to me that this time they are using him. Why, even the top international representatives didn't get into that room full of professors and engineers. That is why it seems to me the workers are not thinking so much of forms of organizations as of forms of revolt; a way of getting rid of all that planning by people who haven't spent a single day on the production line."

REUTHER AND PLANS

Nevertheless Reuther and Plans have always been a pair, an inseparable pair. That was true of him even when he was a worker himself and helped organize the CIO. Always his aim was "to lead" so that when the American working class was changing the industrial face of America, he was attracted most of all by the administrative plan of Russia. In the early 1930's he had worked there for a year and, where the Russian production worker saw only the speedup, this skilled American worker saw only the gray close Plan.

It is true that the tendency to plan did not then seem organic, that is to say, part of the very organism of this skilled worker-intellectual. It was only when America moved from depression to war and the totality of the crises laid a tightrope for the labor leaders who wanted to continue to lead above all else, that the Plan became so characteristically the mark of the American labor bureaucracy.

First Reuther came out with the plan for more planes. He challenged industry's ability to transfer itself rapidly to a wartime basis. That this competition with industry for state approval meant that the worker would be chained down with a no-strike pledge, did not disconcert Reuther a bit. He didn't have to work on the production line. He had his table of blueprints.

He seemed flexible enough when the tidal wave of strikes, at the end of World War II, threatened to overwhelm the whole labor bureaucracy. He placed himself at the head of the strikes and came out with such slogans as "Open the Books." From opposite poles, both workers and management, interpreted this as a challenge to industry's control of production. But Reuther's plan called for nothing of the sort. He soon enough got the slogan so tied to the "sliding scale of wages" that it became nothing but a bookkeeping term.

What he had done during the war with the no strike pledge and in 1950 with the Five Year Contract, he now did with the workers' urge for security in the face of automation. In the face of automation, on the one hand, and the workers' demand for a say over production schedules, on the other hand, Reuther puts the New Deal brains, that used to be on the government payroll, on the union payroll, and comes up with GAW.

Reuther is a master of substitution, that is to say, transforming something into its very opposite.

WORKERS POLITICS

WORKERS POLITICS

That is why the opposition to Reuther now is so total. What form this workers' revolt will take, no one can tell in advance. But what cannot be doubted now is the workers' determination to find other ways, than through their present leadership, to bend production to their will and aspiration for a better life. That is the workers' politics. All other politics they leave to the politicians and intellectual planners.

July 22, 1955

6579

Notes from a Diary

TWO WORLDS

'SOCIALISM OR BARBARISM'
ON THE PROBLEM OF A WORKERS' PAPER

I have received the July-September issue of the French magazine, *Socialisme ou Barbarie* (Socialism or Barbarism), and see that it is largely devoted to the problem of establishing a workers' paper. The article by D. Mothe on the question has, with the experience of some French workers who published a shop paper, in Renault, which is like Ford here, and the experience we have had in America in publishing a workers' paper.

All this is new. Heretofore socialists and other radicals have been content with publishing a paper "for" workers rather than by them. The fact that some now pose the latter question and pose it with the seriousness characteristic of the theoretical journal, is a beginning in the direction in which we have worked for some years before the actual publication of NEWS & LETTERS.

THE SPECIAL PROBLEM OF WESTERN EUROPE

The conditions in France, however, are radically different from those here. We do not have a mass Communist Party to plague us. The Communist Party of France (and even more so of Italy, it must not be forgotten) is a strong force. It controls the largest trade union—the CGT—which is like the CIO here.

No socialist grouping like *Socialisme ou Barbarie* can disregard such a mass force as the Communist Party represents there. It cannot speak to workers on any subject as if the problem were only of workers against capitalists. It is a struggle within the working class; the counter-revolutionary force is right within the revolutionary movement. The problem of establishing a workers' paper in France is a question only the French can decide.

OUR EXPERIENCE

But, insofar as the struggle the world over today is a struggle against bureaucratic domination, and the fundamental problem of workers the world over, in this age of bureaucratization, is to tackle this problem not the day after but today, our experience can illuminate the problem.

The working class stamp in the overall editing and the decentralization in the editing of the individual sections—Labor, Negro, Women, Youth—did not come about accidentally. They were the results of the decisions of a unique combination of worker and intellectual. NEWS & LETTERS, being a product of this unique combination of worker and intellectual, is in its own small way to be sure, the practice of the breakdown of the most monstrous division of all—the division between mental and manual labor which has reached its apex in this epoch.

This brand of any class society also stamps many people who align themselves with the working class, but have no conception of how total the opposition to the old order must be not alone in theory but in practice. This characteristic is not limited to intellectuals, but permeates a stratum of the working class. For

the classic example of that we must consider not the comparatively small problem of a workers' paper, but the historic problem of workers' power itself for it was in the period of the workers' state in Russia (1917-1923) when all the problems of today were seen as if in a blinding flash, and grasped at once by Lenin.

WHAT HISTORY TEACHES US

Before 1917 all radicals saw the problem of a new society as the problem of achieving political power. What the Russian experience showed was that the problem first then began.

Shlyapnikov was a worker who had joined the Bolshevik (Communist) Party long before the Russian Revolution of which he was a leader. Nevertheless, once power was achieved, he refused to see the problem of worker and intellectual—which is another way of saying the role of the party.

Lenin, on the other hand, saw precisely this division as the barrier—the last barrier—that the old decrepit society was setting up in the path of the new workers' state that had won power but was nevertheless heading back to capitalism. He insisted on two seemingly contradictory policies: 1) He said, they must define the term, worker, "in such a way as to include only those who could have acquired a proletarian mentality from their very position in life." By which he meant that they were workers all their life; that they had worked in heavy industry at least 10 years; that they were factory workers not through choice but because they had no other way of earning a living.

2) Nevertheless he showed that the proletarian policy of the party was the result of "the enormous undivided prestige enjoyed by the thin stratum which may be called the old guard of the Party. Only a very slight internal struggle within this stratum would be sufficient, if not to destroy this prestige, then at all events to weaken it to such an extent that it would lose the power to determine policy." And so it was and the workers' state crumbled altogether.

ONCE AGAIN ON PUBLISHING A WORKERS' PAPER

To return from the historic height to the problem raised by our French friends, I cannot see how theoreticians can continue to theorize in the old way while the workers in their various activities break through old patterns to new theory. Just as it is true that the workers, in a workers' paper, do not speak only of their relations at the point of production, but all of their ideas on life, labor and the new society, so it is true that the intellectual's role cannot be just to generalize the experience, but must be to discipline himself to hear all the workers' say instead of hearing only what fits into his previous theoretic patterns.

Workers' actions speak for them without equivocation. The intellectual must be attuned to hear that movement from practice to theory. That is the nub.

I would say that the tendency to say: "A workers' paper, yes, but in that case it must come from the workers themselves, and not from us the theoreticians" is an evasion of the task at hand. Theoreticians cannot be bystanders to a paper that mirrors the workers' thoughts and activities as they happen. We would like to hear more from our West European friends.

6580

Friday, Aug. 5, 1955

TWO WORLDS

NEW TURN TO THE "POPULAR FRONT"

Like a road marker, Russian Communist boss Khrushchev has been tracing a turning point in world history. The facade is impressive enough. I do not mean to say it is just an empty shell. No one like Khrushchev is to be dismissed out of hand. He is the man who coached General Zhukov to tell his "soldier friend," President Eisenhower, the "inner secrets" of Russia's highest political body, the Political Bureau, of which Zhukov is not even a member.

Naturally, Eisenhower is not letting himself be diverted into any direction he doesn't wish to follow. He has allowed himself to be impressed with "the new concept of leadership" which has replaced Stalin's dictatorship, because he is compelled to play the part of "we're-brothers-under-the-skin-where-peace-is-concerned."

The political difference between the leaders of the two powers aiming for world conquest — America and Russia — is that the Russians are masters not only of governmental shows, but also of what is known as the "Popular Front" — a non-governmental get-together of assorted characters who cut across both the working class and the middle class.

I have been leafing through my diary for instances of this specifically Russian concoction which Stalin invented back in the 1920's when he moved to "building socialism in a single country."

The more familiar name for "Popular Front" is "collective security." This has an official, governmental flavor and does not disclose the Communist Party tentacles so readily.

Let no one think that this problem does not exist in the 1950's because we "now know all about it" thanks to the ex-Communists who recently turned informers.

It is not a question of changing allegiance from the American flag to the Russian flag, though there may be that on the part of some. For every convicted or alleged "conspirator" there was an honorable intellectual who flirted with the Communist "idea" and who is presently as opposed to Russian Communism as is possible for intellectuals without roots in the working class.

That's just it. There is no total opposition except from the workers who alone can change things from the roots up because they must! It is on their backs that all exploitation takes place.

It wasn't out of malice, nor out of stupidity, that American intellectuals were sucked into the Communist-led Popular Front during the 1930's. They were sucked in because they were driven by despair over the economic chaos and saw no other way out.

THE 1929 CRASH AND THE AMERICAN MIND

With the 1929 crash, production had come nearly to a standstill. Millions of workers were thrown into the streets. Now that everyone saw that production is primary, the class lines became, not weaker, but stronger. The New Deal is proof enough that the capitalist class too had suffered a serious split. Every

serious tension between the working class and the capitalist class produces a rift in the camp of the ruling class itself. But that is not irreparable.

To run production in capitalist society, the rulers sit upon the direct producers. When there is a crisis, these bureaucrats do not get off the workers' backs. They sit the harder. The New Deal did not tamper with that relationship at the point of production. Neither did the intellectual planners who came out of Harvard and Columbia, Yale and Princeton, the College of the City of New York and the University of Chicago.

Just as there are only two fundamental classes in society — the working class and the capitalist class — so there are only two fundamental ways of thinking. The 1929 crash, which shook the world to its foundations, cut sharply across the American mind, splitting it into two opposing parts:

1) The Brain Trust, or intellectual planners, small and large. Those who invented the New Deal to save capitalism and those who wanted to use the New Deal to move headlong to total planning according to the Russian model, were not so totally different from each other that they did not find cohabitation pleasant. Both had one word for all the ills in the world. It was: Plan.

2) On the other hand, the rank and file workers tried to reorganize production on entirely new foundations by demanding that those who labor should control production. They, too, had but one word to describe how to do it. It was: SIT DOWN. The very spontaneity of the action overflowed into the organization of the CIO.

THE AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL ADRIFT

While the workers were creating organizations of their own, characteristically American and specifically working class, the American intellectual was rudderless, drifting into the Communist created Popular Front.


The Russian Communists had a field day, penetrating everywhere from the Newspaper Guild to the State Department, from the labor bureaucracy in Detroit to filmdom in Hollywood. The American intellectual was not an unwilling victim. He zealously tried to influence the American worker. If he failed it was not his fault. The American intellectual has one trait in common with all intellectuals: he looks down upon the native working class as "backward." But while the Communist Party of the United States took over the American intellectual bodily, emotionally and financially, it remained without serious roots among the American working class.

THE TOTALITY OF THE CRISIS

The world crisis is creating another field day for the Communist bureaucrats in this country. The other day a production worker pointed out to me that the labor bureaucracy is so rocky about its "knowledge" of Communism, that already they have been caught off guard by the actions of the Communists in defending the status quo and in stopping some of the actions of the workers against Reuther. Politics makes strange bedfellows.

The one sane element in all this, is the solid common sense of the American worker. He is showing a total indifference to the shouting out of Geneva through the press and over the air. Rather he is showing a total concern for the fundamental issues of what happens day in and day out at the point of production.

6581



Conflict Behind Peace Talks

So overpowering is the anti-war feeling among the peoples of the world that they compelled a meeting between the American government and the Russian, despite the unwillingness of both.

Ten years after World War II ended and the cold war began, the complete sterility of power politics was revealed by the empty and perpetual smiles on the faces of the Big Two at the Conference of the Big Four. Germany, the key to the European situation, was not there at all. Shattered to smithereens is any illusion about disarmament. The United States delegation did not even include Harold E. Stassen, although but a few months back, Eisenhower created a special Cabinet post on disarmament for him. Russia sent its minister of

war, General Zhukov, as their expert on disarmament.

"I know that the Geneva conference was an empty show," an auto worker told me. "But I can't afford to laugh. They're playing with our lives. Communists in my shop have already changed their line. They're beginning to sound like the Salvation Army at Christmas time. When America and Russia were together in World War II, I remember these Com-mies were for the no-strike pledge and speed-up. They were the biggest pushers. Eisenhower doesn't fool me, but what are the Russians up to!"

THE SITUATION IN RUSSIA

It is not so hard to fathom Russia. Take the present crisis in Russian agriculture.

The Russian worker knew this was behind the fall of Premier Malenkov last February. The American experts said Malenkov fell because he was "for" light industry, and Khrushchev was "for" heavy industry.

The Russian worker knew the crisis came because the Government couldn't even assure sufficient food for the population. Fully 70 per cent of his meagre budget goes for the bare necessities of life, but there wasn't sufficient bread and potatoes in the stores, let alone shoes and radios.

Soviet agriculture has been stagnating for 25 years. Official government figures claim a tenfold increase in heavy industry in the last quarter of a century; but they show that grain is now only at the 1928 per capita level. The per capita level of meat and milk has declined

30 per cent. This total failure in agriculture is shaking the regime to its foundations.

TRANSFORMING NATURE BY DECREE

What to do? Khrushchev had a plan. He always has a Plan. Each time it is more gigantic than the time before. Our readers may know little of the Stalin Plan for the Transformation of Nature of 1948-1950. That is the plan Khrushchev is now reviving under a different name.

When Stalin was alive, they wrote songs about his irrigation projects which would "soon" produce enough food to feed 100 million people. But nothing came of it. Absolutely nothing.

The following year, 1949, Stalin brought Khrushchev to Moscow. Another fantastic scheme was born: to abolish, by decree, the difference between country and city. The ruling bureaucracy ordered the establishment of aggro-towns, or agricultural towns. Between 1950 and 1953, 156,000 collective farms were forcibly merged. These mergers, far from producing aggro-towns, produced such chaos on the country side that the plan collapsed.

The peasant refused to transport, at his own expense

and on his own time, his little hut from the collective farm to the aggro-town. Especially since the apartment house in which he was to live like an industrial worker had not even been planned, let alone built.

TRANSFORMING PEOPLE BY DECREE

The Stalin plan aimed at "changing" farmers into city workers. The 1954-56 Khrushchev plan aims at changing city workers into farmers. The Russian totalitarian bureaucracy is ordering a mass transportation of people to cultivate the virgin land in the wilds of Siberia and the Ural Mountains.

In Russia, youth are compelled to take state training from six months to two years. These are called State Labor Reserves. In exchange for this, they are obligated to work for the State for the next four years "at the prevailing rate of pay," wherever the State sends them.

From these Labor Reserves, Khrushchev sent 150,000 "volunteers." In addition, he has sent demobilized units of the Army who showed an alarming degree of restlessness. Also, he sent experienced Machine Tractor Station operators who were promised an especially big bonus for work in Siberia and the Urals.

Into these arid lands the state has made phenomenal investments—12 billion rubles in 1953, 21 billion in 1954, and 55 billion in 1955. This sum is more than half of what is invested in heavy industry and fully five times as much as that invested

in light, food and local industry—a mere 10.6 billion. They plan to plough up some 32 million acres of virgin lands. They have now increased this to the fantastic figure of 70 million additional acres for the three years, 1954 through 1956.

In the early 1930s, when Russia first turned to mass production, Henry Ford was the model. Now the model is the American farming technique. The Khrushchev speech at the beginning of the year, which foreshadowed Malenkov's fall, was full of praise for American farming technique.

Malenkov must have thought it too big a gamble, when all they can know for sure is that IF the rains are plentiful, the gamble will pay off this year. These lands, now being ploughed up are marginal. In the next year or two they may become dustbowls.

Russia is the only industrially advanced country where as much as half of the population is still engaged in agriculture. At present its rulers are trying nothing short of reversing the historic trend of industry to absorb the displaced farming population. They are sending the urban population—youth, demobilized soldiers, and skilled tractor drivers—into "the country." So total is the crisis in Russia that, after 25 years of alleged socialism, the state-capitalist bureaucracy has no other way of assuring bread for the population.

AUTOMATION, THE PLAN AND THE WORKER

On the eve of the Geneva Conference, an All-Union Conference of Industrial Personnel was held. Who should address it but the ever present Khrushchev. He seems to be everywhere at the same time. He appears at a conference in the Ukraine to urge an increase in the yield of sugar beets. He appears

at a Conference with Tito in Yugoslavia. He is present at the Conference of the Big Four in Geneva. At the All-Union Conference, he spoke of the need to change from "short term" (Five Year) planning to "long range" planning. On the basis of his speech, a new decree was issued: Reorganization of Industry Planning. A new Ministry was created.

All that week, the official papers, Pravda and Izvestia, ran articles on: WHAT IS HOLDING BACK AUTOMATION?

The Conference itself issued "An Appeal to All Workers, Engineers, Technicians and Employees in the Soviet Union" to learn from the experience of "the production innovators."

Note the awkward phrase, "production innovators." It is a high-sounding phrase for speed demons. They dare not create another Stakhanov—the production pace-setter of the 1930's. It was not uncommon for some local Stakhanov to find himself murdered. Now it is "the production innovators" the Russian workers are ordered to emulate. But by whatever name, the Russian worker knows it all comes from the sweat of his brow. The low productivity of the Russian

worker is the measure of his resistance to the totalitarian regime. At the same time, collective farm leaders are being murdered in the country while in the city there is a serious wave of "juvenile delinquency." There is no escape from the totality of the crisis. That is what sent the Russian rulers to Geneva.

AS FOR THE UNITED STATES

Lest anyone think that the United States, where "free enterprise capitalism" rules, is free from crises, let them take another look at our country. Ever since the 1929 crash we have moved in the same general direction

that Russia did: from crisis to war to recession and unto the brink of another war. That is what sent the American rulers to Geneva.

The state-capitalist bureaucrats in Russia cannot imagine any problem which they cannot solve by a blueprint. The private capitalist bureaucrats cannot imagine any problem that the dollar sign cannot solve. A few days back, all the financial experts in this country complained that the Geneva Conference had pushed the Report of the President's Economic Council of Advisers off of the front pages. This report sounded very much like the 1928 ballyhoo of endless prosperity on the very eve of the stock market crash.

Let us for the moment disregard the signs of crisis in this country. Let us turn our heads from inflation and the billions of dollars in installment buying; from the million already displaced by automation; from the beginnings of another serious unemployment in auto; and from the fact that in free enterprise, prosperous, highly-mechanized American agriculture, Governmental price supports are still needed to keep the crisis from showing. For the present let us take this report of prosperity at face value.

The question to be answered is: why did this report play a poor second fiddle to the Geneva Conference? We have the word of the financial editor of the Republican New York Herald-Tribune that it is "the universal quest for peace." For once, he is right.

Look at the people in Iowa who poured out in thousands to welcome the visiting Russian farm delegation. That was the biggest demonstration since Eisenhower's victory parade at the end of World War II. Eisenhower may out-smile Khrushchev,

but he is not Khrushchev's equal at creating "popular fronts of all classes for peace." (See TWO WORLDS, p. 5.)

WHERE THE REAL PROBLEM LIES

The problem is not of antagonism between America and Russia. The problem exists within every country. It is the problem of relations between people. It is the relation of the worker at the point of production to the bureaucracy that dominates over him in his own country. Here again, the crisis in Russia will help illuminate the problem in America.

Top Russian scientists are singing the glories of automation and are exhorting their fellow-scientists "to get closer to life" because "the detachment of scientists from production hinders the fruitful cooperation between scientists and practical workers."

That, no doubt, is true. But it isn't anyone's personal or individual fault. There is nothing subjective or personal about the division between manual and mental work. This separation between mental and manual work is the very foundation on which capitalism rests, whatever its form. It has our society by the throat. Automation will not lessen the division. It has brought the division to the breaking point. Nothing can stop the movement of contemporary society to utter collapse.

This law of motion cannot be reversed so long as production is at the expense of the worker. The only thing that can reverse this movement is the release of the energies of the working people working for themselves: Working in a productive system where the motive force is the development of the individual and not of the machine or of profits.

The American worker is not as poor as the Russian worker, but much more is at stake than the rate of pay. Our dollar-minded politicians and intellectuals have never understood, and do not yet understand, what the founder of the modern working class movement saw 100 years ago. The crisis of production—and hence of society—lies in this: The worker, seeking his dignity and freedom, "be his payment high or low," will oppose a mode of production which makes the worker nothing but a cog in a machine.

Today's political and intellectual leaders look for the root of the world crisis everywhere except at the relations of people at the point of production. The center of gravity has not moved from there just because they have called a conference at Geneva. Nor will launching satellites in space solve the problems of this earth.

"Can mankind survive?" is not a question posed by the H-bomb. Working people have been asking this question ever since 20 million of them were thrown on the streets during the Depression more than 20 years ago.

"Can mankind be free?" is the question the working people are now asking. They ask it not only of one party State bureaucrats like the Russians. They ask it of those leaders who have so riddled this country with reactionary laws that millions of Americans would fear to sign their name to the

TWO WORLDS

In spite of all the Labor Day speeches hailing the forthcoming unity between AFL and CIO, never has there been such a division between workers and the union leaders. This underlying unrest has encouraged the caucus builders.

I am reminded of a typical opposition - caucus builder, Bert Cochran. Recently, one of Cochran's followers claimed to have "the best anti-Reuther caucus in Flint."

During the depression, Cochran was a student at the College of the City of New York. It was when young intellectuals like Cochran joined the strike movement of the workers and the unemployed and give it "leadership." In 1934 when he was active in the famous Auto-Lite strike in Toledo, Ohio, Cochran met some Trotskyists to whom he was greatly attracted as "theoreticians" of the class struggle. Where the Russian Revolution of 1917 made James P. Cannon, the founder of American Trotskyism, break with the Industrial Workers of the World and accept the doctrine of "a vanguard party to lead the workers to power," the American crisis in the 1930's made Cochran accept the doctrine of the party to lead the workers.

His glib tongue and facile pen made him a "specialist" in trade union work. But Cochran's specialty was not to organize masses, but caucuses.

WORKERS, UNION LEADERS AND RADICALS

The average worker was in the struggle for unionization because he wanted a total change in the conditions of work and the relations at work. The workers were ingenious in the ways they devised to fight the corporations and the fledgling bureaucracy. To keep themselves in leadership, the young labor bureaucracy was in need of an ideology, a system of ideas that would attract these workers. This is where the radicals came in. They wrote the programs for the union leaders. Homer Martin's was being written by Jay Lovestone; Wyndham Mortimer's by the Communist Party; Reuther's, it was generally believed was also written by the C. P.

When GM first recognized the UAW it still had no intention of taking the union seriously enough to let the workers decide the conditions of work. Immediately there was a division between the union leadership and the union ranks as to how to enforce the contract. The workers took the road of "quickies." Homer P. Martin, president of the UAW, opposed wildcats.

When the C. P. succeeded in prying Martin's first lieutenant (Frankenstein) away from him, Bert Cochran saw

his chance to play a leading role. He came to Martin with a 20-point program which ranged from a fight against the "big corporations" to fighting Communist "collective security." In a word, Martin got from Cochran the program to fight the Communists, and Cochran got from Martin, the post of UAW-WPA director.

The partnership didn't last long. At the very first strike Martin fired Cochran. That was a lucky thing for Cochran for Martin was soon to bolt the CIO.

Cochran never worked with the rank and file of the union for whom he had nothing but contempt. The few times he worked in the shop, he was known to the workers as a sloppy worker, one whom they had "to carry." But on the platform or in the caucus room, he talked down to them. He was as cynical as any labor bureaucrat from the smirk around his lips, the slouch of his shoulders, to the thumb pointed at the audience as his voice rose to a roar.

THE PARTY LEADER AND THE LABOR BOSS

A petty type like Cochran respects neither fundamental ideas nor rank and file people. He responds only to his own restlessness and to that bureaucracy which gives him a little hope that he can function as a leader.

About two years ago, he glimpsed some hope for the future in the "reforms" proposed by that all-but-forgotten Russian, Malenkov. Claiming to understand "the reality of this world, and this country, and this labor movement," he led a group of dissident Trotskyists into an organization of his own which would "cut a path for itself in the next struggle and developments."

This sudden involvement in international politics had nothing whatever to do either with actual world events or theoretical developments. What was bothering Cochran was not Europe, but the United States; not Communists, but the native labor bureaucracy. So long as the trade union leaders needed these radicals to write their programs, Cochran, the petty intellectual, was satisfied. But the period following World War II is one of total crisis, and no time to play at radical politics. The labor bureaucracy cleaned house, throwing out not alone the Communists but the Trotskyists from all union positions. And Cochran began to display the signs of a well-known political type — the man who is desperately determined to get out from where he is.

Accordingly, he is now busy trying to build an opposition caucus. This harvest is reaped from the theory of "a party to lead the masses."

6585

Wednesday, September 7, 1955

TWO WORLDS

TENSIONS WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION

Russia has suddenly become the most popular tourist attraction for traveling U.S. Senators. Among the most recent tourists have been: Sen. Estes Kefauver, Democrat from Tennessee; Sen. John J. Sparkman, Democrat from Alabama; and Sen. George W. Malone, Republican from Nevada. They have lost no time in giving their expert impressions.

Sen. Malone stated that he found "no evidence the people are going to rise against the Soviet regime." This ridiculous pretentiousness insults the intelligence of the American people and slanders the Russians' unceasing struggle against their totalitarian regime. The truth is:

CONTINUOUS REVOLT BY RUSSIAN WORKERS

1928 TO 1938

1) Throughout the First and Second Five-Year Plans (1928-1938) workers left the plants and returned to their farms with a disrespect for capitalist routines very similar to the Southern production workers in Northern United States.

2) The passport system accomplished as little in disciplining the workers as had the 1932 laws which authorized the factory director to fire a worker for absenteeism and even to deprive him of his food card and living quarters owned by the factory.

3) It was impossible to decree slavery. The Russian worker, like the American worker, knows how to handle his job. Where he is forbidden to strike, he slows down. The Senators and scholars speak of "low labor productivity" in Russia as if that means the Russian workers are backward. Like the economists in the United States in relation to American workers, however, the Russian intelligentsia recognizes low productivity for what it is: a sign of revolt against the conditions of production. Figures show that to complete the First Plan, even in half-way fashion, 22.8 million workers were used where the Plan called for only 15.7 million. Labor turnover was no less than 152 per cent.

4) The totalitarian rulers have more power than any other government in history. Nevertheless, they did not feel capable of disciplining this rebellious labor force. They decided instead to divide it by finding some social basis in the factory among a special section of the workers. American workers who have seen Reuther operating with the skilled trades will have no difficulty in understanding what Stalin was aiming at.

As early as 1931, Stalin called for the "liquidation of depersonalization." This was a very fancy phrase for a very ugly truth. He had no factory personalities to defend his regime. To get them, he decided to give the skilled worker a personality and a wage to go with it and at the same time transform the skilled worker into a speed demon for one day. This man set the rate of speed, through especially good machines and plenty of help, at a pace which he knew he would have to keep up for only a single day. This time-study then became the rate for the rest of the workers to produce every day.

This speed-up movement met with such resistance that it was not unusual for Stakhanovites to find themselves murdered in the dark of night.

1940 TO 1950

At the start of World War II, the laws of June 26 and October 2, 1940, forbade a worker to leave his job and punished 15 minutes lateness with six months "corrective labor"—labor in the factory with 25 per cent reduction in pay.

Yet, after six months of operation of these laws, PRAVDA reported that truancies were greater than in the months prior to it. Martial law was declared on the railroads similar to Truman's proposal to draft railroad workers to prevent their strike in 1946.

In 1943, the conveyor belt system was first introduced. On the basis of assembly line discipline, the State introduced competition by factories. This means that Factory Stalin is ordered to challenge Factory Molotov. Factory Molotov must take up the challenge "to fulfill and over-fulfill" its quarterly plan by 10 per cent. All workers in both factories must pitch into this back-breaking State-ordered plan. This is called "socialist emulation".

IN 1953: VORKUTA

Finally, in 1953, what had been going on continuously under the surface for years, exploded into the open with the revolt of prisoners in the slave labor camps at Vorkuta. (See TWO WORLDS, July 8, 1955.) Despite total censorship, workers in far-off Leningrad knew of the revolt at once and applauded it.

Day in and day out, for 20 solid years, the Russian worker has been unyielding in his resistance. Had the revolt not been so continuous, the terror would not have been so violent. The millions in forced labor camps are a true measure of the never-ending resistance of the Russian workers to their oppressors.

Wednesday, September 21, 1955

TWO WORLDS

'UNDERGROUND WAYS'

Dorothy, a Negro miner's wife, was showing me an article about the Mau Mau in a magazine. She was very upset, not alone about Kenya, but about conditions in this country. So far as she could see, it is not only the British in Africa where the white man is using every barbaric device to keep himself in power and to perpetuate the slavery of the black man.

"They would do it here, if they could," she said. They do it in the South. They just use underground ways to do it, that's all."

The words, "underground ways," startled me. I looked at her as she continued with her story: "Once in a while it comes out in the open, like the lynching of the Chicago boy down in Mississippi. But I'm not talking about that. I am talking about what the white man does to the black man down there every single day of the year, every year of his life.

"We went to visit our folks down in Alabama this year and we almost got killed. A white woman driver was trying to push us off the road. Though it was a wide, four-lane highway with little traffic on it, she came so close to our car that we would have landed in a ditch if we hadn't stopped the car. My husband wanted to get out and fight, but I said, What's the use? She only has to yell 'rape' or something. They have their sneaky, underground ways."

ON BOTH SIDES OF THE IRON CURTAIN

As I listened to Dorothy, I began to contrast the ease with which she moved from subject to subject, while I had not been able to broach the subject I had come to discuss—a book on Karl Marx, the founder of the modern working class movement.

I was particularly struck by her expression, "underground ways," because a great conspiracy is also afoot on both sides of the Iron Curtain to transform Marxism, the theory of the liberation of the working class, into its complete opposite, a theory of exploitation and tyranny.

The Russian Government, on its side, spends millions trying to pin the label of "Russian Communism" to the doctrine of Karl Marx. The American Government is helping Russia on this side of the Atlantic. In all its laws and propaganda it also deals with the two opposites, Marxism and Russian Communism, as if they were one and the same thing.

Nothing could be further from the truth; but the truth is the last concern of the political leaders on either side of the Iron Curtain.

The struggle for world domination, in which these two poles of world capital are engaged, cannot occur by arms alone. They must try to win the mind of man.

Russia takes incredible care and patience to claim Marxism. Just as the labor bureaucracy in America is always evading the answer how it came to be and, instead, tells you what the CIO was when it challenged the rule of G.M., Ford, U.S. Steel, to change the industrial face of America. So the Russian bureaucrats turn from questions about their present barbarism and tell you how, in 1917, the liberating ideas of Marxism helped the people overthrow Tsarism and establish their own workers' state. But this is 1955, not 1917, and Russia now is the greatest tyranny on earth.

TWISTED TO FIT

Here, the American Government plays its two-faced role. Knowing that the American worker has no use whatever for Russian Communism, it pins that label on Marxism. But it is Marxism towards which the workers are instinctively moving in fighting for new human relations with their fellow men, thus to establish a new society free from exploitation and war.

On the other side of the Atlantic, however, the State Department knows that the people of Western Europe and of the colonial world, totally reject capitalism and the two world wars it has brought them in a single lifetime. Accordingly, for overseas consumption, the State Department publishes pamphlets in which it claims that America is not "really" capitalist any longer, but has gone "beyond capitalism." If anyone uttered such words here, they could easily land in jail.

In all this the American intellectuals, who are not on the Government payroll, are playing a sorry role indeed. Whether as paid or unpaid journalistic hacks, or as scholars issuing weighty tomes with hundreds of pages, called objective studies, they conspire to link the names of Karl Marx with the Communist totalitarian rulers. (For example, see *Socialism In American Life*, two volumes of 1351 pages, published in 1952 by Princeton University.)

It is this conspiracy which is keeping the name and doctrines of Karl Marx hidden from the American workers. That is why the audiences I am speaking to now are most incensed against the "underground ways" which keeps the knowledge of workers' struggles and workers' thinking for the past 100 years, stored away where the people of today cannot see them.

6587

Wednesday, October 5, 1955

TWO WORLDS

TENSIONS IN THE RUSSIAN ARMY

A colleague of mine has written the following:
The constant opposition of the Russian workers against their rulers is to be found in the Russian Army as well. (See TWO WORLDS, Sept. 21, 1955.)

THE PURGE BEGAN IN THE ARMY

Back in 1925, '26 and '27, when Stalin was maneuvering for control and building his apparatus, he paid the closest attention to his support in the Army. By 1927 in particular, thousands of soldiers who had served during the Revolution and the years immediately after were disarmed and kicked out of the army. (It was only after that, in 1928, that Stalin imposed his First Five Year Plan upon Russia.)

From this time on, the Russian rulers imposed a systematic brain-wash on their troops. Soldiers were bribed with special allowances for themselves and their families as against the rest of the workers in civilian life. At the same time, they were held accountable for the loyalty of their families (and vice versa).

This preceded the expulsion of roughly one million members, or one-third, of the Communist Party which, in turn, preceded the first wave of open terror in 1934 and the first executions of Old Bolsheviks in 1935 and 1936.

OFFICERS VS. RANKS

Stalin's new Constitution of 1936, which gave official recognition to the new bureaucracy of planners and administrators, also restored to the Army distinctions of rank which had been abolished by the Revolution.

Fraternization between officers and men, between non-coms and privates, was forcibly discouraged. Any non-com or officer who failed to report the most minor violation was immediately court-martialed. Secret police troops honey-combed every company, so that even the most moderate non-com and officer was ready to "throw the book" at the soldiers in his command. Here is one example out of thousands in that period: Five soldiers were sentenced to years at hard labor for having lost a rusty saw which was worth about three rubles.

In 1937, having built his base so carefully for ten years, Stalin completed his reorganization of the Army. He executed the bulk of the High Command and promoted those officers who had gone all the way with him.

THE BEGINNING OF WORLD WAR II

Nevertheless, when Russia invaded Poland in September 1939 and declared war on Finland two months later, thousands of Russian soldiers deserted. Again the familiar crack-down which can be measured by seemingly simple regulations: by special decree, privates were compelled to salute non-coms as well as officers under threat of court-martial.

When Hitler invaded Russia, thousands and thousands of Russian troops deserted to the enemy despite threats from the rear and scores of battlefield executions. Hitler's brutality, as much as anything, else, discouraged massive desertions after the first year.

As soon as the war was over, plans for reorganizing the Army were put into effect at once. Veterans were demobilized as quickly as possible and subjected to special pressures at home. When the government cut the value of the ruble shortly after the war, among the hardest hit were the veterans.

Replacements for occupation duty were checked with special vigilance. Non-coms and officers were hand-picked and recruits were sent from the most remote agricultural regions of Russia. Fraternization with the people of occupied countries is prohibited on pain of death.

With the beginning of the cold war in 1946, secret police files swelled with reports of soldier unrest. GI's were not only criticizing Army life, they were criticizing such civilian matters as tractor-station administrators and factory managers at home.

In 1950, those discharged from occupation service were ordered back to their collectives where they had to spend six months on probation before they could apply for passes to look for work in the cities.

THE JUNE 17th REVOLT

When the East Germans revolted against the Russians on June 17, 1953, they rocked the Russian High Command. Russian Commanders could not trust their soldiers to open fire against the German workers. Small but significant numbers actually mutinied and were executed. There was a marked rise in the number of courts-martial. At the same time there was a steady stream of desertions to the West.

Since the June Days of 1953, entire units of Russian soldiers, discharged from occupation service, are sent as "volunteers" under military command to forced labor in the frozen agricultural regions. Khrushchev is now trying to put under cultivation.

6588

Wednesday, October 26, 1955

TWO WORLDS

ATTITUDES TO AUTOMATION

The sharp division between the rank and file worker and the labor bureaucrat is seen nowhere so clearly as in the different attitudes each has toward automation. Where the auto worker, for example, deals with it as it affects his daily life. Reuther speaks of the future and "the promise" automation holds for a "vast improvement in living conditions" and "leisure."

AUTO WORKER

"I do not know what he is talking about," one woman worker told me, "I don't have any time to breathe, much less to loll about. The work week at Ford's now is 53 hours and here that man goes around talking about 'leisure.' As for working conditions, they are worse than they have ever been since the CIO first came into being. All automation has meant to us is unemployment and overwork, both at the same time."

MINER

I spoke to the miner who had written in to News & Letters about what the introduction of the continuous miner has meant to him—a loss of 30 pounds in weight caused by the speed-up and tensions of automatic production. He added that that was only half of the story. The other half was safety—you just don't take out the time any more for the right underpinnings and there has been a serious rise in accidents.

The coal operators are trying to divide up the unity of the miners by making "maintenance men" part of management. What has happened with automation is this: The continuous miner needs the constant attention of men while it is in operation in order that the mechanic can be on the spot when the machine breaks down. The maintenance man thus assumes a very key position. He is generally younger, more skilled, better paid and outside of the direct production line. Management hopes thereby to use him to divide up the men in the mine.

Safety concern, however, brought the men together again. Because the continuous miner can work 24 hours a

day, the foreman expected the men to proceed with the work although a death had just occurred in the particular mine. The men told the foreman in no uncertain terms that he could operate these machines if he was so concerned with production. They would go to the funeral. The maintenance man said he would go with the miners: "Human life is cheap enough around here."

YOUNG WORKER

A young worker in Los Angeles was most concerned with this question of human life and the fact that the human being in this day of automation is nothing but a "button pusher." "Work would have to be something totally different," he continued, "What skill do you need? What pride can you have in your work if everything is done electronically and you are there—if you are lucky enough to get the job—just to blow the whistle when the machine breaks down. What about the human being?"

SKILLED WORKER

A skilled worker, on the other hand, could not see automation as a reality. It seems there is very little automatized industry outside of aircraft on the West Coast. Unlike mechanization, automation requires not only new machines but the product itself has to be completely redesigned. Naturally this requires not alone the introduction of new machines. You cannot just superimpose new controls on old assembly lines. Everything, including the end product, has to be newly conceived for mass production electronically controlled.

This worker pointed out all the machinery and factories that would have to be scrapped; that to be fully automatized the investment in capital would need to be so immense because every fraction of a second would count up in the thousands of dollars in the question of production costs.

The whole question of obsolescence of machinery, caused and to be caused by automation is very crucial for this second industrial revolution. The mergers in the auto industry last year are but a slight indication of the strange mergers to come, now that electronics is in a controlling position over all industry. The whole pull is toward centralized control "in the hands of one single capitalist or one single corporation," as Marx put it some 83 years ago. We will return to this subject again.

6589

Friday, November 11, 1955

EUGENE VICTOR DEBS: AMERICAN SOCIALIST

One hundred years ago Eugene Victor Debs, who was to become the greatest American socialist, was born in Terre Haute, Indiana. He became a socialist while he was in prison for having led the great Pullman strike in 1894. As Debs put it, it was the gleam of the bayonets of the Federal troops called out to put down the strike for elementary rights that transformed him from a union organizer into a socialist: "In the gleam of every bayonet and the flash of every rifle the class struggle was revealed. The capitalist class. The working class. The class struggle."

The passionate belief in a new society free of all tyranny, capitalist exploitation and war, led him to oppose the holocaust of the first World War. Once again he found himself in prison, this time for his anti-war views.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, ABOLITIONIST

Eugene Victor Debs was proud of the fact that when he was a young man he chaired a meeting for the Abolitionist leader, Wendell Phillips. Debs was then secretary of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and in that capacity had invited the great orator of the Abolitionist movement to speak to his union. Phillips was then 70 years old, but still in the forefront of every social movement. Just as in the struggle to abolish slavery, he had felt that true freedom could be achieved in the South only if the freed men were made the basis of a new South, so now he felt that only labor itself, white and black, could reconstruct society on totally new, truly human beginnings.

"We affirm as a fundamental principle," read Phillips' full body of faith, "that labor, the creator of wealth is entitled to all it creates."

"Affirming this, we avow ourselves willing to accept the final results of the operation of a principle so radical,—such as the overthrow of the whole profit-making system, the extinction of all monopolies, the abolition of privileged classes, universal education and fraternity, perfect freedom of exchange, and . . . the final obliteration of that foul stigma upon our so-called Christian civilization—the poverty of the masses."

THE ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT

The real mass organization of the population for a profound political purpose, such as the abolition of slavery, involves all the modern problems, including what we now call the problem of worker and intellectual, and what was then concretely the relationship between the revolts and movement of the slaves and the small group of talented

journalists and speakers who headed the Abolitionist movement.

In its own organization the relationship of white to Negro was not what it was outside—the principle and need to abolish slavery. In its own organization that relationship of white to Negro became a relationship, a new relationship, between human beings. For the ex-slave often became a leader of the Abolitionist movement heretofore led by an idealistic white group of intellectuals. Frederick Douglass, Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman are but a few names of escaped slaves who became leaders. In truth, Abolitionism moved from a mere idea to an organization when the white intellectuals surrounded themselves with the bitterly militant ex-slaves.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MEN TO WOMEN

A new relationship of men to women was also first worked out in that movement to abolish slavery. From the first, women were active in the anti-slavery societies. The world anti-slavery movement forbade women's participation and this split the movement. The American Abolitionists not only welcomed their participation but some of them, in turn, became involved in the women's movement for their own rights. Frederick Douglass was among the first to come forward and champion the independent movement of women. It was he who chaired the first meeting of the Women Suffragist Movement when the women still felt they needed a man to chair their meeting.

Finally, take the question of a world outlook. William Lloyd Garrison, the founder and editor of the *Liberator*, from the first made the slogan of his paper, "Our country is the world—our countrymen are mankind."

PAST AND PRESENT

Thus every fundamental modern problem—relationship of white and Negro, new relations of men to women, the uniqueness and the deep-rootedness of the American problem and its world-wide connections—all these were first posed in America on the eve of the Civil War.

For Wendell Phillips Abolitionism was the movement in his time for a new and free society. That is what socialism was for Eugene Victor Debs. Those who today praise Debs for his dedication and struggle in the past, actually besmirch him when they fail to see that the new society for which he fought is not past history but the future still striving to be born.

6590

TWO WORLDS

THE GREAT DIVIDE BETWEEN THINKING & DOING

I have just completed a cross country tour during which I spoke to very different kinds of audiences:

One miner put it this way: "There is a time for praying. We do that on Sundays. There is a time for acting. We took matters in our hands during the Depression, building up our union and seeing that our families did not starve. There is a time for thinking. The time is now. What I want to know is: how and when will the working man—all working men—have such confidence in their own abilities to make a better world that they will not let others do their thinking for them."

That miner felt that the union wasn't much better than the company nowadays. The reason for this is that the rank and file had let "others"—the leadership—do their thinking and write their contracts for them. He pointed out that the change the worker had brought about through his activity, had somehow turned into its opposite. The miners would elect some one to represent them in negotiations with management. Then the first thing anyone knew was that their representative became a labor bureaucrat who turned up in the District Office, not to fight with the workers against the company but to order the workers to produce more. This miner wanted to know: what made the miners stick together in 1943 and tell the senators that if they were so interested in production, they could dig the coal themselves, yet no one tells the same thing to the labor leadership today.

"The working man has a mind of his own," concluded the miner, "so why let others do his thinking for him? If only there was no division between thinking and doing."

THE MOVEMENT FROM PRACTICE TO THEORY

I was thinking how far we had moved from the birth of modern socialism which had pronounced: "The philosophers have interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

The miner said the change the workers brought about had "turned into its opposite." He wanted to make sure, before any more changes were brought about, that there be "no division between thinking and doing." He wanted to know how to bring about a unity of theory and practice from the start.

Naturally I had no answer, ready-made or otherwise. I did tell him that his very desire for a total outlook contained the answer. It was a sign of the maturity of the age that he was dissatisfied with piecemeal answers, whether these concern the pay check or the union organization.

The very fact that there was this movement from prac-

tice to theory imparted an urgency to a new unity of theory and practice. I had only one historical example to point to show that the movement from theory to practice had also dealt with this problem. It was what Lenin did at the outbreak of the first World War. I called it the great divide in Marxism.

THE GREAT DIVIDE IN MARXISM

The holocaust of the first World War had shattered everything, including the very working class organization which was built up to oppose the imperialist war. The name of the organization was the Second International and, though it was millions strong, it folded like a house of cards. Its leadership was Marxist and that was supposed to stand for the unity of the world working class, but each of the national organizations voted to send armies to shoot the other. Thus, the greatest of the parties, The German Social Democracy, voted war credits to the Kaiser and forgot all it taught others about class solidarity.

This transformation of a Marxist organization into its opposite was a much greater shock to Lenin than the fact that, say, the elected representatives of the miners turned into labor bureaucrats. It was not enough to say the Second International betrayed Marxism. As Lenin put it later: No one has yet invented a "sincereometer" to measure one's sincerity. The matter had to be proved objectively, in real life. Lenin began by examining what in his own way of thinking had blinded him to the inevitable betrayal. For that he went back to study the philosophic foundations of Marxism.

Although, since then, the first workers state has, in turn, become transformed into the greatest tyranny on earth, I concluded, we have a lot to learn from the way Lenin met the crisis of his time in the *Philosophic Notebooks*.

LENIN'S PHILOSOPHIC NOTEBOOKS

NEWS & LETTERS has had translated and mimeographed the most important extracts from his *Notebooks*. (See ad on page 1.) I want to urge everyone of our readers to grapple with them. It is not that there is in them any ready-made answers to the problems of the day. Just as there is no assured success to practice, so there is no royal road to knowledge. Nothing is ever gained by man except through labor and struggle and patience. For him who has that patience and grapples with these *Notebooks*, all sorts of new vistas will unfold.

6591

Friday, December 23, 1955

TWO WORLDS

TOWARDS A NEW UNITY OF THEORY AND PRACTICE

In the last issue I spoke of the miner who wanted to see this society changed, but feared that it might once again "turn into its opposite." He had seen too many things "turn into their opposite," such as the labor representatives into labor bureaucrats—form small porkchoppers like the District men to large ones like the Washington men. He felt that only some new unity of theory and practice, unified in the worker himself, would assure the creation of a really new society. The question was: when would the worker gain confidence in his own abilities to stop letting "others" do his thinking for him; and how can the division between thinking and doing stop.

SEARCHING FOR A TOTAL VIEW

This worker was searching for a new philosophy, a total view. I had told him about the great divide in Marxism that had occurred after the outbreak of World War I when official Marxism — a movement of liberation — had changed into its opposite and supported the imperialist war.

It was this which had compelled Lenin to examine the philosophic foundations of Marxism. I asked all our readers to study Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, extracts of which had just been published by NEWS & LETTERS. (See ad on p. 1)

LENIN CONDEMNS "COMMUNLIES"

I now wish to deal with Lenin's Will, written 33 years ago this month. In the Philosophic Notebooks, Lenin was preoccupied with how the old Marxists, known as the Second International, had come to betray the working class. In the Will he was concerned with his own colleagues, leaders of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia in November 1917, who had themselves given birth to a new bureaucracy. There was no more severe critic of the first workers state than this great leader of the revolution. He invented new words to describe what had happened to the Communist Party now that it held power. He said they had all become

vain and that all around were heard "communlies" (Communist lies). He warned that if they did not change drastically, Russia would end up being another kind of capitalism—state capitalism—instead of a socialist society.

BEHIND THE FIGHT BETWEEN STALIN & TROTSKY

These words, spoken in March 1922, to the last Congress of the Russian Communist Party which he attended, were not heeded by his co-leaders. A faction fight broke out between Stalin and Trotsky. Lenin searched for the meaning of that fight and it was under this circumstance that he began his Will in December 1922 and completed it in January 1923.

There is no more amazing document in the annals of politics than this brief, two-page Will. It deals in the concrete with the leaders of the Russian Communist Party in a manner which leaves no division between politics and economics, history and philosophy, theory and practice, revolution and counter-revolution.

Lenin states boldly that, if the dual nature of the Russian state—that of being a state of workers and peasants—is at the root of the dispute between the principal combatants—Trotsky and Stalin—then no force on earth could stop the class division from bringing down the workers' state. Its fall is inevitable. However, the trends implicit in the dispute are not yet a reality. With that in mind, says Lenin, let's take a look at the general staff which made the revolution:

- 1) Stalin. He is "rude and disloyal." That is to say, we have in this social personality the ruthlessness of the outright counter-revolution. He must be removed, says Lenin.
- 2) Trotsky. His "non-Bolshevism," writes Lenin, does not in any detract from the fact that he is "the most able man in the present Central Committee," but he is "far too much attracted by the purely administrative side of affairs." (My emphasis.) In other words, there is here the inner danger in the establishment of planning over the workers.
- 3) Zinoviev and Kamenev. They publicized the date of revolution in the capitalist press, at the very moment when the workers were trying to take power. This was "no accident," Lenin reminds us. That is to say, at every critical moment, they can be expected to do the same.

6592

Friday, January 6, 1956

Yet they all were revolutionaries, revolutionary leaders who, when the energies of million-headed masses smashed the old and created the new, could and did make great contributions to the greatest single fact of world history: The creation of the workers' state.

BUKHARIN AND MARXIAN PHILOSOPHY

What stands out in the rest of the Will is that it was not alone the older men who would look for administrative, instead of human, solutions to complex problems, but the younger men. Take Bukharin:

4) "Bukharin is not only the most valuable and biggest theoretician of the party, but also may legitimately be considered the favorite of the whole party; but his theoretical views can only with the very greatest doubt be regarded as fully Marxian, for there is something scholastic in him (he never learned, and I think never fully understood the dialectic)."

Note that, so far as Lenin is concerned, if you have never understood "the dialectic," or Marxian philosophy, you cannot be regarded as a Marxist though you be "the biggest theoretician of the party."

Heretofore no one has paid attention to this analysis of Bukharin. Heretofore the preoccupation was not with mere theoreticians, but with men of power: Stalin and Trotsky.

LENIN'S WILL SUPPRESSED

Far from removing Stalin, the Russian leadership suppressed Lenin's Will. When Stalin consolidated his power and exiled Trotsky, Trotsky published the Will. But, again, the emphasis was Stalin and Trotsky.

It is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than the fact that even Lenin's closest colleagues had been treating his philosophic concepts as the Marxists before World War I had treated Marxian philosophy—as some accidental 19th century addition to "great economic theories."

Nothing could be further from the truth. Without the new humanism of Marx and later of Lenin, the economic theories of both would be meaningless.

Lenin is summing up, in his Will, a lifetime spent in the revolutionary movement and six years as head of the workers' state. He is saying that only when leaders are closely connected with the working class are they great.

But it is the masses, and only they, that can destroy the old and create the new, while the leaders, be they the greatest of theoreticians and beloved by all, can go astray if they fail to respond to the aspiration of the masses of people at every stage.

A NEW HUMANISM OR STATE CAPITALIST BARBARISM

Worse yet, leaders are not classless creatures, floating between heaven and earth. They are very much earth men. When they lose close connection with the working class, they begin to represent the only other fundamental class in society—the capitalist class.

What was not yet a reality when Lenin wrote this, became a reality very soon when Stalin consolidated his power and introduced the Plan. It is true that even Lenin did not see Stalin as representing an alien class. But he was prophetic in this: He stated that if the differences within the leadership did reflect outright class differences, then nothing could save the workers' state. Nothing. Nothing did. It became transformed into a State Capitalist society.

Now that we are confronted with the reality of Russia as the barbarism that it is, the workers have a right to demand, as the miner did, nothing less than a total outlook, nothing short of the unity of theory and practice within the worker himself.

TWO WORLDS

A LITTLE BIT MAD

I received a letter from a new subscriber named Bea. Bea told me that a neighbor of hers, whom I shall call Rita, had suddenly become "a little bit mad." Bea explained that she was writing to me about it because it was evidently induced by her friend's shock that she, Bea, had subscribed to News & Letters.

It seems that Rita had been a radical once but had never admitted it to Bea until that moment, last week, when she came to visit and saw Bea reading the paper. There and then she became "a little bit mad," suddenly calling Bea "stupid" for not recognizing that the paper was "old stuff, old, radical stuff" and for not realizing that she was "being taken."

The torrent of words was abusive enough against "the leadership" but Rita hadn't pointed to anything concrete that Bea could bite into and she didn't know where it was that she was "being taken."

"NEW" PROGRAMS WITH OLD CONCLUSIONS

Bea's letter goes on to say that her husband had told her about a certain type who is well-known, in the factory, to everyone who has ever so much as attended a trade union meeting. There is always the busybody, the caucus builder, the one with an elaborate "new" program that has but one old conclusion: Vote for me. When and if you do—and he gets into office—he not only is no different from all other bureaucrats, he is positively faceless.

"But," Bea concludes, "I never thought our little back fence chate also contained that type. Where exactly would Rita want to lead me as opposed to where you are 'leading?' She doesn't belong to anything that I know about. It is true she talks a lot about 'personality' and she no doubt has one, but if she ran in any popularity contest, she certainly wouldn't win in her own neighborhood. The main reason I am writing this to you is that perhaps you can tell me something about the why of her bitterness and why is it she thinks that everything in your paper is 'old' but everything she says is 'new?'"

THE BITTER EX-RADICAL

Now I don't know Rita so I cannot tell Bea anything about her as an individual, whether faceless or with a personality. But as a social type, I can truthfully tell Bea a lot. There is no set fixture anywhere in the labor movement more familiar than the ex-radical. The population as a whole seems more familiar with the ex-radical who turns stool pigeon, than with the one who is no turncoat; who

can, in fact, not part with some of the ideas of the labor movement. He will even go to a meeting of the group he once belonged to, as a way of self-expression, to show his "independence." And to prey upon any newcomers who may not yet have found themselves at home in the gulf that seems to separate the perspectives of a new society from the routine of running a meeting.

The totality of the world crisis is such that the ex-radical cannot accept the world as it is. But he knows not how a new one will emerge. As a result, he is as jeripy as a grasshopper. Even his smile distinguishes him from the ordinary citizens of his community: It is the unhappiest in the world as if a bludgeon rather than a human impulse parted those lips.

I know of one such who did not even attend meetings. He expended all his enormous energies in letter writing. He invariably began with great indignation at the stupidities of the ordinary mortal, or the magazine, or whatever it was he was addressing. At the end he said, piously if not modestly, that he was writing on the one subject he knows well, but even if it were something he knows nothing about, etc., etc.

His open admission that he knows nothing about some subject is well-oiled hypocrisy to show that even where he knows nothing and the one he addresses knows everything, he is still the superior man.

"THE FRENZY OF SELF-CONCEIT"

The great German philosopher, Hegel, analyzed the development of this type through the ages and periods of historic development. Types such as Rita, develop from being "an alienated soul," that is, unable to find themselves in the new world, to where the madness between the real and the unreal, send them into "a frenzy of self-conceit."

"The heart-throb for the welfare of mankind passes therefore into the rage of frantic self-conceit, into the fury of consciousness to preserve itself from destruction."

Yet these people exert a vampire-like grip on the few who associate with them and put up with their "self-willed impotence" which they hide in "a giddy whirl of self-perpetuating disorder."

Hegel called this type "the alienated type of mind," who, because he has nothing positive to give, produces a spiritual reign of terror bent as he is in "a rage and fury of destruction."

If dishes didn't fly in Bea's house when she refused to cancel her subscription, then Rita has not yet given her "the full treatment."

6594

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

TWO WORLDS

THE FRENZY OF SELF-CONCEIT

A colleague of mine has written the following:
 "You wrote recently ("Two Worlds," Jan. 31) about the ex-radical who wanders through the world sneering at everything. In a "frenzy of self conceit" he cannot accept the world as it is, but he knows not how a new one will emerge. Above all, he scorns any serious attempt to understand the conflicts and contradictions in this cold-war world, while at the same time he has nothing but contempt for the common man's instincts for a better world.

"There are people I know who fit this bill to a 'T.' They grew up during the dark days of the Depression and, during the 1940's, were full of 'the heart-throb for the welfare of mankind.'

FROM 'HEART THROB' TO CONTEMPT

"Today, they are between 35 and 45. Very sentimental about the idealism of their youth, they are equally positive that it was unrealistic because it glorified the worker who isn't interested in anything but his belly.

"One of these men told me he was working up a catalogue of all different kinds of tensions which can arise: from racial tensions in a mixed neighborhood to strike tension in an industrial community.

"His job was to break down the most complicated situations into the way any given individual is affected. For example, how it affects a prejudiced white or an angry Negro; a Jew or an anti-Semite; a young worker or a middle-aged housewife; a storekeeper or a cop on strike duty, and so on.

DEGRADING MAN TO A COG IN A MACHINE

"Since we know from psychology, he went on, 'how to solve the individual's problems, if we analyze the tensions on an individual basis, we can work out the solutions. By organizing these simple solutions on punch cards, whenever community tension arises we can feed the problem into the machine and come out with the correct answers to restore harmony.'

"He said, 'It's harsh but it's true and as a scientist I have to deal with truth. That old stuff we used to talk about the common man changing the world, was just sentimental childishness. The masses never changed anything. A few of us can do more good than 20 million workers.'

IDEALISM OF YOUTH

"Another one is a professor in a large university and his specialty is 'city planning'. He told me angrily that the

'old stuff about the common man' was a lie when we were young. But he's glad that he was part of the movement of the '30's because all young people need the exaltation of idealism, which has no place in the adult world no matter how much he, personally, misses it.

THE TOP SERGEANTS OF LABOR

"A third, who holds a post in one of the large international unions, assured me that labor relations are so complicated that it takes special training to conduct successful negotiations and that untrained rank-and-filers would only foul things up.

"A fourth is now a business man. Until five years ago he was a UAW committeeman. He said Reuther had grown 'too big' and had moved too far away from the dues payer. He also said he never let any of the men on the line force him to process 'unjustified grievances'.

"Like top sergeants many of us have known, the only one he hated worse than the captain was the enlisted man.

"I could go on for 70 pages describing such people that I have known and still meet. One thing identifies them all: they were heartsick boys during the Depression who suddenly found a goal and a purpose in the unemployed movement and the tremendous sit-down strikes that marked the rise of the CIO.

"The rising labor bureaucracy, working hand in hand with the New Deal, suddenly created openings for them. By one road or another, (some actually went to work in the factory for a few years) they made their way to jobs in the unions and out, as educational directors, public relations counsellors, labor relations men, advisers, consultants and analysts of all kinds. That's all their 'radicalism' turned out to mean.

"Twenty years ago they knew that capitalism was choking the world. Today, by word or deed they're all for 'people's capitalism' which is the State Department's line about what we have in America.

"If they were on the other side of the Iron Curtain they'd be just as strong for Russia's 'peoples' democracy'. Caught in between, they'd be for some kind of popular front between 'peoples' capitalism' and 'peoples' democracy'.

'OLD STUFF'

"If they believed what they said 20 years ago, they don't believe a word of what they say today.

"The one thing they won't do is to keep quiet. They've got to give you their 'honest opinion' which always boils down to this: Everyday men and women, especially the workers, are dumb. The common man has never done anything and can't do anything.

6595

TWO WORLDS

WITHOUT A PAST AND WITHOUT A FUTURE

The 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, which met on February 15, 1956 in Moscow, was the first to be convened since Stalin's death in 1953. It wasted no time in launching a campaign against him. The First Deputy Premier, Anastas Mikoyan, perfunctorily dismissed the heretofore sacred Stalin-History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and asked, "How can you justify our lack of an accepted history of the party for two decades?"

A TRAGIC FARCE

"So the Russians are rewriting history yet once again," I heard one Russian specialist say, "I understand that they now publish their Encyclopaedia in looseleaf form."

These vainglorious bureaucrats, without a past and without a future, rule over a land of 200 million, are armed with the H-bomb and are reaching out for world domination. Let us see what is new and what is old in their latest rewrite of history. The last two decades evidently need "correction." Mikoyan specifies the period to go back "about 20 years."

"ABOUT 20 YEARS"

Lenin died not "about 20 years" ago, but 32 years ago. He left a Will in which he called Stalin "rude and disloyal" and asked that he be "removed from his post of General Secretary."

Instead of removing Stalin, the present leadership collaborated in hiding the Will, which to this day has never been published in Russia. To talk only of "about 20 years" means the bureaucracy is anxious somehow to skip a decade. It is the decade in which they helped Stalin not alone to maintain his post, but to transform it into one of dictatorial power.

Above that struggle for power that followed Lenin's death, was the struggle against the newly-established workers state itself. Indeed, the struggle for power among the bureaucracy was only the reflection of the counter-revolution that took from the Russian workers their rights and freedom, instituted bureaucratic planning. In a word, established a relationship between worker and management that in no essential respect differs from that in Western countries.

"About 20 years" correctly sums up the basis on which they mean to begin their rewrite. No one who had not participated in the counter-revolution, following the death of Lenin, is included. Trotsky is therefore excluded. Indeed, their present establishment of "collective leader-

ship" is only a farcial imitation of Stalin's struggle for power against Trotsky on the basis of a collective leadership against alleged one-man rule. Not only that, with the sole exception of Tito, there is not a living person whom they are "rehabilitating." Not only are those to be "rehabilitated" dead, they are those who, in the first place, made their peace with Stalinism. As for Tito, he has power in his own right, rules over a country which is strategically placed, is flirting with "the West" and the Russian bureaucracy needs him. He is of the same cloth as they.

WHEN TO STRUGGLE FOR WORLD DOMINATION

As we can see, the truth is that the entire "collective leadership" lives by virtue of Stalin's leadership which brought them to power.

It is the only foundation for all exploitation: the rulers continue to sit in the seats of power and rule while the workers continue to slave the harder and produce the more.

This does not mean that there have been no changes initiated at this congress. Tito is one of those changes. Stalin had, in fact, lost power long before he died. Not that any one dared challenge him. But he ceased to represent the bureaucracy which wanted a breathing spell between wars, while he was so drunk with power that he was in a mad rush for world domination the day after World War II concluded. The bureaucracy that dared not challenge his rule openly, "collectively" plotted to hasten his natural death. He no sooner was dead than the Korean war came to a conclusion, on the one hand, and some internal changes occurred within Russia.

Although they "collectively" agreed that Stalin was in their way when he was alive, Stalin was no sooner dead than a new struggle for power began. But by now the regime is too crisis-ridden to dare public trials. That, and not the "collectivity" of leadership, is the reason why Malenkov was not "liquidated" when he lost out to Khrushchev.

Greater and more terrifying than the "myth of Stalin" is the present identification of revolutions with counter-revolutions under the gigantic fraud of an alleged return to Leninism. The only way the present "collective leadership" could follow out the Leninist principle is to remove themselves from power.

If Khrushchev, the heir, is not all that Stalin was, his ambitions and appetites are just as insatiable. It was merely a question of when to fight for world power. History, however, will not give the new pretenders to world rule another period of "about 20 years."

6596

Friday, March 30, 1956

AFTER THE 20TH CONGRESS OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Where Is Russia Going?

Since the recent 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, the capitalist press and spokesmen of the West have been so busy publicizing what the Russian Communists wanted publicized—the destruction of the so-called Stalin myth—that they failed completely to see what is new in the present Russian situation.

The Russian people never believed in the Stalin myth in the first place, or in "the cult of personality," as the present Russian rulers call it.

The millions in forced labor camps testify to more than mere disbelief in the myth of Stalin "the miracle worker." These imprisoned millions are proof of the continuous revolt of the Russian people against the tyrant, Stalin, and against his heirs who are now his detractors.

Contrast the big noise in the press, about the Stalin myth, to the matter-of-fact knowledge of the Russian peasant who, when asked by reporters for the name of his collective farm, answered, "Up to now it was called the Stalin Collective."

THE AGRICULTURAL CRISIS

To the Russian peasant it matters little whether it was Stalin or is Khrushchev; or whether it is Khrushchev alone or Khrushchev plus a dozen other bureaucrats who rule "collectively." What does matter — and what is new, is that the newest Plan demands nothing less than 100 per cent increase in agricultural productivity per person.

Since the Russian peasant has resisted the rate of output set by all previous plans and intends to continue his resistance to totalitarian planning, this new, impossible demand can have but one meaning:

A new move against him that will be more ferocious and more charged with terror than even the forced collectivization of the 1930's.

In the depth of the internal crisis of Russia, can be seen the reality and non-reality of the "collectivity" of the Russian leaders. Khrushchev, the leader, dares not openly stand forth as such. He tries to cover himself against the wrath of the Russian people, first by attempting to divert their anger to the dead Stalin and then, by surrounding himself with the collective approval of the leadership. He does not, for one moment, fool himself about any approval by the Russian people.

WORLD CRISIS AND COLONIAL REVOLTS

What does give Khrushchev his confidence is the world crisis. The Russian masses know the Communist system for the tyranny it is. So does Eastern Europe that has fallen under its domination. But the gigantic Communist bureaucracy has no vested interests in the countries suffering under British and French imperialism. The Asian and African people have also come to know what is attached to the American dollar. It is this which gives

Khrushchev a free hand in demagoguery.

He hopes to reap a rich harvest from the hatred of the colonial peoples against British and French imperialist rule to which American dollar-diplomacy and "brink of war" strategy is tied.

By casting away from himself the name of Stalin, Khrushchev hopes to parade under the unsullied banner of liberation of Marxism.

To counter this, the American Government can think of nothing better than a junket for that "brink of war" strategist Dulles, to be followed by that spokesman for "people's capitalism," labor bureaucrat Walter Reuther. But Reuther is no match for the Russian appeal for a "popular front for peace" which will travel from Nehru's India to Western Europe and back again, not excluding America.

The majority of the world's population live in the oppressed colonial portion of the earth. The Russian bureaucracy has shown how brave they can be with other people's lives, as they were with the lives of the Chinese and Koreans during the Korean war.

Khrushchev can now dream of starting the next world war from the East and enjoying the luxury,

which America has always enjoyed heretofore, of not having the battle fields in his own country.

At the same time, Russian power has grown mighty enough so that its Defense Minister, Eisenhower's "old friend" Zhukov, can threaten America with the "mighty guided missiles" he has at his disposal and can hurl at American cities.

INTERNAL CRISIS IN RUSSIA

If the American capitalists and their State Department have freed Russia's hand, the Russian working class has not.

1) Out of 12 million industrial workers in Russian enterprises, no fewer than 2.8 million left their jobs in 1954.

2) 1.45 million workers in the building industries simply left the building sites altogether. In an attempt to counteract this movement, Bulganin proposed to promise building trades workers that ten per cent of all the living space they construct will be for their own use.

The Russian worker can't strike, but he has managed to resist the labor bureaucracy's demands for continuous and heightened production by labor turnover and slow down on the job.

RESISTANCE OF LABOR

The Russian bureaucrats are now breaking their heads on how to solve the problem of the resistance of labor and the shortage of labor.

Just as, at the end of World War II, the Russian rulers had to grant a general amnesty for all labor offenses, to gain some kind of labor force, now, they hope to gain some more production from labor by promising a shorter working day.

The Russian workers have just been promised a 7-hour day, 6-day week. First of all, this promise doesn't give the Russian worker something "new." He had a 7-hour day before the war which was

never restored to him when the war was over. Secondly, the "new" 42-hour week is not promised as of now, but, presumably, by 1960 when this newest—the sixth—Five Year Plan ends. For now, all the Russian worker got was a reduction of two hours a week. Instead of 48 hours, they now need work only 46 hours.

The joker is in the decree which announced this "new" reduced work-week without pay cut. The decree also states: "Managers are instructed to see to the carrying out of the decree and are also responsible for the unconditional fulfillment of the set assignments for the volume of production."

In a word, the Russian workers are required to produce as much in 46 hours as they did in 48 hours.

That is the favorite underhand trick of wage-cutting in Russia. They don't ever announce a wage cut, but they constantly revise the production norms, always upward.

The latest Plan calls for a 50 per cent increase in labor productivity.

TECHNOLOGY AND MORE TECHNOLOGY

The bureaucracy hopes to overcome the workers' resistance by automation. No private property capitalist has ever dreamed more fantastic dreams of push-button factories without workers, than the present dreams of the Russian state capitalists.

Bulganin laid the basis last summer, when he told the plenary session that "some economic managers have lost their feeling for the new . . . Great harm is caused to technical progress in our country by underestimating the achievements of technology abroad . . . The main thing is not to discover first but to introduce first . . . Industry must be redesigned to provide proper incentive to technical innovation."

'DECENTRALIZING PLANNING'

Some Western writers have been completely confused by the new stress the

Russian rulers have put on "decentralizing planning." Like Ford's present "decentralization plans," it is not to give the worker any voice in production—but to give the director, that is the manufacturer, a freer hand and more power over the workers as to hiring and firing and intimidation to extract more production.

The increase in managerial powers is to be backed up by an increase in the percentage of profits that is at the disposal of the factory director. It was between 15 to 45 per cent. It is now to be no less than 50 per cent and as high as 70 per cent.

The totalitarian rulers place no reliance in the Russian working people. "Specialists," said Premier Bulganin, "are our gold reserves. We are proud of them and we value them." This privileged intelligentsia—the engineers, technicians and speed-demons, whom they call "innovators"—are to be wooed with even higher wages than they already receive, which is no less than 20 times more than the average worker gets.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MINDS OF MEN

The Russian tyranny is the exact opposite, in theory and in practice, of the theory of liberation of Marxism-Leninism. In its gigantic effort to force an identity between the two opposites—Marxism and Russian Communism—it gets its greatest help from the American Administration.

The struggle for the minds of men cannot be won under the banner of "free enterprise." Empty talk about "American democracy" will not do. The majority of the world's population is colored and none is as backward as Eisenhower or Stevenson (that he does not know the truth of the situation in the South, which shows in concentrated form the situation in the North).

Russia is winning battles without fighting only because it can pretend to march under the banner of Marxism. There is no way to "expose" that except through

an appeal to—and the realization of—actual freedom. The only thing that will stay the hand of Russian state capitalism, reaching out for world domination, is the Russian working class in alliance with the working people of the world.

American capitalism hopes to use the American workers' detestation of Russian Communism, in order to keep them from going to Marxism. Their hope is in vain. Marxism is not in Russia. It is in the daily life of people the world over, striving to break out of the chaos of capitalism and war to a new society.

The only thing that American capitalism will have achieved by its attempted identification of Marxism with Communism is to identify itself with Communism as the other pole of world capital striving for world power.

TWO WORLDS

THREE DATELINES

Three events have just taken place which emphasize the gulf between rank and file people, on the one hand, and the labor and government bureaucracies, on the other.

The first event was a meeting in Montgomery, Alabama, where the Negro people decided they will never again ride the buses on a segregated basis.

The second event was a UAW conference in Washington, D.C., which showed that the labor bureaucracy can play the game of politics as well as the Democrat and Republican politicians.

The third was a meeting at the summit—and the summits are so far away from the people it is hard even to remember that it is all taking place on the same planet. This newest "summit" meeting happened in England, which played host to those two totalitarians, Khrushchev and Bulganin. As during Geneva, peace was on everybody's lips while the most devastating preparations for war went on at full speed.

THE BIGGEST LIE OF ALL

The Communist Party frontiers, including the so-called left of the British Labor Party, as well as American liberals (not excluding Alger Hiss) all chorused: "Peace is more possible now than at any time in history."

To "prove" their grand illusion they say that never have weapons been more terrifying. As if that had ever stopped a war! The more terrifying the weapons, the greater the scope of war from national to international dimensions!

There is in fact no greater lie than this peace "theory". It is on a par with mouthing phrases about peace while dropping the atomic bomb on Hiroshima.

The hypocrisy of the labor bureaucrats is on a par with the government bureaucrats, whether on the international or national scenes. In the present conference of the UAW it was a case of double self-exposure.

Being out of power, Democratic hopeful, Stevenson, had nothing to lose when he dangled before the UAW bureaucrats the possibility of a cabinet post: "Who," he asked, "from organized labor speaks at this cabinet meeting now? There have been sitting at the cabinet table three men from one corporation—and no one from the 16 million membership of the AFL-CIO."

While Stevenson was bargaining for the labor vote, Reuther bargained for the Negro vote. "You cannot have labor and Eastland in the same party," he shouted.

When he plays politics, he counts the millions of organized labor as if he had their vote in his hip pocket; but when he himself gets to do anything for the cause of equality, all he can do is shout into the microphone. It is picayune, indeed. A typical example of that is the manner in which UAW Local 600 treated Rosa Parks who precipitated the Montgomery boycott.

Here is the largest union local in the world, numbering some 60,000. The leadership invites Rosa Parks to address the local but keeps it so deep a secret that only 200 show up at the meeting. The rest of the UAW members first heard about it when most of us first heard it—after the event when it was reported in the regular daily press.

How could Mrs. Parks have concluded anything but that just as oppression wears a white face down South, hypocrisy does up North?

THE GREATEST THING OF ALL: SPONTANEOUS ORGANIZATION

In contrast to the hypocrisy of the labor bureaucracy and the big lie of the "peace meetings" at the summit, there was the forceful voice of the Alabama Negroes who have taken the matter of their freedom into their own hands and have never let go in all these months.

Because the spontaneity of the walkout and the organization of their forces to keep up the boycott was a simultaneous action, it is here that we can see what is truly historic and contains our future. Just watch how they have never let anything slip out of their hands since the boycott first started:

1) They have been in continuous session; daily there are small meetings; three times weekly, mass meetings; at all times the new relationships.

2) The decision is always their own. When the Supreme Court handed down its decision against segregated buses and the bus company, hungry for their profits, hung up notices they would obey decisions, the Negroes said: We also asked for Negro bus drivers. To the city fathers, who proclaim segregation as the "Southern way of life," they, as Southerners, said that if they never ride the buses it will be soon enough.

3) The organization of their own transportation, without either boss or political supervision, is a model.

Clearly, the greatest thing of all in this Montgomery spontaneous organization is its own working existence. It should serve as a living lesson to the many who see strikes, revolts and struggles but fail to see a new society emerging out of these struggles.

A SECOND LOOK AT KHRUSHCHEV

It is time to stop repeating truisms about Russia. Of course nothing essential has changed since the death of Stalin. The only thing that distinguishes that regime of state capitalism—which calls itself Communism—from private capitalism—which the feather labor bureaucracy like to call "people's capitalism"—is that side by side with exploitation in the factory there are the forced labor camps.

Of course Nikita Khrushchev, the First Secretary of the Russian Communist Party, who dramatically discarded the Stalin myth, continues to bear astonishing resemblance to Stalin.

The point is: why did he blow up the Stalin myth; and why does he rule Stalin's totalitarian party, not in Stalin's name, but by deflating him?

THE INTERNAL REASONS

It is easy to see why he did so for external reasons.

It is not easy to see what were the internal reasons which compelled the change. It certainly wasn't any illusion that he could pass his tyranny off, as Marxian freedom, to people who live under his totalitarianism.

At the time of Stalin's death I wrote that no tyrant had left his fighting heirs a more pathetic last testament than did Stalin with his "Economic Problems of Socialism."

STILL "IN THE NAME OF STALIN"

This is where Khrushchev came in. He never wanted to be saddled with this last testament of Stalin. He thought he could cinemascope that vision, precisely in his special field—agriculture, by moving away from the total concentration on kolkhozy. Instead he looked to plowing up virgin territories in Siberia and creating agrogorods (agricultural cities), not by the peasants but by turning city youth into farmers. At least he sent them by the thousands into that wilderness hoping that this ideal of agricultural cities would arouse their dynamism and dedication as of old.

Purposeless suffering they would not take. But, if Khrushchev could, "in the name of Marxism-Leninism," create that vision, then the ossified party that Stalin left might yet be recharged and made ready for world conquest. The point was to get undisputed control of the Party leadership in order to embark on this social scheme.

MOVING IN FOR THE KILL

During Malenkov's brief reign of power, the attempt was made to recharge the "atmosphere"—that is to say, overcome the crisis undermining the regime—by embarking on expanded production of consumer goods. That failed. Then Khrushchev moved in for the kill.

Just at Stalin, once he crushed all opposition, came out as theoretician "in the name of Marxism-Leninism," so Khrushchev, now that he had Malenkov demoted, moved in his own name. Where, before, he was scuttling some of Stalin's last policies "in the name of Stalin," he now decided to move head on against the status quo in agriculture which was in the greatest crisis.

He refurbished his 1950 scheme. Only now he sent 150,000 youth into the Siberian wastelands. In Russia the youth are in State Labor Reserves and must go wherever they are ordered.

Khrushchev then came out, openly against Stalin, the tyrant, who had ossified the Party leadership and made them incapable of moving forward. With him he had the army, which had long suffered from Stalin's military strategy. He had no further need of Stalin's ghost to recharge his bureaucratic colleagues. The last service that Stalin could do was to be the scapegoat—provide a reasonable explanation for the sufferings of the Russian people and for the bureaucratic regime's unpreparedness to meet the Nazi attack. Khrushchev now could move for the final revision of party history.

Where it took Stalin more than ten years to consolidate his power, Khrushchev could do it in two short years because no class issues were involved. The counter-revolution, which transformed the early workers state into the greatest tyranny on earth, had already been accomplished by Stalin.

The more total the perversion of Marxism, the more compelling the need to do it "in the name of Marxism-Leninism." That ideology of liberation, however, means something totally different to the Russian people. Under its banner, they overthrew the corrupt autocratic Tsarist regime. They will do as thorough a job on the present totalitarian rulers.

—R. D.

Tuesday, September 18, 1956.

6601

TWO WORLDS

NEGRO STRUGGLE & LABOR BUREAUCRACY

Two kinds of politics face each other down South. One is in the voting booth which has legally perpetuated the White Supremacy South. The other is the living, thinking, acting determination of Negroes for full human rights.

Despite all the power of the state and the economy and the artificially inflated prejudices, the Negro has continued his struggles for full freedom to this point. It has thrown fear into the reactionaries. The voting-booth politics has been backed up by the open counter-revolution in the streets—both in the form of the old Ku Klux Klan and its new "more respectable" face of the White Citizens Council.

THE INDEPENDENT NEGRO STRUGGLE

The independent struggle of the Negro people has never been in the voting booth which is exclusively white.

In the South, it has always been the politics not of voting but of doing. The superiority of the Negro struggle lies in this: their deeds open all the elements of a new society, a new way of life.

By their bus boycotts, they not merely served notice that they will no longer tolerate the status of second class citizens. They showed their talent for organization; their ingenious way of self-activity which, as a people, rose to full dignity; and their ability to run their own lives.

TWO FRONTS

At the moment, the war in the South is proceeding along two fronts: 1) the bus boycotts; and 2) school integration.

The Deep South remains solidly anti-Supreme Court, to the point of voting to transform public schools into private schools to maintain segregation. At the moment, it seems not to face the battle of the streets on school integration. There, nevertheless, is where the battle will be decisive. The battle has just begun.

It is to be noted that precisely in the deep South—Montgomery, Alabama; Tallahassee, Florida—the Negro has displayed the greatest talents and determination not to stop his march to freedom. Everyone knows that except the labor bureaucracy, the self-styled "friend of the Negro."

FROM BOTH SIDES OF THE MOUTH

The labor bureaucracy is busy talking out of both sides of its mouth.

Before the convention of the Democratic Party, Walter Reuther was busy shouting: "You cannot have Labor and the East/sides in one party."

At the convention, he swallowed his tongue—even to the point of not fighting for the mere mention of the "revolutionary" Supreme Court Decision.

Now that the South was satisfied not to repeat its walk-out of 1948 and 1952, he is busy shouting once again that Republicanism means "depression". Therefore, he counsels, the Negro better forget his struggles and line up with labor—in the Democratic Party!

This self-appointed messenger boy for that strange capitalist party fears touching the race question, although it is precisely that which has kept the South unorganized.

Politicking to keep labor and the Negro tied to the capitalist machine, Reuther also fears fighting automation as the workers fight it. To him, unemployment is the necessary price for "progress." He never once asks, much less answers: Whose progress?

THE OPEN TAKING OF SIDES

This is news to no one, of course. It is stated here only in order to contrast it with the very open taking of sides by the "cultured South."

Thus, it is not only the monstrous face of the Ku Klux Klan, or of Governor Talmadge, or of the White Citizens Councils that wants the South as is. "Cultured Southerner" Faulkner is ready to spill Negro blood to maintain that reactionary system.

Robert Penn Warren—the "cultured" author of that "expose" of Huey Long (*All The King's Men*)—is busy counseling "gradualism" and "explaining" the South, although it does not differ in any fundamental way from South Africa's apartheid.

The Negro may have no one to look to but himself at the moment, but it is precisely the strength and sweep of his independent struggles that have brought the whites with him throughout American history from the Abolitionist movement to the early CIO. It will again call forth the rank and file of labor who, on their own are looking for a totally new way of life.

—R. D.

Tuesday, October 2, 1956

TWO WORLDS

LIFE MAGAZINE REWRITES AMERICAN HISTORY

LIFE magazine, the internationally-minded, rabid, Republican, Luce publication, is busy selling the "American way of life" abroad. It is also busy whitewashing "the-Southern-way-of-life" up North.

Having begun to display its "understanding" of white-supremacy South, some time back, with a salvo by that Nobel-prize winner, Faulkner—who announced his readiness to defend the Southern way of life by the spilling of Negro blood—LIFE followed up with a current series of articles called "Background to Segregation."

The background begins way back—some 400 years back—in Africa, where some kings sold some of their own people into slavery. This, according to LIFE, is supposed to shed light on the institution of American slavery. Presumably this also explained the background to today's disgusting resistance to the elementary question of desegregation in schools—100 years after the South lost, militarily, the "War Between the States."

No one in his right sense would have expected a magazine like LIFE to write the true history of the Negro — of the mass revolts against slavery in the South and the mass flights of slaves from the South which finally led to the Civil War.

Nor would one expect LIFE to write the true history of the great Negro Abolitionists like Sojourner Truth, Frederick Douglass, Harriett Tubman, David Walker and countless others who helped mold a nation's mind on the question of slavery.

Even less would one expect an objective account of the achievements of the only true democracy that the South ever attained, through the "black parliaments" during the much-maligned Reconstruction period, or of the present Negro struggles for freedom.

Through LIFE we get only white Southern thoughts on freedom for capitalist North. Planter South knows only the white South and not the true, civilized South of freedom-loving Negro Southerners.

No argument can ever break open the skulls of this degenerate cultural alignment.

The climax of this degeneration is reached by LIFE when it maligns the most glorious page of white American history—that written by the Abolitionists. LIFE labels them "incendiaries" and in the

same breath, finds words of praise for the origin of the Ku Klux Klan! "Many of the Klan's early leaders," writes LIFE, "were men of dignity, ex-Confederate officers."

We do not doubt that the leaders were ex-Confederate officers. But these "men of dignity" were the founders of lynch-law, while the men against whom they moved—the freedmen, the Negroes, ex-slaves—constituted the only constitutional bodies that ever brought the South any democracy and public education.

Nor was it true then, any more than it is true now, that white South was afraid of "mongrelization," in which they were the greatest participants all through slavery.

No, the truth is, it was not the Negro the Southern white feared, but the white.

White man down South fears white man. There is not a man among the "cultured" South who can stand up to the KKK or the White Citizens Councils because none has a single principle for which it is worth fighting.

Courage comes, not out of gentility or thin air, but out of conviction that you are part of and represent the wave of the future—as the Negro struggle for freedom does and the "Southern way of life" does not.

Having lost on the battlefield, but not in the economy, the restriction to freedom now assumed a new form — sharecropping. Thus, the planter South entrenched its way of life by the rope and the faggot of the KKK; the politics of the Eastlands; and now again, mob-rule against the Supreme Court.

If the White Citizens Council can burn crosses in Washington, D. C., on the front lawn of the United States Supreme Court Justices — and the FBI appears helpless—why should not Faulkner of Mississippi or Hodding Carter and "other liberals" fear for their lives, from whites, where the military might of the state supports that Southern-way-of-life?

Oppression has ever worn a white face down South. Now, so does the degeneration of its "culture." So do its Northern friends who are so sophisticated as to travel the world "to sell the American way of life." But the European will not buy. He will not buy because he is stretching his hands to another American, and another South, whose struggles for freedom are heard over the sariil voice of degenerate LIFE.—R. D.

6603

TWO WORLDS

THE ABSENCE OF A MASS LABOR PARTY IN THE U.S.

Although it has no labor party of its own, labor dominates the current election campaign. That is natural since they constitute the majority of the population and this is the time when everyone is out to get "the labor vote."

IT'S FANTASTIC

The labor bureaucracy is busy "getting out the vote" for one of the capitalist parties—the Democratic Party—while the other capitalist party is suddenly showing a hypocritical concern with the rank-and-file's detestation of their labor leadership. From the fact that the trade union heads "cannot deliver the labor vote," the Republicans draw the fantastic conclusion that they will have the labor vote.

The absence of a mass labor party is the fundamental factor in American life. It underlies the politics of the big parties as well as the little groupings, the daily lives of people and the general direction of the nation's development.

There is certainly no stranger phenomenon, anywhere in the world, than the Democratic Party which, since the Depression, has gotten the labor vote. Here is a capitalist party which, within one and the same body, contains the most reactionary element in American life—white supremacy South which is openly boasting of its "contented" (that is to say, non-unionized, underpaid, sweat labor)—and the labor vote of the North. This is due to the absence of a labor party.

It isn't that the workers, during the Depression, left their fate up to the NRA. Quite the contrary. They built their own organization, the CIO. They did that, to the astonishment of the world, in a few short years. But they voted Democratic.

THE REALLY BACKWARD ONES

From this, the small radical groups conclude that the American worker is "politically backward" and tell him, year in and year out, that he "should" build a labor party.

The labor bureaucracy itself, at least in words, has threatened to do just that. For the old radicals, now is always the time to build one. For the labor bureaucracy, now is never the time to build one. Neither of them pay much attention to what the workers themselves are thinking on the subject.

In some respects, the American workers may be at a disadvantage in not having built a labor party. On the other hand, they may also see the advantage of not doing so and thus escaping the stranglehold of the bureaucracy that dominates the mass party in each country that now has one. In England, for example, the worker certainly had much less freedom of action when "its" Labor Party was the Government.

It is true that during the war the labor bureaucracy tried to shackle the workers with a "no strike clause." But the labor bureaucracy here is so weak, that wildcatting went on all the time and, at the end of the war, the workers broke out in the GM general strike.

ONE THING IS CERTAIN

What to do now? No one can tell the workers. One thing is certain and that is the one thing that all forget, be they capitalist leaders or labor leaders; big bureaucrats or little, old radicals or liberals:

The next fundamental political development will come from a new, a deeper layer in the population and not from the so-called most advanced, politicalized workers. It will come spontaneously, from below, and not be a plan handed down from above. That is why what form it will take cannot be known.

It may very well be that the American workers will "skip" this "stage" of traditional mass labor party.

Just remember it was the completely new "raw workers" who formed the CIO and changed the industrial face of America. It was not the AFL which was transformed into the CIO. The CIO grew up out of other roots. Not only that. Even unions like the International Ladies Garment Workers Union which did form part of the organizing committee for industrial unionism, came from the pressure of these unorganized workers.

The people most ready to reorganize society were found not in the union apparatus, nor even in the "leftwing" caucuses but among these "backward" workers.

—R.D.

6604

Tuesday, October 30, 1956

TWO WORLDS

Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary

"Russian soldiers, go home!" has become the central rallying slogan of the Hungarian revolution which broke out on Tuesday, Oct. 23. The student youth seem to have been the ones who sparked this revolt. But there is no doubt whatever that the overwhelming majority of the people are not merely "behind" it, but are creatively and actively participating in this struggle for freedom.

THE WORKING-CLASS METHOD

As in all deep, popular revolts, the Hungarian soldiers have joined the workers who form the leading core of the revolution. A general strike tied up all railroad transport as well as most production. Not only did this working-class method of fighting put its stamp on the revolt, but also it thereby linked itself to the military strategy of the rebellion.

AGAINST 'STALINIST' and 'TITOIST'

What is new in this revolt, the way in which it is distinguished from the Polish revolt, is that this mass revolution is not only struggling against Russian imperialist domination. It is also against its own ruling clique, so-called Stalinist and Titoist alike.

Indeed, there is no fundamental difference between these two brands insofar as the relations with the workers are concerned.

The Hungarian people opposed Imre Nagy's "new" government, in which the only thing that is new is that some anti-Communist, but equally reactionary small capitalists (Smallholders Party) are included in the Central Committee. Small business capitalists and state capitalists are thus leagued with the Russians in trying to put down the mass revolt.

THE FACE OF COUNTER-REVOLUTION

There is not a single word, in all the verbiage about national unity and about getting the Russian troops out of Hungary, that there will be any change in relations at the point of production.

The attempt, on this side of the Iron Curtain, is to whitewash counter-revolution so long as it is not Russian. This is something the Hungarian working people are laying their lives down to stop. It is they who have suffered under the rule of the Five-Year Plans. This is true not only of the so-called Stalinist version of plans. In Tito's Yugoslavia as in Gomulka's Poland as in Khrushchev's Russia, the production plans are directed against the workers.

Thus, for example, the so-called "New Course"—which was initiated after the death of Stalin when

heavy industry targets were revised downwards—did not in any way change the conditions of production. The guiding rule remained "strict labor discipline".

In true state capitalist fashion, Gaspar, chairman of the National Council of the so-called Trade Unions, asked on January 12, 1956 that "educational measures (read: jail sentences) must be taken against violators of work discipline."

Nagy, who was so busy talking about the "old sins", did nothing to change that. In fact, in the midst of the revolution against him, when he was still appealing for "national unity" against Russian occupation, he was already busy telling the Hungarian workers how tough things would be for the "first few months" after "order" has been established.

Revising production targets did nothing to change work "norms" (production quotas). On the contrary, until the actual outbreak, the Hungarian press was full of talk against workers' "complacency" to these targets and, while promising better wages sometime in the future, the Nagys continued to talk of "work competitions" (read: piecework and speedup) as the rule of production.

Stalinist or Titoist managers, even as both Ford and Reuther here, can think of no way of running production except on the backs of the workers.

IT DEFENDS ON THE WORKERS

At the same time, however, we must bear in mind the fact that in the popular revolt, too, there are two major forces. The life of the revolution depends on whether the workers or the middle classes gain the leadership.

The present attempts of the workers to seize oil fields, rail centers, steel factories and means of communication and to run these by revolutionary committees—that is to say, workers control of production—is the true sign that this revolution is attempting a total change. In that alone can lie its true success.

If Russia puts down this revolt by its superior military might, it will learn that no counter-revolution can, for long, still the new forces of revolution that have unfolded.

—R. D.

TWO WORLDS

Death, Freedom & the Disintegration of Communism

Death and starvation stalked the streets of Hungary as the rebel radio sent out its last SOS: "We are quiet. Not afraid. Send the news to the world."

The news to the world about five days of freedom revealed more than courageous fighting.

It showed that you cannot kill the idea of freedom. That idea does not float in heaven. People live by that idea.

Overnight the one-party system disintegrated and various political parties reappeared along with small newspapers and radio stations.

Peasants and soldiers united with city workers—spearheaded by the incredible youth who braved Russian tanks.

Hundreds of local and district organizations, from the Hungarian Revolutionary Youth Party to old parties, including both Smallholders and Social Democrats appeared.

So total was the wrath of the people against Russian Communism, that the Hungarian Communist Party tried to appear in a new guise. The temporary puppet leader, Janos Kadar, reorganized it as the "Socialist Workers Party," but no one took that seriously. Indeed it was the same old communism which, while promising withdrawal of the Russian troops and a different way of living, was conspiring to bring back the Russian tanks and troops in force.

The first news to the world was about five days of freedom from Russian tyranny, and from Hungarian communist barbaric 10,000-man secret police. And now, the news is that the wrath of a people is being stifled by a force of 4,500 Soviet tanks, crack paratroops, MVD storm guards and a quarter of a million Russian infantry!

The massacre of the daring young Freedom Fighters has not, at this moment, crushed the revolt.

After a full week of fighting, the uranium mines have been blown up. The workers are still out on general strike and there is neither transport nor production. The Hungarian people are choosing death rather than accept Russian totalitarianism.

BOTH SIDES ON "THE OTHER SIDE"

Ever since the Russian counter-revolution moved in, the radio on this side of the Iron Curtain has been no better than the one on the other side.

First, they have taken the Russians' word for it that the revolution has been totally crushed.

Then, they announced that there evidently was "sporadic" fighting but, while the continued resistance was brave it was "pitiful."

And now, the whole pack of journalists, led by "the pundit" Walter Lippman—under the pretense of being for "maintaining the peace"—favor the Tito and Gomulka type of Communism rather than the independent, "useless," dying of the Hungarian revolutionaries.

While doing nothing, the Western Big Power leaders are all busily horning in on the deeds of the courageous fighters to glamorize themselves with the blood of the Freedom Fighters.

While the Hungarians are dying by the thousands and asking for action, not for words—everyone, from President Eisenhower through Tito of Yugoslavia, (not to speak of Portugal, which is hardly known for its "democracy"), is big on words and zero on action.

No wonder "the West" cannot possibly become a polarizing force for those who want a totally new way of life and control of production.

THEY WILL NOT DISAPPEAR

The revolutionary forces now unloosed cannot be overcome by sheer force. They may be forced underground but they will not disappear. Nor will their impact be exhausted within the national boundaries of Hungary.

Already, in Western Europe, we see the beginning of the disintegration of the mass Communist Parties. Ever since the end of World War II, the West European people—veering sharply against the private capitalism that they knew and hated because it had brought them two world wars in one lifetime—had turned to Russian Communism, literally by the millions.

They now see Russian Communism as but another name for state capitalism. They are tearing up their Communist Party membership cards by the thousands. (See "Our Life and Times," p. 8.) The question is: Where will they go now that they see both poles of world capital—United States and Russia—striving for world domination? I will take up this question in my next column. For now, we must stress that this tearing up of the C.P. membership cards stands on a par with the Hungarian revolution itself in showing a road to freedom out of the totalitarian stranglehold. R. D.

6606

Tuesday, November 27, 1956



—Wide-World Photo
FREEDOM FIGHTERS BUILD BARRICADES IN BUDAPEST . . . This picture was taken on Sunday, Nov. 4. The Hungarian Revolt was nine days old at the time. It was before the brutal counter-revolution by the Russians. Since then the Hungarian workers have been fighting back with a general strike and courage that sets an example to the world.

TWO WORLDS

Italian Communist Party Faces Revolt Dec. 8

The Italian Communist Party, scheduled to meet on December 8, is facing the first major revolt in its ranks since the end of World War II.

At that time, ten years ago, when the Italian working-class rid itself of Fascism, and moved to establish its own rule, the Communists acted as the brake on that movement. It did so "in the name of" Marxism, the theory of workers' liberation.

It was possible for Russian totalitarianism to usurp that name for two seemingly opposed reasons: 1) Behind it was the might of the Russian State and its army and its money; and 2) America was hated as the victorious imperialist power trying to dominate Europe.

No fewer than two millions poured into the Italian Communist Party. It is the largest Communist Party on this side of the Iron Curtain. It is different from those on the other side of the Iron Curtain which are the ruling parties in the land, like the Republicans and Democrats here. The Italian workers joined it voluntarily in the belief that they would thus overthrow hated capitalism.

An entirely new way out was shown by the Hungarian Revolution. The self-activity of the Hungarian workers and youth showed there is an alternative to Communism and to the imperialistic camp of "Western Democracy."

ROAD TO INDEPENDENT RULE

The road to independent workers' rule overnight shattered the myth of Communism as any equivalent to Marxism and freedom. It shattered, as well, the myth of Western Democracy aiding against Russian totalitarianism.

Thousands have already torn up their Communist Party membership cards. But the Italian Communist Party still has the biggest mass base in Western Europe. All eyes therefore are on the December convention of the Party.

Only fools like our ambassador to Italy, Clare Boothe Luce, can imagine that American "democracy" will have any effect on this convention other than to maintain the Communist Party hold on the workers. The one thing the Italian workers will not accept is the old capitalist order, whether in its fascist or so-called democratic form.

RECRUITER FOR COMMUNISM

The biggest recruiter for Communism was McCarthyism, even as now it is the Voice of America. No one is less popular with the European masses unless it is the American labor bureaucrats who try to help sell "the American way of life" by whitewashing the Taft-Hartley Act as well as discrimination and segregation against Negroes. Such laws remain the most effective weapon the Communists have to keep Italians within their fold.

Added to the Western capitalists and labor bureaucrats, are the so-called vanguard groupings who have broken with "Stalinism" but remain chained to its concept of the backwardness of the working-class itself to achieve the reorganization of society. Hence the dependence on the Party State Plan. Because of this bureaucratic outlook, Trotskyism did not and could not become the polarizing force for workers looking for an alternative to private and state capitalism (Communism).

BANKRUPT RADICAL GROUPS

These groupings have exposed the bankruptcy of their own thought by constantly talking down to the workers, and publishing papers "for" them instead of by them. They have continued to act as a "vanguard," that is, an elite looking down upon those on the "outside." Since those on the "inside" are very few, and those on the "outside" the great majority, they end up in nothing more than a mutual admiration society.

Now that the Hungarian Revolution has shown a new road toward freedom in practice, never was it more necessary to create a new unity of theory and practice in the manner in which Marx in his day had done by creating out of the working-class struggles his theory of liberation.

Never before has there been such need for working-class relations on a world scale, not merely on the basis of what you are against, but on the solid foundation of what you are for. Unless you stand for a society where the working people, to a man, manage production and the state, that is, run their own lives and reorganize society on such new beginnings—yielding neither to capitalists nor to any newly-formed bureaucracy—there will be no independent polarizing force facing the Italian Communist Party which will get the millions to abandon it. —R. D.

Tuesday, December 11, 1956

TWO WORLDS

AUTOMATION AND BRAINWASHING

Automation has cut across the thinking of the people more sharply than anything else since the Industrial Revolution nearly 200 years ago.

At the point of production, automation has compelled two fundamentally different class attitudes, depending on which side of the machine you stand.

WHICH SIDE ARE YOU ON?

If you are the one who operates it, you feel its impact in every bone of your body: you are more sweaty, more tired, more tense and you feel about as useful as a fifth wheel. You are never on top of the machine; the machine is always on top of you and keeps you isolated from your fellow-workers. In addition, you feel more isolated as more and more of your shopmates are displaced by the monster machine.

If, on the other hand, you are the one who drives the men and counts the production for management, you praise the machine to the skies.

This attitude of the capitalists and their agents has acted as a brainwashing of the labor bureaucracy.

Instead of listening to the specific grievances and aspirations of the workers; instead of listening to their complaints against the conditions of labor and new speed-ups; instead of listening when the workers questioned the very kind of labor that would transform man into a cog of a machine and make the machine into "the thinker," the labor bureaucracy counselled the workers to do nothing "against" automation. Thus, when the miners were first confronted with the continuous miner in 1949, John L. Lewis disregarded their general strike and announced instead that the union was for "progress."

The working force in the mines was literally cut in half.

By 1953, automation reached Ford. Reuther told the auto workers to consider "the future" which would bring them a six-hour day, and not to fight against the present unemployment.

Meanwhile, there has been no change in the working day since the workers, through their own struggles over decades, won the eight-hour day at the turn of the century.

BRAINWASHED LABOR LEADERS

The latest result of this brainwashing of the so-called labor leadership can be seen in the way in which they let the professors do their thinking for them. There is not a college, from the University of Michigan to Harvard, that does not have its Technology Project. The labor bureaucracy appears at the conferences to parrot the words of "the educated."

The actual findings of "case studies" are hidden behind the windy words of labor bureaucrat and professor. Take the case that every Detroit auto worker knows only too well—the closing down of the Murray Body Works several years ago. Five thousand workers found themselves with lots of time on their hands and no money in their pockets—they were out of work. The management, however, was "forward looking." They went into another business—bowling alleys. They moved out of Detroit. The 5,000 auto workers remained in Detroit and remained unemployed.

Or, take the cases of those who remain on the job in automated plants. Contrary to the ease that push-button work was supposed to bring about, the workers all say: the more production, the more speed and tension.

Contrary to Reuther's abstractions of every worker an engineer, there is little or no upgrading with automation.

What do the labor bureaucrats and the professors do with all these findings? Well, here are some of the questions they posed:

Mr. Ted F. Silvey, of the National Headquarters Staff of the AFL-CIO, stated that the problems they would have to face with automation are 1) labor scarcity, and 2) he saw that "more and more people will be relieved from that acquisitiveness which drives them to obtain personal property beyond all sensible human needs."

Professor Charles R. Walker, the Director of Research in Technology and Industrial Relations, and the President of the Society for Applied Anthropology which sponsored this conference summed it up by worrying about: "What can we find as substitute for time?" (his own emphasis).

It is clear no torture chambers are needed to brainwash labor bureaucrats and intellectuals. They are too deaf to the concrete demands of the workers, and all too-willing victims of abstractions which help maintain the capitalist system.

R. D.

TWO WORLDS

Hungary and Kenya: Two Fights for Freedom

Freedom has become the most abused word in the language these days. Everyone from Eisenhower to Nixon, Walters and Hartley (co-author of the Taft-Hartley Law) are suddenly "for" the Freedom Fighters in Hungary.

They do nothing to help the Hungarian revolutionaries who are carrying on the fight in Hungary itself. Instead, they pick and choose which of the Hungarian refugees they will allow into the United States, that is, those who would be "good security risks." But they wax poetic over the word, freedom.

TRANSFORMED INTO OPPOSITE

It all goes to show that there is nothing on earth that cannot be transformed into its opposite. When one fights for freedom from Russian rule, you play it big. But when one fights for freedom from British rule, as the people of Kenya have done for much longer than has Hungary, then not only do you not play that up, but you call that freedom fight the "fight of savages."

This was brought out at a lecture I gave and I wish here to report it.

Two young workers were discussing with an older worker the attitudes in their shops to the Hungarian Revolution. One thing they all agreed on was that the effusive sympathy of the Administration, culminating in Vice-President Nixon's trip to Austria, was alienating the American workers' sympathy for the Hungarian refugees.

At the beginning of the revolt against Russian totalitarianism, the same workers were all talking not only about how to help the Hungarians but also how they "should do the same thing here in organizing our own factory committees to do our negotiation instead of the union leadership." Now, the workers are asking, "How does it happen Washington is all for Hungarian refugees getting jobs, but they still use the Taft-Hartley law against us?"

The older worker said: "Let's not mix up the refugees and the Hungarian workers who have remained behind and are carrying on the fight there."

One of the young workers agreed, and said he noted that the Hungarian refugees were either professionals or highly skilled workers. None seemed to be production workers, at least none they showed on TV.

WHY NO 'CARE' PACKAGES TO AFRICA?

"But," he continued, "many of the guys in the shop were right when they said they wouldn't send CARE packages. They were asking, how does it happen that none of these packages were sent to Africa? Look how the people of Kenya have fought the British but all we ever hear of them is that the Africans who want Africa for themselves are 'savages'."

There is no doubt that British brutality, in putting down the Mau Mau, more than matches the Russian brutality against the Hungarian revolutionaries.

There is no doubt that the Administration has its own reasons for allegedly being "for" the Hungarian Revolution. They are certainly against Russia and Russia has given them a golden opportunity to appear as if they were for the Hungarian revolution.

"But America is doing nothing for those who bear the brunt of the whole fight in Hungary itself: the Hungarian Workers' Council. If there were a way to help them," concluded the older worker, "that's where I would send the help."

NEW WAYS OF FIGHTING

The nub of the question is what the workers inside Hungary itself are doing, and how they are doing it.

First, they are fighting in the factories which they are using as their places of refuge. The leaders of the Workers' Councils were arrested only after they left the factory and walked to the Parliament building to negotiate.

Secondly, the workers seem to have worked out new ways of fighting, both on the job and when they walk out on strike.

For example, the miners are refusing to mine coal until the Russian Army leaves Hungary. Nor are they letting anyone else mine the coal "for the workers"

When the Russians tried to take over the running of the mines, the workers threatened to blow up the mines. In fact, they did just that to some uranium mines and blew the whole plan to kingdom come. That the people of Kenya did the same thing to the British plans can be seen from the weakness of the British Empire. Nor has the last word been written to the Administration's pretense of being "for" freedom everywhere—except where they rule. —R.D.

6610

Tuesday, January 8, 1957

TWO WORLDS

Youth and Workers in Present Revolts

One aspect of the report from the South (see page 1) once again discloses how organic to the youth of today is organization and revolt. No one has to teach them that. Quite the contrary. The older generation has much to learn from them. It has much to learn from the youth because there is nothing "technical" about mass organization. Revolt is only the obverse side of organization when that revolt is motivated by the struggle for a totally new way of life.

The vision of totally new human relations dictates the Negroes' method of struggle, their organization, their endurance, their heroism. This, the white South does not have. It is the white South, therefore, not the Negro, which cowers in face of the reactionary White Citizens' Council.

Everyone recognizes 1956 as the year of revolution when the talk is of Hungary. Few see the social revolution going on down South. The Hungarian Revolution is the most dramatic and courageous. At the same time, the struggle of the Southern Negroes—and especially of the Negro youth of Montgomery, Alabama—is undermining the whole monstrous institution of oppression and segregation which the capitalist press so daintily calls "the Southern way of life." This, and not guns, is the true mark of a social revolution.

With or without guns, this social revolution has been undermining the whole world of capitalist crisis and wars by questioning the right of either of the two gigantic poles of world capital—Russia and America—to dominate the world.

In this struggle out of world chaos, the much maligned youth of this generation—whether Hungarian or Southern Negro, Russian or Kenyan—has come to the forefront. Everywhere the youth is in revolt against this corrupt society which is in a perpetual state of warfare, moving from one crisis to another, and balancing the very fate of civilization on the tip of the H-bomb.

1950 marked the first sharp dividing line between the youth of this generation and the so-called "lost generation" that arose after World War I. That "lost generation" took itself as part of the intellectual and administrative bureaucracy trying to order the new generation about.

Contrast the high school youth of 1950. In that year, 30,000 high school youths in New York City burst forth in demonstration for such seem-

ingly trivial matters as sports and extra-curricular activities. They weren't led by any radical group. They led themselves. They hadn't yet undergone the discipline of a factory, and yet in their methods of struggle they used working class forms—mass action.

One point in that demonstration had all the old radical leaders with no one to lead, gasping. It was when the youth had crowded onto the two vast sets of stairs in front of the court houses in Foley Square. The cops were trying to drive them off. Suddenly, the cry "Sit down!" went up and down the steps. In half-a-minute every kid was sitting down.

THE COHESIVENESS OF WORKERS

It was the same sort of action—on a much grander historical scale—that electrified the whole world on October 23, 1956 when the Hungarian youth sparked the revolt against Russian totalitarianism. The weight soon shifted, however—of necessity it had to shift—to the working class.

The working class alone has the cohesiveness and power which comes from being so strategically placed at the point of production as to be able to stop all production. No true social revolution can persevere unless it begins on the factory level and changes the relations at the point of production. It is here that capitalism—which is being undermined from its position astride the backs of the workers, and resting on the division between mental and manual labor—attempts to regain its position by bringing forth a seemingly new weapon against the new society. That seemingly new weapon is intellectual domination.

The important thing about the present revolts, the world over, is that the youth is in the forefront because of the totality of their own opposition to the existing society. This creates in the youth, including the intellectual and middle-class youth, attitudes very similar to those of the working class.

Once the working class takes the leadership and puts its stamp upon the form of struggle, its impulses merge with these impulses from the youth, and the doors are open for every layer of the population (that is, all those not connected in any way with the two state-capitalist societies fighting for world domination) to reorganize society on totally new beginnings. In this respect the struggle has only begun. It will not be complete until a new social order has emerged. —R.D.

6611

Tuesday, January 22, 1957

TWO WORLDS

The Confidence Man In Literature & Life

One hundred years ago the great American writer, Herman Melville, wrote *The Confidence-Man: His Masquerade*. It was a story about a trip down the Mississippi in an old steamer called *Fidelo*, or *Faithful*. Everyone on board was either a con-man or a sucker. Everyone was in the game, trying to get something for nothing or at the next man's expense.

They talked about faith when they believed in nothing. They bragged that no one could fool them when they swallowed every lie. Although there is no violence aboard, it is a tale of horror, the horror that comes from man himself when he is a "man-charmer" as certain East Indians are called snake-charmers." Melville sums it up as "the mystery of human subjectivity." The mystery, however, is dispelled when you look at the objective forces swaying the America of his day, 1856.

America was then four years away from the Civil War that was to tear out the old poison of slavery. But on the surface life went on unchanged and hypocrisy pretended it would never change. The confidence racket was being played for stakes as large as life—the life of the Negro slave. It was this crisis of a nation that transformed the cheap, egotistic, self-centered con-man into "a social type."

IT IS MORE CLEAR TODAY

We can see this clearer today than in Melville's day not only because we look at it with hindsight, but because we too live in a birth-time of history when the great masses have not yet come on the historic stage to decide the form of the new society. The totality of the crisis the world over weighs one down oppressively and makes of us all prey to the braggadocio who now says "Have confidence in me and I will lead you to the new."

This is especially true of Europe where small working-class political groups look doubly impotent by the massive Communist parties they must face daily. Under the circumstances the adventurer who promises to overcome all this by the wave of a thesis has the ear of people who should know better, were it not for the fact that they too are out "to get rich quick." I know one such con-man whom I shall call Jim. In America he posed as the European expert who could bridge the difference between American and European

politics by becoming an American. A decade that added up to zero returned him to Europe where he now poses as the American expert who has yet maintained his European origins and "grasp." But although he breathes the free European air (insofar as civil rights are concerned), he remains incognito. Naturally this social type whom Melville long ago had called "man-charmer as certain East Indians are called snake-charmers" would be swept away the moment the small working class groupings get into the stream of the mass movement. But for the moment he is there to plague small groupings even as American labor bureaucrats are there to prey on the mass movements.

TWO TYPES OF BUREAUCRATS

Two types of American labor bureaucrats swarm over Europe and Asia these days. One is the roving type and the other the stationary, vampire type. Both wear fancy ties and smoke fat cigars and try to sell "the American way of life" as if the American world were one instead of two: that of the capitalists and that of the workers. Reuther is the roving kind. He flies in to deliver a speech at a hand-picked labor congress, rides in a U. S. Army jeep, and talks as the long-lost brother. He returns to America to tell the American workers how much better off they are than the Europeans, not to mention the poverty-ridden Asian masses, after he had just told the latter how much better off they are "free."

Irving Brown is the stationary kind. He is the international representative of the A. F. of L. who lives in Europe, is always there to meet and brief the roving kind of bureaucrat whom he distrusts. It is true the two are as alike as two peas, but the stationary kind has gained the knowledge through bitter experience that he must sell Europe something more genuine than the legend that all Americans are millionaires, and that American workers, despite their constant wildcatting, dutifully follow his "labor leadership." He knows he cannot win the mind of the European masses with mere "anti-Russianism." These people are as much anti-American as anti-Russian for they are fighting for a totally new way of life. In that we see the elements of the new society already present within the old which sweep away once and for all both the con-man preying on small political groups and the vampires of the organized labor movement.

—R. D.

6612

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

TWO WORLDS

The Terrible Split in the Scientist's Personality

The world crisis is so total that it pervades not only the relations of people at the point of production, but in every sphere of society, and none more so than the field of so-called pure science.

There was a time when the field of abstract theory was the most remote ivory tower and the scientist was assured complete privacy and non-interference from the everyday world with its cares. The splitting of the atom in World War II also split the scientist into a dual personality, and tore apart his individual pursuit and the social consequences of his discoveries.

The greatest scientist of this age, the late Albert Einstein, tried to suggest that the Japanese be induced to peace terms, not by destroying their cities and raining death upon the people, but by inviting the Japanese leaders "to watch" the havoc of an A-bomb explosion in mid-ocean or some deserted spot. Needless to say, the military brass paid no attention to him. So far as they were concerned "his field of specialization" was science—not military strategy or politics. Men of smaller stature than Einstein attempted not to think at all rather than face the consequences of their discoveries, as they are put to use (abuse) by the capitalist world.

Recently the American Association for the Advancement of Science attempted to take one step out of its neutral position by recognizing the right of scientists to define their views on their own discoveries. To judge by the immediate hostility of the capitalist press, you would have thought that the scientists were a group of minors, a little on the retarded side. They were reminded that being a good scientist is no sign that his opinion on other subjects would be of any value. Evidently having enough money to own a newspaper and hire writers entitles you to an opinion on every subject and makes you a judge of "true patriotism."

THE CRISIS AMONG THE SCIENTISTS

The greatest stumbling bloc to the scientists' finding out their relationship to society, however, comes not from those outside the field of science, but from the scientists themselves. If the totality of the crisis is so all-pervasive as to take in the field of science, the impact of that crisis, on all intellectuals leading two lives, makes most of them anxious to conform, and

some even willing to commit intellectual prostitution.

Where the pressure upon scientists is such that a Robert Oppenheimer would show his conformity and lecture the youth of this country what a great, "free" exciting field science is, an Edward Teller would whitewash every Administration move, including the exclusion of Oppenheimer from access to scientific data because of his hesitation to give the go-sign for the H-bomb fast enough.

The present so-called father of the H-bomb, Edward Teller, now writes that nuclear attack need not be totally destructive. This scientist has a practical plan which he makes sure does not become a point of agitation among the people by publishing it in the journal, *Air Force*. He states that it is possible to store away two years' supply of food, medicine, and all things that would sustain life when the industrial plants have been blown sky-high if we built, for storage and the saving of lives, thousands of "deep underground shelters that any in the densely populated areas in this country can walk to a shelter within 15 minutes . . . These things will be extremely expensive . . . I am not sure it can be done. But I think there is at least a chance that it might be done."

Needless to say, the practical Mr. Teller has not dared propose that any of the \$72 billion dollar budget be used for building these numerous shelters to avoid total destruction. No, but he is free with the type of advice that sows illusions in the people.

WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE?

If the head of the A-project during the war, Oppenheimer, is not kosher enough to have access to high priority scientific data; if what a Teller tells becomes "the truth"; if you must, to enter the field of science, give up all idea of any privacy in your life and pursue discoveries only in directions acceptable to the Administration; then what precisely is the difference between "democracy" and "totalitarianism?"

Now that science is firmly wedded to war, and the time lag between pure and applied science has gone down from 20 years at the turn of the century to 5 and in some instances 1 or 2 years, then on neither side of the Iron Curtain does there seem to be any room for in-between. No wonder that the scientist himself is split in more ways than the atom itself—R. D.

6613

Tuesday, February 19, 1957

TWO WORLDS

Exclusion of Negroes Warps Mind of Whites

This is the time of the year when many books appear on "The Great Emancipator," Abraham Lincoln. As if the Negroes are not part of this nation, this is also the month of Negro History Week, celebrated almost exclusively by Negroes.

The split of this country into two worlds—white and Negro—warps the mind of the white much more than it does the Negro.

In a small way this warping can be seen in the books on Lincoln. The current crop are as superficial as they have been for nearly a century, because the white historian will not seriously grapple with the life and time and the activity of the Negro people in the era of the Civil War.

It is as if, during that great turning point of history—1861 to 1865—history didn't turn at all. At best, the Second American Revolution is presented as a mere economic development which made this country the great industrial land it is, without in the least remaking, or being remade by live people. Let us turn instead to one of the live people of that critical era, the Negro David Walker. He made history then, and his utterances are more alive today than this month's crop of books on Abraham Lincoln.

DAVID WALKER'S APPEAL

In 1829, so extraordinary a sensation was caused by the appearance of a pamphlet entitled, Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the United States, that legislatures in the South were called into special session to enact laws against free Negroes as against slaves for reading it. They put a price of \$3,000 on the head of its author, David Walker.

David Walker was a free Negro from North Carolina who had settled in Boston where he earned a living by collecting rags. His Appeal was addressed to the free Negroes. He took them to task for their meekness. He urged them to make the cause of the slave their own because the wretchedness of the free Negroes' conditions was due to the existence of slavery.

Walker urged them to make freedom their business. He pointed to the superiority of Negroes, in numbers and in bravery, over the whites. He took the great to task as well—especially Thomas Jefferson. Prophetically, he wrote that race prejudice would yet "root some of you out of the very face of the earth."

50,000 copies of this 76-page pamphlet were sold and circulated from hand to hand. Those who could not read had others read it to them. The South trembled at the simple words of an obscure Negro.

The Cambridge Modern History writes that "the excitement produced by Walker's Appeal had not subsided when the danger of writings of this sort was brought home to the slave-owners by a rising of slaves in Virginia—an outbreak known as 'Nat Turner's Insurrection'."

What the historians fail to see is that it was not "writings of this sort" that produced the revolts, but the revolts that produced the writings. Before Nat Turner and the Appeal, there was Denmark Vesey and the Underground Railway. The revolts of the Negro slaves were in fact one continuous chain of struggle from the moment they were brought to this country in chains of bondage. These slave revolts not only produced the writings, but the actual Civil War.

The Negroes had no money, no press, no vote, no party. They were armed only with their feelings for freedom and the certainty that they were right and could not and would not be kept down.

THE ABOLITIONISTS & TODAY'S HISTORIANS

Out of the genius of America, with no assistance from any alien tradition, there emerged the great Abolitionist movement which combined white and Negro in the cause of freedom.

As Wendell Phillips put it: "We do not play politics; anti-slavery is no half-jest with us; it is a terrible earnest, with life or death, worse than life or death, on the issue. It is no lawsuit, where it matters not to the good feeling of opposing counsels which way the verdict goes, and where advocates can shake hands after the decision as pleasantly as before."

This great American saw more clearly 100 years ago than the intellectual sees today. He saw that even the Civil War would not establish new human relations unless "the blacks (became) the very basis of the effort to regenerate the South. We want the 4 million of blacks—a people instinctively on our side and ready and skilled to work; the only element in the South which belongs to the 19th century."

Until the historian today begins where Wendell Phillips left off he will be unable to understand either the history of his country or its future perspectives.

—R.D.

6614

Tuesday, March 5, 1957

TWO WORLDS

New Passions & New Forces

New passions and forces in the struggle against the labor bureaucracy have come to the fore in the local struggles against the Reutherites. The workers in some Chrysler shops have moved from wildcatting to organized action whereby to challenge the bureaucratic stronghold over their Union. When the Reutherites got wind of the rank and file opposition, they flooded the factories with green leaflets, demanding that the opposition state its "program". For these bureaucrats "program" - writing is easy and they will promise anything. That, the workers know from long experience.

The Rank and File caucus refused to enter into a "program"-writing contest. Instead, they stated what they were against — against the labor bureaucracy's domination over the workers in the union hall as on the production line. Every worker understood and voted accordingly. The rest is history—for the first time in 10 years they swept the election in Local 212. (See News & Letters, 3-5-57).

The Rank & File caucus would not fit any of the old descriptions of "organized action." They had come into existence only a few weeks before the election for delegates to the UAW convention became connected with the proposed dues increase. They hadn't bothered to elect officers until the week of the election itself.

While, individually, one or another on their slate may have been a member of some former opposition caucus, this caucus had no connection with any of the old caucuses from the Trotskyites to that "most loyal opposition" led by Stellato. As for the Communists, for the moment they are supporting Reuther.

Yet new formations in opposition to Reuther could have been discerned during the wildcats in 1955. In our analysis of the new stage of struggle against the labor bureaucracy then, we pointed to the new formations among workers. In one instance it took the nebulous form of merely walking to the back of the hall while the leadership sat on the platform. We wrote: "That is how the hunger for unity of purpose and action, gotten on the picket line, expressed itself." (News & Letters, July 22, 1955).

Where, in 1955, the workers expressed their opposition by staying in the back of the hall, they don't want their leaders on the platform at all now.

The most insistent cry today is: put them back on the production line.

THE WORKERS' NEW CONFIDENCE

The Rank & File caucus not only overwhelmed the labor bureaucrats, they also overwhelmed the old "program"-writing radicals. These would-be leaders, even as the present leaders, come with a "program" that is boundless in its promise but reduces itself to the same old story: follow them. They will lead. They know.

Lest these old radicals be too quick with their conclusion, that if the workers do not follow them, they are "backward," let them ponder over these words of Lenin to a "program"-writer of his day:

"When Skobelev, in a moment of ministerial abandon, threatened to deprive the capitalists of 100% profits, he really offered us in that speech a sample of a phrase calculated to impress. It is just such phrases that are always used to deceive the people in bourgeois parliamentary republics . . . Down with all this fracas of bureaucratic and bourgeois project-mongering . . . The workers must demand the immediate establishment of actual control, to be exercised only by the workers themselves . . . If this is lacking, the rest is sheer deception."

There is no more horrifying proof of this than present-day Russia itself. It is toward such barbarism that the old radicals, along with the American labor bureaucracy, are heading with their attitude toward the workers.

They fail to see what is new: the workers' confidence in themselves. Where old radicals have reduced the question to "program," the workers have reduced it to the decisive question: WHO will control production standards in the factory: workers or labor bureaucrats in cooperation with management? WHO will rule in the Union hall: rank and file workers or the so-called leaders who haven't seen a production line in the last 20 years?

Confidence in themselves is all the workers need in their struggle to win back control of their union. It is the only thing that will win them a say over conditions in the factory. That is the problem today, not only in Local 212, but in the country as a whole and in the world over, if civilization itself is not to come down in a crash because of the misrule of the present rulers. The workers alone can control production and build a new society, and nobody else can.

6615

Tuesday, March 19, 1957

TWO WORLDS

On Both Sides of the Iron Curtain

The latest U. S. Supreme Court ruling against the UAW's participation in political campaigns; the rail-roading through the Indiana legislature of the infamous "Right to Work Law"; the enactment by Southern states of laws to circumvent both the Constitution and the latest rulings to grant the Negroes their civil rights—all are but one chapter in the Administration's move to curtail the American people's rights.

THE METHOD OF MADNESS

Although in 1953 McCarthyism seemed an individual madness, by 1954 it had suddenly and actually become the law of the land. The Communist Control Act claimed to have the outlawing of the Communist Party as its aim, but the use of it has been solidly anti-labor.

For example, it was used against the Montana copper miners who belong to the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, which had been branded by the CIO as Communist dominated, a cry since taken up by Attorney General Brownell. The head of the Subversive Activities Control Board openly admitted that the vote of the Montana copper miners for a union of their own choosing would count for nothing; that what mattered was not the democratic vote of the membership of the union, but the ruling of Attorney General Brownell. After 3 years, the Attorney General is moving again with a petition to re-open hearings against the union before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

For one who has studied Russia as closely as I have, I cannot help but feel that economically and politically the administration is moving in the same direction as the one-party totalitarian state on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

THE ATTORNEYS GENERAL: BROWNELL AND VISHINSKY

Day in and day out the Administration is fighting hard to make this country more and more like Russia. Already it has abolished any serious distinction

between Attorney General Herbert Brownell and Attorney General Andrei Vishinsky of the infamous Moscow Trials.

The Attorney General of Russia could become the sole despotic interpreter of the vicious Russian laws because long before the purges the rights of labor had been taken away and the trade unions had been incorporated as part of the state apparatus, that is to say, they had been destroyed as independent organs of the working people.

This is the aim of the latest Supreme Court ruling against the UAW, even as the use of the Communist Control Act against labor is the aim of Attorney General Brownell. At the same time the South is using it against the NAACP.

A CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

By a stroke of the pen Congress thrust democracy out of the window. The Attorney General's decision has become all-important and the workers' vote has been declared null and void. Yet the Senators and Congressmen had the gall to pronounce this a law against "the Communist conspiracy." In truth, this law is the greatest conspiracy against the American people.

The independent Negro struggle in the South and the rank and file labor revolt in the North will stay the hand of the Administration in its headlong rush to transform this country into a carbon copy of Russian totalitarianism with American names.

Under whatever name, the working people know that the control of every phase of daily living—especially the way workers work in turning the wheels of production—would be a step toward total war and the destruction of civilization as we know it. The aim of the daily struggle is to stop that. This is the one thing the Administration cannot control in its move to make this country like Russia. The American people don't and won't take it. To aim at totalitarian power is one thing. To succeed is another.

—R. D.

6616

Tuesday, April 2, 1957

TWO WORLDS

NEW CRISIS IN RUSSIA

A new internal crisis is brewing in Russia. On March 30, the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party passed an edict for the "decentralization" of Russia's highly centralized, planned economy.

The report of Nikita Khrushchev, spelling out the meaning of this shake-up of the Administration of the State Plan, took up no less than two-thirds of all the leading newspapers' space.

RUSSIAN WORKERS IN CONTINUOUS REVOLT

As usual, the daily press in America sees only the maneuverings on top and is blind to — or deliberate ignores — the revolt of the Russian workers from below which causes the maneuverings on high.

I do not mean to say that the workers want this decentralization. They know that whether the desk of the State-Planner is in Moscow or in the district where the factory is located they will have to work harder. Like Ford's "decentralization plans," the Russian decentralization will not give the worker any voice in production.

No, neither the reorganization on top nor the fact that it was caused by revolt from below is the key to the internal crisis in Russia. What is crucial is that the present decentralization will not stop the revolt from below.

Russian workers cannot strike. Their resistance to exploitation must therefore find other ways to express itself. The most common forms of resistance are continual slowdowns and high labor turnover. So great is the labor turnover in the building industries, for example, that the Plan approved at last year's 20th Congress had to promise building workers that 10 per cent of all they built would be used for their own housing. But when First Deputy Premier Pervukhin reported on the success of the 1956 Plan he had to add that plans for an increase in labor productivity were "underfulfilled in the coal, lumber, machine tools, and building materials industries." And he also had to add that there had been "losses of working-time and uneven work."

THE OLD TUNE: LABOR MUST PRODUCE MORE

Over the years and decades the Russian workers have been in continuous revolt against the State Plan. Millions of them are in forced labor camps as a result.

What is new now is that even among the millions of workers and peasants who are not in forced labor camps, who constitute the normal working force, the slowdowns have reached such a high peak since the 20th Congress (See NEWS & LETTERS March 30, 1956) that the Sixth Five Year Plan has had to be entirely scrapped.

A few months ago it was announced that the "planned rate of increase of economic expansion" had been cut from 11 per cent to 7 per cent. But the new Plan is no more acceptable to the workers than the old one because no less than 80 per cent of the total increase in industrial output in 1957 was "planned" to come from increased labor productivity.

During the past few months both Communist Party paper PRAVDA, and the government paper, IZVESTIA, as well as the so-called union paper, TRUD, have been full of sudden stories about "Violations of Labor Law."

Management is blamed for dismissing workers without cause and trade unions are blamed for being "careless in analyzing worker complaints." While Khrushchev has carried out a campaign to get the lesser bureaucrats away from their desks and "into the fields," management has blamed government for the housing shortage. As one manager put it, "It is rare that housing is ready at same time as factory building . . . (and this) greatly complicates recruiting of workers."

But all the bureaucrats — government, management, and "the intelligentsia" — are united in one thing: to take it out of the hide of the worker.

"Some persons," says the outraged, well-fed, well-housed manager, "take a job only to obtain housing and then leave jobs in search of better circumstances for themselves."

At the head of all the bureaucrats, of course, stands Khrushchev, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and the political boss over all planning, the new "decentralized" kind as well as the "centralized" kind. As usual, it all rests on "raising labor productivity."

The struggle over labor productivity is the class struggle which is tearing at Russian totalitarianism. It will not rest until the workers have finally succeeded in overthrowing it. —R. D.

6617

Tuesday, April 16, 1957

TWO WORLDS

The Shorter Workweek, Productivity & Profits

The mentality of the labor bureaucracy is so completely capitalistic that Reuther transformed the demand for a shorter workweek into a complete abstraction. He couldn't spell out how the Unions would fight for the shorter workweek for the simple reason that he sees labor productivity under capitalism not as the extra sweat of the workers, but, as he put it, "the increased productivity of the tools of production."

I have underlined the word, "tools," because it is precisely what the capitalists and their theoreticians claim as the reason why they are "entitled" to the extra profits from automation and need not "pass it on" to the workers to whom machinery has always meant just two things: speed-up and unemployment.

"THE NEW CONCEPT" AND MARXIAN THEORY

It is not by accident that the present-day bourgeois economists have re-discovered the trick of measuring labor productivity by attributing to the machine, instead of to the laborer, the power of creating profits. They now call this "the new concept," and they openly admit that the inspiration for it is the "profit margin's downward trend."

It is doubtful that many readers of News & Letters go in for reading the big business weeklies that have raised this hue and cry about the decline in profit "margins." And there is indeed no reason to cry for the profiteers, like General Electric, for example, who complain they "only" got a profit margin of 10.4 per cent on \$4 billion sales when in 1950, on only \$2 billion sales, they got as high a profit "margin" (rate) as 18.9 per cent.

DECLINING RATE OF PROFIT

There is no doubt, however, that as great as the mass of profits have been, there has been a decline in the rate of profit when you compare it to the total investment in machinery and payrolls. There is nothing new in this either.

Over 100 years ago Marx showed: (1) that only living labor creates surplus value (profits); (2) that technological revolutions compel the ever-greater investment in machinery, and, relatively, the ever-smaller investment in living labor; and that, therefore, (3) there is a decline in the rate of profit, no matter how great the mass grows with mass production.

"In order to produce the same rate of profit," he wrote, "when the constant capital set in motion by one laborer increases tenfold, the surplus labor time would

have to increase tenfold, and soon the total labor time, and finally the full 24 hours of a day, would not suffice, even if wholly appropriated by capital." From this Marx concluded: "The real barrier of capitalist production is capital itself."

One hundred years ago, even as now, the capitalist theoreticians just laughed at this inherent tendency in capitalism toward collapse. No doubt the present-day "new concept," which, in reality, is as old as capitalism itself, is good for the souls of the capitalists. But it is doing nothing for the "everlasting permanence" of capitalism as is shown by the fact that once again the capitalist theoreticians must face "the profit margin's downward trend."

WHAT KIND OF LABOR AND "TREASON"

Ever since the end of World War II, the workers throughout the world, and especially in America, have raised the question of labor productivity on an entirely different plane. They have repeatedly rebelled against the kind of labor that has produced all these crises and wars. They have shifted the question from one dealing with the fruits of labor—wages—to the kind of labor where the worker is more than an appendage to a machine.

The 1946-1947 series of strikes — from the GM general strike, to the power strike in Pittsburgh, to the GI's demand for a speedy return home—spelled out for the capitalists the concrete matters of control of production and profits, unemployment and shorter workweek.

The capitalists' reactions were brazenly specified in their magazine, BUSINESS WEEK: "We couldn't fight another war without dictating to everyone where to work, what to do, what to get paid for it . . . (and to treat) inclement to strike as 'treason'."

Nor did they leave this simply as a matter for discussion—they enacted into law the Taft-Hartley Act which tries to impose on this country the slave labor law operative in Russia and its satellites. At the same time they began to look for more automatic machinery in order to rid themselves of rebellious labor. Automation was the result.

Tuesday, April 30, 1957

6 6 1 9

LABOR PRODUCTIVITY AND THE SHORTER WORKWEEK

The first year of automation, 1950, did give the capitalists their biggest profits. But we are now back again to the fact that only living labor creates all the profits.

While the capitalist looks at living labor through his own out-of-focus spectacles of profits, his theoreticians face it from the point of view of labor productivity. That has become the hot issue. In 1954 and 1955 labor productivity increased by 4½ per cent. Suddenly, in 1956, there was a sharp drop to a point where labor productivity increased only by 1 to 2½ per cent. Not only that. These figures do not include the non-production workers.

Productivity figures never include non-production workers because only production workers produce all new values. Despite their public propaganda the capitalists are realistic enough about their own concerns. This year, however, that hard fact of life has a special significance.

Spokesmen for management, no less than big labor leaders like Reuther, have been playing up Automation as the new wonder which has created so many jobs, particularly in selling, distributing, servicing — white-collar jobs in general. Now, they have to confront the fact that these non-production workers are such a brake on increase in productivity that they have nearly wiped out any gain in labor productivity this year.

NO CUT IN HOURS FOR 50 YEARS

This truth, however, does not change the fact that it is the production workers who do create the new products and whose sweat creates the extra profit for the capitalist. They have not gained any shortening of the workday since 50 years ago when they first won the 8-hour day. It is these production workers who now want the shorter workweek.

But it is these production workers whom Reuther has subordinated both to the skilled and to the white-collar workers, whom he does not have, and who already work a shorter workweek than the production workers. Until they open his skull to their power, no shorter workweek will be won.—R.D.

TWO WORLDS

"We Need a Clean, Clean Sweep"

(Note: This week I am turning my column over to a letter we received from a Chrysler-Local 212 production worker which shows the tremendous gap that separates the Reutherites from the rank and file.—R.D.)

"Chrysler moving the Stamping Plant to Twinsburg, Ohio, has torn people up from one end to the other. People don't know if to sign up to move, or not to sign up. The Reutherites running this Local 212 say one thing and the company says another and they've got the production workers caught in the middle.

"WE'RE NOT DUMB"

"They think they're dealing with a bunch of dumb people, but we're not dumb. We've in this mess all day, we see it and we know it. We know something's got to be done now about what's going on, for after a while it'll be too late. We're going to have to win this election from the Reutherite green slate if we're to have any chance at all.

"At a Local membership meeting on Sunday, April 28, Pres. Pat Caruso told us not to let the company move dies until they settled these 4 issues: 1) men going to Ohio with the job to carry their full seniority with them; 2) housing projects to be ready in Twinsburg for the men when they got down there; 3) any money the men would lose in moving their homes would have to be met by Chrysler; 4) to bring back the cushion jobs that were lost here at the '57 changeover.

EMPTY PACKAGE

"This was the 'package' he offered and it sounded good over the milk, but the way he doubled his tongue up, when the package came down to us it was empty as usual.

"The following Tuesday, April 30, when we came into the shop the company had posted a bulletin on the clock that they had reached an agreement with the Union, and that we had 14 days to sign up if we wanted to move. Now, it seems they reached an agreement with the International back February 15. We didn't know anything about it the way it was done behind our backs, and we still don't know anything about it the way they're explaining it.

"I know on that same Tuesday, shop committeemen went back to the departments and urged the men to sign up for if they stayed in Detroit they'd be lost.

"How are they going to get the Company to make up what the men lose in moving their homes, if they couldn't even keep the cushion department in '56? And how are they going to make the company bring the cushion department back if they go around telling workers to move or they'll be lost?

"—AND NOTHING DONE ABOUT IT"

"This is how the shop has been going for at least the last 5 years and getting worse every year. Men getting fired and no effort to bring them back. Men walking the streets and nothing done about it. More of us are going to be unemployed and the Union does nothing. There's been plenty of grievances written and nothing done about them.

"The worst began in the '56 model. The Company cut manpower but ran the same production. Their alibi was that they were getting ready for automation. The chief stewards said the same. After automation it was worse. The workers would go to the chief steward—the afternoon chief steward would lay it on the day chief steward, the day chief steward would lay it on this, that and the other. Nothing was done.

"That is why I was heart and soul for the Rank & File at the last delegate election when we swept the green slate out. There was a new feeling of confidence among the production workers in the shop. I will admit that some confidence has been lost in the Rank & File since then because it's a fact that a few opportunists have worked themselves in. But they can't have any idea that they can stand alone without the workers, because they do not have a machine. We don't have to work anywhere as hard to get rid of a couple of bad apples as we would to get rid of the green slate machine if they got back.

"WE CAN GET RID OF THE MACHINE"

"We need a clean, clean sweep, and that is why I am going to vote the Rank & File slate again in the Local elections next week.

"We can get rid of the green slate machine and not let a new one be built. If we rank and file workers in the shop take our Local back, we can make sure that the new slate knows they are nothing without the production workers.

"They will have to give each and every man in the shop EQUAL consideration and work directly with the workers. They must not be allowed to promise one man a better job at another man's expense. They will have to take care of each man's problem as it comes up.

"We know what the problems are because we've been living with them for too long. Now we have got to do something about it and we have got to start with a clean sweep."

—Auto Body Worker

6620

May 14, 1957

TWO WORLDS

Scientists, Civil Rights, War & Peace

The pressure the Administration is putting on the 2,000 scientists who signed the petition calling for an end to H-bomb tests raises the whole question of civil rights in yet a new light.

Heretofore, we have associated the deprivation of civil rights with minority groups, mainly Negroes, and, secondarily, so-called Communist groups. In actuality, the anti-Communist laws are so broadly phrased that they can be, and are, used against labor.

It was also clear, when the Administration moved to deny Oppenheimer access to nuclear data (even data he himself developed), that on the question of "security" no one would be permitted to have any opinion that differed from that of the Administration. Still, his civil rights were not tampered with.

A NEW LOW IN BIGOTRY

Now, however, Senator Eastland—who is a bigoted master of depriving Negroes of their civil rights in the halls of Congress as well as in his home State of Mississippi—asked Dr. Linus Pauling, who circulated the petition against further H-bomb tests, to appear before his Senate Internal Security Committee. The whispering campaign is on that "Communists" are behind this act. (No doubt the same "Communists" who were on that bastion of anti-Communism, Formosa.)

The Administration told Dr. Pauling that he could not circulate the petition on Government property. If, in the process, the scientists' civil rights fell by the wayside, that was the least of the worries of our government bureaucrats. It is clear that there is no difference on either side of the Iron Curtain in the way scientists are expected to toe the narrow and crooked political path of their respective governments.

There is no greater breeder of genuine Russian Communism throughout Western Europe, as well as Asia, than just such actions by the Administration.

Here we have a case of 2,000 scientists—among whom are three Nobel Prize-winners, including Dr. Linus Pauling himself—who are so aroused by the harmful effects of the H-bomb tests, that, despite all pressure put upon them, it took only 2 days to collect these signatures. Nearly half of the signers are not nuclear physicists, but geneticists and biologists, concerned with the health of our nation at peace. Their manifesto naturally speaks of the dangers of man-made radiation, but it is addressed to the governments, not to the people. It asks for an international agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs.

It seems, however, that you cannot tell the truth on any subject whatever without inviting the "Communist" label. Evidently the only true patriots are those who are so hell-bent on war that they would endanger the lives of the nation at peace. Nothing indeed so exposes the hollowness of the peace, which is nothing but an interlude between wars.

BOTH SIDES OF THE IRON CURTAIN

The Russian prototype of Senator Eastland and President Eisenhower is the First Secretary of the Communist Party, Nikita Khrushchev. The excuse that this master of double-talk gives, for not even announcing H-bomb tests, is that Russia is such a vast land compared to the "smallness" of America.

Japan bears witness, however, that radiation fall-out in Siberia endangers the Japanese. There is no doubt at all that it also endangers the lives of the Russian people, but their rulers care as little for them as ours do for us. Both turn a deaf ear to the scientists as well as to the popular protests against these bomb explosions.

That this cannot go on forever, is seen from the fact that Britain did not dare to complete all of its tests.

The British authorities stopped short on the ground that they already gained "enough information" from the 3 explosions they did make. We do not know about the nuclear information thus gained, but we do not doubt at all the information they gained about the people's anti-war feelings.

Therein lies the whole, and only, answer to the mad rush to war on the part of the two state-capitalist giants—Russia and the United States. The working people alone can stop wars.

Capitalism, built on the exploitation of man by man, has brought our world into two world wars in a single lifetime. The fact that the inevitable Third World War seems to put the very survival of civilization into question does not stop this competition for world domination.

A STRUGGLE AGAINST TYRANNY

We live in an age of absolutes—on the threshold of full freedom out of a struggle against total tyranny. The lives of the working people depend not on exploitation of man by man, but on their freedom from capitalist exploitation. This spells a totally new way of life for all of humanity. The scientists will learn that and be among the working people, or they will end up as the scientists in totalitarian lands have ended—being a part of the war machine. The opposition to nuclear tests cannot and should not be divided from the opposition to war. The anti-war feelings of the people, not the international agreements which aren't worth the paper they are written on, is the only path to peace.

—R. D.

June 18, 1957

TUESDAY, JULY 16, 1957

Only Freedom Can Solve The Crisis

(Editors' Note: Because of the timeliness and scope of the following article—which was originally submitted for the "TWO WORLDS" column, page 3—we are printing it, instead, as the lead article for this issue.)

According to late reports, it seems likely that the State Dept. will finally allow American newsmen to travel to China so that the American public may at last receive "first hand" reports about what goes on there.

At the same time, Chiang Kai-Shek, writing from his crisis-torn island of Formosa, has just published a book in America, in which he makes what amounts to a last plea to be restored to power on the Chinese mainland, "in the interests of democracy."

Nothing and no one can whitewash the corruption and oppression of Chiang Kai-Shek's regime. The truth of Communist China's totalitarianism cannot be learned from him nor those who speak for him. But it can be glimpsed from an examination of the conflicts within China itself. It can further be approached by an analysis of what Communist Boss, Mao Tse-Tung, revealed in his speech on "Contradictions," that was released to the world on June 18th.

STATE CAPITALIST

The Chinese Communist regime is a state capitalist society. It was born out of the revolution against the corrupt feudal-capitalistic society under Chiang-Kai-Shek. There is no doubt that when Chiang and his Kuomintang regime were overthrown, a much wider base was created for the new state capitalist regime. Chinese Capitalism was finally stripped of its feudal trappings and its corrupt war lords. Honest or otherwise, however, state capitalism is an exploitative society. Exploitation of man by man has its own consequences.

3 CHARACTERISTICS

The three primary characteristics of this development in China are: (1) Forced labor to build water conservation projects, highways and railways. Forced labor for excavation and construction of defense works, and

timber-telling. This mass labor army was supposed to consist mainly of "counter-revolutionaries." But it was soon clear that there were not enough "bureaucrat capitalists" and "imperialists" to fill the mass labor projects, and the rebellious workers were its actual base.

(2) Under state capitalism, the function of free, or trade unionized labor, is not to increase its material benefits, but to fulfill the production quotas set by the State. Indeed, the Constitution openly boasts that the function of the trade unions is to increase production, raise labor productivity, and achieve the production plans of the State.

(3) Since 80 percent of the work, in a country as under-developed as China,

agriculture, the State must ask for what it calls "voluntary cooperativization." That is to say, instead of outright confiscation of the land from its landlords, or its collectivization, only the land of those landlords who did not cooperate with the Chinese Communist Government was confiscated.

Otherwise, as in industry, so in agriculture, there are private farms as well as State farms, as well as joint private-State farms. The lot of the Chinese peasant is still the bowl of rice, and no more.

'LET FLOWERS BLOOM'

The internal crisis, in this limited state capitalism, has produced dissatisfaction

among all layers of the population, including the intellectuals. The totality of the crisis produced Mao Tse-Tung's sensational speech, which ordered, "Let a Hundred Flowers Bloom, Let a Hundred Schools of Thought Contend."

From this abstract freedom, however, Mao's particular totalitarianism was showing badly. Despite the many "flowers," it seems that one, and only one, party, the Chinese Communist Party, must rule. Mao rejected the two-party system as a bad capitalist plot. It is clear, that the so-called democratic, that is, capitalist, parties can exist only insofar as they do not contend for power by any test of vote, much less of mass strength. Thus, has forced labor produced its own type of forced brain work.

MAO "DISCOVERS" CONTRADICTION

Mao Tse-Tung, ruler of China, Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, and leader of its Army, caused a world sensation with his speech on "Contradictions." The speech was made to a closed session of the Supreme State Conference, on February 27th. It was not released until June 18th, after substantial "editing."

It would seem, from the unofficial version of the speech, which appeared in Poland, that Mao had claimed to be the discoverer of contradictions. He stated that "Marx and Engels did not know about these problems . . . Lenin mentioned

them but did not enlarge upon them."

In the officially released text, Mao toned down the "originality" of his discovery by attributing it to "Marxist philosophy." He magnanimously stated that "Lenin gave a very clear exposition of this law" (of contradiction).

The official text might as well have made him the sole discoverer of the law of contradiction, since there is no doubt whatever, that in the manner in which Mao expounds this law of development, it is neither Marxist nor Leninist. It is revisionist.

Not by accident, there isn't a single mention of the whole philosophy of which contradiction is a part: Dialectics. Marxian dialectical philosophy centers around contradiction as the motive power of development, but it does not stop there. The contradictions of capitalist society are resolved only through the attainment of freedom.

MARXIST—HUMANISM

It is the solution of contradiction which distinguishes Marxism. At one and the same time, Marx took contradiction out of its all-too-general context, concretized it as the law of development of capitalist society, and showed that the class struggle, in overcoming the antagonism between worker and capitalist, will thereby abolish the class structure of society. This specific contribution characterizes Marxian dialectical philosophy, or Humanism, as the theory of liberation.

Mao, on the other hand, trying to pass off Chinese state capitalism as something that is socialist, is compelled to tread along two diversionary paths: (1) the objectively-based antagonism between exploiter and exploited, he transforms, from an antagonistic contradiction, into a contradiction which, "if properly handled, can be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and resolved in a peaceful way;" (2) out of the differences within the capitalist class, he creates a new antagonism

between bad capitalists, whom he calls "bureaucrat capitalists" and "imperialists," and good capitalists, whom he calls "the national bourgeoisie."

To deny that contradictions exist in China, says Mao, "is to fly in the face of objective reality." That most certainly is true, but it is this, precisely, which is the supreme manifestation of the class character of the Chinese regime.

Because he tries to reconcile the restless Chinese masses to the existence of capitalism, Mao has been compelled to re-define everything, including the concept, "the people."

WHO ARE "PEOPLE?"

It seems that the people are not the working people, but all those who accept the Chinese Communist regime, which Mao defines as the leadership of the Communist Party and its Army. That is how he smuggled the capitalists into the concept, "the people." Mao says: "In our country, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie, is a contradiction among the people. The class struggle waged between the two is, by and large, a class struggle within the ranks of the people."

That fits neatly into the concept that the N.A.M., and the Administration, as well as Reuther, in this country, call "a people's capitalism." Just as, what we need to re-define in this country is not capitalism, but the class character of the labor leadership, so what needs re-defining in China is not "the people," but the class nature of Chinese Communism.

CONTRADICTIONS—WITH & WITHOUT MAO

Mao warns: "Certain people in our country were delighted when the Hungarian events took place. They hoped that something similar would happen in China, that thousands upon thousands of people would demonstrate in the streets against the People's Government."

He thinks that by admitting contradictions, which he says is facing up to objective reality to the extent of recognizing limited strikes, he will thereby avoid open revolution. That accounts for his pride in "discovering" the law of contradiction, Mao thinks that the translation of the law of contradiction into Chinese will make everybody happy as if to recognize the crisis is to solve it.

Now, it is not Mao, in the year 1957, who discovered the law of contradiction. Nor is it Marx who did. Marx recreated it from the great bourgeois philosopher, Hegel, who in the period 1807 to 1831 gave this law its most profound interpretation in *The Phenomenology of Mind*, *Science of Logic*, and *The Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*.

What Marx did, that was new, was to show that it summed up the law of capitalist development, all of which he proved in the three volumes of *Capital*. In brief, Marx held that, whereas all class societies developed through contradiction, only under capitalism does it reach the intensity where-by it can be transformed into its opposite — freedom from capitalist wage slavery. Capitalism, he maintained, produces its own gravedigger in the working class.

TRANSFORMATION INTO OPPOSITE

Just as Marx concretized this law for capitalism, so Lenin concretized it for the working class organization itself. At the outbreak of World War I, when the Second (Socialist) International betrayed the working class, Lenin demonstrated that it was due to the fact that a part of the working class had become transformed into its opposite — the aristocracy of labor that profited from the super-profits of imperialism, and thereby undermined the working class nature of the Second International.

In a different historic period—World War II—this is what happened to Communism, which became transformed from its Marxist-liberating base into its opposite, a state capitalist, totalitarian philosophy.

CHINESE & RUSSIAN REVISIONS

Mao admits that, just as under ordinary private capitalism, the basic contradictions in Chinese society "are still those between the relations of production and the productive forces, and between the superstructure and the economic base." This is precisely the Achilles' heel upon which Mao's father superiors — the Russian theoreticians — also fell, when, in 1943, they were compelled to revise Marx's economic theory of value.

No matter by what name it is called, capitalistic relationships, at the point of production, reveal their exploitative nature. Why Russia "chose" to revise Marx's economic theories, and why China "chose" to revise Marx's philosophy, is due both to the totality of the world crisis and to the important industrial differences between the two countries.

Russia has become an important industrial land, a country that possesses values China is a vast underdeveloped land, whose main possession is not the machine, but the human being.

600,000,000 HUMANS

It is precisely this backwardness which has pushed China forward to pose—only to pose but not to solve—its crisis in human terms. Six hundred million human beings will not long be bottled up in contradictions. They are sure to find the true revolutionary solution.

—R.D.

**'Let 100 Flowers Bloom . . .
But Only One Party Rule'**

A reader of my article on China and Mao Tse-Tung's perversion of Marxian philosophy (See: "Only Freedom Can Solve the Crisis," News & Letters, July 16) writes: "I fail to see how you can class Mao's speech on Contradictions as the same species of totalitarianism as Stalin's speeches on monolithism. Where Stalin's word was law, Mao invites disagreement with his proclamation: 'Let 100 flowers bloom. Let 100 schools of thought contend'."

**COMMUNIST DOUBLE-TALK Vs.
TOTALITARIAN REALITY**

I will not take time out to tell the reader what he can hear daily on the radio—how short-lived was this invitation of Mao's and how the official Chinese Communist press has now reversed itself. Claiming that "counter-revolutionaries" were taking advantage of the freedom of the press, the Communists put a stop to it.

Anyone acquainted with Communist double-talk should have been able to foresee this development since the very speech, which allegedly granted freedom to "100 schools of thought," also proclaimed that one Party, and only one Party, the Communist Party, may rule China.

TRANSFORMATION INTO OPPOSITE

There is no doubt that at one time the Chinese Communist Party was a workingmen's party, and that Mao Tse-Tung had been a revolutionary who, for 2 full decades, had fought for the overthrow of the feudal-capitalistic regime of Chiang Kai-Shek. But once the party won power, it was not long before it became transformed into its opposite.

It is not the old moral question of "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." But State power, when it becomes one with economic power at the point of production, of necessity becomes the boss over production. That is what Lenin saw at the birth of Communist State power and he warned his colleagues, the former revolutionaries, against "a passion for bossing." It was in vain—in vain not alone for Stalin, the bureaucrat, but for the whole Russian Communist Party.

The same transformation into opposite—of a one-time working class party becoming the ruling Party which plans production—is taking place in China. The Chinese working people refuse to accept this counterfeit. It is this which compelled Mao to admit that contradictions exist in China. To do otherwise, he says, would be to "fly in the face of reality." That most certainly is true, and, as I pointed out in the last issue, "it is this precisely which is the supreme manifestation of the class character of the Chinese regime."

THE FETISHISM OF ONE-PARTY RULE

The fascists were the first openly to proclaim One-Party rule, but the Communists practiced that before the rise of Nazism. One learned from the other during the Depression which shook the world to its foundations. Thus, to win workers, the fascists named their philosophy "National Socialism." The deceit was only in the name, for no one could mistake the anti-Semitic, anti-union, anti-democratic Nazi writings for anything written by Karl Marx, the founder of modern socialism.

In the case of Russia and China, on the other hand, the whole State power is mobilized to shroud the name and works of Marx in its Communist (more truly state capitalist) vice. That is to say, Communism tries to keep the theory of liberation known as Marxism imprisoned in its own perverse philosophy that State property equals socialism. In truth, it is the State property which has transformed what was once a working class party, the Communist Party, into its complete opposite, the One-Party State Power. Therein lies the whole corruption of Communism, that is to say, the full exploitation of the working class by the totalitarian State power.

THE HAUGHTY VASSAL OF STATE POWER

As a social type, the state capitalist individual who calls himself a Communist has one thing in common with the "self-estranged spirit" that the great German philosopher, Hegel, described. It is his relationship to State-power. "Such a type is the haughty vassal," wrote Hegel. "He is active in the interests of the state power," and thus completes the "inversion of reality and thought, their entire estrangement the one from the other. . . . What is found out in this sphere is that neither the concrete realities, state-power and wealth, nor their determinate conceptions, good and bad, nor the consciousness of good and bad . . . possess real truth; it is found that all these moments are inverted and transmuted the one into the other, and each is the opposite of itself."

This, dear reader who sees a difference between Stalin and Mao, includes both Mao and Stalin. The one thing both failed to see in "contradictions" in "each being the opposite of itself" is that it included them above all. For, just as the supreme manifestation of the capitalistic law of value is the worker paid at minimum, so the supreme manifestation of totalitarianism is the One-Party rule: Mao or Stalin, fascist or Communist.—R.D.

August, 1957

Vol. II, No. 2, Sept. 1957

A Challenge and a Promise

(I have received the following letter from a colleague of mine.)

I have just had one of the most exciting experiences of my life. I had the opportunity, some time ago, to read several draft chapters of *Marxism and Freedom*, and, as you already know, was tremendously impressed with them. But I have just read the complete manuscript, and I can hardly contain my excitement—so powerful is the impact of the book as a whole. (See: "What Kind of Work," page 1.)

COMMUNISM AS A WORLD WIDE PHENOMENON

It is the most devastating exposure of Communism that I have ever read. I was greatly impressed with the chapters on Russia when I first read them. Even in preliminary draft, it was unmistakable that a mammoth job had been done in tracing the step-by-step transformation of Russia from the first workers' state in history into its very opposite—the most barbarous totalitarian regime of the modern world. But not until you have digested the book from beginning to end can you appreciate what a powerful weapon this work is in the fight against Communism, precisely because it does not let the reader go on thinking of Communism as only a "Russian phenomenon."

The warning that permeates it, from beginning to end, is that the state-capitalism of Russia—which culminated in Stalin's (and now Khrushchev's) One-Party State—is, in truth, a world-wide phenomenon: "Let no one think because we took Russia as the supreme example, that America is exempt from this development."

WORKERS' DICTATOR

While Lassalle, the first "workers' dictator," may be an unfamiliar figure before reading this book, after the reading he will be known in his fully developed form not only as the Stalins, but even as the Reuthers and the Lewises. You recognize the Planners, one and all, and the "Planned Society" is seen to be precisely what Marx warned about, as far back as 1844, in these prophetic words: "We should especially avoid establishing society as an abstraction opposed to the individual. The individual IS the social entity."

I cannot tell you how deeply moved I was to see just how simple and yet how profound is the essence of Marxism—its deep Humanism—and to realize that all of history is nothing more nor less than the history of the struggle for freedom!

THE COMMON MAN'S ACTIVITY IS THE MOVING FORCE OF HISTORY

What struck me as the most profound theme in the work is the simple truth that it has indeed been the common man who has made all of history, and who has pushed

the world forward at every critical moment.

The minute you open the book, you are immersed in the dramatic description of the activity of the common people during the French Revolution, and the impact of that activity upon Hegel, the greatest of all philosophers. The tracing of Marx's own development becomes the exciting description of the Paris Commune, the American Civil War, and the struggle for the 8-Hour Day, and their impact on his philosophy.

The powerful history packed into the pages of *Marxism and Freedom*, rarely receives more than a line or two in standard history "texts." This alone would make the book an exciting experience. But it is not the history alone that makes the book so gripping. It is the proof, in that history, that there has never been an idea, even in the mind of a genius like Hegel or Marx, that was not first in the activity of the common man; and the warning that "whoever fails to recognize the limits of a theoretical work, although he may glorify theory and genius, also, in actuality fails to recognize the indispensibility of the theoretician."

A CHALLENGE TO EVERY INTELLECTUAL

This is the challenge to every intellectual today: "If, as a theoretician, one's ears are attuned to the new impulses from the workers, new 'categories' will be created and a new way of thinking, which at one and the same time is a step forward in philosophic cognition and a leap into freedom."

I cannot help but add that if your ears are not attuned, you have the pitiful helplessness that passes for "theory" today but is incapable of answering a single one of the critical problems the world faces—What to do about Automation? About totalitarianism? About the H-bomb? It is no exaggeration to say that these questions must be answered if civilization itself is to survive.

The challenge is nothing more than to match in theory the activity our contemporary common man is writing into the history of our age. That is the history that left me the most breathless of all. From the Freedom Fighters in Hungary to the Montgomery boycotters in America, to the miners' strikes against Automation—you can almost feel the pulse of our age's struggle for freedom.

It is not enough to see the totality of the crisis the world faces. That, everyone can see today. But to see, in the activity of your fellow-men, the affirmative answer to the question, "Can man be free?"—that is almost to see the new society already!

Consciously to be aware that you are standing on the threshold of that, the new, society, that you have a place on that threshold, that you are living in the birth-time of true freedom—that is an experience that defies description.

TWO WORLDS

DJILAS' NEW CLASS

Milovan Djilas, former Vice-President of Yugoslavia, has written a journalistic piece on the Communist system from which he has broken. This has been put between the covers of a book and given a million dollars' worth of free publicity by the "free" capitalist press. Thereupon followed rave notices in all the papers and magazines, including "the leftist" press. It was climaxed by LIFE magazine's claim that here is a book "that will rock Marxism." What astonishes us is not the presumptuousness of this claim, but the naivete of the journalists, book reviewers, editorial writers and State Department type thinking that believes this.

Here is a man who is a typical product of the Communist world — an alleged Marxist theoretician whose ignorance of Marxian theory is matched only by the enormity of the contradictions in his statements. Thus he claims that Marx "unintentionally" (our emphasis) laid the basis for a new conception of the world. Otherwise, says Djilas, Marxian philosophy was so threadbare that it "would have been forgotten—dismissed as something not particularly profound or even original" IF—"if the political needs of the workingclass movement in Europe had not demanded a new ideology complete in itself." That is how it happened that this philosophy which "was not important since it was based mainly on Hegelian and materialistic ideas" became "the ideology of the new, oppressed classes and especially of political movements" and as such "it marked an epoch, first in Europe, and later in Russia and Asia, providing the basis for a new political movement and a new social system."

Having thus cleverly slipped in present-day Communist totalitarianism under the Marxian theory of liberation, Djilas feels that he might be called to account for this sleight of hand, so he says magnanimously, "There is no other type of Marxism or Communism today, and the development of another type is hardly possible."

In this one-half of a sentence, that no other type of Marxism is possible, lies the whole secret for the naive belief that this poor excuse for a book will "rock Marxism." If ever whistling in the dark passed for a method of thought, this is it. Thereby "the West" itself has put the seal of bankruptcy on its own thought.

While hoping that the working people do not find Marxism in its original form of Humanism, what is it that Djilas is passing off as the needed philosophy in his book, *The New Class*? According to Djilas, there is "an immutable law—that each human society and all individuals participating in it strive to increase and perfect production."

This immutable law, to "perfect production," has us all sacrificing for "the cause." At least it has Djilas so much in its grip that he even forgives his present Communist enemies for their tyranny at least up until now since there was no other way to industrialize the backward countries.

Marx had a better name for this "perfect production." It was "production for production's sake" which drove the capitalists on, and they rode the workers so that it all ended in the two monstrosities, concentration and centralization of capital at the one hand, and the degradation of the worker to a cog in the machine at the other.

"It is the fact that capital and its self-expansion," wrote Marx, "appears as the starting and closing point, as the motive and aim of production; that production is merely production for capital and not vice versa, the means of production mere means for an ever expanding system of the life process for the benefit of the society of producers."

The real barrier of capitalist production is capital itself. The ultimate form of this is precisely its state-capitalist form now existing in Russia and Yugoslavia and calling itself Communist.

It is hard to believe that Djilas has chosen jail in order to expound the very philosophy which led to its ultimate form as state capitalism, and toward which the whole private capitalist world is moving. Djilas sheds very little light. The Communist tyranny has been analyzed long before he did it, and more seriously. He fails even to shed the light of experience on it. Indeed the one thing I did look for in this book—a live description of Tito's Yugoslavia—is entirely absent.

What, then, prompted "the West" to give this threadbare book this spectacular send-off? We can see the answer not in what they say, but in the objective world situation. Little Rock, Ark., on the one hand, and the Sputnik, on the other hand, have combined to expose the hollowness of American democracy and the claims of superior technological know-how as well. Vice-President Nixon has been compelled thereby to call off his tour of Western Europe. The world sees U.S. aching for a war with Russia over who will dominate the world. It is true that Russia aims for precisely the same thing, but somehow Russia manages to march under the name of "Marxism" and thus is winning the colonial world. The desperation of "the West" can be seen precisely in this running after "the democratic socialist," the alleged Marxist, Milovan Djilas. They are running in vain. The American worker is not as dumb as they think, and not as helpless as the American intellectual without vision of a truly new society where the free and all-round development of the human being, not of "perfect production," is the sole motive force.—R.D.

OCTOBER 1957

6626

EDITORIALS

Outer Space or Total War?

No sooner had President Eisenhower finished congratulating Russia upon her scientific achievement in being the first to launch a man-made moon into outer space, than he followed it up with threats that America is still ahead in the missile field and will speed up that program further. The daily press also made sure that its praise of Russia was followed up with threats and with calculated means of striking terror into the hearts of the American people by visions of germ warfare from outer space. To calm the fears of "total war" that overly-political scientist, Edward Teller, tells us we should be conditioned for "non-total nuclear war." Say, wipe out only one city and one regiment and be prepared for Russia to do the same to us.

Russia, on its part, is taking full advantage to claim "superiority" in getting to the moon as well as in creating inter-continental missiles. Khrushchev thunders: Western Europe had better know that it could be wiped off the face of this earth in less time than it takes to write a neutral manifesto.

Thus are both poles of world capital — Russia and America — rushing headlong into total war.

The Sputnik had hardly been in space for a day when propaganda of the war profiteers began to stream out in the daily press. They shouted that the workers were "responsible" for the inflation, for the recession, for monopoly, for the fall in the stock market. And they warned that American workers better start to learn, at once, to live on a less "high" standard of living.

The labor bureaucracy at the same time, in the person of Walter Reuther, started to compete with the capitalists in statements about the need for "defense" production. What the workers in the factories want to know is: when will he start defending their interests and better conditions in the shops? As most workers put it the day after the launching of the satellite, "All this means to us is higher taxes and more Automation."

The intellectuals, on the other hand, are so open-mouthed in their admiration for the Russian achievement that they are ready to whitewash all Russian claims of "superiority". They have always been prostrate before the Plan.

There is no reason whatever to panic before the alleged fact that Russia is "ahead" of America. Russian Plans were always based on the ever-greater expansion of machines, and they early found that it is easier to produce a show

subway, an H-bomb, and now the Sputnik, than to raise the standard of living of the Russian workers, or to solve the ever-constant crisis in agriculture.

American capitalists are equally efficient masters of sitting harder upon the workers, and now they are getting the Congressmen to railroad through a whole host of anti-labor legislation.

The Republicans in Congress are now trying to grab the limelight from the Democrats in enacting a new strike breaking law mis-named "Right to Work." The Republicans have a hard job there since at the head of the Democrats in this field sits that headline-grabbing Sen. McClellan, who has for a long time now been using his expose of corruption in unions as the cover for a national "Right to Work"

This man of "law and order" is quick in his defiance of the Supreme Court decision on desegregation, quick to run to the defense of his fellow-Arkansas Democrat—that newly emergent face of fascism, Governor Faubus—and even quicker with statements against the Negro children for exercising their democratic rights.

So total is the crisis in the world and in this country, that it took but a few hours of a man-made satellite circling the earth to raise the curtain and show how Russia and America both are preparing for total war. To show that the labor-haters are also the Negro-baiters. To show that Republicans and Democrats alike are planning a total war against the workers' standard of living, and against the workers' present struggles for better conditions in this country. At the same time, the Sputnik showed how rudderless are our intellectuals, and how prostrate the labor bureaucracy.

The rank and file workers have not yet spoken. But already they are turning against not only total war, but the "non-total" nuclear war that the officious scientist, Edward Teller, is preaching. For the workers alone have both the vision and the power to establish a totally new society with totally new human relations, beginning with new relations at the point of production. That is where all decisions will be made.

News & Letters

Vol. 2, No. 23

October, 1957

Voc. 111 111 111 111

Russia's Internal Crisis

UNREST IN THE RUSSIAN ARMY

Russia's scientific achievement in launching the satellite has all but hidden the manifold crisis in Russia—in agriculture, in industry, among the youth, and especially in the Red Army where a Russian marshal gets 114 times more pay than a private. (In the American Army a 5-star general gets about 15 times more pay than a private).

Nevertheless, during World War II the Red Army soldiers flocked into the Communist Party, and were encouraged to do so. When they reached the capitalist West—even such backward areas as Rumania—the soldiers were surprised to learn of the standard of living and plenty of consumer goods as compared to Russia. They showed their dissatisfaction with the Communist Party and immediately the latter retaliated with a vicious campaign against "bourgeois deviations" in the Army. That was in Stalin's time.

In Khrushchev's time, the restlessness of the demobilized Red Army men—particularly those who had been on occupation duty—was such that he sent thousands of them, by regiments and divisions, into the wilderness of Siberia in his attempt to transform that arid land into a new bread basket to compete with the Ukraine. This year, Khrushchev had to admit that the drought has led to a decrease in the harvest. As for the Red Army men that were sent to put down the Hungarian Revolution, there was too much fraternization between the Hungarian revolutionaries and them to please either Khrushchev or Zhukov.

In a word, it wasn't Zhukov's non-acceptance of the Party's leadership but the rank and file soldier's non-acceptance of the Party leadership that led to Zhukov's dismissal. Making him a scapegoat gave notice to the Army that the Communist Party will not tolerate any revolt.

THE REBELLIOUSNESS OF THE RUSSIAN PEASANTS AND WORKERS

No one's memory is shorter than that of our "Russian experts." One would think that because the scientific achievement of the man-made moon signifies the achievement also of intercontinental missiles that, thereby, all the Russian claims of industrial superiority are justified. Yet, it was only recently that the Russians openly reported that they had to scrap the Sixth Five Year Plan launched with so much hallelujah at their 20th Congress.

That plan was based on nothing short of a 100 per cent rise in agricultural productivity, and a 50 per cent rise in labor productivity in industry. Since then, the revolt in the countryside has been so great that they have returned to a good deal of private capitalistic incentives, abolished the agricultural taxes to the State, from private plots, and launched an unsuccessful campaign to get the farmer into the Communist Party.

The scrapping of the Sixth Five Year Plan was not done lightly. It was the rebelliousness of the Russian workers which compelled this. The Russian leadership has had to 1) pass a minimum wage law; 2) reduce the work week by 2 hours and promise a 7 hour day by 1960; and 3) promise that with the new Fifteen Year Plan which will soon be instituted, first consideration—directly after heavy industry, of course—will be given to housing, in 10 or 12 years Khrushchev thought:

THE REVOLT OF THE RUSSIAN YOUTH

Finally, there are the Russian youth who have been reared in Khrushchev's Communism and want none of it. The Russian papers are full of stories about "hooligans," "delinquent youth and delinquent parents." They are now discussing the new law for exiling "parasites." In the 40th year of its existence, the monstrosity they dare call a "workers' state" is passing a law "On Measures for Intensifying the Struggle Against Anti-Social Parasitic Elements"—"able-bodied citizens who are deliberately avoiding socially useful work and engaging in vagrancy!"

No country in the world has more laws designed to force the youth to labor, military service, ideological conformity. The State Labor Reserves draft youth into labor schools and then force them to work wherever the State sends them "at prevailing rates of wages." Thus, when Khrushchev decided on his scheme "to transform" the Urals, 150,000 youth were sent out there. There is, besides, compulsory universal military service, and of course there is "the Party" or rather the youth leagues. Nevertheless, they have run out of words of abuse against the youth, and have now invented a new word for those they call "cynical, bored youth." It is Nibonicho—neither God nor the devil.

The nibonichos, plus the workers, plus the peasants, plus the Red Army soldiers, make up the majority of the Russian people who are in continuous revolt against the One Party Totalitarian State. But we have our eyes turned skyward and fail to see this great human force for freedom.

NOVEMBER, 1957

TWO WORLDS

An American in Paris

One of my colleagues has written the following:

"A friend of mine returned from Europe last month and told me about an old college mate of ours. Let's call him Joe. Since Little Rock and Sputnik I, he wanders unhappily around Paris on the verge of a breakdown. He is stunned by the polite sneers he now receives in circles where, until recently, he was a welcome guest. Even his American friends have begun to avoid him because he keeps begging them to help him decide whether or not to return to the United States for psychoanalysis. He's terrified that war will cut his "cure" short if he begins it in Europe.

BIOGRAPHY OF AN INTELLECTUAL HACK

"Joe was a bright pupil in grammar school. He entered high school in 1932, a terrible year for the family. That year, his father didn't work at all and finally had to go on relief for several months. But nothing was allowed to interfere with Joe's education. He was an honor student in high school, where he was attracted to the Young Communist League, although he never joined.

"Joe entered the College of the City of New York in 1936. That was also the year when the murderous Moscow Trials shocked the world and marked the beginning of his opposition to Communists as the enemies of democracy. He thereupon drifted to the anti-Communist radical youth at City College.

"He was preoccupied with the problem of poverty and unemployment in this land of plenty. He worked out all kinds of plans for the national organization of wealth so there would be plenty for all. He opposed private capitalism in the United States and American imperialism abroad. He detested the AFL craft unions and argued passionately for the organization of the backward, oppressed, unskilled workers in the new CIO. He decided then that he would be a writer or educator for the organized labor movement.

"He attended meetings of the Trotskyist, Socialist and Lovestonette youth. All showered him with great attention, hoping to recruit him, but he never joined. He said he agreed with all on certain points and disagreed with all on others. In this climate, Joe's sympathy for the working class reached its highest point.

THE LURE OF "CONTACTS"

"He graduated with honors in 1940 and got a civil service job as a clerk in Washington, D. C. For the first time in his life he actually met a number of political, labor and literary personalities. He decided that contacts were

essential to his career.

"Shortly after he was drafted, in 1943, he was assigned—with the aid of a contact—to a military research project. Except for his uniform, which he enjoyed wearing, his life continued in its usual pattern. After V-E Day, he longed for the excitement of Europe and wangled himself an administrative assignment in France, where he learned to speak French fluently. The world was his, until he was discharged late in 1946 and had to return home and find a job. Radicalism, he decided, was fine for a young student youth—it trained him in disciplined activity. But an adult had to be realistic. Anyway, the common man no longer figured in his mind as a positive force in today's streamlined cold-war world. Only the liberal minded public figure, he argued hotly, could engineer deals to ease the crisis. Irresponsible actions, like wildcats, angered him as the sure way to throw the country into the arms of the reactionaries or the Communists.

DEATH OF A SALESMAN

"He became a busy little public relations man for national liberal groups, and he met all the big shots. With the Korean War he maneuvered himself into another overseas assignment, again in France, where he felt most at home and where he has lived since.

"With the blessings of the State Department, and the direct and indirect support of the Ford Foundation and the AFL, he established himself as a social lion in the intellectual circles of Paris with frequent trips to England, Germany, Italy and Austria as well.

"Through the intellectuals he hoped to sell American capitalism to the European labor movement. After a while he became one of the most ardent salesmen for the American Way as expressed by Reuther's "Peoples' Capitalism,"—a line that didn't last very long.

"In his youth, this intellectual hack made a career of never quite becoming a Marxist. As an adult, he made a much better career out of the fact that in the past he almost became one. But the crisis moved too fast and, in the global struggle for the minds of men he lost his own.

"He indignantly denounces Russia's barbaric suppression of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. The European intellectuals agree and point angrily to America's failure to help them; and then, in horror, they point to Little Rock; in derision, to Sputnik; and in fear, to Russia's IRBM. Joe has nothing to sell except an anti-Communism that is hardly better than Communism, and he's caught in the cross-fire with no place to hide."

December, 1957

TWO WORLDS

Dr. Von Braun, Hitler's V-2 rocket chief and presently America's missile expert, found it necessary to lecture to the American people upon the fact that the successful launching of an American satellite into outer space should not act as "a sedative to lull us back into complacency."

It was not complacency, however, which tempered American enthusiasm over the Explorer's being in orbit. What tempered the enthusiasm was the sober realization of the total destructiveness of the weapons now in the hands of both America and Russia. It is sufficient to wipe civilization as we have known it off the face of the earth. The relief expressed when Russia broke the American monopoly of the atom bomb in 1949 was not repeated when America broke Russia's monopoly of outer space in 1958 because the illusion is now gone that the world powers both having the same weapons will produce a stalemate. No one now thinks that ICBM's and IRBM's are "deterrents" to war.

POINT OF NO RETURN

Despite appearances to the contrary, however, the point of no return is not the sputnik, but the complete bankruptcy of thought on both sides of the Iron Curtain which leads to such total reliance on weapons of war. Nothing makes this so clear as the attitude to the youth's rebellious spirit, desire for peace, and quest for a totally new way of life.

While the American military were urging the scientists "to catch up" with the sputnik, the Russian people were becoming so restive in the factory, on the countryside, and in the classroom that the totalitarian rulers, at one and the same time, tried to appease them and continue to terrorize them. This dual approach is clearest of all in their attitude to the youth.

RUSSIAN YOUTH IN REVOLT

On the one hand, the Kremlin bureaucracy is passing new laws against "parasitism," "hooliganism," and "nihilism" (read: spirit of rebellion). On the other hand, these same monolithic bureaucrats are trying the kid glove approach to alleged deviations on the cultural front. Recently they decided "to reorganize" the magazine of the youth movement, Komsomol, (Young Guard). That is to say, they fired the editors and put the youth organ under strict Party discipline. It was not Pravda that led the attack, but the Literaturnaya Gazetta (Literary Journal).

The attack on "nihilistic tendencies" among the youth had all the ear marks of the 1948 Stalinist attack on "cosmopolitanism." Behind each lurked anti-Semitism. Or,

more precisely, the attempt to get a foothold in Arab Middle-East, which, in the preparations for World War III is playing the same role that the Balkans played for World War I.

Anti-Semitism appears also in the suddenly unleashed campaign against Howard Fast, the American writer who faithfully followed the Communist Party line for two decades, but who last year broke with it. Literaturnaya Gazetta now claims that "in essence" Fast "had never been a member of the Party," that his break with Communism was due to his wanting to make peace with American imperialism and "America's love of Israel."

It is not Fast's alleged Zionism that is at the root of the Russian attack on him. The truth is that the student youth, like the working class youth, is very restive. While Russia used to good propaganda advantage the fact that the American State Department did not wish to grant American youth the right to travel in China, Russia itself never lets Russian youth travel anywhere freely. Despite that, the outlook of Russian youth is not narrowly Russian but is concerned with world problems. It is this which they want to channelize into "concern" with the Middle East. Their Arab calling card is anti-Israel. Into this they now wish to throw youth, coupling it with attacks on American writers who have broken with Communism, and all the while calling loudly for a summit conference "for peace."

BACK TO THE SPUTNIK AND WAR

The Russian rulers know that Israel is a fact whereas Zionism is an ideology which many Jews do not follow. Indeed, the biggest party in Israel is the Mapai, a sort of labor socialist party. The pretense, that anyone, including American writers, is a "Zionist" and a "militant one" at that, when he balks at the crude and subtle anti-Semitism once again rampant in Russia, is on a par with Von Braun's mistaking the sober facing of the fact of ICBM's for "complacency."

The truth is that the American people in the throes of recession, fear the choice of war as the way out of full-scale depression, even as the Russian people fear that their own "madmen" will be the first to press that war button.

On both sides of the Iron Curtain, the real question that preoccupies the people is: now that the sputnik has an American fellow-traveler in outer space, what happens to the struggle of the people on this earth for a new way of life free from exploitation and discrimination? —B. D.

January 31, 1958

6630

TWO WORLDS

UNEMPLOYMENT AND ORGANIZATIONS TO FIGHT IT

The present unemployment situation has everyone from Eisenhower to the Sunday preacher talking about it. But no one is doing anything about it. A look at the organizational forms which the last depression produced may have some value for us today, if only to reject the old forms and create entirely new ones. It is for this reason that I am turning the pages of history back to the 1930's.

The last depression gave rise to a number of small political parties, the chief of which was the American Workers Party (AWP), officially formed in 1933. Actually, it had existed from 1928 when it was called the Conference for Progressive Labor Action (CPLA). It was formed originally to defend Brookwood Labor College from attacks by the AF of L that the college was harboring Communists. The actual reason for the attack was that the college taught industrial unionism. The chairman of the college, the CPLA and the AWP was A. J. Muste.

In 1931, they launched the great organizing strike in Paterson, N.J. They were in the forefront of the campaign to organize the West Virginia Mine Workers Union as well as the Illinois miners in 1932. They soon found themselves at the head of some 10,000 unemployed in the Midwest. They organized Unemployed Leagues in opposition to the Unemployed Councils organized by the Communist Party.

In 1934 a strike against Auto-Lite broke out in Toledo, Ohio. An AF of L local called the strike, but it soon became obvious it was impossible for it alone to fight all the forces of capital and the police arrayed against it. The local called upon the Musteite Unemployed Leagues for help on the picket line. When the organizing talent of the Musteites was added to the tremendous activities of the workers, Toledo, Ohio, became the birthplace of the auto workers union. Thus the Musteites were in the forefront of what became later the mighty upsurge of labor called the CIO.

THE "AMERICAN ORIENTATION" AND POLITICAL ACTION

But already in 1933 they had come to the conclusion that neither the struggles of the unemployed for relief, nor those of the workers for industrial unionism would be sufficient to change the world crisis into a workers world. Political action was needed. At the AWP founding convention in Pittsburgh, resolutions called for the formation of a genuine mass labor party, "an American orientation."

Pulling in the opposite direction was Louis Budenz, who was looking at the Communist Party with its daily paper, posts and behind it a whole country—Russia. Before that force the "American orientation" crumbled.

WHAT TO TELL THE WORKERS

There is no doubt that these intellectuals had turned to the working class because they believed that the capitalists had led the world from world war to world depression, and that only the workers could change society fundamentally. The difficulty was that the task for them as intellectuals did not end with their turning to the working class. It first began there.

What, between Fascists, Communism and the New Deal, would the intellectuals of the "American orientation" tell the workers?

The situation was a concrete one: in the unemployed leagues and in the strikes one strong force (the Communist Party) and one small force (the Trotskyists) were pulling at the Musteites. The ranks were hungry for ideas. They were attracted to the Trotskyists who seemed to have a body of ideas from plan to world revolution and who were saying to the Communists, "You went down before fascism without a fight. It is because your leader, Stalin, subordinates all struggles to the dictates of the usurping Russian bureaucracy. Only we stand for true workers interests on a world scale."

After the merger with the Trotskyists the ranks were the first to drop out. Trotskyism was completely isolated from the great upsurge that became the CIO.

COMMUNISM, TROTSKYISM, WHAT NOW

Part of the Musteite leadership, represented by Budenz, joined the Communist Party where he became the managing editor of the Daily Worker. He has now become the total stool pigeon.

Muste himself dropped out of the movement soon after the merger of his group with the Trotskyists. He now heads the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a pacifist grouping. Burnham broke with Trotskyism during the war. He saw a new society emerging, not from the workers, but from managers and planners. He is now the outspoken campaigner for "all-out Americanism." Sidney Hook is the advocate of "democracy" for all those who agree with him. It is hard to distinguish between him and Attorney General William P. Rogers.

The unemployment situation and the crisis it will bring will certainly throw up groups of radicals who more than ever will need a system of ideas which will enable them not merely to agitate for the unemployed and take part in the workers' struggles, but will help them to meet the crisis. The time to do that is now. Every page of NEWS & LETTERS is engaged in this task.

—R. D.

March, 1958

6631

TWO WORLDS

One-Half Hour From Total Destruction

Dr. W. H. Pickering, director of California Institute of Technology and responsible for the successful launching of the Explorer, warns that mankind is 30 minutes from total destruction: "We are sorely in need of some principle that will save mankind from mutual annihilation . . . We can't find it by building anti-missiles to shoot down other missiles. We need a unifying principle. I don't know just where we will find it, but find it we must."

This awareness of being one-half hour away from total destruction permeates the young generation as well as the older one, with this very fundamental difference: instead of retreating to the ivory tower that now builds these destructive weapons, college youth are turning toward the Marxist theory of liberation which would unify mental and manual work in a totally new way of life. This became especially clear to me in the tour of West Coast colleges where I spoke on **MARXISM AND FREEDOM**.

COLLEGE YOUTH TURN OUT TO HEAR LECTURES ON MARXISM AND FREEDOM

The first thing that was outstanding about the present tour, as contrasted to a tour a year ago before publication of **MARXISM AND FREEDOM**, was the attendance. Where, before, the usual attendance was 25-50, this time each appearance brought out between 100 to 200 and, in one case, over 500. Where, before, the audience was mainly "a captive one"—that is to say, it was the regular session of some economics, sociology or philosophy class—this time the attendance was voluntary. No credit was given for attendance and the meetings were generally held either at noon time or at 4 p.m., that is to say, at the end of the school day. In one case, in San Francisco, the meeting was held in the evening and this brought out an adult audience, with a goodly number of workers, longshoremen, among them. In addition to the total of 2,000 students that heard me, many more thousands saw and heard me on radio and TV.

The second significant feature of the present tour was the urgency of the questions, as contrasted to the academic nature of the questions a year ago. For example in a lecture on "The Present Trends in the Russian Economy," I spoke about the fact that the Russian people themselves would overthrow Communism. I was then asked whether the Russian people, especially the youth, would follow "the West." I said that I doubted that because they wouldn't be overthrowing Communism, which is just another name for state-capitalism, in order to get back to private capitalism which brought this world crisis about;

that the Russian people were searching for a totally new way of life and we weren't helping them by the Little Rock situations which were exposing the Achilles heel of American democracy. One student said: "You mean it isn't the Communist propaganda that created Little Rocks; that we did by our failure to give the Negro people full democratic rights? And if that is what you mean, what can we do about it?"

In another lecture on "The American Roots of Marxism," I was asked why was the least known part of Marxism; its American heritage, "Is it because our educational system does not teach us all that we should know about our own history?" When I replied that from the days of the Abolitionists through the CIO to the present wildcats on Automation American humanism has moved in a direction that paralleled that of Marxist thought, when he lived and even now, I was asked whether I considered Marx had the answer to today's Automation when he pointed out that it was not the machine which shortened the working day "but the struggle of the workingmen."

WORKER AND INTELLECTUAL

The question that kept cropping up, whether the talk was on Russia or America or the programs of both for the so-called under-developed countries, was how could the intellectuals help workers when the lives of one and the other are so different and why should they "give up" their mental work, which is so much more interesting than that of manual laborers. When I asked if they were satisfied with the fact that their intellectual work had brought about the ICBM but not the unifying principle, that could win the global struggle for the mind of man, some one asked, could science have developed differently "if, instead of development for war purposes, science could have developed alongside the struggles of the workingmen for a different society?"

There is no doubt that the hardest thing for intellectuals to comprehend is that the impulses for a new society come from the workers and not from themselves; that intellectuals aren't "giving up" anything except their own fragmentation when they associate with workers, and that they, as well as workers, must meet the challenge of the times: When civilization as we have known it is but 30 minutes away from annihilation, it is not the time to think that 1958 would be a turning point in history where history would fail to turn. That is a fatal illusion that is not shared by the great majority of the American youth.

—R.D.

April 30, 1958

6632

TWO WORLDS

WHITHER PARIS?

by RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA, author of
MARXISM AND FREEDOM

History, wrote Marx in his analysis of the coup of Napoleon III a century ago, repeats itself: once as tragedy, the next time as farce. Today, two weeks after the coup of De Gaulle, this applies both to General de Gaulle and to the French Communist Party. The General deludes himself that he can become the heroic Maid of Orleans merely by substituting the "I, De Gaulle" for Pétain's capitulation to Nazi Germany. The French Communist Party thinks it can delude the workers because it is saying all the correct things against De Gaulle, although it did nothing to stop him.

There is no greater obstacle in the path of the workers striving for a totally new way of life than that the Communists should gain control of their movement and once again thwart their aspirations, as they have done ever since the end of World War II when they used their prestige as Resistance fighters to establish bourgeois parliamentarianism that brought De Gaulle to power in 1945, and again in 1958.

THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communists had been officers in the French Resistance under De Gaulle. At the end of the war they outdid him in their chauvinistic attitude to Germany. In both cases it was because they followed the Moscow line. So long as they thought they could keep him from attaching himself to the other pole of world capital—America—they didn't find much to criticize in the General.

Meanwhile, a million Frenchmen had joined the Communist Party. Other millions—workers in trade unions—let the Communists gain control of their union. These workers, however, were not playing parliamentary politics. They had hoped thus to have "the form of organization" with which to establish an entirely new society free from capitalist exploitation.

The Communist Party, however, had no intention of reaching for power—not when there was no Russian Army at hand to control the workers. Instead, it began to expand its "cultural" activities while engaging in politicking at its worst. For example, it voted emergency powers to Pflimlin that forbade workers' demonstrations and was part of the parliamentary farce which completed the downfall of the Fourth French Republic. There is no doubt that the social composition of the Communist Party in France has changed radically during this decade as it moved away from proletarian action. The only successful Communist call for strike action in 1958 was from the Teachers Federation. Nevertheless the Communists hope now to regain the workingclass support that the socialists have had.

EXISTENTIALIST INTELLECTUALS HELP TIGHTEN THE COMMUNIST STRANGLEHOLD

A key role in this will be played by the French intellectuals. The most infamous of these are the Existentialists who have been willing victims of the Communists who leave them free "to engage" or "disengage" from any activity in the mass movement by taking over all "responsibilities of leadership."

1948 witnessed the first breakaway of a part of the French proletariat from the stranglehold of the Communist Party. Existentialists offered to lead it—and led it right back to Communism. The most prominent Existentialist apologist for Communism, Jean-Paul Sartre, did break away during the brutal Communist suppression of the Hungarian Revolution, but he is now back in some "popular front against fascism."

Why?

It is not out of any confusion between Marxism and Communism. Nor is it necessarily for lack of bravery. No. The brainwashing these intellectuals have undergone is due to the simple fact that intellectuals, far removed from the discipline of the factory and the class struggle, are afflicted with an incurable malady: the concept that workers are "backward," must be "taught," must be "led." They are totally blind to the fact that the greatest obstacle in the way of the workers' establishing a totally new society, new human relations, is precisely the established self-styled Marxist parties like the Communist, Socialists and Labor Party.

TASK OF THE INTELLECTUAL

Where Marx removed theory from a dispute among intellectuals and made it into a weapon in the class struggle, the modern intellectual reduces theory to a word game reserved for intellectuals. Where the Existentialist intellectual thwarted the proletarian attempt to break away from Communism, the Marxist intellectual let it suffocate for lack of any comprehensive revolutionary theory with which to combat Communism. Where they did not thirst to lead, to sit in the seat of the capitalists and plan "for" the workers, they nevertheless did nothing to face their intellectual responsibility, to put an end to the intellectual sloth that has accumulated in the Marxist movement. Despite all protestations to the contrary, small theoretical groupings who did see Communism for the state capitalist tyranny it is, did nothing to re-establish Marxism in its original form of a new Humanism. It is high time for a serious reappraisal.

JULY, 1958

6633

France at the Cross Roads

PARISIAN WORKERS DEMONSTRATE AND WAIT

250,000 demonstrated in Paris against De Gaulle's coming to power. The overwhelming majority of the French people are deathly sick of the bourgeois talking-shop, called the Parliament, which has brought them two world wars in a single lifetime. Yet in order to show their opposition to the dictator-general De Gaulle they demonstrated "for the Republic."

One New York Times reporter in Paris asked a cab driver why he was not in this mass demonstration. The cab driver answered that he doubts De Gaulle will do any

more than any other politician to get France out of its mess, but he wouldn't fight against him.

But, he added, "I'll tell you what I'll fight for: my per-

sonal liberties, food for my family; if they try to take that away from me, I'll fight."

DE GAULLE AND BIG BUSINESS

"They" soon will move more sharply to take that away from him. That is why De Gaulle was pushed into power. He was pushed, not because he didn't want power, but because he wasn't strong enough to get there on his own. That is to say, he had no mass base.

His attempt at building a fascist movement collapsed, and by 1951, he himself had "retired" from politics, playing a watching and conspiratorial game with "the military." The big brass are the ones who now pushed De Gaulle into power, but they too couldn't have done so without the complicity of big capital.

De Gaulle is, first of all, the choice of heavy industry, which has undergone a re-tooling and has achieved a tremendous rate of growth in the past few years. Although they cannot yet match Great Britain or West Germany, much less Russia and America, they feel strong enough to get rid of the plague of the French economy — the small shopkeeper, the small landowner, the small groceryman, the petty bourgeois in general who has kept France in the small leagues ever since the end of the first World War.

Big Capital would like to exploit labor too in a "new"

way. They have learned from Russian state capitalism what advantages can accrue to them, if only they can make the trade unions into a part of the State apparatus. If a "strong man" could achieve for them what the labor bureaucracy has achieved under state capitalism — doing the disciplining of labor for capital — they would be willing to recognize "the rights of the workers" to such unions.

That is why they are not yet showing their hand to labor. They dream of shackling labor with as little effort as it took to get the eager cooperation of such "socialist" as Guy Mollet and Lacoste.

In this dream world of capital, they have forgotten only one thing: Mollet and Lacoste, no matter what label they pin on themselves, have as much influence on labor as capital itself: none. It is not what has unfolded in France thus far, but what will unfold in the next stage, that will be decisive for France.

Meanwhile, big business feels if it now, once and for all, gets rid of all the many petty bourgeois representatives in parliament, it could once again become a Big Power.

In a word, Big Business now has no use whatsoever for the bourgeois parliament as at present constituted. It wants, instead, a "Strong Man" to create the conditions for it to rule, and to bring back its past imperial glory. Because this is what it wants, it conspired with the military to bring De Gaulle to power.

There are those who are eager to condemn the French workers for their "passivity" at the fall of the republic. Yet these critics themselves played a passive role in the four years since the Algerian masses were carrying on

their heroic struggles for independence.

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN ALGERIA

The French military junta in Algeria plotted this coup with the large French landowners who have kept Algeria in subjection for over a century.

Their "civilizing mission" consisted in putting down ruthlessly every revolt for freedom of the native Algerians; in not industrializing the land although they have had a century in which to do it; in living in wanton luxury on their huge plantations, while they keep the pay of an agricultural worker down to a miserable 80c a day. The average family this worker must support with this "pay" is 7 to 8 people.

It is against this type of economic exploitation, as well as political disfranchisement, that the native Algerian population — they number 9 million while the French colonists number only 1 million — have been in continuous revolt throughout the 19th century as well as in the 20th century. Four years ago the Algerian's revolt took a new and organized shape in their demands for national liberation from French imperial rule.

So elemental has been the struggle of these native Algerian revolutionaries, and so just their demands, that even the American Administration — which has supported French imperial rule all the way from Indo-China to Africa — finally put a condition on its "Generosity." The French government was to negotiate some sort of limited freedom for the Algerian population.

The French government — Gaillard was Premier then — was about to enter into such negotiations when the counter-revolutionaries decided to turn their guns against

the motherland. They are the ones who brought about the fall of the Fourth French Republic. Now that the Republic lies prostrate, they are suddenly filled with love for "France."

Whatever irony there is in De Gaulle's proposal that these counter-revolutionaries give the native Algerians "political equality," the truth is that the overwhelming majority of the Algerians want, not union with France, but independence from France. Shortly after De Gaulle delivered his speech in Algiers, a group of Algerian youth drove through the square, shouting, "Frenchmen, to the gallows!" The unceasing fight for independence goes on.

AMERICA AND RUSSIA AGAINST THE FRENCH WORKERS

Whether De Gaulle will long remain in power, or whether he is only the middleman for the fascistic paratroopers and their "civilian" allies — the landowners who are armed to the teeth — is not the decisive question. The decisive question is: What will the French proletariat do?

Fear of what the French workers will do impelled America and Russia to make a 180° turn in their policies.

The first to do so was the American Administration. Without bothering to cover their tracks, Ike immediately announced that he is one of those who "likes De Gaulle." So cheap are the principles of the Administration that the most quickly forgotten man is Murphy, Ike's special representative who had made a mild attempt to compel France to grant Algeria a measure of independence.

Instead, everyone suddenly found that though De Gaulle demanded and got

dictatorial powers, he is "really" a democrat. Not only a democrat in general, but one who wants to mold the French Constitution on the American model and "stop" (!) the civil war. Never mind that he has instigated a civil war — so long as it was against workers' power.

Not far behind in wooing De Gaulle is Russia. Each, U.S. and Russia, is trying to get his ear and enlist him in the "greater" struggle for world power. That is what De Gaulle is aiming at when he speaks of the "grandeur" of France. He aims to become the balance of power between these two great giants for world domination.

THE HUMAN SOLUTION

There is no doubt that the rise of De Gaulle means the French workers have lost the first round. Nor is there doubt that when their "personal liberties and food" are encroached upon — as must happen when De Gaulle moves to consolidate power — the workers will fight. And they will fight, not only defensively, but for a totally new way of life free from all exploitation at home and abroad.

The one element that the French crisis correctly focused on is this: in the final analysis it is the human element that will decide the course of history. Neither the launching of satellites into outer space, nor the hurtling of missiles across continents can solve the problems of this earth.

The revolution of the Algerian masses for national independence showed the only way out. The counter-revolution is trying to stop the clock of history with unspeakable tortures for the Algerian population and with arms that it uses equally against the Algerians and "the motherland, France." The French workers have not yet had their last say; that will decide the true course of history.

RESPONSIBILITY OF INTELLECTUALS

By RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA, author of
MARXISM AND FREEDOM

I have received several letters from friends abroad who ask me to clarify the last paragraph in my previous column on the question of "the responsibility of the Marxist theoretician." In questioning my analysis of Whither Paris? these critics ask: "Having, ever since the beginning of the French crisis, issued the slogan 'Neither Pflimlin nor De Gaulle,' what else can a Marxist theoretician do except to appeal to workers to establish their own councils and take power? Surely," my correspondents concluded, "it is not the intellectuals, but the workers, who have the power to change society."

This is true, but it is not the whole truth. Were Marxism limited to that one great truth, there would be no reason for it to have continued as a movement after 1848. The fact that Marxism is alive still is not because it is incorporated in books, but because it is in the daily lives and aspirations of the working people, and will remain so until a new truly human society is achieved. It will be achieved only when a new unity of theory and practice in the tradition of Marx but answering today's needs is achieved.

Now that Russia has become a state capitalist society, the unity of theory and practice which made possible, first, the Paris Commune, and then the early workers' state in Russia, evidently must be broadened to answer new questions and new tasks posed by today's workers: "What happens AFTER gaining of power? Will the division between mental and manual labor continue and thus forever confront us with a new bureaucracy—an intellectual elite?"

The theoreticians cannot pretend that they have answered these problems in so total a way that it has matched the grandeur of the activity of the masses who (1) have moved ahead from the period of the Russian Revolution where their primary aim was political power through soviets to the Spanish Revolution where they fought for immediate control of factories. In a word, they combined economic emancipation with self-rule. This has reached its highest development in the Workers Councils in Hungary. (2) Where, before Automation, the worker's control of production seemed to answer all questions, with Automation, workers' control of production is incomplete unless it includes the beginnings of the end of the division between mental and manual labor.

Far from accepting his responsibility, the Marxist theoretician nowadays wants to shift all responsibility to the workers except that of leadership. It will not do.

BACK TO FRANCE

Take the present situation in France which was the subject of my last column. Of course only the French proletariat can work out the new forms of revolt against the new form of fascism. But two factors now stifle the workers: (1) The "ordinary" French intellectual who thinks that, because De Gaulle isn't Hitler, therefore the "republican form of government" will continue and worker and intellectual alike will have their "democracy." (2) The intellectuals who have no such illusions—Communists and genuine Marxists alike—and pretend that they were right all the time, predicting such "barbarism" as the logical outcome of capitalism.

I am not concerned with the Communist who will sing any tune Moscow blares out. I am concerned with the anti-Communist Marxist beating his chest. For, in the concrete, the new form of fascism could not have been foreseen and was not foretold, much less prepared for by unfurling a new banner of Marxist Humanism. Marx unfurled his not alone against capitalism, but against the vulgar Communists who thought all they needed to do to

have a new society was to oppose private property and all other questions would solve themselves.

A NEW LISTENING AND A NEW DOING

Presently, while capitalism in France is learning to imitate not the outright destruction of unions, as in Nazi Germany, but, instead, to try to emulate successful Russian state capitalism and incorporate the trade unions, in one form or another, into the state apparatus, the Marxist theoretician is working with old, outlived categories. For example, every existing institution, including the British shop stewards, has undergone a transformation into opposite, and become an integral part of capitalism. Needed, therefore, are not only new forms of workers' revolt, which workers are sure to discover, but a new listening to workers. A new listening is needed plus (1) a demonstration of the theoretician's belief in the ability of the proletariat to do tasks heretofore the prerogative of leadership. In his own organization, therefore, the theoretician should "give up" editorship of publications in general, and the newspaper in particular. (2) On the basis of the new listening by him and the new doing by the proletariat, the theoretician can create a philosophy which the proletariat recognizes as the new quality of his own thoughts and aspirations for total freedom: freedom from economic exploitation and from political rule by a new intellectual elite. In a word, freedom to reconstruct the wholeness of man.

This unity of mental and manual labor in the worker himself, is to be removed from mere intellectual discussion among intellectuals, and instead made "the order of the day," in the manner in which Marx considered the full and free development of the individual's power, of his natural and acquired talents, not as the "hereafter," but as the road to be taken on the morrow of capitalism's fall, if the nationalized means of production are to serve any better end than the privately owned means of production. Without unfurling such a banner as a first step to any truly new social order, why should workers listen to Marxist theoreticians any more than they do to "their own" labor bureaucrats?

AUGUST, 1958

6636

Use this for...

COLONIAL REVOLTS AND THE CREATIVITY OF PEOPLE

by Raya Dunayevskaya,
author of MARXISM AND FREEDOM

The cold war between America and Russia that began as soon as the hot war came to a halt is proof enough of the fact that World War II had not solved a single fundamental problem that capitalism, private or state, is constantly creating, and for which it is plunging humanity into constant wars. At the same time, the colonial revolts that followed World War II differed quite sharply from those that followed World War I.

The colonial struggles that arose after World War I were inspired by the Russian Revolution of 1917 and followed the pattern of national liberation that linked itself to the working class struggles for a totally new social order, as witness the Chinese Revolution of 1919, led by Sun Yat Sen. On the other hand, the colonial struggles that followed World War II, and the division of world power into two colossal masses of capital, held either by America or Russia, have followed the path of compromise with the old social order.

THE ROLE OF THE ARMY AND THE COMPROMISE WITH THE OLD ORDER

Whether, as in Egypt, it was a compromise with the feudal social structure; or whether, as in Mao's China, it skipped straight to forced collectivization and industrialization à la Russia, what characterized both colonial struggles is what characterizes our whole age: the role of the State.

The greatest single feature of a class state is its Army. Whether it was only secondary army colonels, like Nasser, who achieved power through a quick coup, or General Mao, whose famous Eighth Route Army won only after literally decades of civil war, the truth is that the popular revolts in these were controlled by the Army. Never for any length of time have the untapped creative energies of the millions been brought into the construction of the new social order, as they were in the first years of the Russian Revolution.

The result is that the destruction of the old corrupt regimes of a Farouk or a Chiang has not led to a new life for millions. 600 million in China continue to be bottled up in contradictions, as Mao himself has had to admit. What, then, is it that gives Mao's China so much the appearance of "the new?"

The new seems "obvious." It was not the native bourgeoisie, as in India, that led the national struggle and achieved national independence. It was the Communist Party. True, it is not a workers' party. True, the petty

bourgeois intellectuals that lead this party rely not on the masses, but on the Army. Indeed, the Chinese Constitution gives it equal status with "the Party."

Still, because Mao's obvious adversary is the corrupt Chiang who was driven from his country, despite the support both by Roosevelt and Stalin, the real opponents of Mao—the working people of China—are forgotten, and the illusion is created in many that Mao is "the progressive force" and should be supported in any "localized war." As if in this age of state capitalism and nuclear warfare any war can be "localized" or it is the task of Marxists "to take sides" in such wars! At the present moment this would be the height of folly and would doom the proletarian struggle.

The truth is that which appears as a new social order is only a new stage of—capitalism, state capitalism. Just as in World War I when the labor bureaucracy, whether in trade unions or parties, proved to be an integral part of capitalism, so in World War II the role of the petty bourgeois intellectual has changed. He has transferred his individualism into "collectivism"—the State Plan. One thing remains the same: it is the State Plan against the workers' revolution.

Plan or no plan, so decadent is capitalism and so total is its crisis precisely because each country has the two worlds of capitalists and workers, and yet the whole world divided into but two parts (See EDITORIAL) that it has not the forces nor the means nor the method to undertake the completion of the agricultural revolution or even the relief of tens of millions, much less the construction of modern industrial structures in underdeveloped countries. Neither Russia nor America has been able to help build the Aswan Dam for Egypt. In this day and age India is once again facing famine in large areas. So is China. **NOT MAO, BUT THE CREATIVE UNTAPPED ENERGIES OF MILLIONS**

The idea that Mao and his bureaucrats will lead China to a truly new human order is sheer fantasy. Historic viability China does not have. Every partial solution to a problem only multiplies its contradictions and brings closer the day of World War III. That is its only "historic future."

The only possible progress among a billion people in Asia and the awakened millions in Africa will come from the creative untapped energies of these billions. No military might will decide the question. The question that has been posed by the colonial revolutions is the creativity, the self-activity of the peoples themselves. Nothing on earth will prevent this solution from winning in the end.

EDITORIALS

OIL FOR THE BOMBERS OF WORLD WAR III?

"What are our troops doing in the Middle East anyway?" a Negro auto worker who is a Korean veteran wrote NEWS & LETTERS. "In Korea we were told that South Korea had been attacked and we came to its defense. What is the excuse now? Every time two colored people get into an argument, up pop the heads of Eisenhower and Khrushchev. It looks to me as if America and Russia want to gobble up the whole world between them."

Nothing that has come out from the mouths of the Administration or the learned apologists for landing troops in Lebanon comes up to the profundity of analysis of the worker quoted above. Unfortunately, however, it is not he who has the power to direct policy, but that brink of war strategist, John Foster Dulles, who is now helping Eisenhower elaborate a new theory called "indirect subversion."

"INDIRECT SUBVERSION"

There is no doubt that Russia is fishing in troubled waters at the summit and out of it. There also is no doubt that Nasser stands as the symbol of Arab nationalism. If he cannot free Egypt from its feudal fetters, he can at least thumb his nose at America—as he has just done when he showed up 5 hours late for a conference with President Eisenhower's "personal representative" Robert Murphy and left him holding the diplomatic pouch.

The truth is that this explosive game of politics this side of war is a result of the conspiracy among all the powers against the tide of liberation that is rising not only against the two main world power blocs, but for a new way of life altogether:

—AND DIRECT LANDING OF TROOPS

Nasser can use Israel as the scapegoat for his failure to reconstruct Egyptian society on non-exploitative foundations because: (1) America and Russia and France and Britain and Turkey like to pretend that there was no Middle East problem before the creation of Israel in 1948. That "clears" them of centuries of exploitation of the Middle East long before Israel became a state.

(2) Israel, like any state capitalist country, has acted with such utter disregard for the lives of the refugees from Palestine which had been their homeland before they were huddled into camps in Jordan that it needs no prodding from Radio Egypt to rouse them against Hussein as well as Israel.

HATRED AGAINST AMERICAN DOMINATION

(3) As in Algeria, the color line here is the class line. Little Rock reverberated around the world with the force and speed of the Russian sputnik and exposed the Achilles heel in American democracy at home as well as abroad. It needs something more than the vapid theory of "indirect aggression" to win the global struggle for the minds of men. The direct landing of troops in Lebanon speaks much louder than this theory of "indirect subversion." It also becomes the focal point for the mounting hatred of the Arab people against American domination.

The truth is that the dollar diplomacy and gunboat enforcement which has characterized British, American and French domination of the oil-rich Middle East has not stopped with the nominal independence of these countries. On the contrary. Now that the two poles of world capital—America and Russia—consider no part of the world outside of their "sphere of interest," every single incident becomes that brink of the precipice that might set off World War III.

6 6 3 9

THE WORLD IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS

The world has never been closer to World War III than presently. Those directly involved in the never-ending series of "incidents" of our crisis-ridden world are Communist China and Formosa. But everyone, rightly, is looking, not at Mao and Chiang, but at Khrushchev and Ike.

For the truth that is as big as life and as awesome as death is that our contemporary world is divided into two, and only two, parts—Russia and America.

No matter where the crisis breaks out at any point—whether it is immense China with its 640 million inhabitants, or little Lebanon, and no matter who next gets involved—even if it is America's "major" ally—as was the case during the Suez crisis when Britain and France joined Israel's attack on Egypt—those parties must withdraw when Russia and America are not ready to come to blows at that spot. Are they ready now?

BRINK OF WAR STRATEGY

That brink-of-war strategist, Dulles, has gotten himself so wound up in abstractions on "aggression" that he cannot see the forest for the trees or, more precisely, he cannot see the holocaust that could put an end to civilization as we have known it, for the byplay of Mao on Quemoy.

Of course, the "aggression" is on the part of Mao's China—if anyone today can be shocked by the ordinary imperialist ways of reclaiming an island which is so near the mainland that all American reporters are comparing the distance from Quemoy to China to the relationship of Staten Island to New York City.

Of course, acting on Mao's initiative, Khrushchev agreed that the "timing" is perfect for, in the world's eyes, America's landing troops in Lebanon hardly entitled the Administration to shout "aggressor" at another.

No one in this country doubts that the Administration would hardly win a popularity poll now. Fully 80% of letters received at the State Department are against the Administration's China policy. No war threat has ever been more unpopular than the present one. President Eisenhower recognized that fact when he doubled up his tongue for his appearance on TV. Eisenhower said, at one and the same time, that he would not sacrifice a single American life for Quemoy—but that the "bigger principle" was "non-aggression."

In a word, he will not let a single American soldier die "for" Quemoy, but he will let thousands die on Quemoy.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SAY "NO" TO WAR

No wonder that the American people will have none of Ike's gobbledygook, and turned instead, to watch T.V.'s other show, "The Price Is Right."

Ike's price was as phony as his "principle." What is involved is not "aggression" or "non-aggression." What is involved is this: will civilization hang on the brink of nuclear extinction because the two giants contending for world power are presently so crisis-ridden in their own countries, with their own working people, that they are ready to shoot it out?

It will not be as easy to switch off the war as it was to switch channels when Ike spoke. But the American people have thus shown where they stood in no uncertain terms: this senseless rush to war better stop right now.

News & Letters

Vol. 3, No. 6

September 30, 1958

6639

War Clouds Over China

Listening to a radio report of American military build-up in Formosa, a neighborhood shoemaker remarked bitterly, "Whenever they get into trouble with a depression and millions of people out of work, they try to get out of their troubles by pushing us into the death of war."

"I myself, in my own life have gone through two World Wars and I will surely live to see a third. I was a soldier in the Italian Army in World War I, where my brother was killed. My son was killed as an American soldier in World War II. Now my grandson has been drafted. When the bombs fall for the next one, he will be there and no one here will be saved. It makes me feel that they want to wipe out my whole family for three generations—and for what?"

"BRINK-OF-WAR"

The Administration's brink-of-war policy—which almost landed us in war over Formosa three years ago—has now reached such a low of callous indifference to the American people that commentators have openly warned that this policy can plunge us into a terrible war of atomic annihilation behind our backs. Not only have Democrats criticized the Administration, so have Republicans. Even businessmen, who have long wanted to profit from trade with Red China, whisper that Mao Tse Tung, not Chiang Kai Shek, should be recognized.

In general, faced with the daily reality of lay-offs and speed-up, the workers don't talk much about the Administration's China policy because it seems so senseless that we should go to war over Quemoy or Matsu or Formosa.

See:
Editorial and Two Worlds
pages 5 and 6.

It seems senseless but it's not just words they're playing with. Our lives are at stake. No one can seriously think that if war comes now it will be another "police action" as in Korea, or a "local" Chinese-American War.

Both Russia and America have nuclear weapons and have stated again and again that they're ready to use them. The question is, not whether America will recognize Communist China, but whether Russia and America—the two poles of state capitalism fighting for world domination—will bring on a nuclear war of total destruction, using Formosa as the excuse.

When American troops landed in Lebanon last summer, American standing in the Middle East reached its lowest point and the colonial countries of Asia and Africa were united in their opposition to American policy.

So bankrupt is world capitalism that the crisis in Formosa enables state capitalist Mao to strengthen his masquerade as a revolutionary at home, and as a leader in the colonial struggle against the ravages of Western imperialism.

So corrupt is Chiang Kai Shek, to whom American Far Eastern policy is wed, and so universally detested is he by the Chinese, that Mao found it easy to create a situation whereby he could point to the threat of foreign intervention in order to divert the mounting unrest of the Chinese masses.

INSIDE MAO'S CHINA

What is the situation inside China itself? First there is the fact that Mao is head of a government which speaks for over 600 million on the Chinese mainland, as against Chiang Kai Shek, whom they expelled, to the small island of Formosa where he can't even speak for the 600,000 over whom he sits.

Then there is the fact that in over 100 years of China's struggle for unification and independence from foreign rule, Mao, in 1949, with his powerful peasant army was able to unify China and expel foreign rule and subdue or incorporate the various war lords who had separately bled their own provinces.

It was one thing for Mao to win almost unanimous support against Chiang. But the elimination of China's centuries' old poverty and its reconstruction from 30 years of war deva-

station is an entirely different matter. Full-blown, Mao introduced totalitarian state capitalist controls with a ready made one-party Communist apparatus which he had built up in his army.

Of 640 million, less than 15 million are listed as workers, and the rest are engaged in the most back-breaking impoverished agricultural labor in the world.

If the poor peasants thought that by getting rid of Chiang Kai Shek, they'd free themselves from exploitation and better their own conditions, one of Mao's spokesmen set them straight by explaining that "the basic aim of agrarian reform is not purely one of relieving poor peasants it is designed to set free the rural productive forces."

If the workers thought that under Mao they could improve their conditions of life and labor, the state let them know they had better submit to speed-up—or else—by warning those workers who "do not clearly see the relation between the interests of the individuals and the interests of the State... and, regardless of the financial ability of the State, demand too high wages... and living conditions."

Of the 15 million classified as workers, less than 5 million are actually industrial workers, the remaining 10 million are administrators, technicians, teachers, government workers.

To force the workers and poor peasants to submit to this weight of oppression, Mao has regimented every single aspect of family and personal life.

PUTTING WOMEN TO WORK AND RURAL "COMMUNES"

The latest and most ambitious scheme is what the Chinese rulers dare call rural "communes." Any re-

6640

6 6 4 1

relationship to the old socialist ideal and principle of the Paris Commune—self-government—is out of the question. This fantastic scheme, officially called "People's Public Communities," is controlled strictly from Peking. Its aim is the intensification of the literally around-the-clock work that has been the lot of the Chinese masses. Presently this means the following:

(1) 750,000 "People's Co-operative Farms," or collectives, are to be transformed into 100,000 larger units in which all, including housewives, become "wage workers," that is to say are regimented like factory workers. This scheme was first introduced quietly in April in Honan Province near Peking, speeded up in July, and by now (September 23) a Hsinhua New China) News Agency dispatch claims that 30% of the 500 million peasants have been consolidated into these communes in Honan, Liaoning, Hopei, Shansi, Tsinghai, Shantung, Heilungkiang and Kwangsi.

(2) Tens of millions of millions of women are "freed" from household chores and must work in the field alongside the men full time. Nurseries take care of the children and then the family comes, not home, but to a huge public mess hall. The women who do not do individual household work must therefore cook for approximately 8,000, the average membership in a commune.

(3) Since all are now wage workers and there is no ownership, private or collective, of the land, the inhabitants may be shifted from farm work to the factory.

(4) Indeed, the scheme is not to have the city or industry "lead" the farm, but the other way around. Thus these "communes" not only farm large areas under its control, but build and manage industries, handle trade and banking, and assume a military type of organization, arming and training all the able bodied, men and women.

In face of this, all previous and still existing, forms of control and spying on the population, such as, block committees in the cities and health stations in the Villages, for maintaining police control, pale into insignificance before this super regimentation and Plan to push all labor into forced labor, literally around the clock.

MASS RESISTANCE

Nevertheless, mass resistance can be seen on the countryside just like in the city. Thus the latest information, especially that given to its "cadres" (read: small and large bureaucrats, officials) is to slow up a bit. For example, they have been told that this reorganization need not at once abolish "co-operative ownership," and must not interfere with the gathering of the autumn's harvest.

Despite this totalitarian terror, the workers' resistance can be glimpsed from the repeated complaints in

Mao's official newspaper, "The People's Daily," which blasts workers for high absenteeism, lateness, violation of factory regulations and working procedures and the large number of defective pieces and rejects which are produced.

The speed with which the discussions unloosed by his famous "Let 100 Flowers Bloom" speech were forbidden, and the mass arrests which followed, show how widespread is the unrest in all strata of the population.

AMERICAN CRISIS

If the timing of the Formosa crisis indicates the mass unrest which Mao is trying to divert and suppress in China, it also reflects the internal unrest in America. Not only did the Administration reveal its hand in the Middle East at a time when millions of American workers were being laid-off, the actual sending of military

units to Formosa took place at a time of intensified repression of Negroes in the South.

What lies beneath the Russian-American maneuvers in the international crisis, is the fact that neither Mao nor Khrushchev can solve their internal contradictions any more than the American capitalists can.

The one thing they have in common is that they are all willing to sacrifice the lives of the world's millions to maintain their power.

September 30, 1958

"THE CONFEDERACY, THE CONFEDERACY"

by Raya Dunayevskaya,
author of **MARXISM AND FREEDOM**

A new low in righteous indignation was reached by President Eisenhower when he lost his temper not so much at the fact that hoodlums had bombed Jewish synagogues as at the fact that these hoodlums called themselves "The Confederate Underground." In a high pitched voice and with bulgy eyes, President Eisenhower shouted that he had been raised and educated to have "the highest respect for the Confederacy."

Which side of the Civil War was he on anyway?

Not that President Eisenhower is alone in this "high respect" for the instigators of the most bloody, most costly, most unjust rebellion. Historians have been busy rewriting our civil war history ever since President Andrew Johnson got away with his treacherous conduct on the whole question of Reconstruction. That is the unavoidable consequence of Bourgeois wars that dare not carry through what they themselves have started—a revolution against slavery which was the way of life of their Bourbon co-rulers.

Because the only way to reconstruct the south on truly new, human beginnings was to have the Negro at its base, the victorious industrial North preferred an unholy compromise with the defeated plantation South. They wrote off four long years of destruction and a million American lives in order to re-establish the South as the white man's land.

THE UNION

It was not by accident that "the principle of Union vs. states' rights" was never so firmly set down that some smart lawyer couldn't find his way around it. To this day we suffer from this.

Three long years have passed since desegregation in education did finally become "the law of the land." But not a whiff of this law rules the Deep South. As for the rest of the unreconstructed South, what we are witnessing today in the bombings of desegregated schools is only the natural outgrowth of demagogues in high office from the President down, inspiring litigations that will go on and on and on till they have rolled the clock back to days of "white supremacy."

The lawless short cut to the same end is the legitimate offspring of the legal way around the law: where Governor Faubus, who has state power, reassures his cohorts that he will create legal ways to protect their disregard of Federal law, the Confederate Underground reassures its hoodlums that it will find legal, and illegal, ways to protect them. The inspiration for their arrogance is the FBI that

could not uncover the KKKer who set a cross burning at the home of Supreme Court Justice Warren, not to speak of finding those who had bombed Negro churches, desegregated schools and Negro homes.

The inspiration for their illegal acts is the legal act of the justices of the Alabama State Supreme Court, who refused to reverse the death sentence against a Negro worker for allegedly stealing \$1.95. These high and mighty dispensers of Southern justice defended their barbarous action on the basis that "it is not the amount stolen that counts, but the principle." What principle? Which uncivilized planet do these rulers of ours inhabit?

The inspiration for these acts, legal and illegal, comes from the man armed with the office of Presidency and the power of the Commander-in-Chief.

TIME AND PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Recently President Eisenhower gave vent to his personal feelings that the Supreme Court had acted in haste—that we must "understand" the South and give it "sufficient time."

How many centuries is "sufficient time"? In 1954, at a time when the United States' contention with Russia for world power was suffering setbacks, in the struggle for the minds of the colored peoples of the world, the United States Supreme Court finally moved to make desegregated education the law of the land—only to find that the ever-patient admirer of the Confederacy, President Eisenhower, was incapable of enforcing so elementary a democratic principle.

NEGRO INGENUITY

Desegregated education never will become the law of the land until the Negro enforces it. The Negro youth that braved the troops of Gov. Faubus to enter Arkansas high schools have now been shunted aside by the purely legal battle the N.A.A.C.P. is carrying on. The Negro youth that came to the aid of the brave Rose Parks who refused to give up her seat on an Alabama bus have, again, been left outside of the actions planned by the one who came to lead that movement, Rev. King, who is content now to write books. The white labor bureaucracy, whether of the old school, like Meany, or the so-called new school, like Reuther, have their consciences all too easily satisfied by mere money contributions to the legal battle. If you walk into any Negro community you feel at once the dissatisfaction with the established leadership and the devising of their own ways to win full democratic rights. Therein lies the only way out.

October 28, 1958

6642

AMERICAN SOCIALISM AND EUGENE V. DEBS

by Ray Dunayevskaya,
author of **MARXISM AND FREEDOM**

This month socialists are celebrating the 103rd anniversary of the birth of the American Socialist, Eugene Victor Debs. Like the Communists who try to hide behind the name of Karl Marx although they have transformed that theory of liberation into the practice of enslavement, the Socialists use the name of Debs to cover up their compromise with capitalism. The praise of this native revolutionary is strictly for memorial purposes only, as if the new society for which Debs had given his life will come to be without the type of revolutionary struggles Debs had to carry out in his days.

Eugene Victor Debs had been a militant trade union leader. It was during the great Pullman strike in 1894 that he was convinced to socialism. When the Federal troops were called out to put down that strike, he wrote: "In the gleam of every bayonet and the flash of every rifle the class struggle was revealed. The capitalist class. The working class. The class struggle."

This is where the Socialists of today stop. It was only the beginning for Debs. His greatest development came with his opposition to World War I. Once again he found himself in prison, this time for his anti-war views. For the first time in American history a man in prison was selected to run for President. A million Americans voted for him. The problems that faced Debs when that "war to end all wars" only ended in a depression are still with us. It is only the Socialists who have changed, not the objective situation.

LINK TO ABOLITIONISM

Debs was the direct link to the great Abolitionist movement. He was proud of the fact that when he was a young man he chaired a meeting for the Abolitionist leader, Wendell Phillips. Debs was then secretary of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and in that capacity had invited the great orator of the Abolitionist movement to speak to his union. Phillips was then 70 years old, but still in the forefront of every social movement.

A new relationship of men to women was also first worked out in that movement to abolish slavery. From the first, women were active in the anti-slavery societies. The world anti-slavery movement forbade women's participation and this split the movement. The American Abolitionists not only welcomed their participation but some of them, in turn, became involved in the women's movement for their own rights. Frederick Douglass was

among the first to come forward and champion the independent movement of women. It was he who chaired the first meeting of the Women Suffragist Movement when the women still felt they needed a man to chair their meeting.

The masthead of William Lloyd Garrison's **LIBERATOR** was: "Our country is the world—our countrymen are mankind." Finally just as in the struggle to abolish slavery, Wendell Phillips felt that true freedom could be achieved in the South only if the freed black men were made the basis of the new South, so now he felt that only labor itself, white and black, could reconstruct society on totally new, truly human beginnings. That vision Debs too saw and that need for a new society is still with us.

THEORY AND PRACTICE

No doubt there were many ambiguities in Debs' behavior for he suffered from the greatest weakness of the American socialist movement—its lack of a theoretical grasp of the very ideas which are the basis of the movement.

For example: he had hailed the Russian Revolution of 1917 as "the greatest, most luminous and far-reaching achievement in the entire sweep of human history." At the same time he remained in the leadership of the Socialist Party which opposed the Russian Revolution. The fact that that workers' state has since become transformed into a state capitalist society does not excuse the socialists of today to whitewash "democratic" capitalism, and least of all does it give them the right to parade as "Debsians."

Debs had dedicated his life to the creation of a new society free of all tyranny, capitalist exploitation and war. There is no doubt that courage and struggle and dedication to a cause are insufficient for the creation of a new society. Without a totally new philosophy, such as Marxist Humanism, which unites practice with theory, philosophy with politics, the struggles lack the granite foundation for that vision of the future which becomes the unifying principle that assures final victory. But those who treat the struggles of the past as "history," instead of the future still striving to be born, besmirch rather than commemorate the name of that great American socialist, Eugene Victor Debs.

November 28, 1958

Vol. 4 # 1

THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION, I

The heart of the struggle against colonialism has shifted from Asia and the Middle East to Africa. At the very moment when France went De Gaulle, one word was heard loudly and clearly around the whole world: the "No" to remaining part of France from little Guinea (population: 2.6 million) in French West Africa. Unfortunately, the courageous voice of the man who led the quiet revolution—Sekou Toure—was later heard to say to his fellow-Africans that he would not stop at introducing "forced labor" if the African people continued their easy ways and failed to shoulder "the responsibility" of industrialization: "Nothing must impede industrialization," Toure told John A. Marcu (THE NEW LEADER December 1, 1958). "We will use Chinese mass labor methods if necessary."

Is the Chinese "great leap"—from semi-feudalism to state capitalism via forced labor—to be the road of the African Revolution? We do not believe that the African masses who began the road to liberation directly after World War II concluded in an outburst of elemental, creative activity will now bow to what the African intellectual in a dilemma is dishing out.

When I was in France in 1947 I met a leader of the African movement who described how the African masses, still plagued by tribalism and without any organized labor movement, trade union or political, attempted self-rule after defeat of the axis. He was talking about the French Cameroons where the population as a whole—every man, woman and youth—turned out to try to govern themselves. He said none of the leaders had expected such a mass turnout and did not have sufficient "membership cards." The revolution was short-lived for soon the French, with the connivance of the American military, sped with gunboats to re-establish their old colonial rule.

The sporadic African revolutions have been overshadowed by the more comprehensive revolutions in Asia and the Middle East which hit at the lifeline of the major warring powers so that the self-activity of the masses in far-off Africa hardly rated space in the press. But this African leader came in person to tell his tale of revolution to the mighty French Confederation of Labor, already under Communist domination. His tale fell on deaf ears for the Communists were then the comrades-in-arms of DeGaulle and this African was told to return to Africa and "organize" his people!

THE AFRICAN INTELLECTUAL IN A DILEMMA

While the first stage of the African revolution was thus stifled at birth, the Communists did play at anti-colonialism and in 1949 participated in the Rassemblement Democratique Africain (African Democratic Rally—RDA). In those years Felix Houphouet-Boigny of the Ivory Coast, now Minister in DeGaulle's Cabinet and author of "We don't want independence", spoke quite differently of freedom for the long-oppressed African people. Next to him was the labor leader, Sekou Toure—who even then said that the chief need of Africa was "lots of capital. But to attract capital, we must inspire confidence in investors. Our responsibility is to inform the African people of their responsibility in this matter."

Thus even before the African Revolution got unfolded, signs were evident among the African intellectuals that industrialization meant capitalism, although these intellectuals knew how to guild this capitalism as "socialism." Thus another leader of the Democratic African Rally—Leopold Sedar Senghor—praised "an African road to socialism." Whatever that might have meant before any of the African colonies gained their independence, it means

something very different now that some have state power. In Guinea, for example, they now speak of "single party democracy." In Ghana Nkrumah chose for it the euphemistic title of "the African Personality."

In his speech to the All-African Peoples Conference, recently concluded in Accra, Nkrumah somehow made this "African personality" synonymous with "non-violent revolution." For this he was greatly praised by the capitalist press everywhere, especially in England and America. At the conference itself, however, there were many who could not quite accept the double-talk of "the African personality" equals "non-violent revolution." How could a Kenyan forget the British white terror? Or an Algerian the barbaric white colon rule that brought De Gaulle to power in France itself?

The biggest of all traps to stifle the African revolution is the trap of "non-violent revolution", whatever that might mean. Non-violence has little to do with the realities of the African Revolution where it meets the armed counter-revolution, as in Kenya and in Algeria, or the entrenched armed rulers in racist South Africa. It is a straightjacket for the self-activity of the African masses even as the indiscriminate unity of African states would mean the choice, not of a road to socialism, but to capitalism in its most horrific form of state-capitalism. Just as the bourgeoisie has degraded the word, revolution, to where it means nothing but conspiracy, so Nkrumah, who is emulating the old rulers in everything from yachts to canned biographies and statues glorifying himself, is bent on degrading the organization of society on totally new beginnings to where it means all things to all men except the masses struggling for true liberation from barbaric, armed colonial rule.

WILL HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF AS TRAGEDY OR AS A BANNER UNFURLED?

History is forever repeating itself without us learning much from it. When capitalism moved from free, anarchic competition, to monopoly control, there were socialists who saw in that concentration of capital "order" that would make it "easier" for the workers "to take over." When that kind of socialism collapsed like a house of cards at the outbreak of World War I, there were middle-of-the-roads who called for "a United States of Europe" as "a possible stage in the advancement of revolution." Lenin would have nothing to do with those who considered revolution nothing but a "taking over" of political rule. Unless the population to a man would run production and the state, that type of revolution would lead to nothing but a return to capitalism. Although present Russian totalitarianism is there as big as life to prove the point, the African intellectual is repeating all the old mistakes, and adding some new ones to boot.

The desire for unity of the African peoples is a powerful force. But the desire for unity against colonialism is one thing. It is quite something else when unity is attempted under the catch-all of "the African Personality" which includes republics and monarchies alike, not excluding the classic comprador (native management of foreign capital) rule in Liberia, dominated by the American dollar. None knows this better than Nkrumah's "adviser on African Affairs", the famous West Indian writer who has often been a fellow-traveller of the Communists—George Padmore.

That is why he tried to lard "the African Personality" with some "socialism." He could not do this at the Accra Conference in April since that conference of independent African states included kings and sultans. There the African Personality got limited to the field of foreign

Vol 4 1957

policy: "For too long in our history," thundered Nkrumah, "Africa has spoken through the voice of others," and then down in a whisper: "Now what I have called the African Personality in international affairs will have a chance of making its proper impact." This, in turn got translated into a sort of watered down neutralism.

By December, the conference, this time held on a non-governmental level, allowed Padmore to expand himself so that the Manifesto for the conference stated that it would "formulate and proclaim our African Personality based on the philosophy of Pan-African socialism as the ideology of the African Non-violent Revolution."

While Nkrumah is blending his "Pan-African socialism" with the rule both of the tribal chiefs and British-type industrialization, Toure had his theoretician—the Frenchman Jean Bayer—work up a heady brew called "African communism." This is supposed to blend African communism and European socialism. If you add to that "single party democracy", where exactly would all these "roads to socialism" lead us?

MUST INDUSTRIALIZATION BE TOTALITARIAN

The truth is, by whatever name you call it, neither the new euphemisms, nor the new black color, can hide the old smell of exploitative capitalism. Of course, industrialization of Africa is a necessity. Of course, this cannot be done outside of a relationship to technologically advanced industrial powers. But must the method be capitalistic? Must we see in Africa what we have already seen in Russia and in China—the emergence of a new ruling class that comes with state power and capitalistic industrialization and is totalitarian? The physiognomy of the African intellectual may be idealistic and fresh at first, but the road upon which his present policies set him will make it impossible to resist the objective pull of world state capitalism.

The responsibility of the Marxist Humanist is not that of pushing the Africans helter skelter on the road of industrialization as if industrialization by itself answered the desire for liberation. Nor must the Marxist Humanist—African or Pan-African, or Yugoslav or French for that matter—create new points of confusion such as "violence and non-violence" which can only blind one to the realities of the true reconstruction of society on new beginnings. Revolution is, after, all, nothing but evolution in the fullness of time and in the elemental human form called forth by the need of the creation of this new society on totally new beginnings whose point of departure and point of return alike center around the relation of man to man at the point of production, in the state, and within the context of a human world.

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of MARXISM AND FREEDOM

A FORGOTTEN PAGE OF AMERICAN HISTORY ROLE OF THE NEGRO IN THE POPULIST MOVEMENT

As the latest crop of books from white Southern "liberals" once again proves, the plea for time to "read-just" (another civil war?) is based on the most popular white fetish that the South has "always" been solid on "the race problem."

The truth is that one of the greatest pages of our history—the Populist movement—had its Southern chapter written by white and Negro acting together. "Never before or since," writes the historian, C. Vann Woodward*; "have the two races in the South come so close together as they did during the Populist struggles."

The simultaneous growth of monopoly and depression during the turbulent eighties and "heart-breaking" nineties found the agricultural South at the mercy of the city merchant and ground beneath the wheel of the railroads with their high tariffs, established by an unholy combination of railroad tycoons and the Government. In sheer self-defense, the farmers—white and black, middle class and poor, West and South—united to challenge not only the unbridled rule of Eastern capital, but also their own race prejudices.

One of the incidents during this period will show just how strong the unity of action between white and Negro was. A Negro Populist, H. S. Doyle, was confronted with a lynch threat. A white Populist leader, the Georgian, Tom Watson, then declared:

"We are determined in this free country that the humblest white or black man who wants to talk our doctrine shall do it, and the man doesn't live who shall touch a hair of his head, without fighting every man in the People's Party."

In those days Tom Watson meant what he said. He followed this declaration up by giving Doyle shelter and sending out riders on horseback for assistance. We have a description of this from the biographer of Tom Watson: "All night armed farmers roared into the village. The next morning the streets were 'lined with buggies and horses, foamed and tired with travel'. All that day and the next night they continued to pour in until 'fully 2,000' Populists crowded the village—arms stacked on Watson's veranda."

POPULISM AND NEGRO SELF-ACTIVITY

Populism was a power to be reckoned with both in state and national politics. It was instrumental in the election of Populist governors as well as state and national representatives. The National Colored Farmers' Alliance alone numbered no less than 1½ million. Although separately organized, from the white agrarians, it waged its

battles together with them. At one blow the unity of white and black not only shattered the Solid South but threatened to do the same to the two party system.

Tom Watson gave expression to the Populist principle of a united front of white and Negro in these words:

"Now the People's Party says to these two men: 'You are kept apart that you may be separately fleeced of your earnings. You are made to hate each other because upon that hatred is rested the keystone of the arch of financial despotism which enslaves you both. You are deceived and blinded that you may not see how this race antagonism perpetuates a monetary system which beggars both.'"

It is true that by the time of World War I the old Watson became a race-baiter. The greater truth, the one that will live in history, however, is that, under the impact of the objective situation, that man was spokesman for, and a practitioner of, black and white unity. Of course, he buckled under when the different classes within the agrarian movement separated. When industry won the battle over agriculture, planter and cotton picker found different class alignments. The irresistible power of an idea with a mass following was no longer irresistible when the mass—in this case the National Colored Farmers' Alliance—called for a general strike of Negro cotton pickers.

Poor and rich divided, and so did the South. The president of the National Alliance (white) advised the farmers "to leave their cotton in the field rather than pay more than 50c per hundred to have it picked." The schism within the movement made it easy for the industrialist to unite with the planter to thwart the strivings for a truly new social order.

The point is that while the Populist movement did sweep the country, it had found its most radical expression in the South. This was seen both in the white agrarians' attitude to the Negro, and in the Negro's trying to push the movement forward by mass action of the cotton pickers. As we have seen, at the very height of the prejudice-ridden post-Reconstruction period, when the South was supposedly solidly white in thought and action, the unity of white and black shattered both the Solid South and the two party system. In the same way, the self-activity of the Negroes foreshadowed the class struggles to come and which we are living through today.

*Prof. Vann Woodward is one of the very few white historians who have made a great contribution to the study of American history by not neglecting the role of the Negro. See especially his work, TOM WATSON, Agrarian Rebel, from which the quotations in this article are taken. (Rinehart & Co., New York, \$5)

February, 1959

6646

TWO WORLDS

I give over my column this issue to a letter of protest the Editor sent to Advance.—R.D.

CONDITIONS OF LABOR IN RUSSIA

I must strongly object to the publication of my article, "Labor and Automation in the United States" in an issue of Advance which carries your fantastic editorial whitewash of labor conditions in Russia, entitled "Russia Marches On," thus giving the impression that Automation in Russia has had different effects on conditions of labor in the factory than it has had in America. Nothing could be further from the truth. Had I known that that was the purpose to which you would put my attack on American capitalism—trying to transform it into a whitewash of Russian state capitalism—I would never have consented to this fraternal exchange of articles on conditions of labor in each country.

CONDITIONS OF LABOR IN RUSSIA

In MARXISM AND FREEDOM, to which my article referred, labor conditions in Russia are seen to be no better, but rather worse, than in advanced private capitalist economies. Under Russian state capitalism the exploitative conditions in the factory co-exist with actual forced labor. The whole world, and particularly so the working class world, should have learned from the revolt of the Russian workers inside the forced labor camps in Vorkuta in 1953, a short month after the great East German Revolt in opposition to Russian imperialist rule there, what, exactly, Russian state capitalism is.

You could not have read the original report of Khrushchev to the 21st Congress of the Russian Communist Party, for you could not then have hailed the "achievements" of that land. All your facts—all without exception—are wrong. First and foremost, the work-week in Russia is not shorter than it is presently in America—it is 48 hours in Russia against 40 in America. What Khrushchev promised for 1965 (how patient you seem to be on that count!) would not give the Russian workers anything they did not already have before the Stalin Five Year Plans were initiated. The Russian workers had achieved the 7 hour day in 1927; it was taken away from them as a "war measure" and never restored to them. That is what that loudmouth imperialist called the General Secretary of the Communist Party, Nikita Khrushchev, is promising them as a result of seven more years of hard work at low pay, provided World War III does not break out in the meantime. And he is certainly as adept at warmongering as is Eisenhower.

The minimum pay of a Russian worker, said Khrushchev, will be \$140 a month—in 1965. This isn't a mere bureaucratic distortion of an essentially workers' state; this is the "superiority" of Russian state capitalism. Is that what you wish the British workers to follow as an example? As for Automation—sure, it is highly advanced technology, but it produces, exactly as in other capitalist countries, missiles and sputniks and H-bombs and not, as you put it (but even Khrushchev did not), "flats for all workers."

THE ABC'S OF SOCIALISM

Of course Russia has achieved a high degree of industrialization. So in the last century was the American technological development superior to England, "the mother country." So in this century, in the 1930's, did

feudal Japan parallel "socialist" Russia in its rate of industrial development. Is that what socialism has gotten to mean—industrialization? Have we all forgotten our ABC's, that a new social order begins with workers' control of production, continues to entirely new human relations ending in the breakdown of the division of mental and manual labor so that the freedom and full development of "the individual is the basis of the freedom for all." (Incidentally, why not read the lead article, CONFLICT BEHIND PEACE TALKS, back in August 19, 1955, in News & Letters, for a description of Automation from original Russian sources?)

This confusion on your part—where, on the one hand, you wish to be in a new, truly revolutionary regroupment of Marxist organizations, and, on the other hand, follow the Trotskyist whitewash analysis of Russia because it was once a workers' state—this confusion, if you will permit me to say so from this side of the Atlantic, is in no small measure due to the fact that you have not begun from the basic Marxist standpoint of where the worker is in production and thus not grasped that planning without workers' control of production can only lead to state capitalist tyranny.

RUSSIAN STATE CAPITALISM

That is why Raya Dunayevskaya, in her exhaustive study of the Russian economy as well as profound restatement of Marxist fundamentals for our day, wrote in MARXISM AND FREEDOM:

"The fundamental error of those who cannot understand that a single capitalist society is governed by the same laws as a society composed of individual capitalists is that they simply will not understand that what happens in the market is merely the result and the consequence of production itself . . . They seem to think that a single capitalist society will have a limitless market. The single capitalist—call him 'Collective Leadership under Khrushchev, Inc.' if you will—will have, at a certain stage, a magnificent plant, completely automated, or a jet bomber, but he cannot stop to raise the standard of masses of workers . . . That is why Marx, throughout CAPITAL, insists that either you have the self-activity of the workers, the plan of freely associated labor, or you have the hierarchic structure of relations in the factory and the despotic Plan. There is no in-between."

Because I myself am a production worker, and therefore associate socialism with new relations of production, I took for granted that you, on the British side, who have broken with Stalinism and Trotskyism, see it that way too. That is why I spoke only against American capitalism and the American labor bureaucracy, but the struggle against them is certainly also the struggle against Russian state capitalism and the totalitarian bureaucrats. These two poles of world capital—America and Russia—are presently fighting for world domination and threatening the very existence of humanity itself. Surely the socialist road is opposed to both camps."

March, 1959

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Author
of MARXISM AND FREEDOM

KHRUSHCHEV TALKS ON AND ON

I have finally waded through the 7 hour speech that Khrushchev delivered on January 28th to the 21st Congress of the Russian Communist Party. Even if you give your captive audience a break for lunch, 7 hours is a long, long time to talk. When the sun suddenly shines through the windows, the ebullient First Secretary of the Communist Party takes time out to laugh and call to the attention of the press that the sun shines on this "socialist land" that will in 1970—specifies Khrushchev—overtake America in industrial production and standard of living of the masses. Khrushchev expands himself as a theoretician. Without making any references to the Chinese "Communes," he pontificates on the fact that "the socialist stage cannot be skipped. To pass prematurely (to communism) when the economic conditions have not yet been created would harm the cause of Communism." Having theoretically thus put the Chinese Communist Party in its place, Khrushchev becomes the practical man and denounces those who dare to say there is any disagreement between the Russian and Chinese Communist Parties: "We have no disagreement with this Party nor could we have any disagreement."

Timed "prolonged applauses" punctuate the crescendos in the speech which glorify Russia that was the first in the world to launch the Sputnik and beat America a second time in the try for the moon. Khrushchev mixes his boasts with threats of all-out nuclear war via missiles with a 5,000 mile range.

Seven hours is a long time—long enough to have some truths stand out. Khrushchev, admits that on the production front, as of this moment, Russian industrial power is only half that of the United States and in per capita labor productivity, not only the United States but Western Europe outshines Russia. It is here that the discerning reader can see that the real "crescendo" of the speech is not in the boasting, but in the self-defense against the "bourgeois slander" which has attributed the change in the Russian educational system to a labor shortage.

The cat in the bag is beginning to show itself.

"ALL STUDENTS LIKE WORK IN FACTORIES"

Last year the traditional type Stalinist Five Year Plan had to be scrapped. In trying to escape the challenge of the silent revolt (slowdowns) of the Russian workers against speed up the ever-inventive conjurer of the totalitarian state came up with a brainstorm he called "uninterrupted production practice." This, Khrushchev explained to the 13th Congress of the Young Communists, meant that manual training (introduced in 1956) even to the first four grades in school and extended and supplemented in grades 5-7 with actual work in shop and on farm would become the "voluntary" way of life and create a new source of labor.

Needless to say, the kept Russian press took up the refrain of "uninterrupted production practice" and on July 8th of last year Pravda assured us that the result of the experience of the schools that had switched to a curriculum combining study with production work (three days study; three days work) was that "All students like work in factories"! Characteristic of the totalitarian state, all this was done on a mass scale at the time the Five Year Plan was scrapped and 1958 made the transition point to

the new Seven Year Plan (1959 through 1965).

Khrushchev, the boaster, now becomes Khrushchev, the dictator. "It is the function of all the ideological work of our party and state," thunders the Top Man, "to develop new traits in Soviet people, to train them in... love of work."

What a descent from the mount. If the "ideological work" for the Seven Year Plan consists in training people in "love of work," it is a far cry from everybody from the 5th grade on falling all over themselves "to get closer to life" and rushing to work in the factories they all "like." But Khrushchev isn't one to note contradictions. He is a master at compounding them.

LABOR PRODUCTIVITY, THE PLAN AND WAGES

Because none of the sensationalism of the "De-Stalinization" Report at the 20th Congress pervaded the present speech, this Report on the Seven Year Plan rated a great deal less coverage in the daily press than the one made 3 years ago. At the same time, however, the bourgeois press behaved as if Khrushchev always gets what Khrushchev wants and "therefore" there was no point to examining how this would be done. Never did the old platitude, "Nothing succeeds like success," so overwhelm bourgeois and radical alike. Shooting for the moon held the journalists on earth so spellbound that, in the end, only the Russian bureaucracy itself worried as to just how it will reach the production targets since they are all based on a 50% rise in labor productivity in industry and no less than a doubling of labor productivity on collective farms. "In view of the reduction of the working day," said Khrushchev, the practical man, who was promising a

reduction of the workweek to 40 hours by 1962, "hourly output will rise even more. Higher labor productivity will account for three-fourths of the increase of industrial output in 1965."

Planning specifies it precisely and planning is not based on wishing but on laws and state power and forced labor camps.

And what can the ordinary worker look forward to as a result of trying once again "to catch up with and outdistance America"?

"It is planned," the bulgy tyrant continues, "to raise the minimum wages of low paid workers from between 270-350 rubles a month to between 500 or 600 rubles a month." That is approximately \$100-120 a month at the official Russian exchange! (The ruble has no value on the international exchange.)

So we have wandered all over the globe and unto the moon but had to return to earth, Russian earth, to find that the key to the Seven Year Plan is in labor productivity and that the Russian worker and peasant will once again bear the heavy burden of industrialization. We can be sure that the Seven Year Plan will meet with resistance by the Russian masses who see no reason to increase their labor productivity when conditions of labor after three decades of Plans are no different than the exploitative conditions under private capitalism.

April, 1959

6648

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Author
of Marxism and Freedom

MAY 1 AND THE SHORTER WORK DAY

During the first week of May this year the United Steel Workers presented its demand for a shorter workweek. That it is a ludicrously low demand—a cut from 40 to 38 hours a week—is contributing to the fact that even the so-called radical press is giving it little publicity. The demand is of great importance, nevertheless. It is the first time in long, long decades that a union at contract time put such a demand on the negotiation table.

No doubt it was accidental on the part of the present union leaders to issue this demand in the first week of May. But, again, the significance cannot be lost in the accidental nature of their timing when, historically, May 1 is indissolubly connected with the struggles for the 8 hour day. The initiation of the struggle for the 8 hour day coincided with the founding of the first National Labor Union in America.

Eight-Hour Leagues sprang up everywhere. "In the United States of America," wrote Marx, "any sort of independent labor movement was paralyzed so long as slavery disfigured a part of the republic. Labor with a white skin cannot emancipate itself where labor with a black skin is branded. But out of the death of slavery a new vigorous life sprang. The first fruit of the Civil War was an agitation for the 8-hour day."

The severe financial crisis of 1873 dealt a death blow to the Eight-Hour Leagues, but not to the idea for an 8-hour day. In 1884 not only the idea, but the actions to put it into effect, were once again initiated, this time by the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada, later to be known as the American Federation of Labor. It was this organization which specified that the date for the struggle in the form of a general strike would be May 1st.

The struggle for the 8 hour day during the decade of 1880s received a real blood bath from the counter-revolution initiated by the companies with the help of the government. The anarchist labor leaders, Parsons, Spies, Fischer and Engel, were railroaded to the gallows.

This unfolding of the counter-revolution did not stop the movement for the 8 hour day. On the contrary. The conservative head of the A.F. of L., Samuel Gompers, looked for international help. As he put it in his reminiscences of the year 1889: "As the time of the meeting of the International Workingman's Congress in Paris approached, it occurred to me that we could aid our movement by an expression of world-wide sympathy from that Congress."

They got more than sympathy from the International at its Paris Congress, which immediately adopted the following resolution: "The Congress decides to organize a

great international demonstration, so that in all countries and in all cities, on one appointed day, the toiling masses shall demand of the state authorities the legal reduction of the working day to 8 hours . . . Since a similar demonstration has already been decided upon for May 1, 1890, by the American Federation of Labor at its Convention in St. Louis, December 1888, this day is accepted for the international demonstration."

THE UNITY OF PRACTICE AND THEORY

Just as the Marxist world organization had adopted the American choice of May 1 as the holiday that would combine strike action with demonstrations in support of labor's demand for the 8 hour day, in practice—so, in theory, the struggle for the shorter workday became the axis of Marx's greatest theoretical work, *CAPITAL*. Building on the impulse, action, and philosophy of the working class, for a shorter working day, Marx drew the conclusion that the "development of human power which is its own end, the true realm of freedom . . . can flourish only upon the realm of necessity as its basis. The shortening of the working day is its fundamental premise."

THE PENDING STEEL STRIKE

As words, Marx's phrase—"the development of human power which is its own end"—may sound outlandish. But the thought behind it, the development of the human being instead of greater and greater machines, is precisely what is preoccupying the steel workers presently.

"It will give us a chance to catch our breath," said one of the steel workers at Homestead, Pa. "We sure need it," said another. "The speed-up is just killing us." "Automation has made everything worse," said a third, cutting both our employment and security. This cutting of the workweek, if we can get it, would help some."

It is not that anyone thought that all problems, either of the employed or of the unemployed, would be solved by this minor cutting of the workweek. It is that a beginning must be made somewhere. Reuther is great at shouting about a reduction not only of the workweek but workday when he addresses a meeting of the unemployed. But at negotiation time he is as silent as an Egyptian tomb. The whole question of the kind of labor which has been raised by the American workers since Automation has now been made more concrete by the attempt to limit the time when the worker must work for others, and extend the time for his own thoughts.

MAY, 1959

6649

Vol 4 #7

Aug 1957

NUCLEAR "PERSONAL" DIPLOMACY

The homey touch of Khrushchev and Eisenhower taking their respective spouses on their exchange visits completes the sudden surface transformation of two hostile worlds playing at brinksmanship into one world of "peace and prosperity." What transpires inside the bald heads of those identical twins are not, however, peace plans but plans for world domination that cannot be reconciled any more than can the two worlds of capitalists and workers in each of those countries. Just as Eisenhower did not allow this aura of peace with Russia to stop him from declaring war on the American workers, demanding passage of the anti-labor Landrum-Griffin bill, so Khrushchev made his appearances at automation and agricultural conferences to demand higher productivity from the Russian workers.

At the same time there is no doubt that the two powers that hold the world in their nuclear armed grasp do wish a lull in the cold war between them building up to the hell of World War III—if for no other reason than the fact that the intercontinental missiles with 5,000 mile thrusts are not evidently sufficiently "operational" to assure specific instead of general holocaust. Khrushchev, despite all his braggadocio how near to American industrial power Russia is, is anxious to buy American goods from precision tools to cattle. The Administration is under pressure from American Big Business to do business with Khrushchev even as before World War II it was under pressure to do business with Hitler. The question is: who and what will be put on the sacrificial altar of the lull?

THE DOUBLE-CROSS, BIG AND LITTLE

Our crisis-ridden world is so full of explosive points that no one can say at whose expense—Europe, Asia, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East or the Mediterranean countries—the double-cross will be gotten. The most likely place, however, is exactly the countries Eisenhower is visiting to assure the opposite, especially so West Germany. The one governmental leader who isn't being taken for a ride in this enticing talk of nuclear disarmament is the one who has "a crude bomb" ready to explode in the Sahara Desert.

De Gaulle was therefore the man to expose the fact that Eisenhower is not "the official representative of the West." At the same time DeGaulle himself took a stab at a little double-cross by playing a game with Adenauer as the two who are ready to fight Communist Russia. Poor De Gaulle, his desire for playing at the game of double-cross is more than matched by his impotence. Even before

Eisenhower set Adenauer straight, a small journalistic pundit like Walter Lippman cut him to size.

"The truth is," wrote Lippman, "that France and Germany are for all practical purposes disarmed in Europe, and separately or jointly they are quite unable to contemplate a war with Russia."

"Only the USSR and USA can wage a nuclear war, and they alone, therefore, can make the ultimate decisions which mean peace or war . . ."

"These are the facts of life in the middle of the twentieth century."

In one thing Lippman is right. The division of the world into two, and only two parts, is certainly a fact of the life of the power politicians. Make no mistake about it. This write-off of Europe dominates the thought of both Eisenhower and Khrushchev.

This has been the dominant fact of life ever since America entered World War II. This was not due to the fact that Eisenhower and/or Roosevelt was "soft on Communism." It was due to the fact that state capitalist Russia reached a point of equality with America, once Nazi Germany was defeated.

Naturally De Gaulle is an expert on the double-cross—he was made to sit at the side tables or stand in the hallways all through the war planning and the peace negotiations. What De Gaulle fails to add is that there was not a word of objection from him when East Europe was written off the map of Europe as a separate entity. Just as East Europe fell to Stalin's Russia with the connivance of the governmental leaders of "the whole West," so now allies and satellites alike stand helplessly by as West Europe is being written off. The great and overwhelming desire of the peoples of the world for peace is being exploited by Russia and America to cover up this fact.

At the same time the talk about "possible" nuclear disarmament is loud and involved while the actual preparations for war are silent but to the point. What is at stake on both sides of the Iron Curtain is the freedom of the peoples who are fighting for a truly human world free of the type of production that entails exploitation and leads inevitably to war. In state capitalist Russia or "free enterprise" America, as in Conservative Britain and DeGaulle France and in West and East Germany, the present leaders are ready for any sell-out so long as exploitation of workers continues in "native" hands. For that one inviolate privilege they are ready to put a question mark over the very survival of civilization.

TWO WORLDS

EISENHOWER-KHRUSHCHEV SPECTACULAR

The show is over. The unprecedented TV, radio, and press coverage of Khrushchev's visit faded into the stillness of Camp David, where secret agreements between two such great warlords as Eisenhower and Khrushchev would not be open to mass media coverage. Then, the whole circus tent was taken down.

LEND-LEASE

The official communique from Camp David carried almost as frigid an air after, as before, the well publicized thaw. Nothing but "clarification" of the two opposing positions seems to have been achieved on the question that brought about the crisis in the first place: Berlin. But that is only because another show, more sinister than the one on TV, has to be put on for the benefit of the independence of "allies," especially West Germany.

The main reason that Khrushchev first concocted the Berlin crisis—trade in America—is also being played in a low key and first will be given to experts to see what Russia will pay for its Lend-Lease debt. Finally, still another show, this time for Eisenhower, has been put off until Spring, with the homey statement on the part of Khrushchev that it would be easier for the Eisenhower grandchildren to accompany him then.

"DOING BUSINESS WITH KHRUSHCHEV"

But all these are appearances. Of course the Berlin crisis could not be "resolved"—because the two contenders for world power have no intention of doing anything but prepare for the holocaust of World War III. But meanwhile—while the missiles become so operational that each side is sure it is the other that will be annihilated in the struggle for world domination—we will have "peace," and trade. The biggest victory was won by that part of Big Business, which wishes to do business with Russia.

And this contains the greatest of all threats to the American working class, for the simple reason that at the base of the "doing business with Khrushchev" is the pressure to do as Khrushchev does to his workers. Let us not forget that the biggest "insult" to Eisenhower came not from a "foreigner" but from his own golf playmates—Big Industry, specifically Steel.

Here was the President of the United States, the most powerful single ruler in the whole world, wishing to show off the steel industry to his most potent rival, Russia, and willing to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act to get the workers back to the mills—and the steel industry, feeling it had not yet succeeded in compelling submission on the part of its workers, said, "NO!" The "No" was loud and clear and insulting, but Eisenhower chose to obey it because his capitalist mentality agreed that the American workers must be chained to the machine and factory management.

ALL IS NOT WELL IN RUSSIA

Returning to these class fundamentals also illuminates the other side of this state-capitalist world, Russia—and ensures that we do not forget that Khrushchev came here not because all was well at home, but because it wasn't.

IF the Russian workers had meekly accepted the Khrushchev 7-Year Plan with its impossible goals of increased labor productivity, instead of having been so ingenious in their slowdown, Russia would have achieved what it wanted, and would not have had to come begging for trade with the country it is supposedly well on the way to "surpassing."

IF the Russian peasantry had been eager to obey quotas and over-reach them, instead of having been so ingenious in its resistance to them, Russia, technologically capable of reaching the moon, would not have been so technologically backward in its agriculture, that it had to have its Number One Man go to praise Iowa corn and Midwest cattle and eat hotdogs, without vodka, to boot.

IF the Russian youth were not so restive and frustrated at the new society that has been promised them for three decades but which they haven't yet seen, then Khrushchev might have addressed himself to them instead of to his best friends—the American capitalist class.

USURPING THE BANNER OF MARXISM

Khrushchev, however, has one advantage none of the other capitalist rulers have—he is travelling under the usurped banner of Marxism, although Communist totalitarianism is the exact opposite of that great banner of liberation. Indeed, the stupidities of the State Department are nowhere seen so clearly as in the fact that they thought their image of socialism with horns would keep the American masses "in place." It is clear, instead, that they have a very different public to deal with since the visit of that master showman, Khrushchev—not because his hands are bloody, which they are—but because he has usurped the banner of Marxism and knows how to expose the other capitalists' war-mongering so that the great desire for peace on the part of the peoples seems answered. And Khrushchev isn't limiting his peace overture to America.

WAR & PEACE

From the United States to Algeria, from China to Germany, from France to South Africa, the one theme Russia is playing now is "peace." Even reaching the moon was played down for "peace," as if all along they aren't testing the thrusts, not for scientific space exploration, but for war weapons to hurtle across continents and threaten the very existence of mankind. And the people are just supposed to sit with folded arms, peacefully forget their class struggle, and be drowned in illusions of peace!

But—just as the steel workers have refused to be cowed, although their stomachs are getting pretty empty, and just as all workers, American and European and African, refuse to separate their fight for bread from that for freedom—so the workers in each country on each side of the Atlantic, will prove to be the real antagonists against these hypocritical state-capitalist leaders. Until that struggle is settled, no others can be—because all the others only lead back to the same old exploitative society.

October, 1959

. 6651

Book # 111 November 1962

EXCLUSION OF NEGROES WARPS MIND OF WHITES

A group of West Africans are so interested in Americans of African descent that they are considering doing what our own "Talented tenth" has not done here—publish the original out-of-print pamphlet by David Walker, with a new introduction relating the struggles of the American Negroes to the African revolutions in our era. They have asked us to reprint the *Two Worlds* on this classic that is yet to gain recognition in our country.—Ed.

The split of this country into two worlds—white and Negro—warps the mind of the white much more than it does the Negro.

In a small way this warping can be seen in the books on Lincoln. The current crop are as superficial as they have been for nearly a century, because the white historian will not seriously grapple with the life and time and the activity of the Negro people in the era of the Civil War.

It is as if, during that great turning point of history—1861 to 1865—history didn't turn at all. At best, the Second American Revolution is presented as a mere economic development which made this country the great industrial land it is, without in the least remaking, or being remade by live people. Let us turn instead to one of the live people of that critical era, the Negro, David Walker. He made history then, and his utterances are more alive today than this month's crop of books on Abraham Lincoln.

DAVID WALKER'S APPEAL

In 1829, so extraordinary a sensation was caused by the appearance of a pamphlet entitled *Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the United States*, that legislatures in the South were called into special session to enact laws against free Negroes as against slaves for reading it. They put a price of \$3,000 on the head of its author, David Walker.

David Walker was a free Negro from North Carolina who had settled in Boston where he earned a living by collecting rags. His *Appeal* was addressed to the free Negroes. He took them to task for their meekness. He urged them to make the cause of the slave their own because the wretchedness of the free Negroes' conditions was due to the existence of slavery.

Walker urged them to make freedom their business. He pointed to the superiority of Negroes, in numbers and in bravery, over the whites. He took the great to task as well—especially Thomas Jefferson. Prophetically, he wrote that race prejudice would yet "root some of you out of the very face of the earth."

50,000 copies of this 76-page pamphlet were sold and circulated from hand to hand. Those who could not read had others read it to them. The South trembled at the simple words of an obscure Negro.

The Cambridge Modern History writes that "the excitement produced by Walker's *Appeal* had not subsided when the danger of writings of this sort was brought home to the slave-owners by a rising of slaves in Virginia—an outbreak known as 'Nat Turner's Insurrection'."

What the historians fail to see is that it was not "writings of this sort" that produced the revolts, but the revolts that produced the writings. Before Nat Turner and the *Appeal*, there was Denmark Vesey and the Underground Railway. The revolts of the Negro slaves were in fact one continuous chain of struggle from the moment they were brought to this country in chains of bondage. These slave revolts not only produced the writings, but the actual Civil War.

The Negroes had no money, no press, no vote, no party. They were armed only with their feelings for freedom and the certainty that they were right and could not and would not be kept down.

THE ABOLITIONISTS & TODAY'S HISTORIANS

Out of the genius of America, with no assistance from any alien tradition, there emerged the great Abolitionist movement which combined white and Negro in the cause of freedom.

As Wendell Phillips put it: "We do not play politics; anti-slavery is no half-jest with us; it is a terrible earnest, with life or death, worse than life or death, on the issue. It is no lawsuit, where it matters not to the good feeling of opposing counsels which way the verdict goes, and where advocates can shake hands after the decision as pleasantly as before."

This great American saw more clearly 100 years ago than the intellectual sees today. He saw that even the Civil War would not establish new human relations unless "the blacks" (became) the very basis of the effort to regenerate the South. We want the 4 million of blacks—a people instinctively on our side and ready and skilled to work; the only element in the South which belongs to the 19th century."

Until the historian today begins where Wendell Phillips left off he will be unable to understand either the history of his country or its future perspectives.

Vol 5 #1

January 1960

10

STAGNATION OF U. S. ECONOMY

"They willed it so" sounds like a subjective analysis of the capitalists (in and out of Government), and unemployment. The point can be easily proven, but for the moment we will leave it aside and turn to the supposedly objective analyses of the economy which speak of "the soaring '60's." The one fact that even these analysts must admit is that this "continuing boom" has been interrupted by the recessions in 1949-50, and again 1953-54, and yet again in 1957-58.

These periodic recessions that come every 3 years do not measure up to the Big Depression, but are they really only "correctional" to an ever-expanding economy?

Were we as inhuman on the question of unemployment as Eisenhower, and the Big Business men who set his line for him, we would have to be blind as well not to see that, like the Nazi generals who won the battles but lost the war, Big Business is running the American economy into the ground. Just take one look at the "United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics for April 1959" and you will see that U. S. ranks 33rd in percentage growth of industrial output for the period of 1953-58 and is probably the only nation in the world which has made no gain in industrial output during this period.

THE 3 POSTWAR RECESSIONS

There is nothing accidental about the 1953 recession. It is the third in a series of post-war recessions, each more ominous than the last.

Take the period from the recession in 1953 to the one in 1958 and you will see that, while the value of goods and services rose from \$408.8 billion to \$441.7 billion, population during this period increased 9% as against the rise in production and services of 8%, and thus on a per capita basis the Gross National Product was 1% below the level it was in 1953. If this "pace of progress" isn't stagnation, then consider the empty stomachs of the 4 million unemployed who, with their families, add up to 10 million.

The same period, in terms of rate of growth, witnessed a fall from the increase of 4.6% during 1947-53 to only 1.5% in 1953-58. Thus, on a per capita annual rate of growth what was a growth of 2.7% in '47-53 became a minus, 2% in 1953-58. All this, you must not forget, occurred during a period of Automation and a fabulous rise in labor productivity. Since 1945, for example, the industrial labor force has gone up only 8%, but it produces 40% more per man hour.

ECONOMICS OF WORLD TENSIONS

According to Alan Dulles, who isn't likely to exaggerate Russian success nor to underplay our own, the gross national product in Russia has increased at the rate of 9% annually as compared to the American rate of annual growth of less than 3%.

The standard consolation prize under such telling circumstances used to be to point to American accumulated wealth and advanced techniques as against the backwardness of Russia. There is no doubt that Russia still is backward or, more precisely put, it is the only one of the advanced industrial countries that still has more than 50% of its population in agriculture. Nevertheless, this argument is as phony as the one that all would be well in America "if only" we used our advanced technology in full. The actual, not the potential, utilization is what counts in growth or lack of growth. We are not dealing, moreover, with a Russia that began its serious industrialization in 1928, but with a Russia that has already achieved a sufficiently advanced technological base, to have entered the nuclear age with a forward sprint in missiles.

Finally, it is not only in relationship to Russia, that our rate of growth measures up to a standstill. It is true in relationship to Europe as a whole. No matter how high the accumulated wealth and advanced the techniques, if, for growth, we substitute mere conservation, it spells ruin. It is this exactly which is felt the world over, and nowhere as much as in the underdeveloped countries that look for aid in industrialization from the advanced countries.

The United Nations "World Economic Survey for 1958" shows that the poor primary producing areas have lost more as a result of the deterioration of their terms of trade than the whole of their foreign aid. Despite the aid, alleged and real, that the advanced countries are giving the underdeveloped areas, the truth is the inequality between rich and poor countries is actually increasing. At the same time the industrial proletariat of the advanced countries has not much to show in gains. It is here, in the relationship of labor to capital that we have to look for the causes of the world crisis.

Some serious bourgeois economists (See Thomas Balogh in New Statesmen, Dec. 12, 1959) see the American recession growing into an international depression, and argue that "if we are to survive" we better take a second look at the economics of world tension.

There is no escape, however, "East" or "West" from the dictum of Marx that "The real barrier of capitalist production is capital itself."

PROFITS AND THE STEEL INDUSTRY

The steel industry has always been the perfect example of an insatiable appetite for profits as well as an ability to compel the Government to be on its side by sabotaging production, especially in wartime. Though its mass profits were lush enough, it cried so much about the decline in the rate of profit that it refused to modernize its plants during the Korean war unless it was promised such quick write-offs, tax-wise, as actually to put the cost of modernization back on the people. It won its point and achieved an artificial rise in the rate of profit.

By the first half of 1959 labor productivity had risen so high that with only 1% more industrial workers, it could produce fully 50% as many tons of steel as were turned out, say, in 1947. Nevertheless, when confronted with the fact that Europe had spent \$4.38 billion on steel modernization since 1954, the American steel industry could think only of ways to improve its competitive standing and that is (1) to try to break the union, especially insofar as any say over conditions of labor; (2) to try to keep wages from rising by taking up the Eisenhower refrain of "fighting inflation"; and (3) bring conditions of labor to match the sweatshop conditions of the 1930's and the absolute rule of management. Hence its uncompromising stand in forcing a prolonged steel strike, in winning use of Taft-Hartley Act to compel return to work, and presently to continue its stubborn stand in face of world tensions.

In the decline in the rate of growth, the compulsion to unemployment so that wages and conditions can be worsened, there is all around us growing up an uncomfortable resemblance to the factors that produced the 1929 crash. Indeed, no one even in America is willing to go beyond 1960 for predictions of any continuing "boom." 1961 will see us once again plunged to "ordinary" depression—or to war.

TWO WORLDS

The Roots of Anti-Semitism

By Rayo Dunayevskaya

NOT COLOGNE, GERMANY, BUT DETROIT, USA

The most fantastic of all the current anti-Semitic acts occurred, not in Cologne, Germany, but in Detroit, USA. The self-styled teen-age "fuehrer" of the group that smeared swastikas on synagogues is the son of a teacher at the University of Detroit.

This instructor in the ways of democracy had the gall to say that he "didn't know" that playing with Nazi uniforms and insignia would have any worse effect on his son than playing at being cowboy, especially since he had told him that "the enemy now was the hammer and sickle."

The so-called "minister of war" in that American Nazi group is the son of a policeman.

This group of juvenile delinquents—who were not sent to a house of correction, but given back to the custody of their parents—was originally organized fully 4 years ago by the older brother of the "fuehrer," who has since become a guardian of democracy where he is stationed—in Germany.

The Army issued a statement that it would "immediately" investigate whether the soldier had any connection with the Cologne outrage. At the same time the press displayed such tender feelings in the whole matter that not only were the names of the teenagers not revealed, but neither were those of the parents or the soldier.

That this contrasts sharply with the practice followed when a Negro moves into a white neighborhood is made the more blatant by the fact that all this has occurred in a neighborhood adjoining the one that two years ago saw adult hoodlums attack on Mrs. Watkins' home. Behind every so-called juvenile delinquent stands a respectable adult with all the prejudices of decadent capitalist society.

ON BOTH SIDES OF THE IRON CURTAIN

Let us forget that the Allies no sooner won the war than they began to staff their administrations with former Nazis, let me say that the Army would do better than investigate that single Detroit soldier if it looked at its own top brass. I refer not only to the American Army, but to the four occupying powers, including Russia.

Where, a decade after the Allied victory, "the loser" Nazi General, Spiedel can become the head of NATO, on the other side of the Iron Curtain the Jews have gone through everything from the purges of Stalin's era to the era of Khrushchev which permits publications that rival the infamous forged "Protocols of Zion."

(See articles entitled "Behind the Screen of Zionism," in Sovremenniy Vostok, Nov. and Dec. 1957, and "The Priestess of the God Jehovah," in the Prikopatska Pravda, Sept. 24, 1958. These are translated, and others of like nature summarized, in the Sept. 14, 1959 issue of The New Leader.)

The fact that Khrushchev took quick advantage of the present reappearance of anti-Semitism in Adenauer Germany to point to a recurrence of Nazism, and ask for "no confidence" in West Germany, is pure and cheap politics. Not that Adenauer can be absolved of responsibility, but he is not alone. All the occupying powers in Germany, including Russia, are responsible for the re-establishment of the Krupp empire which nourished and sustained Nazism, and is now doing its own type of flirtation with Russian orders for "peaceful" goods.

CLASS AND RACE

It matters not which of the capitalist powers won, and which lost, the minority problem remains the open sore. This is due not only to the fact that the ruling class needs a "scapegoat" for their crime of never being able to solve a single fundamental problem, in war or in peace. Nor is it due only to the fact that the perpetuation of exploitation follows the old maxim of divide and rule. Basic as these two factors are, they are not the whole truth.

Under the open sore of the persecution of a minority is hidden the greater truth of exploitation—that the exploiters, not the exploited, are the minority. Within this greater truth will be found the answer as to why a specific scapegoat is chosen at a particular time at each separate stage of capitalism's development.

THERE ARE REASONS why the discrimination against a certain race suddenly bursts forth into the lynching of an individual Negro. There are reasons why discrimination against another race takes the form, in late 19th century France, of a single wronged individual as happened in the military conspiracy against Dreyfus, whereas in another country, like Tsarist Russia, it took the form of anti-Jewish pogroms. Whatever the match that started the conflagration, it seemed never to have reached the fantastic proportions of the extermination of a whole race. Yet the barbarous insanity of our times—the extermination of 6

million Jews in Nazi Germany—provoked no such unanimous outcry of horror as the single Dreyfus case. Why?

The Depression, which sounded the collapse of the economic system of capitalism, brought to the fore the flowering of the new element that came to life when the imperialist tentacles of monopoly capitalism reached for the spoliation of a whole continent with its belief in the "Superior Race."

Those who wish to forget that at the root of present-day apartheid South Africa was the "civilizing mission" of the white race—which meant, in fact, such horrors as the extermination of the Hottentot tribes by the Boers, or Leopold II's reduction of 20 to 40 million peaceful Congolese to 8 million—are the ones who took the extermination of the Jews in Germany "in stride"—until the Nazi search for "lebensraum" meant a challenge to their own area of exploitation.

AT THE ROOT: CAPITALISM

What the recent anti-Semitic outbreaks show is that it is impossible to destroy Nazism, the most bestial expression of capitalism, where its root, capitalism itself, flourishes. When imperialism first revealed the truth of exploitation—that it is the majority, not the "minority," that is persecuted; when it further took on the additive of color, the "white man's burden" still seemed to be outside of the "civilized, advanced country." But by the time monopoly capitalism was transformed into the totalitarian state form in Germany, it was clear enough that it meant enslavement at home. Simultaneously with the destruction of the Jews went the destruction of the labor movement, reaching its climax in the Nazi concentration camps with their crematories.

Let an Adenauer be permitted to forget his silence at the extermination of a race at the time it happened; let an Eisenhower forget his impunity which put Nazi officers at head of a rearmed Germany; let a Khrushchev be permitted to parade as a staunch lover of freedom and peace and protector of Jews, let the historic record show:

(1) that all of them and their ilk helped Nazism, and in fact the Nazi-Soviet Pact gave the green light to the unleashing of World War II; (2) all of them and their ilk helped capitalism re-establish itself when Germany lost; and (3) presently all of them march, though not in unison, but rather at opposite poles, toward the same goal—preparations for a nuclear World War III which might spell the end of civilization altogether.

WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

Long before the maturing of the state capitalist world in which we now live, Lenin watched the appearance of bureaucracy in the workers' state and warned of "returning backwards to capitalism." His warning—that unless production and the state were run by the population "to a man," state capitalism would overtake Russia—fell on as deaf ears as his last fight against Stalin's rudeness toward minority groups.

He wrote prophetically: "Scratch some Bolsheviks and you will find Great Russian chauvinists . . . I am declaring war on Great Russian chauvinism . . . the same Russian apparatus, which was borrowed from Tsarism and only barely anointed with the Soviet chrism."

It remains the most telling commentary not only of present-day Russia but of the whole state capitalist world in which we now live.

In contrast to genuine Marxists, liberals have never been able to face the fact of the class nature of oppression of minorities; whether that took the individual form of the Dreyfus affair or the outright fascism of our day. When fascism first came to Italy in the 1920s, they said it could never happen in an "advanced" country; the backwardness of Italy was supposed to have produced fascism. When it came to the most technologically advanced European land—Germany—it became a question of "Prussian militarism." When the "non-military" countries by force of arms destroyed Nazi Germany, and neo-Nazism now reappears not only under "democratic" tutelage there, but is spreading to other countries, including America, then we are supposed to blame "juvenile delinquents."

The truth is, however, that the one feature that is truly new is the mass youth demonstrations against fascism, especially in West Germany. The preponderance of youth in these demonstrations shows how deeply-rooted is anti-fascism among the youth, although they had not suffered the physical tortures and crimes and barbarism of the Nazis. It is the present capitalist world which is constantly recreating the conditions for fascism that they are rebelling against.

Far from being rebels without a cause, the youth of today are reflecting this world they never made, and searching for new beginnings of a truly human world.

The Russian Communist bureaucracy is so unbiased a "protector" of Jews that the Greater Russian Encyclopedia fails to note the Jewish origin of Karl Marx. At the same time The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which replaces Stalin's Short Course on the same subject in present teachings, shows more liberties with the truth on Jewish Marxists than even Stalin did. For example, it fails to include the Jewish Bund as an organization that prepared the first Marxist Congress. Perhaps Khrushchev considers all this "subtle." It certainly isn't the only untruth, or even a large one, compared to the fact that history has been rewritten.

FEBRUARY, 1960

Of War and Peace

KHRUSHCHEV, EISENHOWER AND DE GAULLE APPROACH THE SUMMIT

Nikita Khrushchev's recent address to the Supreme Soviet on "peaceful co-existence" bore every mark of old-fashioned sabre-rattling in which the only thing new was the barbarity of the threat to wipe any "enemy" country or countries "off the face of the earth."

"MORE RUBBLE FOR A RUBLE"

Khrushchev continued to assure his monolithic ruling body that the 17 billion rubles which would be saved as a result of the proposed cut of 1,200,000 men from the armed forces would "not reduce the fire-power of our armed forces . . . The weapon we have today in the hatching stage is even more formidable (than the H-bomb). It is a fantastic weapon."

So fantastic is the age in which we live, that Khrushchev no sooner said this than one American scientist suggested it might mean that the Russians could send H-bombs to outer space, and, with a signal from earth, be able at any time to set it off to any target!

A missile salvo as one road to world dominance is certainly not excluded in the calculations of this totalitarian tyrant. He certainly out-Dullesed Dulles with his view of bargaining "from a position of strength." Being, however, a master of talking from both sides of his mouth, Khrushchev, in this speech, also proposed both a cut in the armed forces and the production of conventional weapons, not to mention "the good life" for the Russian. Whoever this fooled, it didn't fool the Russian people.

THE BIG STICK— AND THE LITTLE CARROT

Once before, in Stalin's day, there was a quick demobilization of the army. The shortage of labor in industry, the war destruction, and the post-war unrest left Stalin's grandiose Plans without a labor force to execute them. There promptly followed, therefore, a general amnesty for all "labor offenses," and, to provide the type of counterweight to labor's demands that is provided by the unemployed, the rapid demobilization of soldiers.

More recently, the shortage of labor could be seen in the fact that no small part of the sudden reorganization in education was due to that shortage

Presently, the proposal for a cut of 1,200,000 is connected both with the shortage of labor in industry and the unrest in agriculture.

Khrushchev let the cat out of the bag when he told his bureaucratic cohorts that "there was no room for the callousness and negligence which officials and managers have displayed toward newcomers entering the former virgin land projects in Siberia."

This, then, is where many of the soon-to-be demobilized soldiers will be headed for. And what about the rich life in the cities? "In spite of this (low harvest)," Khrushchev said, "coming down to the realities of Russian life instead of boasting of Russian rocketry, the government has purchased enough to meet the needs of the population . . ."

YOUTH AND ROCK 'N ROLL

More than bread is needed to keep the loyalty of the youth. The elite ideology constantly thrown at them backfires so much that the Central Committee Resolution, published on the eve of the convening of the Supreme Soviet on January 14, admitted: "Some groups of the population are altogether outside everyday ideological and political influence." And of course they blame "remnants of the past in the consciousness of the Soviet people."

How far "past" these attitudes go can be seen from the fact that teenagers have "produced and sold rock 'n roll records on exposed X-ray film." The Russian press compliments the police for smashing this teenage "black market."

Just as the unrest among the Russian people and the shortage of labor were behind the quick demobilization of the army in Stalin's day, so it is behind the present demobilization. Far from being a step in disarmament, it is a step in the arming of the state against labor in general, and the youth in particular.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Peculiarly enough, neither the internal tensions in Russia,

nor the rocket throwing, got as much play in the bourgeois press as did the disarmament talk. Needless to say, this was not due to the fact that, where Khrushchev didn't fool the Russian people, he did fool the Eisenhower Administration.

No; the truth is that the class struggle in America is not hidden in undefined internal tensions, but is out in the open, and so is the people's deep desire for peace. The American Administration therefore feels that it must be part of the Russian disarmament conspiracy and play at peace as the summit meeting approaches.

Just as strike-breaking and globe-trotting have merged into the office of the presidency, so have disarmament talk and rocket-throwing been merged in the person of the First Secretary of the Russian Communist Party. The annihilating power of any missile salvo has compelled a stalemate between the two nuclear powers fighting for world control.

ANTI-SEMITISM & WORLD CRISIS

But a stalemate can solve nothing. There is no guarantee of peace in it. The lunatic fringe is the first to bring that fact to surface precisely because its madness reveals what is deeply imbedded in the normalcy of capitalist contradictions. The recent anti-Semitic outbreaks have once again revealed that not a single fundamental problem has been solved by the war, and therefore will once again produce war.

While the Adenauer Government can by no means be absolved of the crime, these outbreaks have been worldwide, and did not exclude Khrushchev's Russia any more than Stalin's Russia was excluded from the Four Power occupation of Germany. (See "The Root of Anti-Semitism," page 17.)

Short of a reconstruction of society on totally new beginnings—beginning with the workers taking matters in their own hands at the point of pro-

4.12.1960

duction—the world crisis is insoluble. Nothing shows this more clearly than the attitude of both Eisenhower and Khrushchev to DeGaulle France.

Here is a second-rate power belatedly searching for "grandeur" and both decisive world powers let the poseur get away with it, despite the fact that De Gaulle France is playing the role of imbalance that Germany played in both World Wars. The difference now, as contrasted to the other World Wars when a division of the world between four Big Powers was involved, is that France is reaching for "glory" by attempting to force an entrance into the restricted Nuclear Club where only two powers are fighting for world dominance.

DEGAULLE FRANCE

On the eve of De Gaulle's coming to power, France achieved a technological revolution which allowed big capital to win over petty capital. The rate of growth in France, as in all Western Europe—and in contrast to the stagnation in the American economy (despite or because of its absolute accumulated wealth)—compares to the Russian rate of growth.

This, however, is true only in the metropolis, and not in Algeria which weights the metropolis down. Therefore, DeGaulle—who came to power via the extreme rightists in Algeria, but maintains his power because of so-called "leftists"—has done his eloquent best to project "self-determination" "in the spirit of the times." The fact that his actions in continuing the war against the Arab Revolt belie his grandiloquent phrases does not stop either Khrushchev or Eisenhower from lining up behind De Gaulle. Khrushchev, moreover, ordered the French Communist Party to call off its support of the nationalist struggle in Algeria.

De Gaulle then proceeded to lecture "the West" that the way to win the world struggle for the minds of men is to launch a joint program of aid to the "two-thirds of humanity" in

under-developed countries which still lives "in misery." None more, it might be added, than in the French empire of Afro-Asia.

It was not "the spirit of the times" that moved De Gaulle. It was the Afro-Asian revolutions, after the end of World War II, that toppled the French empire.

Glory-hunting De Gaulle imagines that where the French Empire failed to hold its colonies, the new French "Community" will maintain its hold on Africa. But he holds shaky power between the plots and counter-plots, as was revealed most clearly in the recent fascist putsch in Algeria. (See Editorial, "The Tragedy of France," Page 4.)

HALF TRUTH AND BIG LIE

The plots thicken not because France is "that way," but because the state of the world is that way. We live in the period of the half-truth or the Big Lie.

The ones who perpetuate the Big Lie most are Khrushchev and Eisenhower. Exposed as De Gaulle France became during the latest colonists' putsch in Algeria, Khrushchev and Eisenhower each rushed to assure De Gaulle they back him: Khrushchev because he hopes De Gaulle's search for glory will do what he, Khrushchev, has not succeeded in doing—undermine NATO; and Eisenhower because he is perfectly willing to let De Gaulle have his way—so long as he, Eisen-

hower, can have France in which to fight Russia.

Each is playing for time. But time is not forever. A weapon invented is a weapon used, as was shown when America dropped the A-bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The fact that a more terrible weapon—the H-bomb—is now in the possession of both Russia and America does not mean it will not be put to use. Khrushchev has spoken of even more fantastic weapons, and has sent Mikoyan to Cuba, close to America's

shores, to do more rocket-rattling.

So long as capitalism exists, whether in private competitive form, as in America, or state-planned form, as in Russia, so long will there be war. Whoever thinks otherwise should re-

member those who disregarded Hitler's rantings because they were sheer madness.

While they talk of peace, they prepare for war. Khrushchev chose to call a conference of the Warsaw Pact nations, as well as other Communist satellites, to get a blank check for the summit. Significantly, he stressed his undisputed leadership over them when he signed the joint communique as "Chairman of the Russian Communist Party," a title that has not been used since Lenin's death.

Eisenhower approaches the summit by way of Cape Canaveral to check on U.S. missile power. This is his very first visit there.

De Gaulle prepares for the summit by an early explosion of the A-bomb in the Sahara.

Adenauer talks big against "hooligans" who deface synagogues, but he has yet to fire a single important Nazi from his government post. He considers his anti-Russian stand as sufficient credentials to entitle him to get nuclear war-heads from an Eisenhower.

WHICH WAY OUT

The only way out of this mad march to war is not via summit talk of peace, which is only another way to prepare for war. The only way out is the march to freedom, whether on the part of the African people riding themselves of ages-old imperialism; or on the part of the West Berlin youth marching against recurrent Nazism; or on the part of workers the world over who are demanding an entirely new way of life, beginning at the point of production.

EDITORIAL

The Tragedy of France.

3,000 wilful fascists, who dwindled to 400 during 7 days of threats of armed revolt, succeeded in holding 45 million Frenchmen by their collective throat.

PLOTS AND COUNTER-PLOTS

On the 6th day, if we are to believe the bourgeois press, De Gaulle made so electrifying a speech that he (1) saved France "without bloodshed"; (2) reasserted his complete authority over the French Army, without whose complicity the Algerian fascists could never have held out; and (3) remained true to his "principle of self-determination" for the 9 million Arabs in Algeria.

This fable is both hollow and mythical. It fails to explain why, under the circumstances, De Gaulle took 6 days before he made that "speech of destiny," after which it still took two more days before the plotters' barricades came down. The fact remains that one of the chief leaders of the putsch, M. Ortiz, together with his lieutenants, escaped from under the averted eyes of the cordon of paratroopers and Foreign Legionnaires. The other leader, M. Lagallarde, was given nearly military honors when he left the barricades.

LET US NOT FORGET that when De Gaulle first heard of the colon demonstration, which resulted in 24 killed and 136 wounded, he gave orders to General Challe, his military chief in Algeria, to put down the putsch "during the night." That was Sunday, January 24. Far from obeying the order, General Challe, as well as Delegate General Delouvrier, gave ground before the colons who proceeded to rip up the streets and build barricades. After two more days of stalemate, these great generals panicked and left Algiers for a more secluded spot.

A second look at De Gaulle's 6 days of hesitation, and the Army's two additional days of procrastination, will do more than dispel the fable of his speech of destiny. It will show that his counter-plots are on a par with plots by the Army and the white colonists.

He found that the plot extended directly into his Cabinet. Although they did not participate in the anti-De Gaulle demonstrations, they were one with the aim of the plotters to keep Algeria "French," that is to say, continue the French enslavement of 9 million Arabs.

De Gaulle asked for dictatorial powers for his Cabinet rather than for himself because he owes his continuing power to them.

The crucial fact, of course, is that De Gaulle owes his power precisely to this fascist Army-political corps, and he depends on them to restore the "grandeur" of France. Before he decided to make his "speech calling for obedience to the state power," he sent General Ely to strike a bargain with the Army brass.

The "magical" effect of the speech was due to De Gaulle's promise that the Army would remain in Algeria to supervise any referendum on self-determination.

THIS is the Army whose methods of torture rival those of the Nazis; the Army that has carried on a ruthless struggle against the Arabs for 5 long years. It is the Army that is so violently opposed to self-determination. This is the same officer corps which did not execute a single plotter, but continued to torture and execute Arab revolutionaries.

By the 9th day, when the barricades finally came down, the tragic-comedy became a farce. The martial ardor of the conspirators cooled so quickly that a mere 127 of them volunteered for a token 6-months hitch in the Army while the other plotters went back to the saloons to resume their plotting.

THE SPEECH & THE ACTIONS

Any view that it was De Gaulle's scorn against the plotters that brought the Army officers to obey their Commander-in-Chief flies in face of the reality that it was the Commander-in-Chief who capitulated to the Army's aim of keeping Algeria enslaved. The speech tells you as much. While it thunders against "liars and conspirators," it assures them that "France and De Gaulle" will not "surrender Algeria to the rebellion." The "rebellion" referred to is not the conspiracy to get De Gaulle into line, but the revolt of the Arabs against French imperialist rule, the struggle for national independence on the part of 9 million Arabs, the overwhelming majority of the population of Algeria.

THE ACTIONS that followed the speech show unmistakably that De Gaulle's victory was, in fact, a victory for the Army brass. Take the "mop-up operations" for which De Gaulle requested dictatorial powers. For a Soustelle who was fired, not only does a Debre remain, but War Minister Guillaumat was "punished" by being kicked upstairs to become head of the Atomic Energy Project.

The very man who did nothing against the fascist plotters because he is a fascist himself is now entrusted with the A-bomb. This is a direct threat, not only to Africa, but to the whole world.

Of course there were some arrests of "Rightists." But when the Generals remain on the loose, who can console himself that a Lagallarde is in jail? On top of it all, De Gaulle is now busy breaking Algeria into new political units. He hopes, thereby, not to have to face 9 million Arabs, but a series of religious and "ethnic" groups from Moslem to Berber, from Jew to Frenchman, with the fascist military commanders in charge of keeping "order" in each of these allegedly semi-autonomous communities.

This Gaullic version of Britain's 1921 partition of Ireland makes the Black-and-Tans appear as veritable angels.

THE PROLETARIAN TRAGEDY

THE REAL TRAGEDY of France took place on the streets of Paris. The two so-called workers' parties, Communists and Socialists, which even now control the majority of the French proletarians in trade unions, called for defense of De Gaulle. Worse yet, they asked the workers to demonstrate for De Gaulle on their own time—lunch hour—so as not to disturb capitalist production.

De Gaulle, whose power, aim, and visions of grandeur rest on quite a different class than the proletariat, rewarded this loyalty by asking that dictatorial powers be given to the very Cabinet whose majority were Lagallarde's co-conspirators in the May 13th coup that brought the French Republic down. Even now, some of them hail this fascist anti-Semite as "a patriot."

General De Gaulle chose to disregard the very existence of the workers' general strike because it was so overpowering—involving 12 million—that the alternative to ruling with fascist plotters manifested itself.

The Communist and Socialist leadership, on the other hand, is in a conspiracy with De Gaulle to minimize that mass power. Nothing so exposes the crisis in ideology as this crisis in organization. The betrayal of the proletariat by their own organizations is now complete.

It is precisely the totality of the crisis in Communist-Socialist politics that will free the proletariat from the stranglehold of these organizations. The French proletariat, so full of revolutionary traditions, will yet make its mark on contemporary history.

Does it... [handwritten scribble]

Vol 5 No 3 March 1960

AUTOMATION AND THE DIALECTIC "The Scientific Revolution"

During my recent visit to Great Britain I lectured at such different places as the philosophy departments of the Leeds and Manchester Universities as well as at trades union groups in London and Glasgow, and on such different topics as "Marx's Debt to Hegel" as well as "Automation and the American Worker." The audiences made it obvious that neither worker nor intellectual was as oppressively aware of Automation in Great Britain as we are in America.

The intellectuals especially allowed themselves free play around the question of "the industrial society of electronics, atomic energy, automation" as if all this occurred outside of the factory that involved workers and their reactions to "the scientific revolution." It is true that one scholar, Mr. C. P. Snow, speaks longingly enough of his brief stay in production industry as "one of the most valuable pieces of education in my life." But his preoccupation is elsewhere. He is oppressively aware, not of the workers' attitude as opposed to that of the intellectual view, but of the differences in attitude between two kinds of intellectuals—literary and scientific. He feels that the cultural divide between them accounts for the sorry state of "the West."

Mr. Snow has followed up his new concept of these "two cultures" (first published in 1956 as an article in *The New Statesman*) with a lecture at Cambridge University in 1959 (since published as a separate pamphlet entitled "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution"). Despite Mr. Snow's "valuable piece of education" in productive industry, the debate continues outside of any contact with the factory.

"The Number 2"

"The number 2 is a very dangerous number; that is why the dialectic is a dangerous process," writes Mr. Snow. He seems oblivious of the fact that in our epoch it is also a frivolous one when in the hands of a bourgeois intellectual who ignores the fundamental division of society into two classes.

The dialectic process is a "dangerous" one because it concerns the unity of two forces in such violent contradiction that they must burst asunder. The human force which accomplishes this revolution is the one which, through its very position in the exploitative productive process, must thrust the oppressive weight off of itself and thus propel society forward. In capitalist society the negative force which belies society's oneness is, of course, the working class.

Mr. Snow is not unaware of the toil in production and the shallowness of the intellectual world. He writes:

"It was no fun being an agricultural laborer in the mid to late 18th century. In the time that we snobs that we are, think only as the time of the Enlightenment and Jane Austen."

Mr. Snow has freed himself sufficiently of the literary confines to quote approvingly a scientist who blamed the literary intellectual for the phenomenon of Nazism:

"Yeats, Pound, Wyndham Lewis, 9 out of 10 of those who have dominated literary sensibility in our time, weren't they not only politically silly, but politically wicked? Didn't the influence of all they represent bring Auschwitz that much nearer?"

One might ask: if the literary intellectual is to be "blamed" for setting the stage for Nazism, shouldn't the scientist be "blamed" for the fact that the splitting of the atom resulted, not in the release of the greatest creative energy source on earth, but in the production of the most destructive weapon that may well put an end to civilization altogether?

Mr. Snow has fenced himself, and the dialectic, so tightly into the intellectual scientific corral that

he never leaves it once to learn the attitudes of the workers at the point of production, where the unity of science and industry gave birth to Automation.

The Two-Faced Character of Automation

Let us, however, take a look at Automation and the Dialectic, or the two-faced character of Automation. None but the workers see, feel, know that Automation has resulted, not in freeing the laborers from back-breaking toil, but in reducing him to "a fraction of a man"—to use the expression of a production worker I met recently.

Where the worker sees the dehumanizing effects of Automation, the intellectual sees the scientific revolution as nothing short of a carrier of a new social order which would transform even the under-developed countries "in our lifetime." Because management and labor bureaucrat alike, as well as pure scientist and engineer, all join in the praise of Automation as "progress," they are blind to the negative effects of Automation in a society as presently constituted and therefore cannot see the positive creativity in the workers' opposition to Automation.

Just as it was not the industrial revolution "as such" that lightened man's labor, so it will not be the scientific revolution "as such" that will change the conditions of labor either in the technically advanced countries or, in the underdeveloped countries which, let us not forget, remained underdeveloped precisely because capitalism transported there, not the industrial revolution, but imperialist exploitation.

While it is impossible to unite worker and capitalist, the unity of worker and intellectual is not impossible, provided that the future that is within the workers' bones—that is to say, the new society imbedded in the old—bursts forth as a social revolution that unites mental and manual, science and labor within the individual. Mr. Snow is not unaware that the scientific revolution must mean a social revolution. As he puts it: "Men there (in underdeveloped countries) are no longer prepared to wait for a period longer than one person's lifetime."

Needed: A New Set of Ears

The great merit of Snow's "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution" is that he has focused attention on the losing race science is running with history, that is to say, human activity. This is a much greater contribution than that made by the old radical who fears to attack Automation and makes a cliché of "of course, under capitalism, Automation has not lightened labor, but . . ."

The old radical is deaf to the worker who, in fighting against Automation, has raised the most profound philosophic question by asking: "What kind of labor should man perform?" He, who has a too-knowing look when the worker leaves the production line, saying it makes him feel as but a "fraction of a man," is incapable of hearing anything new. He may think that it is but a rephrasing of Marx's statement about the worker being a cog in a machine. The point is that when Marx said it, he was formulating the worker's instinctive drive to reconstruct society on new beginnings. When the instinct, i.e., the worker, finds his own formulations, we have done away with the divide between the worker and intellectual. The intellectual must therefore gain a new set of ears, not to aim at the generalization, but to hear the concrete.

(To Be Continued)

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SOUTH AFRICA

"Izwe Lethu (our land)," shouted thousands of Africans as they burned their "passes" and marched to the police stations, asking to be arrested for thus having violated the fascist type of internal passports imposed upon them by the white rulers.

In response to Act One of this bloodless revolution for human rights, the counter-revolution burst forth in an orgy of violence, machine-gunning the unarmed mass of humanity—men, women and children.

The Revolution mourned its dead by a mass funeral and staying away from work. The counter-revolutionary apartheid (segregationist) Africa followed up its inhuman violence with vicious baton charges into African crowds, declaring a state of emergency, and outlawing any political organization, mainly black, but black or white, that dared challenge the savage white supremacy.

The Revolution—the struggle for freedom—though it comprised the overwhelming majority, 15 million against 3 million whites, must face, unarmed, the white rulers who are armed to the teeth with everything from bull whips to machine guns, and from the armed forces to jet planes, not to mention prisons, the legislature, factories, mines, farms, ships and concentration camps.

This is the face of "civilized" white rule in South Africa as the economy of the country came to a standstill when black labor stopped to mourn its dead.

Life Is Cheap

87% of the industrial labor force and 92% of the agricultural labor force is African. Since without this black labor force, white oppression could not last, the mailed fist is not reserved for military attacks. When in 1946, 75,000 miners dared to strike, the strike was bloodily suppressed. For demanding the "extortionate" wage of 10 shillings (\$1.40) per 8 hour shift, workers were forced down. "They sat in the tunnels and refused to come up until police drove them to the surface 'stope by stope and level by level,'" as the white Rand Daily Mail described it.

According to official figures, 69% of black families had a combined income below even what white Africa admits is the minimum for life and health. The result has been that 50% of all Africans never reach the working age of 16; infant mortality rate is estimated at 200-300 per 1,000. But what are pot bellies and rickets and babies dead in corners to white "god-fearing Christians"? Life is cheap when its skin is black!

Conditions of Labor

Only 40% of urban white Africans are wage workers and these are mainly skilled (85%) or semi-skilled (12%). While there is nothing extraordinary about the monthly wage of white workers—£65 (\$182), it is five-fold that of the black worker's monthly wage of £13 (\$36.40). Moreover, the white workers' unions are recognized while those of the Africans are not. At the same time, the black worker is forbidden to strike and the dividing line between a strike and a dispute is so vague that the police just move in when there is any sort of stoppage and put down the dispute even where management would be willing to come to terms. Refusal to work is punishable with \$1,400 fine or 5 years in prison or both!

The Revolt Is Continuous

The revolt of black labor has been as continuous as it has been brave nevertheless. And the illegal strikes jumped after they were forbidden from 33 in 1954 to 73 in 1955. When South Africans were involved in the great

bus boycott of 1957, hundreds of thousands walked 20 miles to work and trudged another 20 miles back to their segregated townships for three solid months until they won the fight against the rise in fares.

The Government of Dr. Verwoerd (the Hitler of South Africa) issued the following statement: "It is quite clear that this is not so much an economic matter; it is a political movement."

There is no doubt that the economic, political, social struggle for freedom is indivisible. So is the tyranny of white oppression total—totally depraved. Every African male in the cities can expect to be arrested at least once a year for some petty offense or other.

The indignity of the pass puts yet extra power in the hands of white "labor officials" (Government men). If it shows that one is a "trouble maker," he can be sent off in silence to a "farm compound" which is actually a forced labor camp where the white African big farmers get their cheap labor. The notorious eastern Transvaal area "hires" convicts and others for 2 shillings (25c) a day.

Nothing has changed since the 1947 disclosures when it was shown that African laborers dressed in sacks were clawing out potatoes with their bare hands. They work under the hot sun and the sjambok and spend their nights in stuffy windowless barns with fierce watchdogs outside to cut off escape.

When in 1952 pass carrying extended to African women, the resistance of the women burst forth in the Zecrust and Sekhuhuneland uprisings as well as street demonstrations in Johannesburg.

Thus both in the cities and in the "Reserves" the revolt is continuous.

Political Organization

Just as arms are denied the native African, so is the representation in parliament. With the 1950 so-called Suppression of Communism Act and the Criminal Law Amendment Act of February 1953, the white rulers have indeed destroyed all legal activity by political or industrial organizations that are not dedicated to white supremacy. The one organization left to them was the African National Congress under the leadership of Chief Albert Luthuli. Recently the left wing of that split off, named itself Pan-Africanism and elected Robert Mangaliso Sobukwe as its president. It is he who called for the demonstration in opposition to the pass carrying. These two leaders, along with 300 other Africans have been arrested, as well as even the mildest of white liberals who opposed total, brutal white supremacy. All political organizations except those of the ruling class have been outlawed.

The African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress immediately announced that they would go underground but would not give up the fight for freedom.

Whatever orgy of violence the white rulers will now indulge in, South Africa will never again be the same. The tiny minority of whites who have opposed this inhuman, insane, savage rule of the white supremacists long ago saw that if the Africans are not allowed to live like human beings, it is the inhuman regime, not the human beings, that will have to go. It is only a question of when and how.

As Ronald M. Segal, the editor of the journal, *Africa South*, whose passport had been seized some months back, wrote in an editorial entitled "Revolution Is Now": "In a society where revolt walks always in the shadow of massacre . . . change and revolution have become finally inseparable."

Vol 8 "8" May 1960

AFRICAN SOCIALISM, Leopold Sedar Senghor

American Society of African Culture—N.Y. \$1.25

"To Build A Universal Civilization"

Leopold Sedar Senghor is the poet, scholar, politician who is the president of the Party of African Federation as well as of the Federal Assembly of Mali (Federation of Senegal and Soudan). On June 8, 1959, he delivered a Report to the Constitutive Congress of his Party which, in an abbreviated form, has been published in this country under the title of "African Socialism." In its serious concern with theoretical foundations for the building of a new society, it has no parallel in today's orations.

At a time when the weary American intellectual has been so brainwashed both by the Cold War and the threat of Nuclear War between America and Russia, that he declaims "The End of Ideology," (1) the world that is fighting for its freedom at the cost of its very life — Africa—is charged with a dynamism of ideas. As Leopold Senghor puts it: "A nation that refuses to keep its rendezvous with history, that does not believe itself to be the bearer of a unique message—that nation is finished, ready to be placed in a museum. The Negro African is not finished even before he gets started. Let him speak; above all, let him act. Let him bring like a leaven, his message to the world in order to help build a universal civilization."

"Socialism Is A Humanism"

It is true that the African intellectual is all too conscious of the white imperialist legacy of economic underdevelopment and human poverty to reach out for a total philosophy that challenges, at one and the same time, not only both contenders for world power, but the specific dominant economy over his country—France in the case of French-speaking West Africa of which the Mali Federation is a part. This has nothing, however, to do with not knowing the ideological battles that have dominated Europe since Karl Marx raised the banner of liberation in the mid-19th century.

"Let us recapitulate Marx's positive contributions," says Senghor. "They are: the philosophy of humanism, economic theory, dialectical method." Senghor writes with the simplicity that comes from a profound understanding both of "Socialism is a humanism" and "Socialism is a method." The fact that he aims to combine Marxism with utopian socialism as well as with religion in order to create what he calls an "open socialism" or an "African type of socialism" is not without subjective motivations. But this does not obviate the fact that he wishes the philosophy of humanism that is Marxism to be the theoretic foundation for conducting a triple inventory of: (1) the traditional African civilization, (2) the encounter of this civilization with colonialism and French civilization, and (3) the economic resources and potentialities of the Mali Federation, which cannot exist outside of the economic complex of industrially advanced lands.

"Africa, My Africa"

So powerful and world-enveloping a polarizing force is the Marxist theory of liberation that throughout the Middle East, the Orient, Africa, there are attempts, of various religions, from Buddhism to Christianity and from that to Mohammedanism, to find a bridge to it, even as there is an attempt on the part of Communist China and Russia to ride under that banner, although their state capitalist societies are the very opposite of Marxist Humanism. I do not say that opportunism also characterizes the African intellectual. I do say that, while part of the critique of Marxism is due to the realities of present-day Africa which did not, (and could not) have formed part of Marx's thought, other parts of Senghor's critique of Marxism, especially on present-day economics, is

either wrong or, as in the case of religion, overly subtle. "The atheism of Marx," writes Senghor, "can be considered a reaction of Christian origin against the historical deviations of Christianity."

Oppression in Africa has always worn a white face. This weighs so heavily on the African Freedom Fighters that they react against any white face, even that of the worker. Thus Senghor claims that the standard of living of the European masses rose "ONLY at the expense of living of the standard of living of the masses in Asia and Africa", and that, therefore, the European proletariat "has NEVER REALLY—I mean effectively opposed it." (Emphasis in both quotations added.) The very fact that Senghor must himself interpret "really" as "effectively" shows an awareness of proletarian struggles and revolutions. It is certainly too easy in today's African realities to use that as an excuse to appeal, not to the proletariat of advanced countries, but to the authorities. It is certainly too high a price to pay when it entails an apology for De Gaulle who is exploiting not only the white proletariat but the North African (Algerian) revolutionary. The very fact that on all the concrete questions relating

to Africa's relationship to De Gaulle France, Senghor has had to appear as an apologist for De Gaulle, discloses the tragedy of the underdeveloped countries fighting for freedom in an automated, nuclear age. But this is no place to present my own views in full, which I have done elsewhere. (2)

White Arrogance vs. Black Courage

At a time when the African Revolution is reshaping the map of the world, the Western intellectuals are attempting to impose upon it their ideology, or more precisely put, their lack of ideology. Thereby the arrogance of white civilization shows itself not to be limited to the oppressor class, but to extend to Western socialists, who have rushed to take quick tours of Africa and return to this country as "specialists." Read Sidney Lens (3) and you will see the ignorant disdain of the African's theoretic contributions as if "One man, one vote" summed up the whole of the African's culture.

Leaving aside, for the moment, that "One man, one vote" discloses nothing short of a revolution against white domination that parades as "democratic Western civilization", the Bells, the Lens and their ilk have a long way to go before they reach the African's intellectual comprehension, not to mention his courage, daring, and totality of devotion to the struggle for freedom.

For those who wish to be part of this forward movement of history, ideologically as well as practically, we highly recommend the reading of AFRICAN SOCIALISM by Leopold Sedar Senghor.

(1) The End of Ideology by Daniel Bell
(2) Nationalism, Communism, Marxist Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions by Raya Dunayevskaya. Also, on De Gaulle France, see News & Letters, July 1958.
(3) "The Revolution in Africa" by Sidney Lens, Liberation, January, February and March, 1960.

SUMMIT TO WAR?

On both sides of the Iron Curtain preparations for the peace conference had every ear-mark of preparations for war. After having been caught in a lie about the spy plane sent to Russia by Central Intelligence, President Eisenhower then proceeded to brag about it as if it were the thing to do on the eve of the summit.

KHRUSHCHEV, not to be outdone either in a holier-than-thou attitude or in sabre rattling, condemned the U. S. for spoiling the atmosphere for peace talks, whereupon he went on to brag about the fantastic weapon that shot down the spy plane allegedly at 68,000 feet aloft.

He threatened to wipe off the face of the earth any country that allowed the U. S. military bases from which such spy planes could be sent off. Khrushchev's belligerence nearly torpedoed the conference at its opening session where he designated the spy plane as an "act of aggression" and demanded that "those responsible be punished."

MILLIONS, NAY, BILLIONS throughout the world know that the established leaders in each country are adept in making the other country appear as "aggressor," but that war results from much more basic causes than "aggression." Or, to put it more precisely, acts of aggression are only the manifestations of irreconcilable capitalist conflicts.

In the present case, the conflicts between America and Russia for world domination, are kept in harness only by virtue of the class struggle in each country. This, indeed, is behind Eisenhower reversing himself and saying that spy planes have been stopped indefinitely, even as it is the reason behind Khrushchev allowing himself to be taken into a huddle by Macmillan. Both Khrushchev and Eisenhower would like to lull the common man to sleep while they prepare for war.

Only, in part, is this due to the fact that both know that it really does not matter who is the "aggressor" in setting off the H-Bomb. Once it is set off, civilization itself, as one American scientist (Dr. William Pickering) put it, is but "one-half hour from total annihilation."

THE GREATER REASON behind trying to save something out of this first of a "series" of summit conferences, is the crisis in each country: Khrushchev's 7 Year Plan is beset with a shortage of labor and Eisenhower's Administration by a surplus of labor, that is an unemployed army of 5 million as a near-bedrock underneath his prosperity.

Spying and counter-spying is as common as talking of peace while preparing for war. If the latest incident proves anything at all it is that the so-called series of summit peace meetings can serve as the summit to war.

It is clear that everything in this outlived capitalistic system is invested with its opposite. Just as the worker knows that Automation, capable of lightening labor, under capitalism only sweats labor the more while it throws millions out of work, both at the same time; just as the scientist knows that out of the splitting of the atom came, not the greatest energy source on earth; but the most destructive weapon; Just as the Negro knows that the U. S. Supreme Court decision on desegregation in schools, on its 6th anniversary this May 17th, has produced not a single ripple in the Deep South except where mass action has forced it; so the man on the street, be it Main St., U.S.A. or U.S.S.R., now knows this stark fact: **THAT THE SUMMIT TO PEACE MAY BECOME THE SUMMIT TO WAR. THIS NOW HAS BECOME THE FACT OF OUR EVERY DAY LIVING. THIS IS TRUE, WHETHER THE CONFERENCE HAD TEMPORARILY PATCHED MATTERS UP OR NOT.**

If Macmillan and De Gaulle are permitted now to appear as the great conciliators who will bring the Big Two together, ask any African in British East Africa or French North Africa whether they are known there as anything other than oppressor? Or ask the 100,000 who met in Trafalgar Square to protest the use of the H-Bomb. More than that. The millions and the billions throughout the world know that warfare, nuclear or otherwise, solves nothing so long as the capitalistic system which produces it remains.

These leaders cannot be entrusted with any such life-and-death decisions as war. It is our lives they are playing with. They must not be allowed to do so. The people themselves must decide. Only when the population to a man runs production and the state can a totally new society on truly human foundations be built. The basis for it is to hold the question of war in its own hands.

MAY, 1960

NEWS & LETTERS

A Marxist-Humanists Looks At . . .

THE FREEDOM FIGHTERS OF SOUTH U.S.A.

By Raya Dunayevskaya

— Written for Peace News, London

The greatest achievement of the present Freedom Fighters in South USA is its own working existence. The elemental outburst of Southern Negro college students took the form of sitting down at segregated lunch counters, asking to be served, and continuing to sit down after service was refused.

The spontaneous movement spread from Greensboro, North Carolina, where it began on February 1, till it now covers the entire South, including Mississippi. In that notorious lynch state, however, the form of the movement is not that of the sit-down, but the more passive boycott.

At the same time there has been a deepening of the struggle, a development into mass demonstrations, the first ever seen in the Deep South since Reconstruction Days in the mid 19th century. Out of the 1,000 who marched in Columbia, S. C., 400 young men and women were made to stand in a compound to await trial on "breach of peace" charges although they were the ones who had been soaked by the fire hoses and in a 40 degree cold.

"We will fill the jails if necessary" remains the guiding principle of the movement which now embraces the whole of the Southern Negro population with its slogan of "No Easter finery this year." Again for the first time since Reconstruction days, some whites in the South have participated both in the sit-ins and the boycott.

Having gained a momentum of its own, the movement is now beset by various organizations out "to lead." Chief among these are the CORE (Committee for Racial Equality) and the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People). Both help to pay fines and give legal aid to those arrested. The expulsion of students by the Uncle Tom heads of the Negro colleges has created yet another problem.

The spontaneity, breadth and courage of the Southern students inspired picketing in the North of the Woolworth's, Kress's and Grant stores. For the moment it comprises all radical political tendencies, including revolutionaries as well as pacifists, Trotskyists, Social-

ists, Anarchists and Marxist Humanists. No doubt there are also some Communists, although they have nowhere declared themselves openly. Unfortunately, red-baiting has also raised its ugly head.

On March 26th I was in New York and attended a rally in Harlem. The mass meeting, held simultaneously and near the picketing in support of the Southern Freedom Fighters, was chaired by Bayard Rustin of CORE. It had as one of its principal speakers, A. Philip Randolph, a vice-president of the AFL-CIO who is presently engaged in founding a Negro American Labor Council. Mr. Randolph devoted his time to protect "the sanctity, Christianity and peaceful nature" of the Southern movement and "disassociating" himself from "Communists." He then whipped out the April, 1960, issue of The Young Socialist, which is the Trotskyist youth paper.

It is true that the issue had a particularly stupid attack on pacifists. It said: "In reality the pacifists are interested in something quite apart from the Negro struggle . . . They are not interested in whether the struggle is successful, but rather as to whether it is conducted in such a way as to advance their particular creed." This is the other side of the very argument used against revolutionaries—that their "theory" makes it impossible for them to be "really" for a specific struggle. The argument does not gain in wisdom by being turned against the pacifists.

The point at issue is not pacifism or non-pacifism. The point at issue is the struggle to end segregation and discrimination of Negroes.

At the moment it is concentrating on lunch counters in the South, but it is by no means limited to that. It has also included libraries in its protests.

It is part of the whole movement against segregation in education which had begun when it became clear that the Deep South has no intention of complying with the U. S. Supreme Court decision to end school segregation. . . . The fight against segregation . . . on the school front to that of the bus boycott in Montgomery, Ala. . . . seemed limited to a city or state, the present struggle around lunch counters and libraries is spreading throughout the South and has gained as well active support in the North. . . .

Attempts at reconstruction of society always meets with the violence of the powers that be. There is no org. of violence in South USA much as characterizes South Africa, but there are tear gas and fire hoses by the State governments as well as the violence of the KKK.

It isn't the oppressed and persecuted who commit the violence; the guns are always in the hands of the oppressors and persecutors. Whether you are looking at South Africa or South USA, whether you are looking at the present day or into history, the story is the same. Practice of non-violence does not stop terror by the entrenched rulers, as was seen when Gandhi's satyagraha campaign in 1920 produced the Jallianwala Bagh massacre by the British at Amritsar in the Punjab. It is not that passive resistance has not been very effective, but it has its limitations.

To return to South USA, time: the present. Let us not fall into the trap of the bourgeois who have degraded the word, revolution, to where it means nothing but violence and conspiracy. Nor should we lose our full awareness of how segregation came to be. It came with peace—the collision between the

militarily victorious Northern capitalists and the militarily vanquished Southern plantation owners to rob the freedmen (Negroes) of the "40 acres and a mule" and transform them instead into sharecroppers dependent on the old plantation bosses. At the same time "the gentlemen's agreement" saw to it that, except for the very lowest jobs, industrial jobs were reserved for white labor. Segregation was the inevitable concomitant of the new forms of economic enslavement.

When Marx criticized Lincoln for carrying on the Civil War by "constitutional" rather than "revolutionary" means, he was referring, not to any lack of violence, but to lack of principles. The pacifist, Abolitionist leader, Wendell Phillips was no less a revolutionary than Marx; it was he who predicted that unless the Negro was the basis of the reconstruction of the South, there would be no destruction of the barbaric Southern rule. We are reaping today the results of a Civil War that was bloody enough, but the blood shed and the peace won was for continued class rule. . . . Under the circumstances, to inject a discussion of "violence and non-violence" can only blind us to the needed reconstruction of society on totally new, truly human beginnings.

What the Freedom Fighters of South USA show is that revolution is only the evolution in the fullness of time and in the elemental form called forth by the needs of the moment.

The form any further development of this movement will take no one can foretell, or dictate. What we can do is not to create new points of confusion in the thinking of the young freedom fighters as their doing leads them to grapple with the foundation of a new society whose point of departure and point of return alike would center around the relation of man to man—the relation of man to man sans exploitation and discrimination.

MS 116 June-July 1960

SACCO AND VANZETTI SPEAK TO MILLIONS

Following is a letter that I have received from a colleague.
—R. B.

The recent T.V. dramatization of the Sacco-Vanzetti story has brought them to a whole new generation, many of whom had probably never heard their names before, but will remember them forever more as two of the most eloquent martyrs in the fight for freedom. The program left no doubt that these two Italian immigrants, one a shoemaker and the other a fish peddler, were arrested in 1921 for a hold-up murder they could not possibly have committed, but were really on trial for the "crime" of being active in the organizing efforts of the Massachusetts shoe workers, and for being admitted Anarchists.

PALMER RAIDS, McCARTHYISM?

It was a very real performance, and not only because it was so beautifully acted, but because it was so clearly not past history. Frankly, I wondered at the bravery of the producers in being so faithful to the case and to all the speeches, because every word that Sacco and Vanzetti spoke lashed out at the state of things today as much as in their day. Later I wondered if the intention had been to leave the viewer with a feeling that such a miscarriage of justice as they were witnessing was confined to the era of the Palmer Raids and the black wave of reaction that swept the country after World War I, and was "history."

If that was the intention, it certainly backfired on me! And I am sure it must have backfired on many other Americans who have not so easily forgotten the McCarthy era of only 5 or 6 years ago, and who certainly do not believe that now that "McCarthyism is dead" we need not fear another rise of McCarthyism under a new name.

"NO REASON TO MOURN"

In fact, I recalled and hunted up a column you had written about Sacco and Vanzetti "way back" in that McCarthy era, in which you described the millions who had rallied to their defense throughout the world and then said: "There are those who look at the attack against civil liberties today and mourn for the solidarity of the 1920's. I believe there is no reason to mourn, that to try to put the 1950's into the mold of the 1920's is wasted work. The mourners see the laws and the lawyers and the decisions of the courts. What they do not see is what is fundamental to the question of civil liberties: the aspirations and the activity of ordinary people . . . Whether the name for it is Communism, as practiced on the other side of the Iron Curtain by the dictators in Moscow, or whether it is called McCarthyism as practiced on this side of the Iron Curtain by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, Senators McCarthy and Humphrey, its object is the same: to take away the right of the people to say what they want to say. What the witch-hunters dread is not free speech 'in general' but the specific freedom of workers using their own initiative, having confidence in their own strength to get what they want. . . ." It was precisely this fact that made the drama so real to me and so much present history and not past.

"THEY PROMISED YOU LIBERTY"

"In that respect also, what had the most powerful effect on me were the deeply moving statements against war—particularly Vanzetti's in his long, proud statement of his principles in answer to the court's question of whether he had anything to say before the death sentence was pronounced: "The jury hated us because we were against the war . . . We believe more now than ever that the war was wrong, and we are against war more now than ever, and I am glad to be on the doomed scaffold if I can say to mankind, 'look out: you are in a catacomb of the flower of mankind! For what? All that they say to you, all that they have promised you, it was a lie, it was an illusion, it was a cheat, it was a fraud, it was a crime. They promised you liberty. Where is liberty? They promised you prosperity. Where is prosperity? They have promised you elevation. Where is the elevation? Where is the moral good that the war has given to the world? Where is the spiritual progress that we have achieved from the war? Where is the security of life, the security of things that we possess for our necessity? Where is the respect for human life. . . ."

In this day of U-2, Summit blow-ups and the threat of nuclear destruction hanging over the heads of all men, Vanzetti's voice rang out anew against war. It appeared to me to blend in with so many millions of new fighters for freedom that Sacco and Vanzetti never did die.

War and Automation

(Editor's Note: It should be noted that this column was submitted prior to the opening of the UN General Assembly.)

The UN and Those Two Baldies: Eisenhower and Khrushchev

The not-in-person debate between Eisenhower's "open sky policies" and Khrushchev's "total disarmament" has become farcical since the U-2 plane incident put an end to the grand illusion that there never will be a nuclear war.

The break-up of the summit meeting which followed the incident laid bare the hypocrisy of those two baldies (for lack of brain as well as for lack of hair.) Just as the U-2 exposed the truth that the "open sky Policy" that Eisenhower practices is for purposes of spying, so the break-up of the summit disclosed that Khrushchev's "peaceful co-existence" policy is a screen for war preparations.

The Two Bystanders: Janos Kadar and Fidel Castro

Without any qualms about whose company he finds himself in, stands Fidel Castro, that erratic petty-bourgeois revolutionary who got so quickly sucked into Russia's jet-propelled state capitalistic lure, that he has had not time to reflect on the new type of slavery he is preparing to impose on the Cuban people who had finally freed themselves of enslavement to American imperialism. There is no point, however, in getting caught up in Castro's "unreflective, incoherent stage of consciousness" (to use an apt expression of that great German philosopher, Hegel.)

Along with the destroyer of the Hungarian Workers' Councils, Janos Kadar, Fidel Castro is pure show. He is the gadfly in the American imperialist ointment, but no more than a bystander to the grandstand play of Khrushchev, who will be rocket-rattling while talking about peace; announcing some new conquest of outer space while teaching Mao (who is anxious to bring war on today not tomorrow, but today) a lesson in brinkmanship; crying about the down-to-earth freedoms Africans are dying for, while shouting about the alleged superiority of the Russian over the American economy.

Enter: Automation, the Wage Bill, and War

The real issue is in production, but not in superiority of one or the other pole of nuclear-armed capital. The crisis in production is shaking both poles of world capital. Where Eisenhower is confronted with unemployment and wildcats, Khrushchev is forever facing slow-downs and a shortage of labor.

As against the continuous revolt of the Russian workers against the conditions of labor, Khrushchev is bent on using the discontinuous element in today's technology against the workers at home as well as against the enemy abroad. The discontinuous element is obvious enough in the military field: the A and H bombs and the missiles to send them across oceans and lands are not just "more" weapons. The very concept of war has itself become transformed; there no longer is any distinction between soldier and civilian and very little difference between Russian and American military force. What Khrushchev, however, has aimed at ever since he won the power battle in the Kremlin is to achieve such a discontinuous leap in production in automation as would bring him up to America in per capita production and not just alongside its missiles and satellites.

The 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party was built around that concept but he outsmarted himself with his De-Stalinization speech which stole the spotlight from the new Five Year Plan. Only we pointed to that:

"To the Russian peasant it matters little whether it was Stalin or is Khrushchev . . . What does matter—and what is new, is that the newest Plan demands nothing less than 100 per cent increase in agricultural productivity per person . . . The latest plan calls for a 50 per cent increase in labor productivity." (See News and Letters, March 30, 1956.)

The ones who would not let Khrushchev have his way were the Russian people. They knew that it was their sweat, and not "the miracle" of Automation, that would bring about a 50% rise in industrial labor productivity and no less than a 100% rise in agricultural productivity. De-Stalinized or not Khrushchev had to scuttle the Plan and declare a year's interlude to prepare a new Seven Year Plan (1958-65.)

Meanwhile the ruling intelligentsia was to sell Automation to the Russian workers as "socialism" on its way to "full communism," even as the labor bureaucracy in this country is trying to sell Automation to the American workers as "progress" on its way to creating "leisure." Or, as the bourgeois authority on Automation, Diebold, put it, "a 7 day week-end." Where he failed to specify who would pay for this "leisure," Prof. V. L. Lossiyevski of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences was most specific about the need to do away with large wage bills.

While the popular propaganda in Pravda, Izvestia and Trud speak about the need of the engineer "to get closer to the worker," the theoreticians explain, instead, the need for a "rational order of priority" in the introduction of Automation. This is the Russian euphemism for the economically profitable method. For example, Prof. Lossiyevski pointed out that where the wage bill constituted no less than 66% of the cost price of coal, the mine was obviously "inadequately automated." The matter of "prime cost," he concluded, should be the very first consideration in judging where Automation should be introduced first. It would thus appear that mining would take priority. But it didn't.

It didn't because, in an irrational world madly rushing to self-destruction, no "rational order of priority" can be set by State Planners, any more than it can be set by vested private interests.

Even as the American mastery of automatic control process and computer technique went into war preparations, so in Russia they went into ICBMs, Sputniks Lunik, Sreika and Belka and whatever else is being cooked up for Khrushchev's trumpeted appearance at the UN.

Only Trotskyist apologists for Russian Communism can believe that because State, rather than private capitalism is in control of production in Russia the Russian economy is moving headlong to fully automatic production. Even if the Russian economy were not beset, as is the American, by obsolescence of capital (and the constant stream of articles against management's use of "partial" automation, where "full" automation is called for, testifies to the contrary) that is not the overriding consideration. No obsolescence of capital, but the human problem, is the overriding issue.

The Workers

In Russia, as in America, Automation has intensified the exploitation of the worker. In America, the worker wildcats. In Russia, he slows down. In America, unem-

Uae 5+8
Oct 1960

ployment signals the crisis. In Russia the shortage of labor serves that purpose. Or, put more precisely, there is always a shortage of labor in industry, and an overabundance in agriculture, although none ever appear on any unemployed line since officially unemployment does not exist.

Because Khrushchev knows full well that the low labor productivity of the Russian worker (as well as that of the peasant) is not due to his "backwardness," but is the exact measure of his resistance to state capitalistic production, Khrushchev acts a great deal wilder on the subject than he did when he blew up the summit. In desperation he has done everything from demobilizing the army to introducing child labor in education.

The show he is now preparing for the UN to present himself as a fighter for freedom of oppressed peoples may fool Fidel Castro. It won't fool the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. Even as they know that nothing can wash clean the hands of this butcher of the Hungarian Revolution, so Khrushchev knows that flights to outer space, with dogs or with man, cannot solve the problems of this earth.

In due time the Russian workers will decide his fate. Russian and American workers must stay the hands that would unleash the nuclear holocaust—and the power struggle between Washington and Moscow will do just that long before either power achieves fully automatic production.

Vol 5 # 9 November 1960

RUSSIA'S CHANGING ROLE IN AFRICA

Khrushchev's spectacular performance at the U.N. as "protector" of the struggles for freedom in Africa must be seen in the light of Russia's military, economic and scientific prowess. The American Government has yet to learn from Dulles' arrogant junking of the Aswan Dam aid and Russia's taking over financial responsibility that Russia is no 10th rate power and America is not the only "real" world power. Nor can any illumination be gotten from whether the old radicals or the new ones like Castro who have swallowed whole Russia's claim to being "the first power." Africa has not, and it is Africa that has been declared the new battleground. To understand the new stage in the Cold War we must turn to Russia's changing policies there.

Up until 1953-54 Russia showed very little interest in Africa. In the midst of World War II its African specialists from among the West Indian Communists, like George Padmore, had broken with the Communist International because war had created the possibility for some African countries to gain national independence "on their own." Padmore aligned himself with Nkrumah. Russian Communists dismissed Nkrumah as a "nationalist stooge for British imperialism." The same held true of their view of the African freedom fighters in French West Africa.

"The Sweet Smell of Success" Makes Khrushchev Run a Jagged Line

Nothing, however, succeeds like success. As the various African nationalist movements either won their freedom or were in the process of winning it, Russia began to sing a different tune. First, however, it walked quite gingerly. When it began to participate in the technical aid programs to the Afro-Asian world, it was, more or less, within the context of the U.N. That is to say, as the Big Brother aiding the little fellow not because he thought "the little one" of great aid in meeting the challenge of the Western Goliath, but because its neutralism in the struggle between East and West would leave Big Brother free for the decisive battle in Europe.

There was some change in 1956 when, at the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, Mikoyan berated the lag between African studies in Russia and African realities. But when De Gaulle, in coming to power, criticized NATO, Khrushchev rushed to his side to assure him he understood his "position in Algeria." The Communist Parties were ordered to stop their flirtations with the nationalist rebels.

Table Thumping—Khrushchev's New Sign

The story is a very different one now. It has come to a climax in the Congo. It is this which brought Khrushchev to New York. Lest anyone think table thumping brings "defeats," he better reread Khrushchev's calculatedly "freedom loving" speech at the U.N.:

"Ours is the age of the struggle for freedom . . . Stormy developments have flared up on the African continent. The young Republic of the Congo on the third day after the proclamation of her independence fell victim to aggression . . . Raw materials for nuclear weapons—uranium, cobalt, titanium, cheap labor—that is what the monopolists are afraid of losing in the Congo . . . Colonialism should be done away with . . . Who can say that French mothers whose children are dying in the fields of Algeria are less unfortunate than the Algerian mothers who bury their sons in their own lands."

A Declaration of War

Of course Russia is as interested in the uranium mines in Katanga as Belgium and America and the U.N. But, for the moment, Khrushchev has achieved exactly what he set out to do: on the day 13 newly-independent African states joined, he dominated the U.N. and at the same time separated himself from ITS policies. Under the banner of peace and "total disarmament," he declared war on the U.S. and the U.N. and "colonialism."

Those who think that this has not opened many doors in Africa that have not previously been opened to Russia, or that Russia's butchery of the Hungarian Revolution will make the African accept American "democracy" so openly aligned to the existing colonialism on the African continent, are blind entirely to the tidal struggle for freedom in Africa. There is no doubt whatever now that everything—from the abstract declarations for freedom to the detailed figures on the rate of economic growth in Russia under State Plans as against that under private capitalism; yes, and even table thumping as a sign of opposition to "colonialism"—will flood the African continent. It will not be long before a School of Africanists is established in Russia, and the Russian technicians in Africa are armed not only with economic aid but the usurped banner of Marxist liberation.

6666

Doc 8410 Dec 1961

The Cuban Revolution: The Year After

In a few weeks the Cuban Revolution will mark the first year of its victory. It is no accident that its enthusiastic and uncritical alliance with the Russian orbit of power is almost as old. Contrary to the claims of the old radicals, who can no longer remember what constitutes principled working-class politics, this was not the only path open to it when it shook off the American imperialist yoke, the relations that preceded it—in the Middle East and in Africa—took advantage of the global division into two nuclear-armed blocs fighting for world power to play off one against the other to its own national advantage. If Cuba chose to disregard this precedent and align itself with but one of these power blocs, the answer cannot lie outside of itself.

FIDELISMO

Forget Russia for a moment—it was nowhere around when Fidel Castro marched into Havana at the head of the July 26th guerilla movement. Neither it nor the native Cuban Communists supported that movement during the seven years it hid out in the Sierra Maestra Mountains. The revolutionary petty-bourgeois lawyer who led this movement had been so little concerned with Communist theory that he gained financial help from many a Cuban, and even some American, liberal bourgeois who had had their fill of the corrupt Batista.

The guerilla fighters from the mountains, the peasants in the Oriente province, the proletarian and students of Havana merged to bring the greatest revolution Latin America had ever witnessed. There is no doubt that with the overthrow of the bloody Batista dictatorship, the revolution broke decisively with United States imperialism which had plundered the Cuban economy. In expropriating the American capitalistic owners, it achieved an agricultural revolution and put an end to the feudal relations between the Cuban peasants and the Cuban-American plantation owners. At the same time, however, the power lay not in peasant committees, but in the state who was the new owner.

STATE-ISM

As for Castro's attitude to the industrial workers, from the very start his boss's administrative mentality stuck out from the very first day of victorious entry into Havana when he demanded that the revolutionary students and workers there put down their arms. He proclaimed his movement alone to be the government, his army alone the army. Nevertheless, the overwhelming enthusiasm for the revolution made the proletariat, despite its reservations, lay down its arms, and wittingly lighten its belt even as the unemployed continued to be silent. When it did, in due course, at the first trade union congress, question some economic policies of the new government, Castro ran out of the convention, calling it a "madhouse."

It is at this point that a kinship was established between the new regime and the native Communists, for it is they who used their leadership of the trade unions to transform them into a pliant tool of the new armed state. TOGETHER WITH WORLD COMMUNISM FIDEL CASTRO SHARED THE CONCEPTION OF THE "BACKWARDNESS OF THE MASSES" WHO HAD TO BE LED, THE STATE WOULD HENCEFORWARD GIVE THE ORDERS, THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS WOULD CONTINUE TO WORK HARDER WHILE THE LEADERS CONTINUED TO LEAD AND SET FOREIGN POLICY.

Just as the peasant found that, in tilling the soil, he was responsible, not to a committee elected by himself, and subject to his recall, but to the state, so the worker found that he too had no organization responsible to him. Despite the lower rents, there has been no change, except for the worse, in the workers' conditions of life and labor. Unemployment continues as do poor wages. Worst of all, there are no Workers' Councils or any other form of free expression, whether in their own organization or in the press. Those who had hailed the revolution had by now as little freedom to criticize any action of the government, least of all its total embrace of all things Russian, Chinese, East European, including the bloody regime of Kadar's Hungary.

The stream of refugees are by no means restricted to "Batista's supporters" or "agents of American imperialism." Every one from the editor of Bohemia to militant trade unionists have attempted to escape, and if the price isn't always the firing squad, it is always silence. When only a Castro—Fidel or Raul—or a Che Guevara have endless voice here and abroad while the masses are made voiceless; when all spontaneity becomes hypostatized into state grooves; when relations with the outside world are not as people-to-people but through arm-state powers; and when all this occurs in a world whose division into two nuclear-armed powers, which threaten humanity's very existence—isn't it time for a new realistic balance sheet to be drawn up? Least helpful in this regard are the old radicals.

OLD RADICALS

Trotskyists, who have spent years in exposing Russia as "a degenerated workers' state" headed by a counter-revolutionary bureaucracy, now feel that it is necessary to whitewash that regime "in order to fight the main enemy, Yankee imperialism." Even some radicals who have spent many years exposing Russian Communism as just another form of state capitalism feel that it is their "revolutionary duty" to spend all their time attacking American imperialism, and none exposing the other pole of world imperialism—Russian totalitarianism.

What is it that impels such self-imposed blindness to the tragedy of the Cuban Revolution which still has a chance to compel its leaders to follow an independent road? Why should the workers and peasants in Cuba be allowed to think that in the Chinese "commune" the Chinese peasants are any less oppressed than the Cubans were by the American plantation owners? Why should the Cuban workers be kept in ignorance of conditions of labor in totalitarian state capitalistic Russia? Why should the Cuban people know that the Guantanamo base is a threat to their existence and not know that the Russian tanks rolled over the Hungarian Freedom Fighters? Why should they only know of the discrimination against the Negroes in the South but not know of the extermination of nationalities opposed to Stalinism in Russia?

SOME POSSIBLE DOUBLE-CROSSES

Why should literacy be equated to illiteracy of the realities of a world divided into two, and only two, nuclear-armed powers out for conquest of the world? Why not allow your new

hero, Castro, to know some things about Russia—its cynicism in foreign policy — which might easily result in its dropping of Cuba the minute it could get a "peaceful co-existence alliance" with America? Why, for that matter, not make yourself aware that this petty bourgeois lawyer is just as cynical and could as easily slide into alliance with the American State Department if it came to face the only truly independent third force—the masses wishing to mold their own destiny in their own hands sans Fidel Castro, Che Guevara and the newly-arisen state bureaucracy?

There is one reason, and one reason only, behind all this self-imposed blindness to the realities of our state capitalist world. One and all are Planners who fear the spontaneity of the revolutionary masses more than anything else on earth, including state capitalism.

Fidelists, like Communists, Trotskyists like other radicals who thirst for power, share the capitalistic mentality of the "backwardness of the masses." All are ready "to lead," none to listen.

WHO ARE DOOMED?

It has been said of Jesus: "He could save all others. Himself he could not save." It needs now to be said of the old radicals: They could save no one, and now they do not even want to save themselves. The one consoling feature is their impotence. Far from being capable of dooming the revolution, history will show them to be the doomed ones.

The New Russian Communist Manifesto

On December 7, 1960, the eighty-one Communist Parties that had met in Moscow in secret for three weeks, issued a 20,000 word Manifesto. The New York Times published the full English translation provided it by the Russian news agency, Tass.

The press has been busy playing detective ever since. The consensus seems to be that Khrushchev and Mao met "half-way", that is to say, the Khrushchev slogans—"peaceful co-existence" and "war is not fatally inevitable"—that permeate the Manifesto and a belligerent Maoist sound. Belligerent they always were since Khrushchev never spoke of peaceful co-existence without at the same time rattling rockets, but "Maoist" they are not.

THE UNREAL WORLD OF ISAAC DEUTSCHER

The only analysis which goes even further afield in bourgeois obtuseness about the "half-way" meeting between Khrushchev and Mao is that made by a "Russian expert" who passes for an anti-Stalinist, semi-Trotskyist, "independent" thinker, but who has so organic a Communist mentality that he might as well carry a party card instead of a scholastic one. This famous author's name is Isaac Deutscher. Deutscher calls the arrogant heads-of-state meeting in Moscow "very nearly a revival of the old Communist International." To make sure he means the Communist International of Lenin's day, Deutscher assures us that this new conclave was greater than the 1928 Comintern which first proclaimed Stalin leader, since "in the Russo-Chinese dispute—the quarrel, that is, between the two Big Brothers—it was clear that neither was big enough to lay down the law." (See the Reporter, January 5, 1961.) Deutscher gets himself so embroiled in his "it seems" and "in effect" that he writes as if indeed he was present at the closed conference and participated brilliantly in its debates! Deutscher is so proud of that article, which is an endless string of clichés whitewashing Communism that the "World Copyright" to it, we are told, has been reserved by Isaac Deutscher.

THE REAL WORLD OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

It is unnecessary to dignify the parallel to the early Comintern. Nothing could be further from the truth. The scholar in Deutscher should know that there is as much in common between the present meeting and the Communist International of Lenin's day as there is between a counter-revolutionary, established state—capitalism, and a workers' state, newly born from the greatest spontaneous revolution in history. The present meeting, it is true, differed also from the 1928 Comintern, but not because, in the one, Stalin's infallibility was acknowledged, and here the "two Big Brothers" were equals who were both forced to display "mutual tolerance" by a majority rule.

No. The difference between 1928 and 1960 is one between a workers' state isolated from the world, and a world power dominating it. Khrushchev is more flexible than Stalin, it is true, but it is Stalin who created "the form" of totalitarian power which enables Khrushchev to be flexible. There is not a whiff of "socialism in one country" in the present document only because that has now extended itself to the establishment of a "world socialist system."

Although eighty-one parties signed the Manifesto, and China gets more credit than the others because it "contributed in great measure to changing the balance of world forces," there is no doubt whatsoever, at any stage of the document, as to who "laid down the law." From the first to last, the document holds up the undisputed leadership of Russia.

Indeed, not only is the Soviet Union "the first country in history to be blazing a trail to communism for all mankind"; not only is it "the most striking example and the most powerful bulwark for the peoples of the world," not only is it the greatest in the "world socialist system"; it is the first in the whole world and not only of the existing world, but of future civilization. Thus "Soviet science has ushered in what is virtually a new era in the development of world civilization."

"INDEPENDENT NATIONAL DEMOCRACIES"

WHAT IS NEW IS THE THIRD WORLD. THE AFRICAN-LATIN AMERICAN WORLD, THE WORLD OF NON-COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONS, STRETCHING FROM THE CONGO TO CUBA, WHICH THE MANIFESTO CALLS "INDEPENDENT NATIONAL DEMOCRACIES." THIS THIRD FORCE RUSSIA IS SO EAGER TO EMBRACE THAT THE MANIFESTO LISTS THEM AS SECOND AND EVEN ON A PAR WITH "THE SOCIALIST WORLD."

Now this has not always been so. The "socialist countries," that is to say, the East European satellites and China, used to be called "people's democracies" or "people's republics" while "the national movements" were clearly labeled "bourgeois." Indeed it was easier for Khrushchev to understand and to do business with Nasser's Egypt which had suppressed the Communist Party but continued to fight the "the West" than to understand the strange phenomenon of the ex-colonial, African

countries whom he had given niggardly technical aid, and whom he criticized in strident voice as "bourgeois."

Here Mao did give Khrushchev a lesson and the present Manifesto shows this: "By giving a further powerful impetus to the National Liberation Movement, it (China) exerted tremendous influence on the peoples, especially those of Asia, Africa and Latin America."

Khrushchev was suspicious of this non-Communist world and especially so of Africa, if for no other reason than that Communism had no one there. Nor was there anyone there with whom to create "a popular front." There was neither a substantial proletariat nor a native African bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeois intellectuals who led the movement were educated, not in Moscow, but in "the West." If they had a dream—and they did—it was, not of Russian Communism, but of Pan-Africanism. For the time being, as could be seen from the first country—Ghana—that gained its independence, the leadership was closer to Great Britain than to Russia.

Khrushchev saw the handwriting on the wall. A new world was emerging without owing anything to Russia and without showing any inclination to follow its path. Russia had to intervene if it was not to lose this new world. The new Russian Communist Manifesto transforms Khrushchev's performance at the UN into the theory for the whole world under its command, China included. (China had objected to giving as much aid to this non-Communist world as to the Communist one, especially China.)

It is this world which Russia aims to dominate, as is evident from its actions in Cuba, in the Congo, and in Laos. Everywhere Russian jets are in evidence; nowhere Chinese. Russia has the power; China only has the population. An ideology to suit both are searching for.

The Manifesto also refers to the 1957 Manifesto which exorcised "revisionism." That is to say the 1956 Hungarian

Revolution and the theoretic banner under which it fought for freedom from Communist imperialism. The period in which Hungarian workers and intellectuals had raised the question of the Humanism of Marxism, which they spelled out as freedom from Communism, had coincided with the period when the Africans had raised the question of a different, a human path to industrialization, and had accounted for the cautious moves in Africa. Times have changed since then. The first Sputnik did a great deal to dull the sickening memory of Russia's bloody counter-revolution.

THE SPUTNIK, THE UN, AND THE THIRD WORLD

The Sputnik generated self-confidence and over-confidence in Khrushchev. Here he was first, not only in the "socialist world," but in the whole world, including America. Russian prestige need no longer be limited to the ideological front. Economic aid must now be emphasized boldly, with the aim of drawing the recipient into this new "world civilization." The knowledge that America will not allow Russia this unchallenged place in science only made Khrushchev go all the more out for this new third world.

The violent gyrations between shouting about "peaceful co-existence" and missile-rattling had all the farcical elements of an actor who had not learned his lines well. But none had ever learned them better than Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, who had writtend, spoken and directed them. No crowning of king or queen was more carefully planned than the "spontaneous" and contradictory outbursts of Khrushchev at the UN.

Surely no "popular front" in Stalin's day had this audience, this power, this independence, these international ramifications as the Afro-Asian world he addressed at the UN. When Khrushchev first embarked on his dramatic de-Stalinization in 1956, it was in no small measure to give himself a new mantle in the Afro-Asian world. Latin America was nowhere in the cards then, but it would come in mighty handy when Cuba too fell into the Russo-Chinese orbit. De-Stalinization permitted the Stalinist, Khrushchev, to travel under the unsullied banner of Marxism-Leninism and thus appear as an exponent of a liberation theory in countries which had gained their freedom from Western imperialism by their own sweat and blood.

Where Stalin was wary of neutrals unless he could fully control them, Khrushchev gave them the bear hug and told them they could go their independent way. The Manifesto spells out the price for the aid "without strings": A new historical period has set in in the life of mankind; the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America that have won their freedom have begun to take an active part in world politics. If any one doubts that "world politics" is Communist politics, let them read the Manifesto.

6669

The lesson in "world politics" Khrushchev is giving the Afro-Asian-Latin American world is this: The war that is "not fatally inevitable" does not mean that the Russia of sputniks and ICBMs subordinates its policy in any way to that of "the West." On the contrary, Russia champions "peaceful co-existence" because the war that is "not fatally inevitable" means that "the West" is walking on glass lest any small war start the nuclear holocaust. Therefore the "independent national democracies" may go far indeed in challenging the United States and Russia will do all it can to help. In a word, "peaceful co-existence" is the careful nurturing of every crisis from the Congo to Cuba.

WHAT IS OLD AND IS "FOREVER"

The Manifesto of the 81 by no means limits itself to what is "new." Neither the new third world, nor the "other" world whose global domination it is challenging can make the Communists forget their own troubles with labor in both industry and agriculture. After all, the Five Year Plan that issued from the De-Stalinization Congress in 1956 had to be scrapped because the Russian people would not continue to sweat itself in accordance with the "norms" that called for a 50% rise in industrial labor productivity and a 100% rise in agricultural labor productivity.

The new Seven Year Plan is meeting opposition. The crisis in agriculture is openly acknowledged. But there is also a silent opposition of worker and youth in the cities. The silent opposition in the most recent period seems to take the form of not going to work at all. It would appear from the Manifesto that the affliction is not only characteristic of Russia, but is a world problem.

The Manifesto states that "the survival of capitalism in the minds of people persists over a long period, even after the establishment of a socialist system." This is the Communist underhanded way of saying that labor still resists capitalist exploitation even when it calls itself "communist." The Manifesto goes on to say that if the working people, instead of opposing the state, had a "Communist attitude to labor," it would be for "vigorous improvement of the scientific and technical standard; of Automation." Exploitation, speed-up by any other name feels just as tiring and that is precisely why labor opposition to "norms" set by State Plan continues.

One thing is clear: "the new world civilization" is built on the same old capitalistic foundation; the sweated labor of the workers. We see that despite the victories in outer space, and even in the ideological battles in the new lands that do not know these rulers as their own workers know them, the problem at home is to make the workers produce more and more.

The working people of this allegedly "world socialist system" know the old and forever exploitation. They want this changed before they go out to conquer "new worlds." ICBMs may not need to be manned but Automation machines in the factory require inhuman speed of men. Thus the silent opposition of worker and peasant is taking the form of not going to work at all.

The most sobering experience I can offer any self-deluded would-be Communist enamored of the Manifesto is to go on a steady diet of reading the Pravda, Izvestia and Trud, which carry on a daily campaign against "idlers who lack labor discipline," "parasites who do not know that he who does not work shall not eat," and then see that what awaits alleged "idlers" is not just propaganda, but prison terms. It is clear that 43 years of Communist rule has not wiped out the continuous labor resistance.

JANUARY, 1961

10c A Copy
6d in Great Britain**BELGIAN WORKERS SHOW THE WAY**

Tens of thousands of Belgian workers have been on general strike ever since December 20th. The militancy of the strike and demonstrations of these unarmed masses facing the armed police on horseback, wielding sabers, and on foot, using tear-gas and guns, has not been seen in Belgium since the Nazi-collaborationist King Leopold was forced to abdicate. Provoked by the so-called Single Law, which the Belgian workers call "The Law of Misery," the strikers aim to overthrow the government of Prime Minister Gaston Eyskens.

General Strike 100% Effective In Industrial South

Eyskens has shown as little understanding of the needs and aspirations of the Belgian workers as, six months previously, he had proved to have of the Congolese masses who had won their freedom from Belgian imperialist rule. Then he connived with his puppet, Tshombe, to withdraw the rich province of Katanga where lay 80% of the wealth of the Congo from the newly-born Congo Republic. This time he aims to saddle the Belgian workers with the whole burden of the imperialist loss of the Congo by a 20% tax. With this workers' sweat and blood, Eyskens aims "to modernize" Belgian industry by isolating the mines, steel plants and cement shops of the industrialized South, which is Socialist, and building new plants in the Catholic North.

While the strike among the miners, steel and cement workers in Liege, Mons, Ghent is 100% effective both economically and politically, leadership of the Catholic trade unions of the North has voted not to support the strike because "it is not an economic but a political strike." Thereby they have intensified the old division between the French-speaking Belgian workers in the industrial South and the Dutch-speaking Flemish population in the North. By now this has international ramifications.

Enter Africa

No one was hated more by the Congolese masses than the Flemish-speaking Belgian oppressors. Belgian imperialism dates from, and is akin to, the white supremacist South African. The old, blatant imperialist excesses of the century that had not been disciplined in any way by the mass revolts of the 20th Century has now turned inward against "its own" proletariat. This narrow, bigoted, reactionary, exploitative rule is as ruthless against the advanced proletariat as it has always been against the allegedly "backward masses of Africa."

Whether the moderate Socialist leadership, which has led the strike whereby the unarmed workers have brought the economy to a near standstill despite the bloody intervention of the armed police, will now back down or move forward and appeal to the international proletariat remains to be seen.

One thing is sure of all of Western Europe: Just as the future of France depends upon the solution of the Algerian war, so the future of Belgium is inseparable from the freedom fighters in the Congo. Africa has moved over to the center of the European stage and is daily proving that the world cannot stand divided, half-free and half-slave.

End of the Eisenhower Administration

Just as the one-world in which we live connects Europe with Africa, so it connects United States to Asia and Latin America. In the last weeks of the Republican Administration, the General, who won power by promising to go to Korea and bring peace, ended his eight-year rule by very nearly precipitating World War III. It was not enough that he was leaving the American economy in deep recession with unemployment as high as in 1940. He also was brandishing the mallet fist with its nuclear power all the way from Laos to Cuba.

In utter disregard of the 1954 Geneva Agreement, which ended the Indo-China War by recognizing two Viet Nams, and establishing a single neutral government in Laos, Eisenhower engineered a military coup there of the worst Rightist elements.

Even John Foster Dulles' own creation—SEATO—could not bring itself to approve this unilateral American adventure. The British and French Allies were so outraged at this senseless brinkmanship that they compelled Eisenhower to back-track somewhat. By now, however, the cold war there is so heated up, it is not yet certain that this situation will not again go out of bounds.

The senility of American imperialism never stood out more sharply than when Eisenhower

fell right into Castro's studied invitation for the American Embassy to pack up and leave Cuba. While the orders with which Che Guevara returned from Russia and China may have included the suggestion to close up the American Embassy, the haste with which Eisenhower rushed to obey shows that it was his very own idea as well.

Monday, January 2nd, past midnight, Castro delivered his harangue that the American Embassy be cut to eleven within forty-eight hours, adding the further provocative statement that if "all" wish to leave, so much the better. By 2:20 A.M., the order was duly delivered to the American Embassy in Havana. Eisenhower retaliated by cutting diplomatic ties with Cuba the very same night, Tuesday, January 3rd. Since only three weeks were left to Eisenhower to play Commander-in-Chief, what was the great hurry? The answer can be seen best neither in Cuba nor in Laos, but in the Congo.

Africa Once Again

Last summer when Khrushchev took the UN rostrum to declare war on Hammarskjold and put himself up as champion of African freedom, it was clear that every inch of African territory would from then on be contested by this chief protagonist in the cold war. The American Administration came all out for the UN as the true, the only, the impartial, the sacred, international body to which so great a "sovereign nation" as America was willing to subordinate itself "to keep the peace."

During the subsequent weeks, however, the Eisenhower Administration began to double-cross their favorite of Khrushchev's visit—UN's Hammarskjold—by giving independent orders to the American-Belgian created "Strongman," Mobutu.

Nothing—neither parliamentary legality, nor the will of the people on the street; neither the African nations nor

the Asian neutrals, nor even the UN itself—absolutely nothing was to be allowed to bring back to the government the duly-elected Premier Patrice Lumumba.

While the Congolese find it impossible to tell the difference between their centuries-old exploiter, Belgium, and their new "friend," America, the high and mighty Hammarskjold is lost in this tug of war between America and Russia on African soil.

All too obvious, however, is Eisenhower's illiteracy in reading the signs of the times. It is inconceivable to the Five-Star General that military power, (shadowy as in the Congo or real as in the U.S.) is no substitute for the struggle for the minds of men. It is beyond his comprehension that people fight and are ready to die for freedom, but that imperialist stooges do not become strong, just because they are American or Belgian-armed.

All that the conspiracy with Belgium, which put the Ruanda-Urundi air base at Mobutu's disposal accomplished was to expose that "Strongman Mobutu" is as weak as he is base—a puppet of doddering imperialism.

Eisenhower is too old to learn. He proceeded to disregard the ideological struggle even as he disregarded the fact that Laos has a common border with Communist China. The old battle-axe could not gracefully give up the idea that he and the state were one, and thus risked starting World War III, for the Russia-China Axis ideology is as mightily armed as is the United States.

1960 was Africa's year. Already it is learning what a big gap there is between gaining formal independence and achieving genuine freedom and an economy to back it up. It now must face every problem from industrialization to the cold war.

The fall in the price of raw material has canceled the sum total of aid it received from the "advanced countries." And, as if it were not burdensome enough to have gained freedom at a time when the two nuclear-armed world powers are struggling for world domination, Nasser has now inject-

ed the Arab-Israeli conflict as part of "Africa's fight." (See "Our Life and Times," p.8).

British Workers' Display of International Solidarity

What the heads of state are preoccupied with, however, and what the masses are doing shows the unbridgeable gulf between workers and rulers. The first sign of international solidarity has come with the offer of aid from the British workers for the Belgian strikers.

The British Trades Union Congress voted to loan, interest-free, \$140,000 to the Belgian workers. The Executive Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen has asked its members not to service any Belgian vessels at British ports.

The American labor bureaucracy, on the other hand, has remained as deaf to the needs of the Belgian strikers as to American labor. Now that the Belgian workers have shown the way to independent action in the biggest official strike which Europe has seen since the war, and the British work-

ers have displayed their sense of labor solidarity, isn't it time to compel Reuther to stop playing capitalist politics, and define his international role in world trade union organization?

A New Page

The Belgian general strike symbolizes a new stage not only in West European labor, but also in Africa, even as the youth demonstrations last year opened a new stage in Japan, in South Korea, in Turkey, in South Africa and in South U.S.A. Just as the capitalist crises will heighten in the new year, so the battles for freedom the world over will expand.

A new year has begun. A new page in the labor movement has been opened.

FEBRUARY, 1961

TWO WORLDS *By Raya Dunayevskaya*

Negro Intellectuals in Dilemma

Introductory Note: In the midst of World War II a comprehensive study of the Negro question—*An American Dilemma* by Gunnar Myrdal—appeared in America. The critical review of the work that I wrote then is republished here because the 17 years since publication have borne out the validity of our view of the revolutionary role of the Negro masses in the development of America on the one hand, and the Uncle Tom-ish role of the Negro intellectuals, on the other hand. The African Revolutions of our decade that are still in process and that are reshaping the world again reinforce our view that a portent on the horizon was the shamefaced Negro American intellectual's attitude to Marcus Garvey.—R.D.

Over four years were needed to complete this study. It is a product not only of the Swedish scholar, Gunnar Myrdal, and his two associates, Richard Sterner and Arnold Rose, but of some seventy-five intellectuals, both white and Negro, who gave full or part time to the gathering and analysis of data. Some of these supplementary studies were elaborated and published separately. The outstanding of these are: *The Negro's Share*, by Richard Sterner, *Patterns of Negro Segregation*, by Charles S. Johnson, and *Organized Labor and the Negro*, by Hebert R. Northrup. Other manuscripts prepared for the larger study have remained unpublished, but have been placed on file at the Schomburg Collection, where they are available to the public. Even without these more detailed studies of separate aspects of the Negro problem, the Myrdal work comprises the most comprehensive thus far produced on the subject, and make it possible to clear our shelves of many of the earlier volumes on this topic. This assertion, which has been made by the Negro intellectuals in their reviews of *An American Dilemma*, is not, however, repeated by the present reviewer as unqualified praise of the book. On the contrary, that this work makes such a clearing possible is only further testimony as to the paucity of adequate books on the subject. There is not a single outstanding work dealing with the Negro problem "in general," although there are good studies of specific facets of the Negro problem. In the present research we get an over-all view of the entire field.

THE 14 MILLION FORGOTTEN NEGRO POPULISTS

However, in some instances, as on the Reconstruction period, it is a retrogression. I speak of retrogression because, whereas Myrdal states that no comprehensive scientific study of the Reconstruction period has yet been written by American historians, and urges that such a study be made, he is not helping the case along by more or less dismissing the Negro studies of the Reconstruction period as mere counter-balances to the prejudiced reports by the whites. W. E. B. Du Bois' *Black Reconstruction*, which is a first-class piece of research and analysis in a field barely touched by our venerable white historians, can in no way be dismissed so cavalierly.

One of the most serious shortcomings of the Myrdal book arises from the fact that in those cases where no study of a field had ever before been made, as on the Negro role in the Populist movement in the South, those unexplored fields are not only further neglected but are ignored. At the very height of the prejudice-ridden post-Reconstruction period, when the South was supposedly solidly white in thought and action, the Populist movement that was sweeping the country found its most radical expression in the South. The National Colored Farmer's Alliance alone numbered one and one-quarter million members and, although separately organized from the white agrarians, waged their class battles as one. It was a power to be reckoned with both in state and national politics, and was instrumental in the elections of Populist governors as well as national and state representatives.

There have not been many Negro organizations with so large a membership. Any "social scientists" seriously studying the Negro problem, as Mr. Myrdal surely did, could not have escaped becoming interested in and probing to the end this outstanding example of class solidarity across racial lines. However, Prof. Myrdal seems to be ignorant of this movement. In a bibliography of thirty-five pages, no reference is made even to such popular works as the scholarly and sympathetic study, *Tom Watson, Agrarian Rebel*, by C. Van Woodward, or the scholarly but prejudiced study, *The Populist Movement in Georgia*, by A. M. Arnett. The bibliography does include John D. Hicks' standard *The Populist Revolt*, which contains one reference to the Negro Farmers' Alliance. If that left any impression on Mr. Myrdal, however, it was insufficient to induce him to pursue the study of this phenomenon through primary sources.

This failure must be analyzed. It was surely not due to lack of money or unavailability of scholars to undertake such a study, if an awareness of the need for such research had been felt. Mr. Myrdal neither searched this field nor even indicated that it should be searched because his outlook could not encompass the possibility of such a movement.

The fact, however, is that the "negative outcome," that is, the first appearance of the Solid South, was shattered but a few years after it was instituted due to the onslaught of the Southern agrarian movement in which white and black fought together against the planter-merchant-railroad vested interests. In the previously cited work on Tom Watson, Mr. Van Woodward traces this period of white and black unity, and comments: "Never before or since have the two races in the South come so close together as they did during the Populist struggles." Yet Mr. Myrdal, in a sum total of 1,483 pages on the "Negro problem," finds no space for so much as a footnote to refer to the Negro role in this tremendous mass movement. This is the result of his "non-class struggle" approach. In this respect it is not devoid of interest to note that the sponsor of this study is the Carnegie Corporation.

MYRDAL'S "VALUE PREMISES"

The present study was projected by this corporation, which sank over a quarter of a million dollars into the venture. So prejudiced are the American "social scientists" that, in order to get the facts on the Negro problem impartially set down, the corporation found that it would need to engage a foreign scholar. Not accidentally, however, its search for one unprejudiced in racial questions ended when it found one who was anti-Marxist in political outlook. Mr. Myrdal's anti-Marxism colors his approach to the entire work as well as to his co-workers. Mr. Myrdal's insistence on the invalidity of the Marxian theory shows that he knows quite well where the "main enemy" is and who his sponsor is.

Mr. Myrdal denies that "the economic factor" is the primary one in the development of society, or rather, in the existence of the Negro problem. To him the Negro problem is a moral problem arising out of the conflict between the "American creed," that all men are created equal, and the American reality, in which the Negro minority is so unjustly treated. However, it is clear from the 1,000-odd pages of text, that, if the Negro problem is in the "mind and heart" of America, it has nevertheless a most solid economic foundation.

A particular admirable job was done with the section on the Negro laborer. That section was under the general direction of Mr. Sterner, who also is the author of the appendix relating to this section. This appendix is entitled "Pre-War Conditions of the Negro Wage-Earner in Selected Industries and Occupations." It deals both with the industries in which the Negroes are the predominant labor force, lumber milling, fertilizer manufacturing, turpentine farming, etc., and with the industry which practically excludes any Negro labor, the major Southern industry, textiles. From it we also get a glimpse of the difference between the conditions in a non-unionized industry and a unionized one. In turpentine farming the Negro earns little more than \$200 a year and some forms of peonage are still extant. In mining, however, the worker get comparatively high wages, being unionized in the United Mine Workers, where no discrimination exists. In fact, even in Alabama, the Negro union member talks as freely as the white union member, and the local union itself is generally administered by a white president and a Negro vice-president.

The study of the Negro worker is preceded by an examination of the plight of the Negro share-cropper. The chapters on Negro and Southern agriculture are on as competent a level as those on the Negro in industry. Anyone who has entertained any illusions as to what the New Deal meant to the poor farmers, white and Negro, in the semi-feudal conditions of the South, will have them quickly dispelled by the accumulated weight of evidence. This shows that the governmental agricultural policies had graver consequences in uprooting the Negro farmer than soil erosion, the boll weevil and the South-western shift of cotton culture combined.

The above citations indicate that the value of *An American Dilemma* does not reside in its "value premises" but in the fact that it offers up-to-date informational summaries of the economic, legal and social status of the Negro in America.

No criticism of Mr. Myrdal's "value premises," however, could have dealt them so fatal a blow as was struck by the author himself. This occurs when his thesis reaches the South, where, after all, four out of five Negroes still live, where the Negro problem was created, where it still has its roots. It is there that the contradiction between the "American creed" and the economic reality is sharpest. It is therefore not at all surprising that it is there that the contradiction between Mr. Myrdal, the scholar with "value premises," and Mr. Myrdal, the "social scientist," becomes not only acute but ludicrous.

IN PLACE OF A CHALLENGE, A WHIMPER

Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, writes that with the entrenchment of slavery in the South, the blackout on independent thinking was so overwhelming that Southern thought to this day suffers from lack of free intercourse with the varied currents of thought since the early nineteenth century. "... The region is exceptional in Western non-fascist civilization since the Enlightenment in that it lacks every trace of radical thought. In the South all progressive thinking going further than mild liberalism has been practically non-existent for a century." (Page 468.)

Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, further demonstrates that the war, which has increased the militancy of the Negro, has scared these Southern white liberals into an outright reactionary position. They would not continue their cooperation with the Negro intellectuals against discrimination unless the latter accepted, nay, avowed, social segregation. So benighted is that region that the following passed for the words of a liberal! It is Mark Etheridge, ex-chairman of the FEPC, who writes in July, 1942:

"There is no power in the world—not even the mechanized armies of the earth, the Allied and the Axis—which can now force the Southern white people to the abandonment of social segregation. It is a cruel disillusionment, bearing germs of strife and perhaps tragedy, for any of their (Negroes) leaders to tell them that they can expect it, or that they can exact it, as the price of their participation in the war" (The Virginia Quarterly).

This, then, is the "American creed" when expressed in Southern lingo. What happens now to the scholar's "value premise," that the Negro is entitled to full participation in American democracy? Overboard goes the scholar and out emerges the "social scientist," who turns out to be a bourgeois politician. Mr. Myrdal, the "social scientist," begins to appeal to his Southern bourgeois class brethren. Since, says Mr. Myrdal, the good bourgeois, "changes should, if possible, not be made by sudden upheavals but in gradual steps" (page 518), the South had better start enfranchising its Negro citizens now. Mr. Myrdal pleads that this "is truly a conservative" conclusion. And just to prove to the Southern bourgeois that it is not a wild-haired Marxist who is asking them to take this plunge, he writes that they can, to begin with, start enfranchising "the higher strata of the Negro population" (page 519). The appeal of the "social scientist" is not a challenge; it is a whimper.

Here you have the political formula of this massive work in a nutshell! Here is a scholar who has digested the major part of the available literature on the subject of the Negro problem, who has conducted field studies and case histories, all of which lead him to uphold "value premises" that demand the full participation of the Negro in all aspects of American life, who holds no brief for for Intellectual Uncle Tomism of either Negro or white variety, who says the South is as backward intellectually as economically, that its ignorance is, in fact, unique in non-fascist Western civilization, and yet so bourgeois is he that his class instinct prevails upon him to produce so impotent, so ludicrous a "solution" as to turn the American tragedy into a Swedish farce!

THE TREASON OF THE INTELLECTUALS

One might have supposed that the Negro intellectuals would arise one and all in criticism of *An American Dilemma*. But any such supposition is, unfortunately, quite unfounded. Mr. Du Bois, for example, who considers the "acculturation of the masses" to be the task of the "talented tenth," did not consider it the task of the "talented tenth" to criticize a work saddled with so much high-brow talk and so little high or low-brow action. On the contrary, he considered it to be a "monumental and unrivalled study" whose scientific approach should be emulated (Phylon, second quarter, 1944). In general, the Negro press met the work with paucans of praise.

A sadder commentary yet on the state of the Negro intelligentsia than the Negro press is the manner in which Mr. Myrdal got from it its staff members. These intellectuals were at his beck and call at all times, although some of them seem to be so far to the left of him as to be on the opposite side of the fence. Mr. Myrdal's chief complaint against them is that they have been influenced by Marxism.

Consider, then, the case of Charles S. Johnson, who has been so influenced and who considers the Negro problem to be rooted in economic factors. During the extensive Negro migrations northward in the period of World War I, Mr. Johnson saw the solution to the Negro problem in the urbanization and proletarianization of the Negro which more or less automatically, would shift the problem from a racial to a class plane. When the depression interrupted the continuity of this development, Mr. Johnson seemed to rely upon the impact of the crisis to cause such an upheaval in the Southern economy as to unseat King Cotton. When the AAA pumped some subsidies into cotton culture and propped up the collapsing regime of cot-

6 6 7 4

tenancy. Mr. Johnson still had his eyes on some "automatic" economic revolution to be caused by the introduction of the mechanical cotton picker. Mr. Johnson the scholar seemed blissfully unaware of the significance of the political alliance of the New Deal-Wall Street North with the burbon semi-feudal South. Or perhaps not so much unaware as unwilling to give up the quiet of an academic chair for the hubbub of mass activity which would "induce" the "economic" revolution . . .

Every so often in the works of Mr. Johnson one finds a situation described so lucidly that the revolutionary answer to "anything can happen" seems clear enough. But it is never stated in so many words. The reason lies partly in the fact that the majority of the research projects or economic and social analyses regarding the Negro have white guardian angels in the form of some bourgeois fund, whether it is Carnegie, or Rockefeller or Rosenwald or the government. It is only natural that the studies stop short of their implicit conclusions. It indeed the professors ever breathe the conclusions even to themselves and thus jeopardize the comfort of the academic chair. Researchers, of course, are paid to indulge in "educational treatises," not to carry on revolutionary propaganda. Thus it happens that the attacks of the "radicals" on Uncle Tom Negroes does not encompass them, and the struggle against Booker T. Washington's philosophy of "cast down your bucket wherever you are" does not get far beyond the academic hall, while the Negro masses continue to be ground beneath the millstone of class and racial oppression.

BUNCHE AND REDDICK

The sorriest spectacle of the Negro "talented tenth" is presented by Ralph Bunche. Mr. Bunche is critical not only of the economic, political and social status of the Negro, but of all existing Negro organizations that strive to ameliorate this condition. He calls them "philosophic and programmatic paupers." He is critical likewise of all Negro leaders who, he says, "think and act entirely in a black groove." In his pamphlet, *A World View of Race*, he even comes up with a solution to the Negro problem:

"The Negro must develop, therefore, a consciousness of class interest and purpose and must strive for an alliance with the white working class in a common struggle for economic and political equality and justice."

Yet this most radical of radicals found it permissible to shelve his more radical conclusions in the Schomburg collection, while his research data is used by Mr. Myrdal for his own conservative ends. This is not at all accidental. Mr. Bunche's revolutionary thunder is no more than radicalism of the chair.

Mr. Bunche may not attack Mr. Myrdal, but Mr. Myrdal does not hesitate to attack Mr. Bunche:

"In passing it should be observed that the academic radicalism of Negro intellectuals exemplified by the citation from Mr. Bunche, can easily come to good terms with the type of liberal but skeptical *laissez-faire* (do nothing) opinion so prevalent among white social scientists, writing on the Negro problem . . . Since neither party is very active in trying to induce or prevent an economic revolution, it does not make much difference if the Negro radicals look forward to an economic revolution and the white sociologists do not." (Page 1398, footnote 13.)

Of the Negro intellectuals who have reviewed the Myrdal volumes, the only critic so far has been L. D. Reddick, curator of the Schomburg collection. Mr. Reddick has written two re-

views, one for the *Journal of Negro Education*, spring, 1944, and the other for *Opportunity*. In both reviews he offers three criticisms of the book. He rejects Mr. Myrdal's sociological concept of weakness of the historical sections of the book; and he is critical of Mr. Myrdal's solution. The best thing in the reviews is his recognition that the ultimate solution of the Negro question is along class lines. However, the way in which Mr. Reddick phrases this is extremely significant. He writes: "Finally, Dr. Myrdal is unduly pessimistic over the possibilities of Negro and white workers uniting and struggling together for common goals." If Mr. Myrdal is unduly pessimistic, it is clear that Mr. Reddick is not unduly optimistic . . .

THE GARVEY MOVEMENT

This brings us to one of the most significant omissions of this book. If even Mr. Myrdal is unaware of the Populist movement, no one who thinks of the Negro question at all is unaware of the Garvey movement. This is the most remarkable phenomenon in the history of the Negro in the United States. Mr. Myrdal recognizes its importance. He writes:

"For one thing it proves that it is possible to reach the Negro masses if they are appealed to in an effective way. It testifies to the basic unrest in the Negro community. It tells of a dissatisfaction so deep that it mounts to hopelessness of ever gaining a full life in America." (Page 749.)

Mr. Myrdal himself does not analyze the Garvey movement, although he states that this, along with a thorough study of the movement, ought to be done:

"Negro intellectuals, for understandable reasons, show certain inhibitions in dealing with the topic, as do the white students of the Negro problem. But it is worthy of intensive historical investigation and careful reflection." (Page 749.)

Why Mr. Myrdal has not done so in a study lasting four years and covering 1400 pages of text remains inexplicable. Mr. Myrdal further observes that the

"Negroes are beginning to form a self-conscious 'nation within the nation,' defining ever more clearly their fundamental grievances against white America.

America can never more regard its Negroes as a patient, submissive minority. Negroes will continually become less well "accommodated." They will organize for defense and offense." (Page 1004.)

PORTENTS ON THE HORIZON

To anyone who is concerned about the Negro question today, this neglect of the Garvey movement has just about reached its end. There is stirring in the Negro people in the United States today a racial consciousness which has a present found its most extreme expression in the writings of Richard Wright, Wilfred H. Kerr, co-chairman of the Lynn Committee to Abolish Segregation in the Armed Forces, has noted the phenomenon, which he calls "Negroism."

These are portents on the horizon which can be ignored only to the peril of the labor movement. But they must be approached upon the indispensable basis of the revolutionary struggle for socialism and of the proletariat as that social class which will solve the Negro problem along with all other major problems that capitalist society cannot solve. From the very fact that scholars like Mr. Johnson and Mr. Myrdal make such valuable contributions to the Negro question, it is necessary for Marxists to attack and expose without mercy their false philosophical premises.

FEBRUARY, 1961

6674

The Three Faces of N. Khrushchev

The conflict in Russia's policy of "peaceful co-existence" came out glaringly when three variations of the same theme were played within a hectic ten-day period against the sharply contrasting backgrounds of London, the Congo, the UN, India, and Washington, D.C.

"The Secret Document"

In a copyrighted article in The London Observer of February 12, the noted British journalist, Edward Crankshaw, wrote: "There has come into our hands a documented report of the charges and countercharges between Peking and Moscow . . . There is a strong possibility it was a deliberate 'leak' on the part of the Russians."

Instead of allowing also for the probability that the "detailed summaries of hitherto secret correspondence" were tailored to order, the Russian expert fancifully elaborates: "Khrushchev's impassioned evocation of the perils of nuclear war and his insistence that he was absolutely sincere about disarmament ('the only true humanism') and co-existence in the end had their effect," that is to say, won the day over the objections of the Chinese.

There is no need here to go into that new Manifesto of the 81 Communist Parties, which we had analyzed as a victory for Russia when the "Russian experts" were busy telling us it was a "compromise" between Russia and China. (See News & Letters, January 1961). What is of significance in the purported secret document is the date of publication, the date that made it impossible to take full advantage of the peaceful face of co-existence, because the news of the murder of Patrice Lumumba hit the air waves early the following morning. This compelled Russia to show the second face of "peaceful co-existence"—the war threat.

Zorin's UN Role and Khrushchev's Letter

That this, in turn, was "only" a threat is clear enough from the dual role of Russia's UN Ambassador, Valerian Zorin, in the morning of February 21st. At one and the same time he had proposed that the UN scuttle the whole Congo operation, and made possible the passage of the Resolution which not only called for the UN troops to remain in the Congo, but authorized them "to use force."

The single-voiced silence of not vetoing the Security Council Resolution so resoundingly exposed the double-tongued oratory of the Russian Ambassador that Nikita Khrushchev hurried to expose the third face of "peaceful co-existence." He dispatched a letter to Prime Minister Nehru of India, asking for "a common language . . . in defense of the freedom and independence of the Republic of the Congo." But once again, the timing disclosed the hollowness of Russia's claim to bring the defender of the Congo's independence.

The letter was written February 22nd, the day after the Security Council, with the forbearance of Russia, had passed the Resolution, introduced by Ceylon, the UAR, and Liberia, which empowered the UN to use force "to stop civil war." It was not released to the press until the 26th, the eve of U.S. Ambassador Thompson's departure for Moscow. The bourgeois press interpreted this as a warning to the Kennedy Administration that Russia's desire for peace is not to be at the cost of its Congo policy. In actuality, this was a posture for the Afro-Asian world, not for Washington, D. C.

Enter President JFK

The young Kennedy, who postures as effectively as the old Khrushchev, took to the air the minute it was obvious that Khrushchev meant to use the murder of Lumumba to enter the Congo. Departing from his studied oral informality, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in a military stance, and with a measured Harvard accent, read a prepared statement, informing the world that the United States Government would not countenance any "unilateral action" in the Congo.

Khrushchev understood exactly what Kennedy threatened. He ordered Zorin not to exercise his veto power. But the masquerade must never stop. Hence the letter to Nehru which implied the opposite of the Russian vote in the UN. To make sure that if the letter didn't fool Nehru, it should nevertheless capture the imagination of the press, it was released to the "Western" journalists, who are easier to dupe.

Khrushchev's Masquerade

We can be sure that Khrushchev's letter to Nehru will get the widest possible circulation in the Afro-Asian world for whose ear it is intended. It speaks about the "roots of the conspiracy" of the UN action in the Congo, but keeps silent about Russia's vote for that operation in order to carry on its own kind of conspiracy, beginning with its advice to Lumumba to request UN intervention. The letter begs for "a common language" with the Afro-Asian world, but has nothing to say about the common language already established in the Manifesto of the 81 Communist Parties which declares their bid for domination over that third world of uncommitted nations as "the highest form of the class struggle." And Khrushchev seems to have lost his tongue altogether when it comes to specifying the United States as the "other colonialist power." Khrushchev has no intention of finding his tongue so long as playing with disarmament can be presented as "the true humanism."

Only the Action of the Congolese

The dismemberment of the Congo will continue so long as it remains the victim of "unilateral action" outside of, or inside of, the UN. Whether by war, or by conspiracy, the Congo has become the battleground both of the two nuclear titans fighting for world domination and Belgian imperialism—determined to maintain its old stranglehold over its former colony. The only thing that can stop the dismemberment is the action of the Congolese masses to take destiny into their own hands. Short of that, we now face, in addition to two Koreas, two Germanias, two Vietnams, the tragedy of three Congos.

A British edition of my pamphlet, "Nationalism, Communism, Marxist Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions" is soon to be published. In view of the fact that it was originally written in June 1959, I was asked to bring it up to date. The new introduction is printed below.—R.D.

1960

1969 was the year when 16 nations in Africa gained their freedom from Britain and France. 1960 was the year when Belgium thought it could grant formal political independence to the Congo while retaining an economic and military stranglehold. In the rich Katanga province, the Congolese people faced the new fact that white imperialism could speak through a black puppet; three short days after the creation of the Republic of the Congo, Moïse Tshombe declared Katanga's "independence." Premier Patrice Lumumba requested UN aid. Imbedded in this UN intervention was a new form of struggle between the two nuclear armed titans, the Soviet Union and the United States.

PATRICE LUMUMBA

Khrushchev's performance at the UN was designed to make the world forget that Russia voted for UN intervention in the Congo. Khrushchev is no one to underestimate: his table-thumping was calling attention to his disdain for that organization. His removal of his shoe created an aura of separateness from the UN despite his previous approval of the dispatch of UN troops.

Khrushchev was winning a battle for the minds of men in the Afro-Asian world through his alignment with the most popular Freedom Fighter in the Congo, Patrice Lumumba, the only one who had built up a truly national movement that crossed tribal lines and who had spearheaded the movement of independence.

Patrice Lumumba had asked for UN aid because he thought he could use both Russia and the United States to maintain independence. But before the Premier could use, he was used.

THE BRUTAL MURDER of Patrice Lumumba was the inevitable result of American imperialist connivance with Belgian imperialism and their African puppets against the leadership of Lumumba's Congolese National Movement. The crocodile tears shed by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and the UN Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson, were quickly brushed aside the moment it became obvious that Khrushchev, on his part intended to use that criminal act to establish a foothold in the Congo through recognition and support of the Antoine Gizenga regime as the only legitimate government in the whole of the Congo.

This challenge to the UN-US domination over the Congo and its uranium, cobalt, and titanium was immediately answered by the wily young Kennedy, who thrust it right back at the wily old Khrushchev with nuclear determination. Russia backed down somewhat, ordering its UN Ambassador, Valerian Zorin, not to veto the resolution introduced by Ceylon, the UAR, and Liberia, to empower the UN "to use force to stop civil war."

Whether the UN can stop civil war in the Congo is questionable; that it cannot stop the US-USSR struggle for world power is certain. The threat of dismemberment now stalks the tragic Congo. Must there now be three Congos, just as there already are two Germanies, two Koreas, two Viet Nams?

"IZWE LETHU"

1960 was a turning point in the struggle for African freedom. Even where the African Freedom Fighters were defeated, as in apartheid South Africa, they electrified the world with their mass burning of the hated passes and brave shouting of "Izwe Lethu" (Our Land). Where they had already gained political freedom, in Ghana and Guinea, they began facing the struggle for economic independence. 17 newly independent nations were born in Africa: the Cameroun, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo Republics (one formerly Belgian, one formerly French), Dahomey, Gabon, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, the Ivory Coast, Malagasy (formerly

Madagascar), Mali (formerly French Sudan), Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Togo and the Voltaic Republic.

BY YEAR'S END, light had been shed on the darkest of white-supremacist rule, not excluding the "quiet" dictatorial terror of Portuguese Africa, much less boisterous Sir Roy Welensky's Federation vigorously challenged by Kenneth Kaunda's United National Independence Party in Northern Rhodesia, and Dr. Hastings Banda's national movement in Nyasaland. The outburst of elemental creative activity of the African masses has, in the short period of a single decade, remade the map of Africa and thereby of the world. From the outset, when this surge was still overshadowed by the revolutions in Asia and the Middle East, it was clear that a totally new, a higher stage in world development had been reached.

It was met by an orgy of violence when it first appeared in France's Madagascar during World War II and in Britain's Kenya after the war. But the Mau Mau taught British imperialism a lesson: other struggles for independence should be handled with grace in the hope of retaining economic privileges afterward. Although DeGaulle's France had learned nothing from its bitter drawn-out war with Moslem revolutionaries in Algeria, it had learned from tiny Guinea's brave, loud "No" that it should change its tune in relationship to former colonies in sub-Saharan Africa.

SINCE THEN the tidal wave of freedom has engulfed the former British, French and Belgian empires, so that in two short years 19 independent African nations emerged from the Atlantic to the Congo. And freedom's handwriting is on the wall for others. Not only is Tanganyika ready for independence, but even where there is a counter-revolutionary white settler element, Kenya Freedom Fighters have no intention of delaying the achievement of independence. The tocsin for freedom has been sounded throughout the African continent, West and East, North and South.

A BACKWARD GLANCE AT THE 1950'S

As the Africans surge toward freedom, Russia is anxious to unfurl the usurped banner of Marxism, although present-day Communism is the exact opposite of Marxism, as was clear from its brutal suppression of revolution in its East European satellite of Hungary. It is true that Khrushchev's UN performance in the summer of 1960 was transformed by the 81 Communist Parties that met in Moscow in December into a theory about "the independent national democracies." But those who are ready to believe that Russia stands for freedom, at least in Africa,

should take a backward glance at the 1950's.

UP UNTIL 1953-4, Russia showed very little interest in Africa, called Kwame Nkrumah "a nationalist stooge for British imperialism," a label it had previously reserved for India's Nehru. Russian Communism was suspicious of the uncommitted, non-Communist world in Asia, in the Middle East, and especially so in Africa; if for no other reason than that Communism had no one there. Nor was there anyone there with whom to create a "popular front." There was neither a substantial proletariat nor a native African bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeois intellectuals who led the movement were educated not in Moscow, but in "the West." If they had a dream—and they did—it was not of Russian Communism, but of Pan-Africanism. For the time being, as could be seen from the first country that gained its independence—Ghana—the leadership was closer to Great Britain than to Russia.

Khrushchev saw the handwriting on the wall. A new world was emerging without owing anything to Russia and without showing any inclination to follow its path. Russia had to intervene if it was not to lose this new world. Hence Khrushchev's performance at the UN. Hence the allegedly unstinted support (that the manifesto of the 81 Communist Parties give "the independent national democracies.")

(To be continued)

IN 1958 KHRUSHCHEV first declared that imperialist war was "not inevitable." His famous de-Stalinization speech at that Russian Communist Party Congress permitted the Stalinist, Khrushchev, to travel under the unsullied banner of Marxism-Leninism and thus appear as an exponent of a liberation theory in countries which had gained their freedom from Western imperialism by their own sweat and blood.

Peaceful Coexistence

Where Stalin was wary of neutrals unless he could fully control them, Khrushchev now gave them the bear hug and told them they could go their independent way. De-Stalinization was the first step in the change of the Russian line, but what generated the self-confidence and over-confidence in the Khrushchev of the late 1950's was the Sputnik. And now the manifesto explains: "A new historical period has set in in the life of mankind: the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America that have won their freedom have begun to take an active part in world politics." If anyone doubts that "world politics" is Communist politics, let them read the manifesto.

The lesson in "world politics" Khrushchev is giving the Afro-Asian-Latin American world is this: the war that is "not fatally inevitable" does not mean that the Russia of Sputniks and ICBMs subordinates its policy in any way to that of "the West." On the contrary, Russia champions "peaceful co-existence" because the war that is "not fatally inevitable" means that "the West" is walking on glass lest any small war start the nuclear holocaust. Therefore the "independent national democracies" may so far indeed in challenging the United States, and Russia will do all it can to help. In a word, "peaceful co-existence" is the careful nurturing of every crisis from Congo to Cuba.

The American Negro

To escape being torn between the two warring poles of state capitalism, America and Russia, the African masses must turn directly to the workers in the technologically advanced countries, whether they are Russian, West European, or American. It is within this context that the American workers' struggles against Automation, with its division between mental and manual labor, are to be seen.

The self-activity of the Negro in America, since the successful Montgomery bus boycott and especially since the sit-ins of the Southern Freedom Fighters, is a reservoir of strength for the African revolutions. It isn't only that the Negro identifies himself with the African revolutions as a question of color; it is that he is revolutionary in his everyday life, in his struggle with existing society, and therefore he has an immediate and profound perception of the African revolutions. Because of the Negro's unique position in American life he is a spur for the American working class as a whole.

The West European Proletariat

In the mass demonstrations in London against the Sharpeville massacre and the "Boycott South Africa Goods" movement, the British workers have shown an affinity with all the African Freedom Fighters. The affinity is not limited to demonstrations of sympathy. It is inherent in their daily struggle against their capitalist oppressors.

Without the aid of the majority of the workers of a technologically advanced country, neither the African nor the Asian revolutions can escape exploitative capitalism and bureaucratic State Planners. In June 1959, when I first analyzed the African revolutions, I asked whether "this great awakening (is) to be confined to a half-way house doomed to stand at the crossroads? Must it choose . . . one of the two poles of state capital—Russia or America?" Because of the urgency of this problem and because inseparable from the struggles for freedom, are the theoretical banners unfurled, we print here "Nationalism, Communism, Marxist Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions." The views expressed are as valid today as when they were written two years ago. We append an analysis of some of the writings of President Leopold Senghor and Sekou Toure that have appeared since the publication of this pamphlet. We also took the liberty of adding a paragraph at the end of the text on events such as the feat of the first world cosmonaut, Major Yuri Gargarin.

MAY, 1961

"Although it is all too obvious that Roy Welensky's "multi-racialism" is but another name for Verwoerd's fascist policy of apartheid, white liberals, in both Kenya and the Rhodesias, have asked why should a nationalist, rather than a "multi-racial" political party, be used as the instrument for freedom in Africa. To this question by Reverend Colin Morris, Kenneth Kaunda has replied: "When you look at the nations in Africa which have achieved the independence we desire it will be found that a Nationalist movement in each case brought about the solution. No multi-racial political party has yet managed to obtain for Africans their Independence . . ."

"We are not concerned solely with the rights of Africans; we are struggling for human rights—the inalienable rights of all men. We are engaged in a struggle against any form of imperialism and colonialism not because it has as its agents white men; but because it has many more wrong sides than good ones . . . "I should now add that I believe the only effective answer to our constitutional problems is that the British Government transfer power gracefully from the minority to the majority groups—that is, to the Africans. The happiness that Africans will feel will, I am almost certain, make them forget and let bygones be bygones, and so will be born in North Rhodesia a new state in which Black men rule, not to the detriment of any one race, but to the good of all inhabitants because the majority will have nothing to fear from minority groups." (See Black Movement, A Discussion between Kenneth Kaunda and Colin Morris.

APPENDIX

Note: We print only part of the appendix, since the first portion is a review of LEOPOLD SENGHOR'S AFRICAN SOCIALISM, which was published in the May, 1960 issue of NEWS & LETTERS.

We print below only the sentences which tie in with the quotation from Sekou Toure, and the conclusion.

Sekou Toure's Africa

The very fact that on all the concrete questions relating to Africa's relationship to De Gaulle France, Senghor has had to appear as an apologist for De Gaulle France, discloses the tragedy of the underdeveloped countries fighting for freedom in an automated nuclear age.

On the other hand, Sekou Toure of Guinea, where the people had dared to say "No" to remaining part of the French Community, is much bolder in his concept both of the contribution of the African and of the future world developments:

"In the realm of thought, man can claim to be the brain of the world, but on the concrete level of real life, where any occurrence will affect both the physical and spiritual being, the world is always the brain of man. Because it is in the world that all the thinking forces can be found, the dynamic forces of development and perfection, it is there too that the fusion of energy takes place and where the true quantity of the intellectual capacity of man can be found. So who could claim to exclude any one school of thought, any one kind of thought, or any one human family without by so doing excluding himself to some extent from the total society of man? . . ."

"The science resulting from all human knowledge has no nationality. The ridiculous disputes about the origin of such and such a discovery do not interest us since they add nothing to the value of the discovery. It can therefore be said that African unity offers the world a new humanism essentially founded on the universal solidarity and cooperation between people without any racial and cultural antagonism and without narrow egotism and privilege. This is above and beyond the problem of West Africa and as far removed from the quarrels which divide the highly developed countries as are the conditions and aspirations of the African people." (1)

We cannot know in which direction these African leaders will turn in the critical 1960's. We do know that their serious concern with the theoretical foundations for the building of a new society has no parallel in the intellectual leaders of "the West." Our epoch is a "birth-time of history" (2) and the contribution of the Africans to thought as well as to revolution, is an integral part of the reconstruction of society on new beginnings.

(1) Sekou Toure's speeches are from those excerpted by Abdoulaye Diop in his "Africa's Path in History." See AFRICA SOUTH, April-June 1960, Capetown.

(2) G. W. F. Hegel, PHENOMENOLOGY OF MIND

Intellectuals in The Age of State Capitalism

We live in an age of state capitalism which, at one end, Russia, persists in calling itself "Communist," and at the other end, America, still designates itself as "free enterprise." Not only are the conditions of production hardly distinguishable from each other, however, but so is the administrative mentality of the intellectuals at both poles of world capital. As befits one who chooses to defend the American side, a Daniel Bell will speak of "The End of Ideology" to mark the alleged end of a "proletarian cause." As befits one who chooses to whitewash the other power, an Isaac Deutscher will proclaim the near-identity of interests of the proletariat and the Russian state.

In each case the scholarship of the writer gets sucked into the veritable conspiracy between the two nuclear titans to force an identity between those two opposites, Marxism and Communism, although Marxism is a theory of liberation from capitalism while Communism is the practice of state capitalist enslavement. While, in origin, the administrative mentality dates back to the 1929 world crash that signalled the end of rationality of capitalist production relations, it is only with the nuclear age that the administrative mentality became the all-pervasive phenomenon it is now.

Take the Hegelian-Marxist philosopher, Herbert Marcuse. In the 1940's he produced the profound study, "Reason and Revolution," which established a continuity of analysis by the young and mature Marx which went beyond the economics of production to the human relations. In the 1950's, however, he was impelled to the fantastic notion of establishing a "continuity" between Marxism and Stalinism.

HERBERT MARCUSE'S "SOVIET MARXISM"

Prof. Marcuse begins reaching for this feat with the very title of his book. While "Soviet" stands for councils of workers and peasants that achieved the Russian Revolution, and now exists in name only, the use of the word allows the author to cover Stalin with the same mantle as Lenin. At the same time the loose use of the word, Marxism, for the entire post-Marxist period makes it possible for Prof. Marcuse to straddle the historic fence.

We feel impelled to review the book now since it has just been published in a new paperback edition which, quite obviously, aims at a popular audience. Without explanation, this new addition leaves out the original introduction which explained his method of analysis as an "immanent critique." That stated, "The critique thus employs the conceptual instrument of its object, namely, Marxism, in order to clarify the actual function of Marxism in Soviet society and its historical direction." (p. 1)

Furthermore, "the immanent critique," we were assured, can give us the "cue" not only to the causes of the "theoretical deficiencies," but also the "objective trends and tendencies which are operative in history and which make up the inherent rationality . . ." (p. 1) At least these are Prof. Marcuse's assumptions.

There is no end to the magical qualities of that instrument, "the immanent critique": "For what is irrational if measured from without the system is rational within the system." (p. 86) This writer cannot guarantee that the irrational can appear rational anywhere outside of a madhouse, but Prof. Marcuse has not only undertaken that feat, but also its opposite, that of endowing the rational with irrational features.

"THE NEW RATIONALITY"

Although Prof. Marcuse admits that "Neither the rise of the Soviet intelligentsia as a new ruling group, nor its composition and its privileges are any long disputed facts . . ." (p. 107) he nevertheless dubs the totalitarian, state-capitalist society of Russia as "The New Rationality."

The reader must restrain his interest in motivation, and judge the author only by what he holds to be "the truth": (1) Marx's concept of the revolutionary nature of the proletariat is supposed to have "exploded" (p. 13) at the point of transition from capitalism to socialism, that is to say, the October Revolution. On the other hand, Soviet Marxism's hypostatization of that tenet into a ritual is judged to be nothing short of "an instrument for rescuing the truth." (p. 88)

The resulting play on words beggars rational description: "It (Soviet Marxism) is not 'false consciousness' but rather consciousness of falsehood, a falsehood which is 'corrected' in the context of the 'higher truth' represented by objective historical interest." (p. 81) And, of course, when all else fails, an intellectual can always blame "the backward population." "The new form of Marxian theory corresponds to its new historical agent—a backward population which is to become what it 'really' is: a revolutionary force which changes the world." (p. 89)

(2) Lenin's attempt to confront the post-Marxist phenomenon of imperialism by "redefining" capitalism, and attempting "to draw the peasantry into the orbit of Marxian theory and strategy" is alleged to have suffered from "The refusal to draw theoretical consequences from the new situation." This, Prof. Marcuse concludes, "characterizes the entire development of Leninism and is one of the chief reasons for the gap between theory and practice in Soviet Marxism." (p. 30)

Not only is the unbridgeable gulf between Marxism and present-day Russian Communism blamed on the "theoretical deficiencies" of Lenin, the latter is made the author of the one original contribution of Stalin—the theory of "socialism in one country." Prof. Marcuse does not even bother to tell us that that is what he is doing; he merely quotes the one or two isolated statements as if these had never been called into question and that Stalin built on that. There is not a single reference to the voluminous writings of Leon Trotsky precisely on that one point over which so much blood flowed between Stalinism and Trotskyism over the meaning of Leninism.

Quotations out of context from Vol. IX of Lenin's "Selected Works" are used "to prove" that Lenin was for industrialization "without liberation." Nothing is said about Lenin actually inventing words to describe how "mortally sick" he was of "Communism" (Communist lies.) Yet this is in that same profound Vol. IX (p. 345.) As Lenin warned there: "History proceeds in devious ways . . . (Soviet state) has taken the road that will lead to the ordinary bourgeois state."

(*) 1961 edition, Vintage Russian Library, Random House, New York, \$1.25; 1959 edition, Columbia University Press, N.Y., \$4. Page references in this review are to the original edition.

(3) While none of Lenin's castigation of the Communists' "passion for bossing" now that they had power comes through in Prof. Marcuse's "Soviet Marxism," Stalin comes off with fairly clean hands. Even the reign of terror is very nearly justified: "The height of Stalinist terror coincided with the consolidation of the Hitler regime." (p. 75)

This, in this writer's view, is an inaccuracy. The height of Stalin's terror came during the First Five Year Plan which began with the expulsion of the Left Opposition and the exile of Leon Trotsky, and ended with forced collectivization, the institution of forced labor camps, the ruin of millions of human beings who, in turn, slaughtered thousands of heads of cattle and brought such havoc on the countryside and actual famine conditions that the whole regime nearly collapsed. At the same time Stalin's international policies did nothing to stop the coming of fascism. Insofar, however, as the Stalin period was one continuous reign of terror, one could, in truth, designate very nearly any year as "the height of terror."

Obviously Prof. Marcuse prefers to substitute for the years, 1930-33, the period of 1936-39. But in that case the "immanent critique" must come face to face with the Stalin-Hitler Pact as something inherent in, not "outside of" Russia. But there is no time for a critique when the over-riding compulsion is "to prove" the thesis stated in the Introduction (missing from the 1961 edition): "There is theoretical continuity from the early Marxian notion of the Proletariat as objective truth of capitalist society to Soviet Marxist conception of *partinost* (partisanship.)" (p. 8)

THE PARTY, THE PARTY

The loose translation of the word, *partinost*, party-ism, as "partisanship" is inexcusable in the crucial content of the Stalinist concept of the Party, the Party, which is alleged to be synonymous with Marx's concept of the proletariat as the gravedigger of capitalist society. To the extent that Marx developed any concept of a proletarian party it was, (and Prof. Marcuse admits this) of a party as the self-organization of the proletariat. The proletariat was the historic force which would establish "an association of free men." Under the circumstances how could Marcuse become party to the Stalinist sleight of hand substitution of their monolithic monstrosity for "the self-organization of the proletariat?" Yet this is the inescapable consequence of this method of blaming everybody—Marx, Lenin, the proletariat, above all, the proletariat—in order to avoid facing the reality of the new stage of world capitalism—state capitalism—which manifested itself first on the historical stage in the Stalinist counter-revolution in Russia.

No wonder the promise of the "immanent critique" to reveal "the historic direction" just "perished" to use a Hegelian phrase. In the explosive contradictions of the new rationality. The reader of the new as of the old edition must be content with the last paragraph: "Ideological pressure there seems to tend in the same direction as technical-economic pressure, namely, toward the relaxation of repression . . . these forces, though unformed and unorganized, may well determine, to a considerable extent, the course of Soviet developments."

Truly the mountain has labored and given birth to . . .

THE FLEXIBLE DIALECTIC

Although Prof. Marcuse admitted that "The difference between the first years of the Bolshevik Revolution and the fully developed Stalinist state are obvious," (p. 74), he has refused to admit that Stalinism, far from being a "continuation" of Marxism-Leninism is a break from it. (1) Indeed he puts the word, break, in quotation marks, and explains: "But if the dialectical law of turn from quantity to quality was ever applicable, it was the transition from Leninism (after the October Revolution) to Stalinism." (p. 74) (2)

Obviously, Prof. Marcuse has been greatly influenced by the irrational becoming rational "within" a certain context. Here he is doing nothing less magical than equating counter-revolution with revolution!

Nothing can stop him now. He concludes the one chapter ("Dialectic and Its Vicissitudes" which still shines with some fine Hegelian-Marxian perceptions with this astounding statement: "The Soviet Marxist 'revision' is 'orthodox.' Since Soviet Marxists maintain that Soviet society is a socialist society, they consistently invest it with the corresponding dialectical characteristics. What is involved is not so much a revision of dialectic as the claim of socialism for a non-socialist society." (p. 154)

In a word, all that is wrong are—the facts! Prof. Marcuse might at least have remembered what Hegel called the method of assuming what one should prove. The word was "barbarous." The method hasn't improved with age. Barbarous it is.

Jean Paul Sartre has recently "Critique of Dialectical Reason" shows anew that which has long characterized Existentialism—that all is fair not only in war and love, but also in the use to which the dialectic is put. But even a Sartre had to separate himself from Russia's brutal suppression of the Hungarian Revolution, and hail the Hungarian Freedom Fighters for breaking loose from all brainwashing. Not so Marcuse. So organic is his conception of the backwardness of the proletariat that, where he does admit that Russian rulers have "arrested" the dialectic in its classical Marxist sense of liberating "the subjective factor," he concludes that "the ruled tend not only to submit to the rulers but also to reproduce in themselves their subordination." (p. 191)

THE MAJESTY OF "THE RULED"

This vilification of the masses appears nearly a decade after the forced laborers struck in Vorkuta inside Russia itself, following the June 17, 1953 East German Revolt against Russian imperialistic rule there, and 5 years after the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 had demonstrated for all the world, even "the learned," to see that the courage, the fortitude, the humanism of "the ruled" can break through not only Russian brainwashing but Russian steel tanks!

Though the ivory towers remain impervious to the self-activity of the masses, the majesty of "the ruled" beckons for all to join their life-and-death struggles for freedom.

Note: The footnote references appear on pg. 8.

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1961

- (1) Professor Marcuse has much to say on Lenin's "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," which gave the green light to vulgar materialism and which is now used as "the" philosophic text, without once mentioning Lenin's break with his own philosophic past emanating from his later, profound "Philosophie Notizen." Yet this quintessential work is available in Russian, German, French and Italian, and, in an abbreviated version, appears in a first edition translation as an appendix to my MARXISM AND FREEDOM. We saw above that Prof. Marcuse also failed to consider the Trotsky-Stalin controversy over "socialism in one country." One other word must be stated on Prof. Marcuse's selection of sources in the war and post-war periods. He makes a reference to the "spectacular public controversies" which are supposed to be less cogent than the more fundamental analysis he makes. But, while he manages not to make a single mention of either the 1953 reversal of all previous teachings of the Marxist law of value, or of the 1955 attack on the humanist essays of Marx, he does find space for the lesser linguistic controversy.
- (2) Here too there is a looseness of expression. It is true that after quality is transformed into quantity, the analysis continues "conversely." In strict Hegelian terminology, however, transcended quality is quantity, but transcended quantity is measure. Is Stalin now to be taken as "the measure" of the "new" society?

6679

Tito's Turnabout

Russia's atomic blastoff scattered to the winds filled with radioactive fall-out, the pie-in-the-sky promises in the Draft Program of the Communist Party which is to convene in Moscow October 17th.* But it succeeded in pulling Tito back into the Russian orbit. His break from Stalin had never, of course, been a fundamental departure from the state-capitalist fold. I do not mean that Stalin's order for Tito's expulsion from the Cominform wasn't real. It assuredly was. Enthusiastic mass support by a country that had won over the Nazi juggernaut propelled Tito to take the daring step away from Stalin's Russia. But what the Yugoslav people aimed at in their break from Stalin and what Tito aimed at in his derived from two different class sources.

"Different Paths To Socialism"

Tito's break with Stalin produced a new crop of theories on "different paths to socialism." The crop was a sufficiently alluring one to win Trotskyist world support, despite the fact that Tito had come to head the Yugoslav Party because he had dutifully followed through with the Moscow Frame-Up Trials, and headed not only the Yugoslav Trotskyists but also Spanish Trotskyists who stood in way of Stalin's aim to dominate the Spanish Revolution. The "objective" reason for this unasked-for Trotskyist support was based on Tito's "struggle" against the bureaucracy and alleged return to the Marxist-Leninist theory of the withering away of the state. The only trouble was that the struggle was directed, not against his own Single Party Bureaucratic State, but only against Russia.

Nevertheless it would be wrong to think of Tito's break as merely a "nationalist" one, anymore than Stalin's theory of "socialism in one country" was proof of his "nationalism," though Trotsky died thinking so. "Socialism in one country" is only secondarily nationalist. Primarily it is a euphemistic expression for state capitalism—a state exploitative system that aims to become a "world system" which, at the point of production, preserves the relation of manager to worker which characterizes private capitalism.

The "giving up" of the pursuit of "world revolution" is true only where it involved the release of spontaneous action from below; it is not true where it meant the establishment of world domination by arms, a coup, or the undermining of the self-activity of the masses. Indeed, just as "socialism in one country" called upon the workers of the world to defend Russia, so the Yugoslav "new path to socialism" was declared "a new universal."

And there was never any doubt that Tito was building in a single, small country the same system Stalin built in a single, vast land. In December 1946 Tito revealed that as far back as 1944 the Anti-Fascist Council of National Liberation had so strengthened the state apparatus that it would be a mere question of "taking over," not of reconstructing from below. "Nationalization was well prepared organizationally . . . All enterprises in the entire country were taken over on the same day (of liberation) and almost at the same time without the stopping of production." (My emphasis.)

The same held true on the day of Tito's break with Stalin. The bureaucratic state mentality ruled undeviatingly; the managers continued to order the workers about, and the workers had to produce ever more. As Article 14, entitled "Work and Cadres," of the Five Year Plan of 1947, had put it, it was necessary "to ensure a steady increase in productivity of work by introducing the greatest possible mechanization, and by thoroughly utilizing working hours." (My emphasis.)

The Dialectic of "Revisionism"

What is instructive in Tito's "revisionism" is its own dialectical development. The changes introduced into the State Plan to appease mass pressure produced a still more theoretic in-

sights into Russia's revisionism. For example, Yugoslavia abandoned forced collectivization in favor of a combination of state farms, cooperative, and private farming. From this experience Milovan Djilas, who had not theretofore been distinguished by any profound comprehension of Marx's third volume of Capital, now characterized Russia's agricultural policy as "a struggle with the collective working peasantry for absolute rent."

Kardelj gained as penetrating an insight into Russia's industrial set-up from the changes introduced in Yugoslavia's decentralized planning accompanied by establishment of "workers' councils." (How totalitarian rulers torture words, to transform them into their opposite!) Although these so-called workers' councils were not born of revolution and could not therefore signify any "withering away of the state," nevertheless the cracks in the iron wall revealed new life, like grass that suddenly shows through between stones. And Kardelj came through with a price-less description of Russian Communism as "a pragmatic statist revision of Marxism."

No wonder there was no end to the screaming about Tito's "apostasy" at the 21st Congress of the Russian Communist Party on February 6, 1959. The following year, however, after the U-2 spy flight, a new wooing of the "apostate" began. Tito held back. While condemning the U-2 flight, he insisted that it "should not and must not" be used to heat up the cold war. Tito proceeded with his own plans to convene the "non-aligned" nations as a "third force" between the two contending blocs of powers.

The Nearness of War

On the very eve of his success, as the heads of nations gathered in Belgrade, when Khrushchev seemed openly to slap their collective two-facedness, Tito suddenly announced that he understood the "reasons" behind Russia's unilateral action in resuming nuclear testing. What changed between the time of the openly provocative U.S. spy flight deep into Russia and the equally provocative Russian atomic explosions that poisoned the whole world's atmosphere to have caused Tito's turnabout?

We can discount the arrogant stupidities of the American bourgeois press which attribute to all but themselves obedience to superior force. A country like Yugoslavia that fought Nazism at the staggering cost of a full 10 per cent of its population, and then stood up to Stalin, needs to produce no "credentials" of its bravery to the well-paid press pounding typewriters in the comfort of their sheltered ivory towers. No, the struggle such a people is sure to carry on against its leadership for catapulting it to another war will be due for mightier convictions than those of "Western democracy with all its imperfections." The masses are well aware of what has changed: it is the nearness of actual war.

For Tito, the nearness of war that may spell the doom of the Single Party State and its "world system" of state-capitalism is sufficient to make him praise his chief opponent in the Communist world: Mao Tse-Tung. Tito's "path to socialism," it is true, lasted a good deal longer than Mao's violently aborted call to "Let 100 flowers bloom. Let 100 schools of thought contend." But it was bound to come to an end with the approach of war. Now that the nearness of war may inspire the Yugoslav masses to find a truly independent class road away from state and private capitalism, their joint chaos leading to world war, Tito must realign himself to save his rule. Therefore he accepts Russia's substitute for the class struggles at home—the designation that the struggle between the two nuclear blocs for world domination is "the class struggle of today."

For Tito that is a "must" choice. For the Yugoslav masses the war-charged transformation of the Marxist theory of liberation into the Communist practice of enslaving is something they are experienced in fighting.

*See ad on p. 6 for my informal letters analyzing the new Draft Program of the Russian Communist Party and that of Lenin's Program.

If This Isn't Madness, What Is it?

On October 23, Swedish, Danish, and French observatories recorded a violent explosion and speculated that Russia might have set off the monster bomb. A few hours later the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission announced that the Russian explosion was of a bomb "probably only" in the 30 megaton range. This still made it the biggest ever exploded to that date and one that would contaminate the air dangerously for those living and those not yet born.

The explosion of the 50 megaton bomb was such senseless power exhibitionism, such atomic horror, such colossal gall in the face of world protests that it remained unbelievable. With the inference that Russia probably would not do so, even those who put nothing past Khrushchev's terror tactics kept hanging on the word "probably" in the Khrushchev statement that Russia would "probably" explode the 50 megaton bomb by October 31. It seemed senseless from a military point of view as well as from the human point of view since no one can die more than once and the smaller bombs are just as devastating. It obviously would do irreparable damage to the image of Russia as the "world's peace fighter" while it undermined Khrushchev's own theory of "peaceful co-existence."

On October 30 the 50 megaton bomb was exploded. If this isn't madness what is it?

Weigh the explosion of the monster bomb presently against the decision to resume nuclear testing on the eve of the convocation of the Belgrade Conference of "neutrals" and it is easy to see that the world, "neutralist" or otherwise, is of less concern to Khrushchev than the Communist orbit in general and Russia in particular. And yet the Russian people will of necessity finally learn that the contaminated air cannot be left only to "other lands," not their own.

No doubt none of the Russian leaders, least of all Khrushchev, will rush to quote Dr. Pauling who says that a 50 megaton nuclear blast would cause 40,000 babies to be born with physical defects in the next few generations, produce bone cancer and leukemia among persons now alive, and pollute the atmosphere for 6,000 years. Nevertheless the Russian masses will learn the truth. On what scale will they now weigh the 22nd Russian Communist Party program promising utopia in 1980?

The Speeches vs. the Program

It is true the Russian masses never considered the Draft Program anything but "pie-in-the-sky" promises for it was obvious, when it was first published, that the preconditions for the fulfillment of the promises were an impossible rise in labor productivity, and the absence of war. That is why the resumption of nuclear testing, which blasted these promises sky-high, was kept from them. But now that the Russian Communist Party has convened and the speeches are being published, news of the military buildup and the nuclear blasts are seeping through.

There is, of course, a side show—the attack on tiny Albania's "deviationism" and the Russian party "degenerates" who formed the "anti-party group" in 1957, and the Chou En-lai's "dogmatism." But, compared to the gory trials in Stalin's heyday, these cannot deflect from the fact that there has been a continuous retreat from the utopian promises of the Draft program. Whether you take Khrushchev's marathon speeches for two solid days, lasting a total of 12 hours and 20 minutes, or the shorter speeches of the minor delegates, the shift from "building communism in our lifetime" to the realities of the bad harvest in the virgin lands, the perennial crisis in housing, the proposal to have no new capital investment projects for a year, and the extolling of the tastiness of horsemeat, all add up to hard times "for the present."

"Peaceful Co-Existence"

Nevertheless there has been an improvement in living conditions as well as the conquest of outer space since Khrushchev first pronounced that war "was not inevitable" and elaborated the theory of "peaceful co-existence" at the famous "De-Stalinization" Congress of 1956. It is true the Khrushchevite theory has had a checkered career for it was soon confronted with the Hungarian Revolution which it crushed bloodily. But he saved his power internally by putting down the "anti-party" group's challenge and the British imperialist adventure in Suez soon also brought him new growth abroad. Again, United States, U-2 spy flight put an end to "the spirit of Camp David" while the Congo crisis and the Cuban invasion produced a double-barrelled Monroe Doctrine. But all remained short of war even in Laos, attack on the UN and the open challenge to the U.S. and its

The "comradely relations" in the Communist orbit, on the other hand, have been anything but peaceful. Their co-existence has erupted into open disagreement at Khrushchev's initiative. It is obvious that Chou didn't have foreknowledge of the attack on tiny Albania which is, in fact, an attack on her mighty protector, China. If not only the "revisionists" (Yugoslavia), and the "anti-party" group in Russia, but also the "deviationists" (Albania) and "dogmatists" (China) must be attacked, isn't it clear that the explosion of the bomb is not only to terrorize the outside world, but that part right inside the Communist orbit?

So sure does Khrushchev feel of his home ground that he publishes Chou's criticism. It means also: "You haven't heard the last of this yet. Wait till I sum up. Until I do, just listen to those nuclear blasts."

If It Isn't Madness: View from the United States

In his secret "De-Stalinization" speech in 1956 Khrushchev called Stalin in his last years a "madman." But what are "individual" murders compared to annihilation of the human race which a nuclear holocaust might spell out? If the protestations of "peaceful co-existence" are cited to contest this, and "proof" is further given about easing of the war of nerves through removal of the deadline over the signing of a separate peace treaty with East Germany by December 31, the continued pollution of the air at the Congress by speeches and in the world by the utterly irresponsible nuclear explosions still defy description. If it isn't madness, it is only because we live in the kind of world where the madmen in power are the ones who decide what is rational.

Take our military and you will see what I mean. The U.S. Air Force has been boasting just how good we are at delivering the "smaller bomb" which is just as effective. Furthermore, another Atlas missile base has become operational at Topeka, Kan., and the 9 giants set on their underground pads are "improved" E models and carry heavy payloads and carry them as far as 8,000 miles. And just to pinpoint it so that "Khrushchev gets the message," Lt. Gen. John D. Ryan of the Strategic Air Command stresses that each of the Atlas weapons at the new

base has a specific target behind the Iron Curtain! And of course the President feels it incumbent upon him to heighten the tensions by bringing it back home and creating hysteria about "bomb shelters." (See article on p. 1).

The Sanity of the Average Man

Just as the Russian worker goes about his own business of working, but not breaking his neck and raising labor productivity for Khrushchev "100%", so the American worker is disregarding the hullabaloo about underground shelters and asking instead some crucial questions about his conditions of labor. An African from Southern Rhodesia I heard recently, speaking on the image the U.S. is creating of itself in Asia through Mississippi jungle justice against Freedom Riders, said: "You Americans see Communists behind every bush, and when we fight for our freedom, you ask us what we think about the space race with Russia. To us Africans that space race is really for the outer reaches of space—way out. We want freedom right here and right now on this earth."

MARXIST HUMANISM IN NEW BOOKS AND REVIEWS

A whole new spate of books have been published this year on the Humanism of Marxism. (1) In contrast to the almost total silence which surrounded my **MARXISM AND FREEDOM** in 1958, which first published an English translation of the early Humanist essays of Marx, the reviews of the new books and the letters to the editors about them are numerous and exude enthusiasm. The most pretentious of these are by socialists who make each comment sound like a manifesto announcing the discovery of a new world. What they all fail to note is that the new books which started out as scholarly, eloquent treatises on "original Marxism," on Marx as a philosopher of freedom, ended by falling into the trap of the veritable conspiracy between the State Department and Russian Communism to force an identity between those two irreconcilable opposites—Marxism, a theory of liberation, and Communism, the practice of enslavement.

The shocking and—so far as the new authors are concerned—unintentional similarity of results arises, of course, from an affinity of belief in capitalism. Nevertheless, the "end product" sounds unbelievable in face of the authors' own denials of the Communist contention that there was a young, immature, "left Hegelian" named Karl Marx, and there was "the scientific economist and practical revolutionary" whose theories comprise Marxism because of its founder Karl Marx—and the twain never met. Therefore, the "how" of the startling result is worth going into.

UNFOUNDED CONCLUSIONS

Let's first take the most profound of the recent studies—**MARXISM** by George Lichtheim. It is a truly eloquent presentation of Marx's vision of world history, as a "creative drama of human liberation." Mr. Lichtheim writes as passionately in defense of the truth that the young Marx and the mature Marx were one and the same:

"It is true that in later years he (Marx) took a less exalted view of the part which thought had to play in transforming the world, just as the concept of social revolution which would transcend philosophy by 'realising' its aims, disappeared from his writings; but it was never repudiated, nor could it have been, for it was precisely what he meant by the 'union of theory and practice.'" (p.54)

As Mr. Lichtheim reaches post-Marxist Marxism, however, his hatred of Lenin allows the scholar to write as if present-day Communism and Leninism are very nearly one and the same. No doubt Mr. Lichtheim thought he was attacking Lenin, not Marx. In fact, he was inexorably led to the rejection of Marxism for our era. "The real trouble," he writes on p.397, "is that Marxism tried to do duty both as a theory of society and as a philosophy of history and that its philosophical insights are hopelessly at variance with its scientific insights." Out of nowhere comes the sudden conclusion that "we" (that is to say, the exploitative capitalist society against which Marx had rebelled, aged by a century) have "realized" Marx's vision of "the creative drama of human liberation."

Now it is one thing to rationalize one's acceptance of the status quo—men made of sterner stuff than scholars have often done so. It is quite something else to read into Marx such an analysis and "hence" a rejection of post-Marxist Marxism, not to mention an equation of Leninism with its Communist usurpers. This unfounded conclusion is even more vulgarly presented in the less important work—**PHILOSOPHY AND MYTH IN KARL MARX** by Robert Tucker.

Prof. Tucker destroys the myth of two totally different philosophies—Humanism and "scientific economics"—by creating a new myth, which, however, he attributes to none other than Marx: "the myth of warfare of labor and capital was Marx's final answer to the problems of man's self-alienation." (p. 258). Only a man living in an ivory tower, far removed from the class struggle of everyday life, in the factory and out of it, could describe everyday reality as a "myth."

(cont'd.)

Dec 6682

RELATED "DISCOVERIES"

Nevertheless, this book is hailed as "the best single study of Marx's early Manuscripts," by Daniel Bell, who has made a name for himself as a "scholar on Marxism."

Although it followed the Communist attack on Humanism in 1955 (2) by four years and the Hungarian Revolution which had raised the Humanist banner by three years, Mr. Bell had still not "rediscovered" Humanism.

Allegedly the "left" socialist, Michael Harrington, opposes all this—or so he tells us in his "Marx versus Marx" (New Politics, Fall 1961) where he pompously announces as if it were the first time these words were ever uttered;

WORKERS REVOLTS GIVE NEW MEANING TO HUMANISM

"The dispute over who was the first to translate Marx's 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts into English is a meaningful controversy only if it has a substantive relationship to the spirit of those essays and of our times."

"When in the period between the East German Revolt and the Hungarian Revolution, the Russian Communists openly attacked those Essays (Voprosy Filosofii, #3, 1955) I once again began my round of publishers."

"Because Marxist Humanism to me, is the only genuine ground from which to oppose Communist totalitarianism, I felt the compulsion to show that Humanism is not something invented by me, but came directly from Marx who fought what he called 'vulgar communism,' writing that 'communism, as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society . . ."

"As to whether I am European trained or American, I reclaim the latter especially since my work, in addition to re-establishing Marxist-Humanism, aimed at uncovering the American roots of Marxism which had for too long been hidden. I was, however, born in Russia."

Now why all the anxiety to praise all works on Marxism except one by a Marxist-Humanist? The answer is really quite simple and has nothing whatever to do with "first-edness."

What is important in the flood of writings is the historic framework which compelled the concern with Marxist-Humanism that is to say, the political maturity of the age, the impotence of all propaganda on both sides of the Iron Curtain to exercise the ghost of Karl Marx and rebury him, this time as a Humanist. It cannot be done.

Marxist-Humanism will remain alive so long as a new world on truly new, human beginnings has not been established—and it will remain alive thereafter not as a "means to an end," but as the "first necessity of life"—its breath, its work, its thought—the self-activity of the "all-rounded individual" gaining a new human dimension.

(1) Representative of these are the two books under consideration here: MARXISM by George Lichtheim (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961), and PHILOSOPHY AND MYTH IN KARL MARX by Robert Tucker (Cambridge University Press, 1961).

(2) See the section, "Communism's Perversion of Marx's Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts" in my MARXISM AND FREEDOM (pp. 62-68).

(3) Mr. Bell seems to have a predilection for titles which include the phrase, "in search of," without ever finding what he searches for. Thus in April 1958 he wrote an article entitled "Ten Theories in the Social Sciences of Reality: the Prediction of Soviet Behavior in the Social Sciences" (WORLD POLITICS). I then wrote the editor that it was no accident that Mr. BELL, despite writing about a "great number of 'theories,'" had not included among them the fundamental theory of state-capitalism, "because far from being in search of reality, the state-capitalist theory analyzes reality and does indeed yield the state-capitalist analysis of Russia—its economy, its rulers, and its policies." Perhaps if Mr. Bell finally found himself, he wouldn't be subject to the compulsion to go "in search of" all manner of things that aren't there and blind himself to those staring him in the face.

(4) Knowing foreign languages doesn't seem to help Michael Harrington to know the facts. Thus he writes in NEW POLITICS: "This Marxist humanism is anathema to Communist ideology—and that is at least one factor in Russia's delay in publishing the Manuscripts. Now there was no delay by Russia in publishing these Manuscripts for the simple reason that when they were first published in Russian—way back in 1871—the Marx-Engels Institute was still headed by the great scholar, Byazanov, who published them as soon as he could pry them loose from the vaults of the Second International who had inherited them from Engels and kept them hidden from the world. To accomplish that it took a successful proletarian revolution plus money. The excitement over them lasted a very short time since it coincided with Stalin's triumph over Trotsky. When the Manuscripts got published in their original German in 1932, discussion was again short-lived since Hitler was coming to power. It is true that Moscow didn't publish an English translation until the year after I did so in the United States but that was due to the conception of the backwardness of the American movement which is held by most Europeans. The attack on them, however, began in 1955. (See footnote 2).

(5) The New Leader didn't publish the letter although I had been invited to straighten out the record on the dispute that had been raised around my MARXISM AND FREEDOM in the magazine's issue of October 30, November 13th. In the November 27th issue one incomplete sentence of my letter appears without any indication that it is but one sentence of a whole letter.

TWO WORLDS

In Memoriam:

Natalia Sedova Trotsky

By Raya Dunayevskaya

ROLE OF WOMEN IN REVOLUTION

The death of Natalia Sedova Trotsky marks the end of the generation that achieved the greatest, and only successful proletarian revolution in history—the Russian Revolution in 1917. It has brought into sharp focus that other unique phenomenon—the unusual role of women in the original Russian Marxist movement.

One has only to compare an opportunist like Furtseva, the only woman to reach, for a single year, the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party, with a Vera Zasulich—one of the three founders of the Russian Marxist movement—to see the class abyss that divides one from the other.

I mention Zasulich rather than the one woman in the world Marxist movement that has made her mark as an original theoretician—Rosa Luxemburg—because, in memoriam of Natalia, I wish to speak of those women who had not gained theoretical leadership and therefore were very nearly disregarded except as faithful wives and mothers. (1) Vera Zasulich, though a leader, was known for her bravery and emotions rather than for any theoretical contributions although it was her letter to Karl Marx that had produced his answer on the special role that the mir (old Russian agricultural commune existing even in Tsarist days) might play if Russia could find a way "to skip" capitalism in her path to industrialization.

VERA ZASULITCH was only 16, in 1861, when she was first arrested. She was in and out of jails when she gained prominence for shooting the most hated Tsarist Governor General of St. Petersburg, Trepov, for the flogging of an imprisoned fellow student. The exciting thing was that she had turned her trial into such an expose of the horrors of Tsarism that even in those days (1876) the jury acquitted her! She was then smuggled out to exile and it is to her place that all who escaped from Tsarism found their way—Martov, Lenin, Trotsky. She was Plekhanov's colleague when he broke with the populists, attacked terrorism, and founded Russian Marxism.

Natalia told me that even though they were all convinced Marxists, that is to say, believing that only the mass movement can overthrow Tsarism or capitalism, and writing heated articles against terrorism, they would all feel so elated when some particularly hated Tsarist official was shot, that they would quietly drink to the dar-



Leon and Natalia Trotsky and the author—Mexico, 1938.

ing terrorist who had made that attempt.

DEATH AND DARING

When, on January 23 the air waves from France carried the news of the death of Natalia, there came over me both extreme sadness and yet a warmth and the kind of good feeling that comes from having witnessed intellectual daring and never-ending revolutionary optimism. For the tragic news of death followed on the heels of the last letter from her addressed to the French press that I received in which she hit back against the misrepresentations of the French press that had quoted her as saying that Leon Trotsky was allegedly "the spiritual father of Mao Tse-tung."

"These words don't belong to me at all," she fired back, "they were introduced by the writer of the interview . . . A great revolutionary like Leon Trotsky could not in any way be the father of Mao Tse-tung who won his position in direct struggle with the Left Opposition (Trotskyist) and consolidated it by the murder and persecution of revolutionaries just as Chiang Kai-shek did. . . I don't expect anything from the Russian party nor from its fundamentally anti-communist imitators. All de-Stalinization will

FEBRUARY, 1962

6684

prove to be a trap if it doesn't lead to the seizure of power by the proletariat and the dissolution of the police institutions, political, military and economic, based on the counter-revolution which established Stalinist state-capitalism." (2)

This was the first time that Natalia Trotsky had used the designation of state-capitalism in her reference to established Communism, in China or in Russia "or all others based on the latter model." Never before had Natalia developed a position beyond that developed by her famous husband. Because of this, I must confess that when, in 1947, I had come to visit her, I still thought that her theoretical development had been willingly stifled because she had subordinated everything in her life to that of Leon Trotsky.

I had asked her what about her Diary (to which Trotsky refers and quotes in his *My Life*.) She said she had undertaken it only to help Trotsky remember certain events in periods when he was so pre-occupied that he couldn't pay attention to them, and that Trotsky had exaggerated the diary's value. I felt that in no case would she publish it if she thought any views she had might differ from those of Trotsky. But both 1951, when she broke with the American Trotskyists, and 1961, when she exposed Khrushchev's de-Stalinization as a fraud "based on the counter-revolution which established Stalinist state-capitalism" proved me wrong.

Natalia meets Lev Davidovitch

Natalia Sedova Trotsky first came in contact with the revolutionary movement in Tsarist Russia when she was only 15. When still in her teens she emigrated to Europe to study, and there joined the small Russian emigre group around the paper, *Iskra*. This modest self-effacing young woman had been assigned to get a room for a new and promising young theoretician who had just escaped from Siberia and whose name she had not been told. It turned out to be Lev Davidovitch Trotsky, and she was asked to make sure that he was not wasting time but preparing for his first lecture in Paris.

THIS WAS THE ONLY incident of her personal life that Natalia ever told me during the years (1937-38) that I was in Mexico as Trotsky's secretary. She said that she just couldn't get herself to enter Trotsky's room and deliver the message of the need to concentrate on the lecture. She therefore told the older comrade that she thought he was preparing since she had heard him whistling. Her interpretation of the whistle, however, was not accepted and she was sent back to knock on the door and speak to him. She was blushing and walking slowly toward the room when Lev Davidovitch burst out of it, almost knocking her over.

It was love at first sight. She was then almost 21. She remained his life-long companion. Through the exile from Tsarism, and in Tsarist prisons, through the tidal wave of revolution and in power, in exile from Stalin till the tragic murder parted them.

Natalia's Only Tears,
and the Moscow Frame-Up Trials

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

They departed to their rooms and in a moment came her scream. We did not see them for eight days. The blow was the harder not only because Leon Sedoff had been their only living child, but also because he had been Trotsky's closest literary and political collaborator. When Trotsky was interned in Norway, gagged, unable to answer, the monstrous charges leveled against him in the first (August 1939) Moscow Trials, Sedoff had penned

Le Livre Rouge, (3) which, by brilliantly exposing the Moscow falsifiers, dealt an irreparable blow to the prestige of the GPU (Russian Secret Police).

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

ON THE EIGHTH DAY Leon Trotsky emerged from his room. I was petrified at the sight of him. The neat, meticulous Leon Trotsky had not shaved for a whole week. His face was deeply lined. His eyes were swollen from so much crying. Without uttering a word, he handed me the hand-written manuscript, *Leon Sedoff, Son, Friend*, which contained some of Trotsky's most poignant writing. My eyes set first on this statement, "I told Natalia of the death of our son—in the same month of February in which, 32 years ago, she brought to me in jail the news of his birth. Thus ended for us the day of February 10th, the blackest day in our personal lives . . . Together with our boy has died everything that still remained young within us." The pamphlet was dedicated "to the proletarian youth."

The following morning the papers carried the announcement of the Third (March 1938) Moscow Trials, scheduled to open within two short weeks of the death of Leon Sedoff.

One day shortly after this Natalia went for a walk with me in the woods and there she began to cry quietly and asked me not to let Leon Trotsky know since he more than anyone needed all his strength and our help to answer these fantastic, slanderous charges from the man in the Kremlin who was bent on murdering the one man (Trotsky) who could still lead a revolution against the bureaucracy and restore the Russian, and thereby the International movement to its Marxist path of liberation.

WITH THE BEGINNING of the Third Moscow Trials we had to forget everything else and concentrate on fighting the fantastic charges. Stalin, backed up by the might of Russian state and military power, had been preparing the stage for these monstrous frame-ups for a full decade. Leon Trotsky had only two hours in which to answer—and that only because the Mexican press would tell him what charges came over the teletype and held the presses open for him to answer.

Natalia's Full Stature

Two years after the Trials had been exposed not only by Trotsky himself, but by the Commission of Inquiry, headed by the late John Dewey, as the greatest frame-up in history, a GPU agent drove an ice-axe into the head of Leon Trotsky. In the lonely, hectic decade that followed, Natalia also found that she had to separate herself from the Fourth International her husband had founded.

When I had visited Natalia in 1947, she had asked me about my writings. Although I had broken with Trotsky over the class nature of Russia and its defense, she not only treated me as a colleague because of my past association with Trotsky, but was very interested in finding out what were the theoretical reasons for the break. She had me translate for her, word for word, the articles on the Russian revisions of Marx's theory of value. (4)

She refused, however, to take a position on the designation of Russia as state-capitalist. She said that it was implicit in Trotsky's fight against the bureaucracy, that she felt he himself would have reached that position had he lived through to the end of the war and seen the Stalinist exploitation of Eastern Europe. But she insisted that she simply did not know enough theory to venture out on her own when Trotsky had died before coming to such a conclusion. (5)

IN 1951, however, she felt she had to speak out against the American Trotskyists for falling into the trap created by Tito's break from Stalin as well as the Korean War. She wrote to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party in unflinching Bolshevik language.

A decade passed before we saw from her pen her final conclusion that Russia was a state-capitalist society. It came during the 22nd Russian Communist Party Congress where that obedient Stalinist in Stalin's lifetime, Nikita Khrushchev—dared to picture himself as an anti-Stalinist as if his suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of

1956 had not been in the true counter-revolutionary tradition of Stalin. The Trotskyists, no, having learned anything from these counter-revolutionary actions, were now tending to accept the ground rules that Mao was laying down on war and revolution.

Again Natalia refused to follow. This time she hit out against both Khrushchev and Mao. She did not limit her attack to an attack of "bureaucracy." She rose to her full stature and declared both countries state-capitalist, warning that all "de-Stalinization will prove to be a trap if it doesn't lead to the seizure of power by the proletariat, and the dissolution of the police institutions, political, military and economic . . ."

I Shall Remember Natalia

Shortly thereafter she fell ill. On January 23 she died. The last words of this frail 31-year-old Bolshevik had all the revolutionary vigor and the optimism of a new, youthful adherent to Marxism. She leaves this generation a great heritage of heroism, independent thought, and devotion to world liberation that gives the appearance of a lack of any personal life. But I shall never forget the one moment of tears when her son died.

I shall remember Natalia in that one moment when she let the tears rain down, but reminded me not to tell Trotsky about it, and not to let it interfere with the needs of the movement—to expose the Moscow Frame-Up Trials. It so clearly expressed the combination of personal tragedy and worldwide concern, the discipline old Bolsheviks imposed on themselves not to let anything interfere with the liberating movement that presses ever forward.

I shall remember Natalia as the great revolutionary whose thoughts were as majestic as her devotion and her daring in speaking out even against those who had led the movement her husband had founded because nothing at all could stay in the way of principles.

I shall remember Natalia as the mother who had brought up her children in the midst of all these hardships to be revolutionaries in their own right, men of character who knew how to stand up to might and not flinch.

I shall remember Natalia for the legacy she has left us of a generation that made a revolution, saw the first workers' state transformed into its opposite—state capitalism—and yet wavered not either in its principledness or its optimism.

I shall always remember the tenderness that shone through the hard-as-flint attitude toward the rulers of the world who are now leading us to a nuclear holocaust.

Death here becomes a beacon to the future—the inter-communication between the ages will continue until a new, liberated world is born.

FOOTNOTES

(1) To this day the American Trotskyists maintain this type of bourgeois attitude. In the February 5, 1962 issue of *The Militant*, the article that is supposed to praise Natalia's life is, in actuality, derogatory of her role as revolutionary and as an independent thinker. Their condescension reaches its most paternalistic hue in a reference to disagreements between them: "But this (period of political disagreements) never altered the respect or affection or material support which the movement tendered her." While they fail to publish her letter breaking with them, they do go out of the way to slander her by innuendos which imply that, if it were not for the wisdom of "the leaders of the SWP" (Socialist Workers Party), Natalia would have fallen into the trap of the House Un-American Committee. Wouldn't it have been more honest if they, at least, had published her last statement denouncing Khrushchev and Mao which showed how totally different her method of fighting Stalinism is from their shadow-boxing!

(2) For the full text, see January, 1962 issue of *News & Letters*.

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

(4) "A New Revision of Marxism" in *The American Economic Review*, September 1944, September 1945.

(5) For the full text, see below.

Natalia's Break With The SWP-1951

To the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers' Party:
Comrades:

You know quite well that I have not been in political agreement with you for the past five or six years, since the end of the war and even earlier. The position taken on the important events of recent times shows me that, instead of correcting your earlier errors, you are persisting in them and deepening them. On the road you have taken you have reached a point where it is no longer possible for me to remain silent or to confine myself to private protest. I must now express my opinions publicly.

The step which I feel obliged to take has been a grave and difficult one for me, and I can only regret it sincerely. But there is no other way. After a great deal of reflections and hesitations over a problem which has pained me deeply, I find that I must tell you that I see no other way out than to say openly that our disagreements make it impossible for me to remain any longer in your ranks.

The reasons for this final action on my part

are known to most of you. I repeat them here briefly only for those to whom they are not familiar, touching only on our fundamentally important differences and not on the differences over matters of daily policy which are related to them or which follow from them.

Obsessed by old and outlived formulas you continue to regard the Stalinist state as a workers' state. I cannot and will not follow you in this. Virtually every year after the beginning of the fight against the usurping Stalinist bureaucracy, L. D. Trotsky repeated that the regime was moving to the right under conditions of a lagging world revolution and the seizure of all political positions in Russia by the bureaucracy.

Time and again, he pointed out how the consolidation of Stalinism in Russia led to the worsening of the economic, political and social positions of the working-class, and the triumph of a tyrannical and privileged aristocracy. If this trend continues, he said, the revolution will be at an end and the restoration of capitalism will be achieved. That, unfortunately, is what had happened, even if in new and unexpected forms. There is hardly a country in the world where the authentic ideas and bearers of socialism are so barbarously hounded. It should be clear to everyone that the revolution has been completely destroyed by Stalinism. Yet you

continue to say that under this unspeakable regime, Russia is still a workers' state. I consider this a blow at socialism. Stalinism and the Stalinist state have nothing whatever in common with a workers' state or with socialism. They are the worst and the most dangerous enemies of socialism and the working-class.

You now hold that the states of Eastern Europe over which Stalinism established its domination during and after the war, are likewise workers' states. This is equivalent to saying that Stalinism has carried out a revolutionary socialist role. I cannot and will not follow you in this. After the war and even before it ended, there was a rising revolutionary movement of the masses in these Eastern countries.

But it was not these masses who won power and it was not a workers' state that was established by their struggle. It was the Stalinist counter-revolution that won power, reducing these lands to vassals of the Kremlin by strangling the working masses, their revolutionary aspirations. By considering that the Stalinist bureaucracy established workers' states in these countries, you assign to it a progressive and even revolutionary role. By propagating this monstrous falsehood to the workers' vanguard, you deny to the Fourth International all the basic

(Continued on Page 7)

Natalia's Break With The SWP-1951

(Continued from Page 6)

reasons for existence as the world party of the socialist revolution. In the past, we always considered Stalinism to be a counter-revolutionary force in every sense of the term. You no longer do so. But I continue to do so.

In 1932 and 1933 the Stalinists, in order to justify their shameful capitulation to Hitlerism, declared that it would matter little if the Fascists came to power, because socialism would come after and through the rule of Fascism. Only dehumanized brutes without a shred of socialist thought or spirit could have argued this way. Now, notwithstanding the revolutionary aims which animate you, you maintain that the despotic Stalinist reaction which has triumphed in Eastern Europe is one of the roads through which socialism will eventually come. This view marks an irremediable break with the profoundest convictions always held by our movement and which I continue to share.

I find it impossible to follow you in the question of the Tito regime in Yugoslavia. All the sympathy and support of revolutionists and even of all democrats, should go to the Yugoslav people in their determined resistance to the efforts of Moscow to reduce them and their economy to vassalage.

Every advantage should be taken of the concessions which the Yugoslav regime now finds itself obliged to make to the people. But your entire press is now devoted to an inexcusable idealization of the Titoist bureaucracy for which no ground exists in the traditions and principles of our movement.

This bureaucracy is only a replica, in a new form, of the old Stalinist bureaucracy. It was trained in the ideas, the politics and morals of the G.P.U. Its regime differs from Stalin's in no fundamental regard. It is absurd to believe or to teach that the revolutionary leadership of the Yugoslav people will develop out of this bureaucracy or in any way other than in the course of struggle against it.

Most insupportable of all is the position on the war to which you have committed yourselves. The Third World War which threatens humanity confronts the revolutionary movement with the most difficult problems, the most complex situations, the gravest decisions. Our position can be taken only after the most earnest and freest discussions. But in the face of all the events of recent years, you continue to advocate, and to pledge the entire movement, to the defense of the Stalinist state. You are even now supporting the armies of Stalinism in the war which is being endured by the anguished Korean people. I cannot and will not follow you in this.

As far back as 1927, Trotsky, in reply to a dis-

loyal question put to him in the Political Bureau by Stalin, stated his views as follows: For the socialist fatherland, yes! For the Stalinist regime, no! That was in 1927! Now, twenty-three years later, Stalin has left nothing of the socialist fatherland. It has been replaced by the enslavement and degradation of the people by the Stalinist autocracy. This is the state you propose to defend in the war, which you are already defending in Korea. I know very well how often you repeat that you are criticizing Stalinism and fighting it. But the fact is that your criticisms and your fight lose all value and can yield no results because they are determined by and subordinated to your position of defense of the Stalinist state. Whoever defends this regime of barbarous oppression, regardless of the motives, abandons the principles of socialism and internationalism.

In the message sent me from the recent convention of the S.W.P., you write that Trotsky's ideas continue to be your guide. I must tell you that I read these words with great bitterness. As you observe from what I have written above, I do not see his ideas in your politics. I have confidence in these ideas. I remain convinced that the only way out of the present situation is the social revolution, the self-emancipation of the proletariat of the world.

Natalia Sedova Trotsky
Mexico, D.F.
May 9, 1951

6686

Kennedy's Nuclear Spectacular: Testing, Blackmailing, Brainwashing

Tearing a page from Khrushchev's nuclear testing and blackmailing last October, President Kennedy, on March 2nd, announced that he has ordered the resumption of nuclear testing the latter part of April — "if" Russia has not signed a test ban control to suit him. In one respect only, Kennedy changed the Khrushchev formula of combining testing and blackmailing. Kennedy went in also for brainwashing the American people.

Toying With People's Lives

As if he were reading a cigarette commercial about just how "cool, cool, cool" it is when you change to the sponsor's brand, President Kennedy said that radioactive fall-out was "less than 1/10 of 1% of the exposure guides set for adults who work with industrial radioactivity." The President also stated: "By conservative estimate the total effects from this test series will be roughly equal to only 1% of those due to this natural background. It has been estimated, in fact, that the exposure due to radioactivity from these tests will be less than 1/50 of the difference which can be experienced, due to variations in natural radioactivity, simply by living in different locations in this country."

Obviously, his audience was supposed to think all this was no more than shedding one's overcoat as one deplanes from a jet that left Washington, D.C. in a blizzard and arrived in Florida's sunshine just in time for a sunbath in the nude. After all, the President moves between these two "different locations" weekly! To achieve this cool conclusion he made no reference to the hysteria created in the country on every subject from strontium 90 in the milk to fall-out shelters when Russia was testing. Had he done so, he would not only have exposed his statements today as a lie, but have had to take responsibility for creating the soil which gave birth to the barbarism of the home-spun vigilantes armed to kill their neighbors who might try to take shelter "not their own."

The Heavy Heart and the Last Mile

At the same time it was supposed to be "a grim Kennedy" who made this speech, a man with "heavy heart" because of his great concern that "even one additional individual's health may be risked in the foreseeable future." Promptly a bi-partisan Congressional chorus rose to lighten the "Presidential burden."

Senate Democratic Leader Mansfield spoke with eloquence on how "The President has walked the last mile and a little beyond" to try to achieve agreement with Russia on testing and disarmament. Not to be outdone by the Democratic Senator, Republican House Leader Halleck was fulsome in his praise of how the President discharged "his full responsibility. . . Civilization could require no more than this." How easily politicians mouth word about "civilization" as they prepare to annihilate it!

And as the politicians heartily approved the heartless decision to resume nuclear testing, the press went into a double-spin of playing up the presidential decision and playing down the reaction against it both by the American people and the people the world over who took to the streets in protest marches for peace.

The Big Lie

TIME magazine chose fancifully to build up just how "Kennedy patiently waited out the argument," as "the doubters were turned into advocates as the chilling details of the Russian test series became apparent, largely through a detailed report submitted by a panel headed by Cornell's Dr. Hans Bethe, a theoretical physicist well known as an opponent of unnecessary nuclear testing." There was only one trouble with his build-up. The truth was out before the lie in the predicted March 8th issue reached the newsstands.

It seems that after President Kennedy, on March 2nd, made his announcement of the decision to resume testing, Dr. Hans Bethe delivered a lecture at Cornell opposing the resumption of testing. Allegedly, the President had made the decision "only after the weight of evidence from a "unanimous" report on Soviet testing had "compelled" him to do so for the "nation's security."

The press did not see fit to publish Dr. Bethe's speech, but in the early hours of the morning when not many people listen, the NBC TODAY program, on March 6th, did interview Representative Hollifield of California who is chairman of the House Committee on Atomic Energy on the "discrepancy" between the official report of the scientists and the independent speech of their chairman, Dr. Hans Bethe. After much double talk on Rep. Hollifield's part, and no over abundance of lucidity on the part of the NBC interviewer, Martin Agronsky, one thing finally emerged. The "specific assignment" that the President gave the scientists was to report on the Soviet test series. The scientists attested to the fact that Russia achieved "progress" in the nuclear field. "But" the President "also" had at his command "classified material" and "of course" the President alone makes decisions, etc., etc., etc.

What is clear now is that the lie began with President Kennedy's contrived statement in which the "unanimous" recommendation for resumption of testing was made to appear as if it came from the scientists when, in fact, it came from Administration "department heads." TIME magazine, preoccupied with "populizing" the speech, expanded the implied lie to appear as God's truth with the result (the unplanned result since obviously no one expected Dr. Bethe to speak in his own name) that we all now must live the Big Lie.

Martin Agronsky, flustered at the unbridgeable gulf between the official report from which Hollifield quoted and the speech by Bethe which Agronsky had in his possession (not released by the press) only underlined the fact of bourgeois reporting. What gets published is not the news fit to print, but the news fitted into the mold of the capitalistic "decision-makers", even where these decisions affect all of mankind adversely. Like a false composite photograph, TIME magazine's fanciful touch-up of the President's speech couldn't stand up to the light of truth.

MARCH, 1962

The Algerian Revolution Enters a New Stage

(Note: This article, by one of my colleagues, is a follow-up to the lead article, on the Algerian Cease-Fire, he wrote in the March issue of News & Letters—R.D.)

Despite de Gaulle's pompous declaration to hunt down the Secret Army Organization (OAS) without mercy, more than six weeks have passed since the Franco-Algerian cease fire went into effect on March 19, and still the OAS continues its savage slaughter of unarmed Algerians, numbering hospital invalids, women and children among its victims.

When, on March 25, the French conscripts showed they were ready to mount a mass attack to cleanse Algeria of the OAS killers, and disperse its supporters, de Gaulle thereafter limited operations to regular Army patrols and half-hearted police action.

THE SHOW-CASE TRIAL, by which, on April 13, the butcher OAS General Edmond Jouhaud was sentenced to death, was aimed more at disarming the Algerian masses and lulling the French than at curbing the counter-revolutionary colons. Jouhaud wasn't tried for his assassin's role in Algeria, he was purged for opposing de Gaulle during last year's "Generals' Revolt." Nor does the strangely easy capture of the opium addict, Salan, on the eve of the anniversary of that "revolt," (April 20) signify more.

Provoked by these dilatory tactics, the FLN recently announced it knows the identity and address of every OAS member. But de Gaulle has not seen fit to avail himself of this intelligence, and FLN military units have so far been constrained by the terms of the cease fire from participating fully in rooting out the OAS.

The Counter-Revolution Re-Groups

Under these circumstances, OAS supporters are regrouping both in Algeria and France. So confident have they grown that they will be the ultimate beneficiaries of de Gaulle's policy, that Georges Bidault, one of France's reactionary ex-Premiers, has been emboldened lately to identify himself with the counter-revolution. He has set up, presumably in Switzerland, a National Resistance Council to fight for "French Algeria."

"French Algeria" is the rallying cry of the fascists today; yesterday it was de Gaulle's; the day before yesterday it was the Socialist Guy Mollet's, and the Radical Republican Mendes-France's. Whatever the particular form of their ruling coalition, the cornerstone of their policy is to conciliate all that is represented by the million colons who sit astride the 10 million Algerians.

This is what "French-Algeria" has meant to the Algerians: Disease, starvation and a death rate so high that over half the population is under 20 years old. Such unemployment and deprivation that at least two of every five adult males are unemployed, and the per capita income is less than a dollar a week. Such exploitation that were capitalist France to invest a billion dollars a year for the next 20 years it would raise the average Algerian's standard of living less than a nickel a year. Such degradation that in all of Algeria there is not a single trained teacher to educate Algerian children in their own tongue.

The Strength of the Algerian Revolution

THE GREAT VICTORY of the Algerian masses is not only that they withstood the armed might of France for 7½ years. It is not only that they forced de Gaulle—that haughty personification of military authoritarianism so characteristic of French capitalism in crisis—to sign the cease-fire.

The full measure of their strength is that their determination to reconstruct Algeria on the basis of new human relations helped to release the self-organizing energies of the French masses. Of all the modern colonial struggles for independence, the Algerian most clearly shows its links with a technologically advanced working class. The parallel mass demonstrations by the French workers combined with the Algerian movement to force de Gaulle to recognize Algeria's independence.

In a blatant maneuver aimed at diverting the French workers, and once again subordinating Algerian independence to his grandiose plot for power, de Gaulle staged his so-called peace referendum on April 8. It was a companion piece to the Jouhaud trial. No one needed a referendum to poll the workers' opposition to colonial suppression. They had already cast their votes, most democratically, in their mass demonstrations. Like a slyster asking "Do you still beat your wife?" de Gaulle tallied every "Yes" ballot for himself. There was no way to vote against de Gaulle except to vote against the cease fire.

The Communist Party, as hostile to independent mass action as is de Gaulle, supported the referendum. So did the Guy Mollet Socialists who not only fear the workers more than they do de Gaulle, they actually endorse his treacherous masquerade as the architect of Algerian peace and independence. Small wonder that Algerians looking at the tasks ahead say they will have to seek socialist solutions but emphatically not of the Mollet variety.

Algerian Reconstruction Affects Europe & Africa

One of the urgent problems will be the expropriation of large European-owned estates for the resettlement of landless peasants and unemployed agricultural workers. This will involve also the conversion of hundreds of thousands of acres of commercial vineyards to food production for undernourished Algeria.

The magnitude of that struggle is only hinted at by just one recent incident. On April 19, Algerians demonstrating against continuing OAS degradations were surrounded by the riot police who prove so ineffectual at rounding up the OAS.

If Algeria looks North across the Mediterranean to France, it also faces South across the Sahara to the rest of emergent Africa. In Angola, for example, freedom fighters against Portugal's tyranny have received military training and equipment from the FLN. In turn, from sub-Saharan Africa came the fundamental protest against de Gaulle's use of the Sahara for his murderous nuclear testing adventures.

Though Algeria was forced to grant him the right to continue A-Bomb testing, Algerians' opposition has already been expressed in their insistence that the newly discovered wealth of the Sahara shall be used for education, health and liberation from poverty.

In the end, reconstruction in Algeria will not be a question of statistical tables, economic exploitation or capital investment blueprints. Whatever the political regroupments, whatever the theoretical clarifications, whatever the historic mobilizations Algeria has yet to experience the bulwark against the counter-revolution—and therefore the promise for reconstruction on new human beginnings—is the creative activity of the mass movement. It has already shown that its human links stretch from Angola across jungle, desert and sea to the heart of Paris.

—V. L. J. Granger

*By an astonishing series of historic parallels, embattled Algeria shows in yet another way its deep links with the French workers' struggles.

In 1830, the restored Bourbon monarch, Charles X, was overthrown on the revolutionary barricades of Paris. While the bourgeoisie were the first to protest his would-be absolutism, IT WAS THE PARISIAN WORKERS AND STUDENTS WHO BORE THE FULL WEIGHT OF THE FIGHTING AND REFUSED TO SURRENDER BEFORE THE ARMY'S BAYONET CHARGES. Their revolutionary courage so terrified the bourgeoisie that they sold out in a compromise with the General whereby Louis Philippe ascended the throne. Later known as the "bourgeois king" he promptly moved to divert and suppress the mass initiative by LAUNCHING A MILITARY CAMPAIGN OF CONQUEST AGAINST ALGERIA.

IN 1871 HE SOUGHT AGAIN TO DISPEL THE HAUNTING SPECTER OF REVOLUTION BY A FEROCIOUS ALGERIAN CAMPAIGN IN WHICH THE DARING MUSLIM LEADER ABD EL-KADER WAS KILLED.

February, 1848, saw Louis Philippe overthrown in turn on the barricades of Paris. Again the initiative came from the bourgeois Republics but THE VICTORY WAS WON BY THE WORKING MASSES who established what they called the Social Republic. By June, the bourgeoisie betrayed, disarmed and massacred the workers. 1848 ENDED WITH THE FRENCH WORKERS' SUPPRESSION AND THE COMPLETE SUBDUING OF THE REBELLIOUS REMNANTS IN RESERVE ALGERIA.

After a generation in the sordid strait jacket of the Second Empire under Napoleon III, the Parisian workers rose up once more in 1870. This time to save France from the treachery of the Bonapartists just returning from their defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. FROM NOVEMBER THROUGH DECEMBER, 1870, THE UNASSUMING WORKING MEN AND WOMEN EXALTED HUMANITY BY CREATING A NEW FREE SOCIETY—THE RADIANT PARIS COMMUNE. By 1871, the counter-revolution destroyed the Commune in a series of acts of terror and assassination. ONLY THEN, IN 1871, WAS ALGERIA COMPLETELY SUBJUGATED AND ANNEXED TO "METROPOLITAN FRANCE". (For a full striking account of the Paris Commune read THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE, by Karl Marx.)

The Evolution of a Social Type

Editor's Note: In an article published in October 1953, Raya Dunayevskaya analyzed the evolution of several types of labor bureaucrats, including Walter Reuther, Jay Lovestone, and Irving Brown, emphasizing that "the point is none of them has changed any basically..." Nine years later, not only are all these "leaders" still prominently around, but by now they exhibit in full-bloom the characteristics of the Planners in our age of state-capitalism.

Jay Lovestone is now an international "consultant" for the AFL-CIO, and lectures on what Russia is like. Irving Brown is now not only a representative of the AFL-CIO in Europe, but, ever since his attendance as translator at the 1958 Accra Conference, has tried to meddle in the Algerian Revolution, and now is trying also to meddle in sub-Sahara African affairs. Walter Reuther's most recent exploits at the UAW Convention are detailed on page 1 of this issue. It is clear that the article written in 1953 from which the following extracts are taken has become even more significant in 1962.

Today everybody knows the Communist Party as the agent of the greatest barbarism on earth—Russian totalitarianism. But in those days, when the Russian Revolution had overthrown the Czar and established workers rule, the Communists were men of high principles who stood for a new social order, a totally new way of life, for tens of millions of people who hoped to rule themselves in production and in politics.

The problem in the American Communist Party was that the backbone of it was immigrant stock. Jay Lovestone was a new type in the early days of the Communist Party. He was not a hardy proletarian type. He was a college boy, or, as the phrase then went, "a petty-bourgeois intellectual." But he was American.

"Training Organizers"

He built up a whole theory of American "exceptionalism". That was quite a chauvinistic theory. It meant that America was so exceptional it need not follow any principles of independent workers activity, but could "get there" (to a new social order), through all sorts of fantastic schemes, playing around with liberals etc. Thus, just as his successors in the 1930's fell for the New Deal, he went hook, line, and sinker for La Follette's Farmer-Labor Party. But that was not his worst feature. I am told, that the part which the rank and file of the Communist Party of those days hated most of all about his rule was his conception of "training organizers."

Before Lovestone's leadership in 1925-27, Communist organizers would go into the sweat-shops and learn from the workers their conditions as one of them, and with them, see whether the shop could be unionized. Lovestone's idea was quite different: he trained his organizers to work with the top leadership of the union. And suddenly there grew up the new type of organizer who was not of the workers but "for" them. The needle trades thus swarmed not only with regular labor bureaucrats, but the special "consultants" supplied by the Lovestonites. That is how a type, a combination "leader", union organizer and general debater arose...

Two Types of Bureaucrats

In Europe at this moment there are two types of American labor bureaucrats. Both wear fancy ties and smoke fat cigars and try to sell the "American way of life" as if that were one world, instead of two. One, like Reuther, is the roving kind. He comes to deliver a speech at a hand-picked labor congress, rides in a U.S. Army jeep. He ends up by telling the American workers how much better off they are than the Europeans, after he had just told the West German workers how much better off they are, with their unemployment, than the East German workers who must come for bread to the West. Then, through the Voice of America, he has the audacity to tell the East German workers who dared challenge their rulers at the cost of their lives, that they need "to believe in democracy."

The other, like Irving Brown, is the stationary kind. He is the international representative of the A. F. of L. who lives in Europe, is always there to meet the roving kind of bureaucrat, but at the same time distrusts him. You see, he knew Reuther when he was the fair-haired boy of the Communist Party and knows that he still is the planner, always ready to pull out of his pocket as many Five Year Plans as any totalitarian bureaucrat and therefore resembles too closely for Irving Brown's comfort the Communist fellow-travelers who are always "giving the line." Moreover, as one who has himself been the fair-haired boy of a former leader of the Communist Party, Jay Lovestone, he knows that he must sell Europe something more genuine than that all Americans are millionaires and that the American worker who is always wildcalling just loves his labor bureaucrat. He knows that this is the epoch of total crisis, including the crisis of the mind. He knows he cannot win the mind of the European masses who are struggling for a totally new way of life with such vulgar sales talk. So he welcomes them. He is also looking for some European names to fight the deep anti-Americanism there.

Plan And Planners All Around Us

... The point is none of them has changed any basically. That is why I went into their past, which, to all appearances, seemed so different. The leader type in those days anticipated in all essentials the labor bureaucrat of today. It doesn't matter that the C.P. produced them first; the age of state-capitalism produced them all—the plan and the planners. They are all around us now.

MAY, 1962

JUNE-JULY, 1962

Grand Illusion of Our Times: DISARMAMENT

At the so-called General Disarmament and Peace Conference taking place in Moscow, its main instigator, Nikita Khrushchev boasted on July 10th that Russia has "nuclear weapons of 50, 100 and more megatons, inter-continental rockets, the global rocket which is practically impervious to defense and anti-missile rocket." As if that weren't proof sufficient of how unswervingly the Chairman of the Russian Communist Party follows the path to peace, Premier Khrushchev added that "nobody will live to see the Socialist (???) countries disarm unilaterally."

UNILATERALISM—IN NUCLEAR TESTING

This noted Russian world disarmer is expert at quite a different sort of unilateralism, as he made clear to the world in October 1961 when he unilaterally broke the nuclear test ban and exploded the monstrous 58 megaton bomb. Right now he isaping President Kennedy who, when Russia resumed nuclear testing, announced that so would the United States. This time, after Kennedy shocked the world by exploding the high altitude bomb which lit up the skies for 1,000 miles, Khrushchev announced that Russia feels free to be "the last to test."

The timing of both actions shows this blustering Communist's disdain for public opinion. The first action exploding the 58 megaton bomb, was timed to the opening of the conference of the non-aligned nations meeting in Yugoslavia. The second and present action was timed to coincide with the sessions of the self-styled World Conference on Disarmament and Peace. Neither the actions nor the timing were accidental. The first was meant to expose the impotence of non-alignment and thus compel de facto alignment. The present action and timing are aimed to divert the nuclear disarmament movement in "the West" (including Japan!) toward anti-American channels, pure and simple.

Like the Tower of Pisa, neutralism has been found to lean heavily in one direction. Are we now to witness a transformation into its opposite of the people's desire for world peace into nothing but a whitewash of the criminal actions of one of the two world nuclear powers? This may sound fantastic to those who know the origins of the nuclear disarmament movement in Britain which had been independent both of Russia and America. But history knows all sorts of stranger transformations, and we are witness now to one such tragedy.

Contrast the naivete of this movement's acceptance of the invitation to the Moscow conference on the ground that they would have a "platform" from which to expound unilateral views for disarming to the purposive and insulting bomb-rattling by Khrushchev. Consider next the uses to which their presence will be put by the Moscow "hosts". Then ponder the Communist infiltration of the nuclear disarmament movements (both the CND and the Committee of 100) in Great Britain itself.

UNILATERALISM—IN LEAFLET DISTRIBUTION

Last year the Scottish anti-nuclear movement had made sure that its anti-Polaris leaflet, asking for a demonstration at Holy Loch, expressed opposition to nuclear bases and nuclear testing both on the part of America and Russia. When the Communists read the leaflet, they sat on the 5,000 leaflets they had volunteered to distribute. The masses, however, turned out in great numbers. For once, moreover, the turnout was not limited to the middle class but included the working class and its trade unions.

This year, on the other hand, the anti-Polaris demonstration at Holy Loch brought out, at most, 400, while the leaflet assured everyone that over 1,000 had already volunteered and called for 2,000 to show up at the demonstration. This year the leaflets were eagerly distributed by the Communists for they read: "When we are free from America, and not a threat to Russia, Britain can play a great part in negotiating disarmament . . ." (My emphasis, R.D.) "Our governments are doing worse than nothing," continued the leaflet, to stop the next war, and to the question, "What about the Russians?" Its answer is a complete whitewash: "The only reason they might want to destroy us is because we're a threat to them." (My emphasis, R.D.)

No wonder the Scottish people didn't turn out en masse. I was in Scotland on June 6th when this demonstration took place and talked to many people who had previously participated in the movement but who refused this time to march under such a lying banner.

"SUPPRESSION OF HUMAN REASONING"

The Committee of 100 was a militant outgrowth of the CND, of those militants who felt that the annual Aldermaston March had become routinized and could not possibly, in itself, stop the insane rush by the rulers of the world toward a nuclear holocaust. Direct action and other types of new activities, including searching for links with the working class and its potent strike weapon, were undertaken. Unfortunately, there was no equally deep probe for a philosophy of freedom around which these activities were to be carried on and expanded.

The face of the new movement—Lord Bertrand Russell—may not be armed with state power. But he is armed with as administrative a mentality and as bureaucratic a concept of the one world super-state as any in-power state administrators. Lord Russell aristocratically "dismissed" the Marxian philosophy of liberation in favor of practical activities alongside Communist state capitalists. Instead of probing into the root cause of war—the class structure of society with its inherent veering between economic crises and wars—he dove into the grand illusion of our time: Disarmament. To the Moscow Conference currently meeting he sent the following message:

"I should like all negotiators from the West to state: I am firmly convinced that the nuclear war would be worse than the world-wide victory of communism. I should like every negotiator from the East to declare: I am firmly convinced that a nuclear war would be worse than a world-wide victory of capitalism."

Lord Russell may think that this statement is an improvement of the infamous slogan "better Red than dead." The new variation of the spiritless old theme reminds us, however, of the scornful attitude toward democracy on the part of some of Lenin's Bolshevik co-leaders—Bukharin and Pyatakov—at the outbreak of World War I. Such a scornful attitude toward democracy, wrote Lenin, "constitutes one of these forms of depression or suppression of human reasoning by the war."

In our day this type of "depression or suppression of human reasoning" has resulted from the fear of nuclear war. The attendance at fake disarmament and peace conferences is one manifestation of the suppression of human reasoning. Thus these same searchers for peace do not quiver at the Wall erected in East Berlin to keep the German workers confined to that narrow strip nor are they horror struck at the gun-fire directed at any who would escape that prison. The indifference remains when Communists hoo Willy Brandt in London and the heads are turned the other way at the Scottish Committee of 100's excusing Russia, which supposedly would never have exploded or rattled H-bombs if only Scotland were "not a threat to Russia." (sic!)

If Russell, as an anti-Marxist, will not be moved by Lenin's struggles against both fake pacifism and ultra-revolutionism during World War I, may we not hope that his followers at least will listen to the voice of today's peace fighters who felt compelled to break from the Communist hypocrites. I am referring to the split in the Japanese movement.

JAPANESE SPLIT SIELDS NEEDED LIGHT

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

"The fear of nuclear weapons has obscured the understanding that war is rooted in the capitalist system; the simple wish for peace has become the dominant idea, taking the place of class struggle, revolution, socialism . . . This ideological armistice corresponded perfectly with the 'united front' tactics of the Communists and their allies. It combined the jargon of the left with the tactics of rightwing opportunism . . . In the course of these events one striking characteristic of the official left leadership stood out clearly—contempt for the masses."

The British anti-nuclear movement has a great deal to learn from the split in the Japanese movement. Only if it does so in time, then the "depression or suppression of human reasoning" will give way to a new flowering of thought which will not separate itself from action. Only through the unity of thought and action can we hope to stay the hand of both nuclear powers. Otherwise, the Communist bomb will more effectively snuff out life than Communist brainwashing presently suppresses human reasoning.

Our Underdeveloped Intellectuals

I have just returned from a trip to West Africa where the dynamism of ideas is in sharp contrast to the mental blankness of "the great debates" here. In my analysis of the impact of Communism and neo-colonialism, (1) I wrote about the dynamism of "Freedom Now" which infuses even old ideas with a force capable of piercing through any shield of apathy. This subject, with which I have dealt in the articles in AFRICA TODAY as well as in Political Letters from Africa (2), is not my topic this time. Here I am concerned not with Africa and Africans, but with books on Africa by Europeans and Americans, especially the latter.

Though it surely doesn't take a genius to discern that the economies of Africa are primitive, unindustrialized, left so by centuries of imperialist domination, reams and reams of books are coming off the press on the "underdeveloped countries." But there is not a single book that deals seriously with their ideological battles. Where the "political picture" is not a mere recitation of existing parties, or a propaganda tract extolling "the West," it still veers between one of two extremes: either it equates any brand of independent thought to Communism, and bemoans the latter's victory. Or, contrariwise, it states categorically that Communism never will win because it "does not understand" that the African is deeply religious, (3) or his tribal character is simple and/or complex, or—well, anything at all, in order to avoid confronting the reality of African socialism.

What is more obvious even than the African continent having a monopoly of underdeveloped economies is that the technologically advanced countries have a monopoly of underdeveloped intellectuals.

"PERHAPS WE SHOULD BECOME MARXIST . . ."

Turning away from books by our so-called Africanists to non-Marxist studies of Russia and Marxism, I did find open admission that if Russia were nowhere around and the Africans had never heard the name of Marx, Marxism would be a popular philosophy. It is contained in a book titled *The Unfinished Revolution*, by Professor Adam Ulam. Professor Ulam is an anti-Marxist, but not a vulgar one. He is not one who contends that "since" Communism is the only "Marxism" that exists in the world instead of just in books, that "therefore" Marxism and Communism are one. He may not agree that Communism is a total perversion of Marxism, but he does see that it is its "other side", that is to say, not the underlying philosophy of revolution, but what comes after the conquest of power to those who wish to hold on by any and all means. As a serious student of the works by Marx himself, he senses its revolutionary, humanist spirit and contends that, in the African context, Marxism is a "natural"—that is his word and his emphasis.

The catch to this admission of naturalness is that it is supposed to be so only to underdeveloped countries. So convinced is the professor that Marxism does not apply to the industrialized nations, that he comes up with a most original suggestion. "Perhaps," writes Prof. Ulam, "we should become Marxist to the point . . ."

No wonder his co-defenders of capitalism shied away from such a conclusion and gave very indifferent reviews to the book when it first appeared two years ago. Since he is a non-Marxist scholar from a well-established university—Harvard—the reviewers could not surround *The Unfinished Revolution* with the conspiracy of silence that usually surrounds a serious Marxist study, but the type of reviews it did rate elicited no compulsion from the reader to go find the book, nor was he aware of the fact that it dealt with Africa in the ideological field that has remained so barren in the specialized studies of Africa. What interests us is the desperation that produced the original suggestion that "perhaps we should become Marxist to the point . . ."

THE THEORETICAL VOID

The bourgeoisie is never short of "explanations" as to why Marxism remains so alive when Marx himself has been dead nearly 80 years, and the bourgeoisie has never stopped burying him alive and reburying him every year since he died. It would appear that he was "always" wrong, and that his theories especially do not apply to "our age"—but that nevertheless, people by the millions, live and die by that philosophy of freedom. What is new about Prof. Ulam's theory is the originality of his suggestion that "Perhaps we should become Marxist to the point . . ."

Here is a serious anti-Marxist student of Marxism who is so weighted down by the fact that capitalism is losing the battle for the minds of men in the newly-independent nations of Africa; so conscious that the popularity of Marxism is not due to a "Communist conspiracy" that he is begging his own class to recognize its naturalness for a period transiting to industrialization, that is to say, searching for a method to industrialize other than via capitalist exploitation, a different way of life resembling the Marxist philosophy of freedom.

The other books do not even face the problem. It is so much easier to make jokes about "dialectics" (3) and, to counterpose to its alleged abstractions, statistics about the state of the economy.

The whole "theory" that Marxism applies only to "backward" countries is of course only a variation of the sterile debates when fascism arose in Italy. Rather than confront its naturalness for capitalism in decay, the theory propounded in the "advanced" countries is that fascism could come only because Italy was a "backward" land. Then, when Nazism came to the highly technologically developed land of Germany, the argument was reduced to calling Hitler a "madman." Mad he was, but it was not the madness of an individual but the insanity of an exploitative system in total crisis. It was impossible to find a "liberal" capitalist willing to fight this mad monster. Both the private and state varieties of capitalism preferred Munich or Hitler-Stalin Pacts to a battle of sanity against "insanity." Only when Hitler made it clear he would not settle for a mere redivision of the world but wanted mastery of the whole world were the other capitalistic nations compelled to undertake the battle to the finish.

This time they would like to fight the opposite—Marxist Freedom Fighters—to the finish, but they dare not yet. They recognize that a philosophy one lives by—and millions of anti-Communists live by Marxism—is not something to play with and in that respect they are right in rejecting Prof. Ulam's original suggestion.

It is one thing for a Bircher to copy the Communist method to fight Communism. There isn't very much difference between Communist totalitarianism and capitalist authoritarianism.

It is quite something else to try out the Marxist method. The gulf between Marxist Humanism and liberal capitalism is unbridgeable. And any one who tried to win adherents for capitalism under the guise of being a Marxist would fall into the cross current. Of all the people who recognize paternalism, under whatever name, the African does. And he would make short shrift of such double-tongued orators.

There is a great deal more to the African reality than the figures of its underdevelopment. But there is also a great deal more to its attraction to Marxism than its desire to achieve rapid industrialization. The human factor which gave little Guinea the courage to say "No" to the mighty de Gaulle revealed the latter not to be almighty.

Where the preoccupation of "the West" with "fighting Communism" has stultified thought, the preoccupation of Africa with freedom has given birth to the flowering of thought which will yet overcome Communism as well by the return to the Humanism of Marxism, fructified by the new heaven that is African aspirations for a totally new society. In "the affluent society," on the other hand, the theoretical void sucks in the intellectuals, transforming them into nothing but—to use a phrase from Marx—"prize-fighters for capitalism." (5) They are not very good prize-fighters at that; they are losing the battle for the minds of men.

FOOT NOTES

(1) See AFRICA TODAY, July issue, for the article "In the Gambia during the elections", and the September issue for the article "Under the Impact of Communism and Neo-Colonialism."

(2) See NEWS & LETTERS Political Letters from Africa: April 30—"Theoreticians at the Cross Roads, or Toward A New Formulation of the Relationship of Theory to Practice." May 28, "The African Revolutions at the Crossroads: Role of Labor, the Single Party, Neo-Colonialism, State-Capitalism and Africa, Africa, Africa."

(3) Paradoxically this type of analysis appears in the very same journal (SURVEY, London, '62) which specializes in studies of the effect of Russian

Communism on Western Europe and how the biggest Communist Party in the "Western world" can be in a country predominantly Catholic—Italy—very obviously this has not cut the membership of the Italian CP which is no less than 2 million. But, somehow, on African soil this religious or national or tribal character is supposed to be the factor that will assure Communism's defeat.

(4) 3 issues of the USIA Problems of Communism were devoted to Africa, but see especially the March-April 1962 issue for the article by Christopher Bird, "Scholarship and Propaganda".

(5) Karl Marx, Preface to CAPITAL, Vol. I.

How Much Has The South Changed?



Old Engraving Depicts Discovery of Negro Slave Revolt Leader Nat Turner in 1831.

Editorial

Either Freedom Here and Now —or the Magnolia Jungle

The bloody night of September 30th, which enshrouded two innocents murdered, scores wounded and injured, cannot be washed clean by the belated appearance of Federal troops which finally brought "law and order" into Oxford, Miss., only by re-segregating the armed forces during their stay in the magnolia jungle.

In sharp contrast to the determination and courage of James Meredith, the man of indecision who occupies the White House—John Fitzgerald Kennedy—delivered a maul-mouthed talk about not having had "to use force" thus far.

This was said at the very moment, 8 p.m., Mississippi time, September 30th, when the unruly, seedy specimens of white supremacy, numbering by then 2,500, unloosed, from the darkness of night and the safety of the campus environs, jagged banks of concrete from smashed-up campus benches, Molotov cocktails, shotguns, and a bulldozer headed directly for the Lyceum building of the University of Mississippi at Oxford where Federal Marshals held fort.

THE TRAGEDY AND THE FARCE

Were it not for the overwhelming tragedy which unloosed the very joints of time, so that we were witnessing the films of life unroll backwards a full century, the genteel dialogue between President Kennedy and that leading member of the White Citizens Councils (the KKK in white shirts instead of white hoods), who occupies the gubernatorial chair—Ross Barnett—would have taken on all the elements of a farce.

Here was the Chief Executive of the biggest single power in the world, who is forever ready to challenge the other nuclear titan, Russia, for mastery over the whole world, begging a saw-dust Caesar of one out of 50 states of his own country, a state 80 per cent of whose economy depends on Federal contracts, for an answer to his telegram, "this evening." The telegram was sent the Governor despite the fact that from his mansion of power and policed safety, he was inciting the barbarian hordes against so elementary a right as desegregated education; and who was soon further to tell this mob about "the oppressive power of the United States of America."

This creature had already arrogantly refused to obey Court decisions and yet when he had called "this evening" (at 7:30 p.m.) and asked for more time for him to work out a reply to the President's telegram, not only was more time granted but during that time the President evidently went on dreaming about a face-saving solution for the governor who should have been arrested, —and not, only for contempt of court.

Instead, all was forgotten—the eight years' notice since the U.S. Supreme Court Decision on desegregation in education during which the governors had ample time to plan how to enforce,

instead of flout the law; the two-year flight of one single brave Mississippian, James Meredith; and the 10 days of direct confrontation with the Federal Government trying to enforce the fourth of the District Court's orders which Barnett lawlessly and contemptuously rejected while putting on a show which passed for courage he never had.

THE LONG NIGHT OF VIOLENCE

"This evening" merged into the next day. Because Barnett had told the Attorney General that it would be a wise move for the Federal Marshals to steal Meredith in on Sunday while the campus was deserted, the President of the United States and the Department of Justice, with the Defense Department standing by, brought Meredith to the campus to face the technicality of no registration "on a Sabbath."

The spineless university administrators, who thought nothing of giving up their academic independence so that the bigot ruling the state could become "acting registrar", now could find no way to overstep the technicality of no registration on a holy day. Thereby they became part of the unholy conspiracy that led up to the long night of violence, arson, pillage and murder.

As Mrs. Bates of the NAACP, who had had her experiences in Little Rock, Ark., put it, "Some can't stand daylight . . . Night-time is when they crawl out from under the rocks."

The long night of violence on September 30th began at the very moment when President Kennedy was finally addressing the nation via TV (8 p.m. Mississippi time), after still other delays caused by indecisions piled upon indecisions. During this time the treacherous Governor had removed the State Police so that the legitimate brainless children of his magnolia jungle had lebensraum for armed rioting at the citadel of "higher education" which, in its supineness stands not very tall but thereby is the right symbol of the warped minds and economic backwardness that has kept the average annual income, along with its educational level, pegged to the last rung of the national ladder.

The racist fury did not abate until the early morning hours of the following day, after the United States Army finally arrived somewhere between 2 and 3 a.m.

What worth are the condolences of the President to the family of the French reporter, Paul Gullhard, who was shot 10 short minutes after he arrived on the campus at 8:30 p.m., shot in the back by these trigger-happy Klansmen in sports clothes? The long night of violence only gained momentum after it wreaked its toll of lives.

And all this happened, not on a battlefield behind the Iron Curtain, but in the magnolia jungle of these United States of America!

THE LONG COURAGE OF JAMES MEREDITH, NEGRO AMERICAN

As against the brainlessness of the mob, and the authorities who spawned it, and in overpowering contrast to the legalisms and indecisions of the President, the Negro Mississippian, James Meredith, who had to run the gauntlet of the jeering ugly-faced white Mississippians, spoke out as forcefully as he had acted: "It is more for America than for me." In the days that followed it became clear that this statement applied not only to the questions of desegregated education, but to the U.S. Army itself. "This condition," he said, referring to the "re-segregation" of the Army stationed at the university, "constitutes a dishonor and a disgrace to the hundreds of thousands of Negroes who wear the uniform of our military services."

Nor had Meredith's courage and determination displaced a sense of humor. "If Governor Barnett keeps this up," he said after that ignoramus had twice personally refused his application, "I may not vote for him."

There is as big a chasm between this sense of humor and the low comedy of a Barnett, as there is between the latter's hypocrisy and Meredith's forthrightness. The total oppositeness in attitudes brought to the fore the two different worlds co-existing in Mississippi: Negro civilization vs. white barbarism.

Asked whether the white student isolation of him made him feel lonely, Meredith replied: "I have been living a lonely life for a long time now." This characterizes not only Meredith, but the Negro people as the key American minority.

NORTH AND SOUTH

North, as well as South, the Negro has been ghettoized. Although he has played a vanguard role in every aspect of life and art in the historic development of this country, the President of the United States disregarded this role—if indeed a Harvard man ever learned of the fact that it was the Negro who first introduced public education to the benighted South as well as having given it the only democracy it ever had. The true and full history of the South has no need of such false heroes as the President suddenly created out of thin air when he called upon white Mississippians to follow in the traditions of Lamar. (See p. 7.)

The Automation Battlefield And the Philosophical Battles

Were we even to discount the actual deaths workers claim are caused by Automation (1), the decade since its introduction would reveal a battlefield strewn with millions of unemployed, three full-fledged recessions, and ever shorter periods of prosperity. It has been obvious for some time that an arrested rate of economic growth accompanies unemployment.

RATE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Today's press (2) carries one glowing report on the cooperation of French private capitalists with DeGaulle's State Plan. President Kennedy has been so tantalized by West Europe's phenomenal rate of growth that he has sent his chief economic advisers to France and other West European countries, especially those in the Common Market. The President's move is a rather belated one since "the European miracle" is unwinding as an industrial spurt following wartime destruction which is now coming to a halt. Were we even to discount countries like Scotland, where the only thing phenomenal is its immense army of unemployed, we would have to consider another report emanating from France dealing with unemployment.

It is true that this one (3) singles out American companies for blame. It seems that GM and Remington Rand have fired 1,000 workers. The French Minister of Industry, Michel Maurice-Bokanowski, attacks the companies for their "anti-social" attitude, adding that "it is inexplicable that decisions of retrenchment be taken . . . without authorities of the interested state being informed."

Very clearly two elements are here involved. One is the State Plan, and the other is Automation. Both are integrally connected, not so much with the "flourishing economy" (of which the workers would have a different story to tell) as with the crisis in automated production; the evergrowing army of unemployed and the fluctuating (downward) rate of economic growth—an arrested one in the United States against a more or less (presently less) expanding one in Europe.

THE RUSSIAN CONTROVERSY

An interesting illumination on the present controversy over state plan and rate of economic growth can be shed by a previous post-war discussion on "equilibrium" in Russia in 1946-8. The brief interlude between wartime collaboration and the cold war saw the publication there of a book by Eugene Varga entitled *Changes in the Political Economy of Capitalism Resulting from the Second World War*.

The thesis of the book can be summed up by the statement that the war has revealed that capitalism, as well as "socialism", can plan; and "therefore" an "equilibrium" has been established which "excludes" the general crisis.

As Stalin turned from "peaceful co-existence" with his wartime allies to unbridled attack on the United States and its Marshall Plan, Varga's book came under heated attack (4). What concerns us here, however, is that one bold economist, Maria Natavno-Smith, attempted to use the controversy to make Lenin's conception of state-capitalism the new point of departure. Needless to say, she too was put in her place.

"During the war", Lenin had written, referring, of course, to the first world war, "world capitalism took a step forward, not only toward concentration in general, but also toward state-capitalism in even a greater degree than formerly" (5).

Everyone suddenly agreed that nothing new had happened—neither the movement from planlessness to plan, nor from monopoly production to state capitalism. The year following the dispute, however, a new technological stage was reached. In Russia as well as in Europe and the United States, it was called Automation.

THE WORKERS' THOUGHTS, AND MARX'S

It is here that the philosophical battles began all over again. This time, however, they were on an altogether different level. For presently a new voice was heard. It was that of the workers. The locale too had changed from Russia to the United States, and from governmental and academic halls to the mines. Confronted with Automation, the American workers moved the struggle with the capitalists from one concerned over the fruits of labor (wages) to one concerned with the kind of labor—the degrading division between mental and manual labor which had resulted in transforming the worker into nothing more than an appendage to a machine (6).

Not by accident the new attitude toward working appeared in all battles of workers with capitalists, whether or not they revolved around Automation, and irrespective of whether these struggles took place within a capitalist democracy or against Communist totalitarianism. By the time these struggles culminated in the Hungarian Revolution, not only had the workers' revolts and workers' rule assumed a new form—Workers' Councils—but so had its underlying philosophy—Marxist Humanism.

Furthermore, it was not only dissident Communists like Imre Nagy (7) who raised the question of the Humanism of Marxism. The question was also being raised in far-off Africa by Pan-Africanists who held that, more than "the economics" of Marxism, its Humanism was applicable to the problems of the

underdeveloped economies (8). The one-worldedness of the question demands, however, that, instead of restricting ourselves to the early Humanist essays of the young Marx, we turn to the mature Marx's greatest theoretical work, CAPITAL.

THE PROCESS, THE RESULT, THE VOID

One of the many dualities in capitalist production that Marx traces is that between the process and the result of machine production. The process led from cooperation through manufacture to machinery as it became an "automaton." The result was a movement of concentration and centralization of capital till it reached its ultimate: "In order to examine the object of our investigation in its integrity, free from all disturbing subsidiary circumstances, we must treat the whole world as one nation . . ." (9).

We have not, and, in its capitalistic form, will not reach that ultimate form. Nor did Marx expect us to. On the contrary. The whole point of making this extreme assumption was to prove that, so long as machine remains master of man, that is how long we will be confronted with the crises of capitalism. They are integral to its growth and result in "the general absolute law"—the unemployed army and the imminent collapse of the system as a whole.

The capitalist's sense of values is circumscribed by the fact that only one value exists for him—the accumulation of the un-paid hours of labor. The capitalist's knowledge is false because he is hemmed in by the fetishism of commodities; that is the only ideology that exists for him. This is why also the only world that exists for him is the world market, which was both a stimulant to, and an outlet of Capitalist production.

Outside of that the only capitalistic phenomenon that is world-wide in scope is war. Far from industrializing the whole world, all two world wars succeeded in doing was putting a question over the very survival of civilization at the same time the shotgun marriage of science and industry, which resulted in Automation, put the seal of bankruptcy on its thought.

THE TODAY-NESS OF MARX

Marx's analysis of the inevitable collapse of capitalism flowed from his perception of "the new passions and the forces" imbedded in society—the working class and its aspirations. The only way to overcome capitalist contradictions is to begin production anew, on a human foundation, not with man's subordination to machine, but his mastery of it. His self-development is not just a new "motive force of production." It is a new human dimension. Underlying the today-ness of Marx is this over-riding humanism.

In contradistinction to the today-ness of the past of Marxist-Humanism is the obsolescence of bourgeois thought today as it seals itself into a capsule far removed from the thought and aspiration and voice of the workers. On both sides of the Iron Curtain intellectuals stand in awe of Automation; the automatic factory that will "free" management from concern with labor; the "Artificial Intelligence" (10) which will help government solve the problems of economic growth; the science so insulated from life's needs that it can probe outer space. At phenomenal cost, both sides are in competition to reach the moon first. Neither is interested in releasing a new human dimension.

The conquest of outer space cannot, however, solve the problems of this earth. All our age has added to Marx's prediction of capitalist collapse is the specifics of nuclear holocaust. Until the philosophical battle and the factory struggle are joined there is no way out of capitalist crisis. Only a new human dimension can eliminate the "no exit" sign hanging over our crisis-ridden civilization. That human dimension has but one source of life and one source of thought. It is the life and thought of labor. Therein lies the history of the past and the present. Inherent in today is tomorrow.

FOOT NOTES

- (1) *Workers Battle Automation* by Charles Denby, (News & Letters, 8751 Grand River, Detroit 4, Mich. 25c).
- (2) The syndicated columnist, Marquis Childs, October 3rd.
- (3) Press Associates, Inc., Sept. 23, 1962, is a labor news service. This dispatch printed in RWDSU RECORD.
- (4) The stenographic transcript of the Russian discussion was published in English by the Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C.
- (5) V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol XXX, p. 300, Russian only.
- (6) See the chapter, "Automation and the New Humanism" in my *MARXISM AND FREEDOM*.
- (7) IMRE NAGY ON COMMUNISM, (Praeger Publishers, New York).
- (8) *African Socialism* by Leopold Sedar Senghor, (American Society for African Culture, New York.) See also Sekou Toure by Aimé Césaire, (*Presence Africaine*, No. 1, English edition, 1959.) Both authors are quoted in my *Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions*, (News & Letters, Detroit 4, Mich., 25c).
- (9) Karl Marx, *CAPITAL*, Vol. 1, p. 630.
- (10) See the special (March 1962) issue on "Automation" by the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.

Such "total recall" may suffice for a President who fears a frontal attack on bigotry, limiting his appeal to white Mississippi which boasts of its long list of renegades which has punctuated its history from its secession from the Union in the last century to letting the murderers of Emmett Till go free in our times. The President is all too eager to forget this checkered history of the magnolia jungle. One hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation, he is still so steeped in legalisms that he cannot see the issue of human rights. Nor does his alleged omnivorous reading seem to include the fact that the Negro constitutes 43 per cent of the population of Mississippi. No wonder he is totally blind to the fact that Meredith may be lonely, but he is not alone.

THE SELF-ACTIVITY OF THE NEGRO MASSES

We do not mean to bring Meredith's individual courage down a peg, but it is a fact that the stuff out of which individual courage comes is the self-activity of the great masses. This is not just a question of history, although the struggle for freedom began with Negro slave revolts long before the Civil War which it finally impelled. This is a question of today, the today which began approximately at the time of Meredith's birth in the 1930's when the Negro helped the white workers remold the industrial face of the nation through the establishment of the CIO, continued through World War II and after to end Jim Crow in the United States Air Force which Meredith had joined, and came to a climax in the last few years with such conspicuous successes as the bus boycott in Montgomery, Ala., and the desegregation of lunch counters in many Southern states, inspiring white, as well as Negro, Freedom Riders to fill the jail in Jackson, Miss.

Although Meredith and Meredith alone made the decision to apply for entry to the University of Mississippi, the self-activity of the Negro people created the spirit of the times, which enabled him to walk onto the segregated campus as a symbol of all the freedom struggles.

Over 100 years ago Wendell Phillips recognized that the new human dimension given to American history, as well as to his own entry into the pages of that history, was the gift of the Negro. What was true of the great New England Abolitionists is a hundredfold truer of the Freedom Fighters of today, Negro and white. At every turning point in American history, this self-activity of the Negro also became a point of departure, for world development. Before the Negro American gained so immeasurably from the African Revolutions which are presently reshaping the map of the world, he helped that emerging world.

The Negro will not now stop at tokenism, whether that be in Southern education, Northern employment, or the type of voting which puts a man like Kennedy in the White House. As one reader wrote NEWS & LETTERS: "If the President moved at such tortoise pace in the Mississippi situation when it had withheld the electoral vote from him in 1960, can you imagine the total paralysis that would have overcome that man if Mississippi had cast the decisive electoral vote for him as President?"

THE AMERICAN IMAGE ABROAD

World attention was focused on Mississippi. So compelling was the drama there that even the spectacular six-orbit space flight of Astronaut Schirra became a secondary matter. President Kennedy's self-induced myopic view of the world, as of American history, however, blinded him to the impression he was making. As it happens, a Negro worker expressed best what appeared in the European press:

"The government can move thousands of troops in a matter of a few hours under the pretext of fighting Communism. It has done this in Laos, in Africa, in Viet Nam as well as in other places. Now it threatens to move in on Cuba. But when it is a matter of American citizens, and those citizens are Negro, the Administration feels paralyzed."

The Administration accuses the Ross Barnetts of playing into the hands of Khrushchev by creating a poor image of America abroad. The Barnetts and their ilk did their bit to expose how hollow are phrases about freedom and democracy. The President with his "go slow" policy made a not very much better showing. "After all," a worker told NEWS & LETTERS, "we are in the midst of celebrating the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. No one can possibly call a hundred-year span a race with time."

Like his Republican predecessor in office, President Kennedy kept stressing the fact that he was merely executing the law of the land because that is his job. The not illogical conclusion of an attitude that you must obey the law "whether you like it or not"—and that is all the President's appeal to white Mississippi amounted to—is the madness which produced a Major General Edwin Walker. Yesteryear he commanded the troops at Little Rock with just such an admonition. Today he led the bigots into wild frenzy and rioting. Surely Nazi Germany has not receded into such distant history that anyone can afford to ignore the Walker episode and say of fascism, "It cannot happen here." (See p. 8).

FREEDOM HERE AND NOW

Fortunately, at the opposite end of the Mississippi spectrum stands not the President, but the Negro. The very continuity of his struggles, both throughout his history and today, in war time as in peace time, brings sanity into the development of our country. Along with the white worker, he created the CIO. He now says he will wait no longer for any man to lead him. Nor will he stop short of total freedom HERE and NOW.

Either that—or you become a prisoner in the magnolia jungle. There is no in-between. It is for this reason that we hail the action of Meredith and see it as the beginning, not the end, of the Negro struggle as well as the struggle of the working people as a whole, for a totally new society. If it is on truly human foundations, it will not only know no color bar, it will know no geographical boundaries. Back in 1831, when the LIBERATOR was founded, William Lloyd Garrison chose for its banner, "The world is my country." What was then a wish is today a necessity. What was the center of the struggle then—the abolition of slavery—now encompasses man's inhumanity to man in all his other dimensions. Short of a new human dimension, we will retrogress to the times of those slave revolts. It is for this reason we have reproduced, on page 1, the great leader of Negro slave revolt, Nat Turner. These are the true traditions of the freedom fighters of today, white and Negro. No need for eloquence for those abroad. What is needed is freedom HERE.

OCTOBER, 1962

6694

8.000

IDEOLOGY AND REVOLUTION: A STUDY IN WHAT HAPPENS AFTER . . .

The sudden transformation of Cuba into a Russian missile base, followed by the even more sudden dismantling of the base, makes it necessary to probe deeply into the matter of what happens after a revolution is won and the heroes from the mountains become the administrators of the state.

This paramount question is not merely a new variation of the old moralistic question about how power corrupts and how absolute power corrupts absolutely. Rather it is one that concerns the internal dynamics of revolutions in underdeveloped economies that evolved out of small guerilla bands and came to fruition in a nuclear age which has split the whole world into two, and only two, Big Powers—the United States and Russia.

In contrast to the African Revolutions which, after victory, set out on a course of "positive neutralism," the Cuban Revolution was, after a year, sucked into the Russian-Chinese Communist orbit. Fidel Castro now claims that there is no third road. The truth, however, is that Cuban independence was achieved without Communist help and the first year of revolution revealed an original philosophy as well as social transformation.

Between that first year and the present satellite status, the point of transition was caused, not by a "foreign agent," but by natural affinity between Fidel Castro, administrator, and both the native and world Communists. Let's take a closer look at these three clearly discernible stages that transpired since Fidel Castro came to power nearly four years ago, in January, 1959.

THE FIRST YEAR OF REVOLUTION

The first year of revolution unfolded with no dichotomy between philosophy and deed. The banner it unfurled made it as original in ideology as in its indigenous roots. Even Fidel Castro could express it succinctly then. The Cuban Revolution, he wrote was "a humanistic revolution because it does not deprive man of his essence, but holds him as its basic aim. Capitalism sacrifices man; the Communist state, by its totalitarian concept, sacrifices the rights of man."

The Cuban Revolution was a high stage in the development of freedom in the whole of Latin America. It did more than overthrow the cruel and despotic Batista dictatorship, which was both puppet of American imperialism and tyrant over its own nation. It achieved a revolution in agricultural relations.

Although the State, and not the agricultural worker, is the owner of these expropriated vast tracts of land, the feeling of liberation was exhilarating, and true, when compared with the previous state of servitude to the United Fruit Co.

While no comparable revolution in industrial relations was achieved, the fact that there was little industry in Cuba, and the people had to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, when they didn't even have boots, also made the workers willingly, though not uncritically, identify themselves with Fidel Castro and his July 26th Movement.

The first point of division came when the workers took issue with the State Plan and wanted to make sure of retaining their trades unions. Fidel Castro attended their trades union congress to urge the election of Communists whom he had found to be the most enthusiastic of State Planners and concerned with "rational investment." When the trade unions balked at electing Communists who had nothing to do with their revolution, and had, in fact, played with Batista, Castro declared the congress "a madhouse."

This kinship with the Communists, an attraction of one bossist attitude to another; this sharing of a conception of "the backwardness of the masses who had to be led"; this ordering about of workers to obey planned production targets and get over their "lack of revolutionary conscience and enthusiasm in their work"; in a word, this substitute of the State Plan for the people's needs marks the first divide between the Cuban state leaders and the Cuban workers.

THE POINT OF TRANSITION

It was the beginning of the end also of the independence of the July 26th Movement and the beginning of domination by the Cuban Communist Party whose general secretary, Blas Roca, began to spout forth counter-revolutionary slanders: "The true role of Trotskyism throughout the entire world is well known. In their eagerness to fight the Soviet Union, they went into the ranks of Hitler's apparatus of espionage and provocation and into that of the North American imperialists . . . Today in Cuba we also have libertarian anarcho-syndicalists." (See article p. 3).

Such outbursts in Havana and Khrushchev's declaration at the UN prompted us to write in September, 1960:

Russia is now trying to make it appear that it ended America's domination of Cuba. It isn't true. To the extent that the revolution is due to any other source than the Cuban people themselves, it is due to the African Revolutions which preceded it.

By fighting for independence from imperialism and embarking on a new path of development, the African Revolutions also put an end to the isolation of Latin America in the Western Hemisphere as well as to the loneliness, the feeling of helplessness of any underdeveloped country anywhere in the world.

The only thing Russia can rightly claim credit for is hardening Castro's natural petty bourgeois tendency to solve administratively what can only be solved through the self-activity of the masses. This hardening of the administrative mentality has meant that revolutionary changes notwithstanding, the single element of not creating a form for the release of the creative energies of the masses, of not allowing any reorganization from below, of doing everything from above, that single element of the administrative mentality, which is the hallmark of our age of state capitalism, was sufficient to begin the rapid descent of Cuba into the quagmire of Russian-Chinese totalitarianism.

At this point the tragedy is assuming tragically comic aspects. Fidel Castro thinks he is "The Leader." In truth, he

*From "On War and Peace," News & Letters, 8751 Grand River, Detroit 4, Michigan, 20c.

is being led. He does not even have any comprehension of where in the world's capitalistic complex he is being led to.

That great German philosopher, Hegel, spoke with profundity about just such blabbermouths seeking "self-expression." He said they reflected "an unreflective, incoherent stage of consciousness" characteristic of societies that are no more than a "community of animals."

"An unreflective, incoherent stage of consciousness"—what could better describe a Castro?—characteristic of "a society as a community of animals." This is the best contemporary description I have yet seen anywhere of state capitalist societies like Mao's China.

ENTER RUSSIA

Russia has certainly hit the jackpot in Cuba, and America is eaten up with jealousy. Nowhere, from Alaska to Adenauer's West Germany, does America have so monolithic, anxious, enthusiastic, undivided and blithely unsuspecting a collaborator-victim, 90 miles from the shore of its main protagonist, as Russia has in Cuba.

As if sucked into the jet-propelled Hushin, the Cuban Revolution has been unable to resist the totalitarian pull of Russian state capitalism, with the administrative mentality running roughshod over the self-activity of the masses. Suddenly we are face to face with the negative element of a world crisis that will not let go of the newly-freed countries.

Castro fancies that his loud pronouncements against the stupidities of the American State Department "make up" for his "incoherent stage of consciousness."

In truth, they only too clearly show that this "haughty vassal"—to use yet another expression of Hegel's—is so bitten by the state capitalistic bug—that is, "a passion for bossing"—that he does not even stop to reflect that he is trying to foist on the Cuban people hands made bloody by their crushing of the Hungarian people's revolt. Nothing can wash those hands clean. NOTHING . . .

This new arrogant administrator may feel sufficiently like a king, now that he has a nuclear power at his side, as to issue invitations to all underdeveloped countries to come to a command performance in Havana. The African countries gave him his first rebuff when they refused to be taken in by this later-comer on the revolutionary scene and his pretensions of "world leadership."

In declining the invitations for a conference in this hemisphere, when they have carried on the struggles for freedom decades ahead of him in Africa, they have given him his first lesson in freedom that is not dependent on Russia and China who are only using the Cuban Revolution to further their own ends of world conquest.

There is yet time to escape the world holocaust Mao Tse-tung is in such a hurry to unleash today, not tomorrow but today. If Fidel's Cuba will break loose from both poles of capital . . .

(Cont'd)

November, 1962

(cont'd.)

The two years that have passed since this was written have witnessed Castro's irretrievable entanglement in the Communist web, including also his total acceptance of the Communist perversion of Marxism. Fidel Castro is a man who thinks that if he himself drives the last nail into his own coffin, he thereby remains alive, and, if still alive, then certainly he is still the leader!

THE TRAGEDY OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

Far from seeing that when the going got tough between the Big Two Powers Khrushchev would find him to be expendable, he was busy "proving," on December 2, 1961, that, long before he got power, he had read Marx's CAPITAL "up to page 370" and "a text of Lenin" and would remain "a Marxist-Leninist to the end of my life." Misnamed as a speech on "Marxism-Leninism," Castro only proves that he has swallowed hook, line and sinker the Communist perversion of Marxism-Leninism. In any case, both the occasion for, and purpose of, the speech is to excuse the final dissolution of the July 26th Movement into the Communist Party, now renamed the Integrated Revolutionary Organization. He has discovered that the single party state is "the ideal government" and that that single party "is a selective party which leads."

It matters little whether, by the time Castro equated "The Revolution" he had made without any party to "The Party," he was also signing away to Russia the rights to missile bases and their operation. There was little left of Cuba that remained in the hands of the working people themselves. The State Plan reigned supreme and thought control was so total that it not only choked off the philosophy of freedom but overfilled the prisons.

Where "the party to lead" dominates one's every thought, and the masses to be led must have no organizations of their own, there the fulfillment of the State Plan takes the place of the liberation of mankind. Where one is busy with power politics rather than the release of human energies for their self-development, there one stifles both the human needs of a single country and the human aspirations of the forward movement of mankind the world over. Where missile bases have sprouted, and may again, there one has buried the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism.

The leadership complex, itself a by-product of our state-capitalist age and its drive for world domination, blinds Castro totally to the creativity of the masses. That, for him, remains an unopened book. Therein lies the tragedy of the Cuban Revolution.

EDITORIAL

Kennedy and Khrushchev Bring the World Close to the Point of No Return

The world held its breath this October 22nd as President Kennedy confronted the other nuclear giant with the announcement that he had proof of the existence of missile bases in Cuba, and declaration that "it shall be the policy of this nation to regard any nuclear missile launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western Hemisphere as an attack by the Soviet Union on the United States requiring a full retaliatory response on the Soviet Union . . ."

NUCLEAR MISSILES IN HANDS OF "RUSSIAN OFFICERS"

So well did the other brinkmanship master—Nikita Khrushchev—understand this framework in which Mr. Kennedy, as Commander-in-Chief, announced a blockade of Cuba as an "initial step," that he immediately stepped half-way back, then proposed a swap of missile bases—Russia will give up the Cuban one if the United States gives up the one in Turkey—and finally agreed unilaterally to dismantle the Cuban base under UN inspection. At no point had Russia consulted Cuba. On the contrary, the latter's satellite status had been made painfully clear before those 7 fateful days drew to a conclusion, as Khrushchev assured Kennedy: that he need not worry about any misuse of the missiles since these were not in the hands of Cubans, but in those of "Russian officers."

THE CUBAN PEOPLE

Nobody, especially not the Cuban people, was interested in gaining admission to the exclusive, murderous nuclear club, though Fidel Castro went on TV to declare: "We must learn to live in the age into which we were born." Fidel Castro is now trying to regain the attention of freedom fighters by demanding the evacuation of the Guantanamo Base as price for allowing a UN inspection team to witness the dismantling of missiles. This cannot hide the tragedy of the Cuban Revolution which had been diverted from its independent and humanist foundation into the Russian-Chinese totalitarian orbit (TWO WORLDS p. 5).

OPPOSITION TO WAR MUST BE NO WHITEWASH

Nevertheless it is not Castro, but Kennedy and Khrushchev, who have brought the world close to the point of no return. The opposition to war must therefore begin with opposition to BOTH nuclear titans who have shown their readiness to thrust mankind into the nuclear holocaust.

Of necessity, this demands that genuine opponents of imperialistic wars do not fall into the trap of arguing on the basis of who is the "aggressor" for thereby you are taking the class enemy's grounds of argument and, depending on whether you live on United States or non-U. S. soil, "proving," on the one side, that Khrushchev started it with the transportation of missiles to a new base, or, on the other side, that Kennedy started it with the blockade. It ought to be obvious even to the blind, that this is but another route to nuclear holocaust.

On the part of the Trotskyist apologists for Russian-Chinese Communism, this becomes all too obvious. "President Kennedy's

blockade of Cuba brands him as aggressor . . ." reads the Statement by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, (The Militant, October 23, 1962). "He has invited military retaliation in self-defense . . ." Since, whether for "self-defense" or otherwise, the "military retaliation" involved is the nuclear holocaust, it can mean only that H-bombs are A-OK—if they are Russian, or if they originate from Cuban soil. The nuclear disarmers who could carry a sign "Viva Fidel!" proved only one thing: they are not opponents of missile bases where these are aimed at the United States!

As Americans we are concerned with showing the other America, the workers' America, the America that is opposed to the nuclear holocaust and knows that the rulers are trying to catapult us into it. This is not the first time John Fitzgerald Kennedy threatened nuclear war and it is not the first time the battle lines were drawn by him around Cuba. When he first did so last year, we wrote editorially:

Marxist-humanists opposed, and will continue to oppose any American imperialist invasion of Cuba . . . It is no secret to any Latin American that, while the Monroe Doctrine may defend his country from European invasion, it could not protect it from American aggression for which it was designed.

The opposition to imperialism and its wars does not, however, mean giving a carte blanche to Castro's Cuba. It is no longer just a question of Fidel Castro's aligning Cuba with the Russian-Chinese totalitarian orbit. It is a question of the strangulation of the Cuban Revolution itself. (News & Letters, May 1961).

November, 1962

RUSSIA IS EXPORTER OF COUNTER-REVOLUTION

Never has this been more true than at the present moment. For those who had eyes to see with, and who looked for the development of the Cuban Revolution, instead of looking at its "maximum" leader, this was obvious long before the latest cold war crisis witnessed the dialogue between the Two Big Powers over Cuba without any consultation with the Cuban people. Nor had they been consulted when Khrushchev and Castro cooked up the deal about missiles and Castro agreed to let all power remain in the hands of "Russian officers."

This is not a question only of Cuban sovereignty. It is a question of the counter-revolutionary role of Russia the world over. Millions recognized this when it meant the outright destruction of the Hungarian Revolution. There are, however, more ways of killing a revolution than suppressing it after it has broken out. There is the attempt to strangle it before it ever has a chance to blossom as the full social revolution it is. In the case of the present Russian build-up of Cuba, there are not only missile bases which make it a pawn between the Big Two. There are also conventional arms that can in no way be a threat to the United States but can be and are a threat to the revolutionary underground and the unarmed masses who are trying to recapture the humanist revolution their leaders have diverted into state-capitalist channels and overfilled prisons.

OPPOSITION TO WAR MUST SHOW WHAT YOU ARE FOR

Long before fear gripped mankind during these perilous 7 days, we expressed ourselves on the question of war and peace in the only principled way that could mean peace:

So total and incontrovertible is this desire for peace on the part of the peoples of the world, that even the rulers preparing for war speak of 'peace'. At the same time, the radicals who oppose war, as is the case with the Trotskyists, actually line up with Russia. That is why it will no longer do to repeat such enticing slogans as "The enemy is in your own country." The slogan is a good one, but it is not good enough. It may have sufficed before the world was divided into two power blocs. Presently it is a trap to suck one into the other nuclear orbit, and thus doom both the advanced economies and the Afro-Asian-Latin American liberation movements . . . In a word, it is insufficient to declare what you are against without declaring what you are for.

Preparation for war against Russia tomorrow is all-out war against the American workers today, tomorrow, and the day after. That is why the point is not who throws or will throw the first stone, especially when the first stone will be the H-bomb . . . To the barbarism of the war we pose the new society . . . (Speech on War and Peace, September 1960).

In a word, we oppose the war not only as "against" but primarily because we are for a totally new society, on new, on human beginnings, free from exploitation and discrimination, where the population to a man holds destiny in its own hands, beginning with the workers at the point of production. Short of this, we get the constant rebirth of a new class of rulers and the working class as ruled and this exploitative society leads from crises to wars and back again so that by now the very survival of mankind is at stake. Surely this does not change with the locale of the missile bases and who—the United States or Russia or even Fidel himself—can push that button. To begin now playing the game of who is the "aggressor" and "deceiver" and who the violated and deceived would only make puppets of us all.

Fidel Castro knows of no way out. All he is doing now is moving a little away from Russia and a little toward China at the very moment that the latter has chosen to war on India. China can no more bring independence to the Cuban people than it is bringing to the Indian people.

There is no way out unless you break not only with the two nuclear giants but with all those who stand in the way of a new world on truly human foundations. Only in that way can you link the liberation struggles of the people in the colonial and semi-colonial world with the struggles of the workers in the technologically advanced lands. As we wrote at the time of the invasion of Cuba:

We must say loudly: Neither United States imperialism nor Russian totalitarianism; neither Fidel Castro nor Miro Cardona. Only a Cuba that is independent of both America and Russia, and is freed from the domination of the single party, the Communists, can save the Cuban Revolution. Armed with its own rank and file committees, workers and peasants organizations can still keep Cuba from sliding into state capitalist channels. When they get ready—and not when the CIA, with or without Kennedy's benediction, orders them "to revolt"—the Cuban people will know how to deal with Fidel Castro, Che Guevara, Blas Roca and their henchmen who are besmirching a glorious page in Latin American history, as well as with U. S. imperialism which is trying to turn back the pages of history. The working people of the world over, and especially so in the United States, will join this forward movement for total freedom.

This is the only road to peace.

—Raya Dunayevskaya

6697

Protests Report From The Gambia

Editor's Note: Raya Dunayevskaya, who is on tour as this issue goes to press, has received the following letter concerning an article which appeared in the November issue of News & Letters, entitled "A View from the Gambia." Because that article has stimulated considerable response from our readers (see also "Readers' Views" p. 4) we are printing this letter in full below.

"Dear Raya—I know that our policy in the paper is not to edit other people's writings, and particularly not when articles come from Africa, especially in view of your well-known position of sympathy for renaissance Africa. In my opinion, you, more than any other theoretician, have expounded and supported the great contribution made to the world struggle for freedom by the mass movement of self-mobilizing African Freedom Fighters.

"Nevertheless, can we allow two standards of analysis in the paper just because an article comes from Africa? I refer of course to . . . 'A View from the Gambia,' by W. D. Colley (N&L, Nov. 1962) . . .

WHITEWASH OF KHRUSHCHEV

"In this particular case I want to quote what you yourself wrote both in 'Two Worlds' (June-July '62) and in your 'Political Letter' of Aug. 1, 1962: Like the Tower of Pisa, neutralism has been found to lean heavily in one direction. Are we now to witness a transformation into opposite of the people's desire for world peace into nothing but a whitewash of one of the two world nuclear powers?"

"You go on to show that with his so-called World Congress of General Disarmament and Peace, held in Moscow last July, Khrushchev sucked in a number of organizations which, if they are not anti-Communist, certainly consider themselves non-Communist.

"As a matter of fact, you indicated that Khrushchev deliberately invited representatives from nominally non-Communist organizations so that he could point to them and claim that even those who don't believe in him as the world Communist leader nevertheless believe in him as the 'world peace leader.'

"Now it appears that Mr. Garba-Jahumpa of the Gambia, either cynically or naively, has allowed himself to be sucked into this horrible whitewash.

"If this whole sorry spectacle was so shocking in July, how much worse is it today for in the November issue of N&L in the aftermath of the Cuban crisis, and of China's attack on India?"

WHO IS MR. GARBA-JAHUMPA?

"With regard to Mr. Colley's article, as it relates to information on The Gambia, who exactly is Mr. Garba-Jahumpa, and what are his credentials for arrogating to himself the role of spokesman for the Gambian masses, or gaffly to the new government?"

"Mr. Colley identifies him as 'former Minister of Agriculture . . . and now General Secretary of the Gambia Democratic Congress Alliance.' If memory serves me, in your article, 'In The Gambia During Elections . . .' (published in AFRICA TODAY, July 1962) you reported that the People's Progressive Party emerged as the majority party with 18 seats, as a result of the first general election by universal suffrage held last May. You further reported that the previous ruling party, the United Party, emerged as the minority with 13 seats; and that the Democratic Congress Alliance, Mr. Garba-Jahumpa's party, could muster only enough votes to win just one seat.

Mr. Colley's article gives the impression that this spokesman for a tiny minority party is in fact the spokesman for all of The Gambia.

Mr. Garba-Jahumpa may protest that I don't understand the situation. I would demur, though most respectfully. But the issue is not whether I understand the situation in Africa, but whether he understands the world tyranny of Communist state-capitalism locked in mortal combat with that other tyrannical titan of state-capitalism, the United States.

MUCH TO LEARN FROM JAPANESE LEFT

"In this respect, the 'New Left' which has arisen in the Japanese movement, and which you quoted in the same 'Two Worlds' column I referred to before, expressed it best:

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

"The fear of nuclear weapons has obscured the understanding that war is rooted in the capitalist system; the simple wish for peace has become the dominant idea, taking the place of class struggle, revolution, socialism . . . This ideological armistice corresponded perfectly with the united front tactics of the Communists and their allies. It combined the jargon of the left with the tactics of rightwing opportunism . . . In the course of these events one striking characteristic of the official left leadership stood out clearly—contempt for the masses."

"It is not only the British anti-nuclear movement that has a great deal to learn from the split in the Japanese movement. The peace movement throughout the world has much to learn. As you wrote then: 'Only if it does so in time, will the 'depression or suppression of human reasoning' give way to a new flowering of thought which will not separate itself from action. Only through the unity of thought and actions can we hope to stay the hand of both nuclear powers. Otherwise, the Communist brainwashing presently suppresses human reasoning.'

"That is why I am compelled to protest the Gambia article which I believe falls into the Communist trap.—Yours, V. L. J. Granger."

December 1962

Author's Special Introduction to the New Italian Edition

EDITOR'S NOTE: We are naturally very proud to announce the new Italian edition of *Marxism and Freedom*. However, the publisher, La Nuova Italia in Florence, felt that a preface by Gaetano Arfe, co-editor of Rome's *Mondo Operaio* (Workers' World), was preferable (see excerpts, P. 8). We feel the special introduction that had been written by the author, Raya Duna-yevskaya, is of the greatest importance. I am therefore giving over my column space to print it in full.—Charles Denby

Italian history is filled with instances in which it antedated the future development of humanity. When other nations were still in the dark regions of the Middle Ages, Italian cities had already opened the epoch of the Renaissance. Frederick Engels, the lifelong collaborator of Karl Marx, found time in his address to the Italian Socialist Party to refer to Dante as "the first universal man of our modern era." Marx himself singled out the Florentine, Buonarrotti, as the one who extended the ideas of the French Revolution.

"The revolutionary movement which began in 1789 in Cerele Social, which, in the middle of its course, had as its chief representatives Leclere and Roux, and which was temporarily defeated with Babeuf's Conspiracy of the Equals brought forth the communist idea which Babeuf's friend, Buonarrotti, reintroduced into France after the Revolution of 1830."

REVOLT—AND FASCISM

At the beginning of the 20th century Italy, despite its late-ness in achieving national unity, leaped forward to a mass socialist movement which outstripped all other countries, with the sole exception of Germany. This is the more impressive when one considers that Germany was technologically the most advanced country while the Italian economy was the most retarded in Western Europe. Italian Socialism was further distinguished by the fact that its members were not only factory workers and intellectuals, but peasants and agricultural workers. For one brief moment in world history, in 1920, the whole center of the European revolutions shifted to Milan and Turin.

But, in its death agony, Italian capitalism won a respite by exuding fascism. World War II, however, gave the lie to the malicious slander that the Italian people had been brainwashed by fascism. The truth is the exact opposite. The very generation that was reared under fascism comprised the backbone of the Partisans. Nor did the Italian people allow the monarchy to cover its complicity with fascism simply by changing sides in the midst of war. After 20 years of fascist rule the Italian workers went straightaway to take destiny into their own hands. In Milan and Turin the workers occupied the factories, saved them from Nazi vandalism, and, reinforced by the Partisan brigades, tried to reorganize society on entirely new foundations. But the Communist Party policy which followed the Kremlin line ordered the committees to hand over their power to a "Popular Front Government."

ITALIANS KNOW COMMUNIST BETRAYAL

If the Italian workers mistake Communist totalitarianism for Marxist liberation, it is because the Communist Party is not in power in Italy and therefore the Italians do not know this party as the workers in Russia and the satellites know it—as their exploiter and oppressor. But the Italian people are not without experiences of their own, including the sight of the Communists voting with De Gasperi to incorporate in the republican constitution the Lateran pact made by Mussolini with the Vatican. The fully counter-revolutionary role of Russian Communism was first clearly seen in Western Europe when it brutally suppressed the Hungarian Revolution and its Workers' Councils. Thousands upon thousands of members of the Italian Communist Party tore up their membership cards.

No one is asked to put blinders on and fail to recognize that the Italian Communist Party, with a little less than two million members, is still the largest in Western Europe. Neither should one forget the fact that the social composition of the Italian CP has undergone a change, and that inevitably the deepest layers of the Italian workers will come into conflict with the Communist bureaucrats, topped by Togliatti and his cohorts. The polarizing forces which would attract the Italian workers away from the Communist stranglehold can be nothing short of a total philosophy in the full tradition of Marxist Humanism.

YOUTH, WORKERS POSE PHILOSOPHIC QUESTIONS

The totality of the world crisis compels the re-examination which guide man's practice. Two of the ways in which the maturity of our age helps this re-evaluation are the following: 1) the youth are searching intensely for a road out of a world they did not make; and 2) the working class is beginning to pose questions of great philosophic importance. In this respect the American workers, confronted with Automation in a way that Europe is not yet faced, have an important contribution to make. Automation, the ultimate in machine production which has dominated man has by now created mass unemployment as a permanent feature. Thereby it has raised the relationship of the employed to the unemployed to alienated labor. Specifically, the American workers are grappling with the following questions: What kind of labor should man perform? Why should science be allowed to do all our thinking for us when it cannot put a man to work, although it can send him up to the moon? Can't the division between mental and manual labor be abolished?

The intellectuals cannot forever remain insensitive to these impulses from below which go to make up a veritable movement from practice to theory.

MARXISM SHEDS LIGHT ON CRISIS

We live in "a birth-time of history and a period of transition" such as characterized the age in which Marx lived. Only ours is of truly world-wide scope where not only Western Civilization but that of the Orient and the people of Africa are blazing forth a new trail to freedom. Our epoch has been correctly designated

as the age of the struggle for the minds of men. Intellectuals are there upon called to perform tasks far removed from any ivory tower. Marxists and non-Marxists alike have much to learn from Marx who, when asked why he had broken with bourgeois society, replied that to become a radical meant to grasp a thing at its root, and "The root of mankind is man."

Our life and times have opened up so many frontiers of scientific knowledge that we often forget that simple truth. Out of splitting of the atom came not the greatest source of energy for mankind, but the most destructive weapon. Since the Sputnik statements from the rulers of Russia as well as America stress not so much the conquest of outer space as the fact that the forces which lift these man-made satellites—ICBMs—can lift H-bombs across all frontiers. Far from doing away with the barbarism of capitalism, private or state, science has brought humanity to the edge of the abyss. As the eminent bourgeois scientist, Dr. William Pickering, put it: No matter whose ICBM drops the first H-bomb, civilization itself is within "one half hour away from total annihilation."

The young Marx foresaw the impasse that science in a class society would reach. He wrote: "To have one basis for society, and another for science, is a priori a lie." For Marxist and non-Marxist alike, isn't it time to learn the methodology of one who foresaw so clearly the development of our crisis-ridden world?

MAN, NOT MACHINES, IS BASIS FOR FREEDOM

Surely when the destiny of civilization—not just in a rhetorical sense, but physically—is at stake, it is high time to end the illusion that machines, not men, will bring mankind its freedom.

The genuine Italian Marxist can learn much both from Marx who fought the vulgar Communists of his day, and from Lenin who fought what he called the new Communist "passion for bossing." This founder of the Soviet state was also its severest critic. Inventing new words, such as "communelles" (Communist lies) with which to express his criticisms. Without avail he warned that "History proceeds in devious ways," and that the Communists must listen to the "simple class truth of the class enemy" when it writes that the Soviet Government "has taken the road that will lead it to the ordinary bourgeois state." (See Lenin's Political Report to the Eleventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party, March 27, 1922.)

Just as Marx had to fight the vulgar Communists who thought all ills of capitalism would be overcome with the abolition of private property, we must not fall into the trap of mistaking Communism's "anti-capitalism" for any-other than what it is—the full logical development of capitalism itself into state capitalism. Marx's point was that so long as machine is master of man, not man of machine, you will have capitalism, no matter what name you call it. To get rid of the perverse relations under capitalism one must rid society of what is most degrading of all, and the cause of all other ills, the alienation of labor itself. At the root of alienation is the division between mental and manual labor which has characterized all class societies and reached its most monstrous form under capitalism. Where the laborer himself is transformed into an appendage to a machine: all our senses are dulled. Only an entirely new, truly human society, wrote Marx "creates the rich and profoundly sensitive men." Because Marx made the human being the subject of all development, he saw the emerging new society.

Jan, 1963 (cont'd)
6699

(Cont'd)

Each generation must meet the challenge of its own times. Lenin was adamant on one point: the masses, not only as action but as reason would create a new society on totally new foundations. Either that, that is to say, either the population to a man (Lenin's phrase) runs production and the state or you get a "return backwards to capitalism."

THEORY MUST MATCH GRANDEUR OF PRACTICE

In our age of absolutes, when revolution and counter-revolution, are so interlocked, it is not only the intellectual "in general" who must leave his ivory towers; so must the Marxist theoretician. The ceaseless repetition for the need of a vanguard party "to lead" has blinded him to the fact to which the mass of people are not blind—that everyone is ready to lead them; nobody to listen to them. Yet the movement from practice during the past three decades has been ceaseless while the move from theory has been at a near standstill. What is there, in present-day theory, which matches the grandeur of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution?

Each generation either meets the challenge of the times, or fades into oblivion. No one however, can have the illusion that our epoch marks the type of turning point in history where history fails to turn. On the contrary. This author feels that the Italian people, inheritors of its own rich traditions of cultural humanism and mass movements of liberation have a great contribution to make to the creation of a new Humanism which is founded on the Marxist theory of liberation that "the freedom of the individual is the basis of the freedom of all."

MARXISM AND FREEDOM is a theoretical contribution toward that end. It has a three-fold purpose: 1) to reestablish the Humanism of Marxism as it developed in the period of the class struggles during Marx's maturity, 1843-83; 2) to get to the roots of the philosophic foundations of that great divide in Marxism-Leninism, especially on the so-called vanguard party to the masses in the period of 1903-1923; and 3) to analyze the problems of our own age. While this part, of necessity, centers in Russia and America—the two poles of state capitalism contending for world domination—the two worlds of capitalists and workers in each country is such that it has an application also to Italy.

April, 1959

—Raya Dunayevskaya

January 1963

6700

THE NEW AXIS



Two Worlds

The New Franco-German Axis

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Author of
MARXISM AND FREEDOM

The pathetic part of the American press's criticisms of De Gaulle is the control it exercises over itself. De Gaulle the invincible is, after all, a creature it invented when, in the post-war years, it transformed the junior general whom Roosevelt had spurned during World War II, into the hero who "had saved France from Communism" in 1944-45 and from "chaos" in 1958. Of necessity, therefore, the underlying motif even of the strongest criticism is: "Keep cool with Kennedy." As for Kennedy, he is "keeping cool" by privately searching for ways to undermine De Gaulle, and publicly saying that De Gaulle couldn't possibly mean what he loudly says he means since his defiance is, in fact, based on "reliance on U.S. nuclear power to deter Russia." Allegedly, it is because De Gaulle "takes United States power for granted" that he allows himself the glory stance.

DE GAULLE'S IMPERIAL PRONUNCIAMENTO

A few hours prior to President Kennedy's appearance before a joint session of Congress, where he was to deliver the State of the Union address, integral to which was his concept of the "Atlantic Community," De Gaulle summoned a press conference. It was Jan. 14, the eve of the signing of a Franco-German Treaty that would "guarantee" mutual consultations on everything from language courses in elementary schools to military defense.

The press conference that was so meticulously timed to precede both Kennedy's appearance before Congress and Adenauer's appearance in Paris heard the cultured Fuehrer—the face was as cynical as that of Hitler, but his French was impeccable (1)—present himself as an alternate, a superior, leader of Western Civilization. Not only had De Gaulle unilaterally excluded Britain from the Common Market, but from Europe itself. These imperial actions were, in turn, subordinated to what was of world importance: De Gaulle's Europe, not Kennedy's "Atlantic Community," was to become the centre of the universe.

De Gaulle allowed that Britain may earn membership in Europe "in 50 years," provided that she has, in the meantime, broken from her "dependence" on the U.S. and recognized the "primacy" of France. By then, said the man who condescended to admit that he is not immortal, "I will without doubt no longer be here."

(Continued on Page 5)

(1) This is the man who, at the end of the war, demanded the "internationalization" of the Ruhr and the Rhineland!

March 1963

God rested on the seventh day; De Gaulle will not until he is dead. Will he even then? Unless he is sure of living until the ripe age of 122, he can only mean either that he is a prophet, or that he is confident that the totalitarian institution he calls a parliament "above parties" would carry out his line until glory comes. And De Gaulle's concept of glory envisions not only that "insular, maritime Britain" becomes subordinate to France's Europe, but also that the United States be considered beyond the pale.

Far from De Gaulle acting as he does only because he can depend upon the U.S. for nuclear protection, he is acting as he does because he thinks that nuclear protection is very nearly worthless because of the nearly equal might of Russia. Moreover, De Gaulle thinks he can win over Russia—and from "the yellow peril" at that! As he expressed it in 1959: "No doubt Soviet Russia . . . recognizes that nothing can change the fact that she, Russia—a white European nation . . . is face to face with the yellow masses of China . . . casting their eyes about them on the open spaces over which they must one day spread."

If this is madness, as it is, it is not, however, the madness of an individual egomaniac. It is the madness of the state-capitalist age that has exuded a Mussolini and a Hitler and failed. De Gaulle is ready now to embark on equally fantastic misadventures.

To understand De Gaulle, we need neither "psychology" nor "dependence" on Kennedy and the American bourgeois press. What is essential is that we turn back the pages of history to the Depression in the year after the rise of Hitler, and the attempt of French fascists to take over France.

TWO TURNING POINTS IN FRENCH HISTORY: 1934-36; 1946-48

On Feb. 6, 1934, the fascists in France attempted to overthrow the government and themselves take power. The riots to that end found the established government, as usual, powerless. But the proletariat rose up spontaneously against the fascists, battled them on the streets and, within six days, came out on general strike, putting an end to the fascist pretensions. The proletarian victory was followed up, in 1935, by the formation of a popular front and general elections in which the Socialists, for the first time, won a clear majority. Even then the proletariat did not let power slip from its hands but followed up the parliamentary victory and ascension of Leon Blum to the Premiership with SIT-DOWNS which covered the whole of France. The following legislation was quickly enacted: the 40 hour week, rise in wages, vacations with pay.

What was the French military brass, including its not-so-junior officers, doing during these three critical years? We have the revealing French pundit's book (*The Grave Diggers of France*, by Pertinax), written to expose the rottenness of the French general staff, and to play up the junior General de Gaulle as the head of a free France. When the foundations for French fascism were openly being laid in 1934, but were met by "a veritable popular revolution," Petain, states the January 1935 diary of Pertinax, "was cut to the heart by the fear of social upheaval which in so many a conservative had silenced every feeling of patriotism." (p.423) Petain was for Laval, and Laval, ever since 1935, was for a Franco-German rapprochement. And what was General Charles de Gaulle doing? He was arguing with the General Staff, but it was not about any opposition to native fascism. The French general was arguing as a military man who considered the "defensive doctrine" futile, and wanted to mechanize the French Army.

When World War II broke out in 1939 De Gaulle felt himself vindicated, as if tanks would have won the war! The truth is that he was part and parcel of the bourgeois army and bourgeois class which was undermining the French Republic ever since 1934.

Again Petain thought France needed Laval, and Laval thought France needed Hitler! Petain came to power in France to make it an adjunct of Nazi Germany.

The Allies paid little attention to De Gaulle until the proletariat in France organized an underground. The Allies then recognized him as the French government in exile—in order to make sure to foist him on the National Resistance as "its leader." The fact that the Communists were willing, upon instruction of Stalin who feared independent proletarian rule, to use their prestige as Resistance fighters toward the same end, assured De Gaulle the presidency of the provisional government after liberation. Without them, in 1944, he would have been as powerless as he was in 1958 without the OAS.

(Cont'd) 6701

(Cont'd)

This was not because he didn't try to establish his own type of fascist party. He founded the "Rally of the French People," but, as in 1934 the French proletariat would have none of the Croix de Feu, so it would have none of the Rassemblement in 1947. (When I was in Paris in 1947 I had occasion to experience that the Rassemblement, which was supposed to be "above parties," was not above fascist anti-Semitism.) The strikes of 1947 and 1948, especially the latter, were independent as well of the Communists.

THE NEW IMPERIALISM

The imperialism of state-capitalism is the key to the understanding of the present stage of imperialism all over the world. It is the capitalism which extended its imperialistic domination from the technologically backward lands to the most advanced, as Hitler had done in his blitzkrieg of Europe. It is the imperialism which refuses to abide "by the facts," that two, and only two, big Powers remained standing at the end of World War II in place of the several big powers which had divided the world among themselves previously. It would rather pretend to act as buffer between them, not by being a buffer, but by belonging. De Gaulle is asking Europe to belong to him, or to the new Franco-German axis, not merely because of glory hunting or prestige politics, but because of hard economics.

Now that De Gaulle's France has automated its industries, centralized its capital, and, through a Common Market, rather than by a blitzkrieg, accomplished the same for part of Europe, De Gaulle dreams much more fantastic dreams than Hitler ever did, not because he belongs to the 19th century and dreams of past glories, but because he is of today and dreams of future conquests. Without Hitler's armed might and his "secret weapon," indeed disdaining the nuclear might of the United States because

it has been brought to a standstill by the equal nuclear power of Russia, De Gaulle has, by sheer daring (Mao has a much gall when he challenges Russia) laid down his gauntlet and demanded that Kennedy, not Macmillan or even "continental Europe," but Kennedy's USA—pick it up.

His only concern now is that rebuilt Europe still lacks nuclear power. This is the Achilles heel of De Gaulle's hard economics underlying the Common Market, and hard politics underlying the new Bonn-Paris axis. Let's see whether, in recognizing this vulnerable point (through which Kennedy hopes to regain dominance of Europe), De Gaulle has become vulnerable, not in the heel, but in the head.

"Touched in the head," or otherwise, De Gaulle, as we see, has found the vulnerable point in both the Anglo-American axis and "the Warsaw powers," including the Sino-Soviet orbit. All the outcry in Europe against one-man domination has been words. Just words.

Whether it is De Gaulle's intellectual chauvinism or France's central geographic position which has led him to play for the very highest stakes—forcing Kennedy (or Khrushchev) to play power politics according to the tune he, De Gaulle, calls, does not matter. What does matter is that he has, with the Treaty with Adenauer, created a new, a powerful, a frightening axis in Europe. Frightening because despite the dissimilarities of our "prosperous" times against the depression of the 1930's, despite the dissimilarities of the personalities of Hitler and De Gaulle, despite the dissimilarities between the Nazi terror and the French democracy, there is more than merely a reminiscent analogy between the present axis and Hitler's.

SHADES OF HITLER, OR STATE-CAPITALIST MADNESS

The underlying similarity between the opposite personalities of the living De Gaulle and the dead Hitler stems from the economic compulsion of the imperialism of state-capitalism. Ever since the Depression sealed the fate of competitive capitalism, capitalism has tried to hold on to its power through some form of the State Plan. Rich countries like the U.S. could hold on through a comparatively mild admixture like the New Deal; defeated (from World War I) and impoverished countries like Germany did not stop short of fascism. Fascism's search for "lobensraum" was an expression of the impotence of capitalism; even with totalitarian methods it could not hold on to power unless it "expanded" its foundations.

Only by not being confined to Germany, only by centralization of European capital, could the "master race" hope to challenge the United States' world position. Hitler would have liked to have created a German-British axis before undertaking the task of world destruction. He almost succeeded at Munich. When that failed, he went it alone, never fooling himself that Vichy France was a substitute for the greater power of England.

(The outcry that one cannot use the term fascism except to describe a petty-bourgeois mass party à la Nazism forget (1) that Mussolini's fascist corporate state was not quite the same as the Nazism of Germany; (2) that by no accident fascism at first called itself National Socialism. It was only after it had total power that it showed its true visage of centralization of European capital and the horrors of the concentration camps; and (3) that once Nazism was defeated, it would surely not reappear in the same form, especially when the capitalist crisis today comes, not from a depression, but from a prosperous state-capitalism hungering for single world domination. The truth is that fascism was no sooner defeated than the United States found that before it could "claim" Europe, it would have to rebuild it, and it would have to be done on an all-European scale. Hence the Marshall Plan.)

De Gaulle is a man with an elephantine memory, which goes back not merely to the France of Louis XIV, and of Napoleon, when French culture held sway throughout Europe, but to the beginnings of civilization. To him France is not "just" France, not even "just Europe;" she is the finest European flower of Græco-Roman culture, that is to say, of all of Western Civilization (and was there ever any other that wasn't absorbed by it, including Egyptology?).

Yes, De Gaulle remembers everything. But he has learned nothing, nothing at all from the fall of empires in general, and class societies in particular. He is blinded by his culture, his state, his military caste, his class. He fails to recognize the decay of capitalism, the disintegration of all class civilizations, from the fall of the Roman Empire to the collapse of France in 1940. His class may let him get away with it in Europe and even, perhaps, in the United States. Surely there is a group of apologists, from both "left" and right, that stands ready to expound his "cause" and to show that he not only "has a point" (Europe has a right to "independence from American domination") but he also "has a value" (his "little bomb" should not be dismissed.)

WHICH WAY OUT?

What they all too easily forget is that neither De Gaulle-Adenauer, nor Kennedy-Macmillan, nor Khrushchev-Mao found a way out of the capitalistic kind of chaotic production and perennial wars which have brought us to the razor's edge of mankind's extinction. Automated production remains value production, brought to an extreme by the fact that the violent and incessant technological revolutions are constantly throwing out the only surplus-value creating substance; living-labor.

Because the terror is rooted in the relations of production and the need to control the working class, only the working class can destroy it, at its root. De Gaulle may have found the weak point in his own class, but he has never yet found he can hold power when the working class en masse turns against him, as they have done in the past turning-points in history, which did away with outright fascist pretensions in 1934-35 and De Gaulle's ones in 1947-48. It will do so again. No one else can.

6702

March 1963

MARXIST-HUMANISM: African, American Why Not a New International?

(In order to open a discussion between African and American socialists on ideas and realities with a view to establishing new organizational relationships as well, I reprint substantial excerpts from an article written especially for PRESENCE AFRICAINE.—RD)

One thing African and American Marxist-Humanists share in common: the indigeneness of its roots are questioned by "all others."

The African Revolutions, having written the most exciting page in post-World War II history, have given African socialism an advantage over the American, in deed and in the recognition of its philosophy. Independence has made the views of African spokesmen for socialism "official." In capitalist America, on the other hand, Marxism—not only in its Communist transformation, but in its original form which Marx called "a thoroughgoing Naturalism or Humanism"—is treated as a "foreign doctrine."

The question mark over the relationship of African socialism to Marxist Humanism relates, not as it does in America, to the fact that it is hard to hear the voice of the second America over the atomic din of the established authorities. Rather, the question arises over the contradictory statement of African socialists themselves. I do not mean that the voice of American socialism is one voice. Far, very far from it. But here the differences are shouted, emphasized, over-emphasized, while in Africa the contradictory statements are made with the same breath as the affirmations of Pan-Africanism and a unity which is supposed to exist although there are now two blocs among the independent countries. Though as sharply divided as, say, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe and the Nigerian Youth Congress in Nigeria, or as between Ghana and Nigeria, or Senegal and Guinea, or Mali and Togo—nevertheless all insist they are for Pan-African socialism. Unfortunately, this only means that Pan-Africanism, far from illuminating what African socialism is, helps to confuse friends more than enemies...

WORLD PHILOSOPHY VS. RULING IDEOLOGY

In two respects I agree with Professor Pierre Alexandre's article on "Marxism and the African Cultural Traditions" (SURVEY, August, 1962): (1) that there "are some points of resemblance, not so much between classical Marxism and traditional cosmologies as between the modern African interpretations of remnants of such cosmologies and Marxism as reinterpreted by Africans." And (2) that it is not altogether unlikely that the Africans would succeed in achieving a new synthesis of idealism and materialism "africanising them into an original whole." Where I disagree is that there is any advantage, absolute or relative, in having met Marx and Mao at the same time and gotten to know Russia long after the Russian Revolution achieved the first workers' state in history. Even if Africans do not believe, with me, that Russia has by now been transformed into its total opposite—a state-capitalist society—the fact still remains that Soviet Russia and the Chinese Republic are world powers rather than world philosophies, and ruling ideologies is not what Marx had in mind when he first elaborated his Humanist philosophy. This is precisely what he warned against when he wrote: "We should especially avoid re-establishing society, as an abstraction, opposed to the individual. The individual is the social entity... Communism is the necessary form and the energizing principle of the immediate future. But Communism as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society."

The point of affinity between African and American Marxist Humanism is the present as it relates to the future—the world developments, the unfinished revolutions to be brought to a conclusion on an international scale. It is for this reason I traveled to Africa, and not only to hear in person the views of the leaders, but to get to know the thoughts of the man on the street, and in the bush, at this critical juncture of history.

Let us first turn to the views of the leaders of three representative trends of Pan-Africanism; Nigerian, Senegalese, and Guinean. When I interviewed Dr. Azikiwe, he said:

"I cannot divorce theory from practice. What philosophy we have has not been systematized in such a way as to make it appreciated outside our shores. Let me give you the basis. Our way of life is tied with land tenure. Here it is communal—the implication is that every person has a stake in the land. He cannot sell it but his sons are heirs. It belongs to them. You don't

own it as individuals in the sense that you can sell it for profit and it became communalistic. They hold the land in common. Thus we have no landless peasantry... and there is no permanent laboring class, although this is becoming so. Since there is no landless peasantry, nor a permanent wage earning class, Marxian socialism doesn't apply to us; African, Nigerian socialism does. No doubt the theory should be systematized, but it has not yet been done.

"Welfare state, our own brand of socialism, is not Communism or Marxism or Fabian guild, but something to suit our way of life. To this we will stick. Welfare state is rooted fundamentally in socialist beliefs. Most of our people believe in free enterprise but not that it should mean profit at all costs."

YOUTH AND WORKERS SEE DIFFERENT SOCIALISM

The complaint of the opposition was that it, unfortunately, did mean profit at all costs. A mass rally I attended in Lagos held by the Youth Congress and the Trade Unions opposed the austerity budget demanded by the Development Plan.

Very obviously, there was a difference between the conception of African socialism between those in the office and those on the outside. The same was true in Senegal, and, of course, there were differences between the Casablanca and Monrovia blocs. But when I asked President Senghor about it, he replied: "The difference is not serious. What is serious is the division between the United States and the Soviet Union..."

"The program of the 22nd Russian Communist Party Congress is like that of the United States—completely materialistic—a civilization of frigidaires and TV.

"You have Communism, you have American free enterprise; and you have the plan in Western Europe.

"Each ideology has a truth, but only in part. Where is the ideology which is not all materialistic, which permits room for the spiritual? That is our ideology. I think I should say in all justice that we use the socialist method..."

"Negritude isn't pure resurrection. It is a modern adaptation of African history and culture. We take the technique of Europe in order to permit the creation of a new civilization for the Africa of the 20th century.

"In Marxism there is determination, scientific and discursive reason, and humanism. The revolution is scientific and it is philosophic. Einstein is 20th century, but so is the artist 20th century. The 20th century culture is more than scientific. Communism is not the whole truth. It is abstract and scientific. In this, capitalism resembles Communism.

"The culture which today finds a method for Black Africa where we can take science from Communism and capitalism; and, from Africa, poetry and spirituality, is the culture we need. We want a culture that is African, the conclusions of the PHENOMENOLOGY of Teilhard de Chardin."

HUMANISM: ABSTRACT AND CONCRETE

To this writer, the trouble with President Senghor's humanism is that it is general and abstract where it should be concrete and specific. The fundamental difference between Senegalese socialism and that envisaged by Marx does not reside in the difference between "spiritualism" and "materialism" but that between theory and practice. To me the tragedy of the African Revolutions appears to stem from the fact that its leaders are so weighted down by the consciousness of the backwardness of the technology, the need to industrialize, and rapidly, that they turn for aid almost exclusively to the powers-that-be in the technologically advanced countries, instead of the proletariat in those lands. Let me make it clear at once that I am not opposed in the least to any African country accepting aid from any source whatever, be that De Gaulle France, Kennedy's America or Khrushchev's Russia. Western imperialism has plundered Africa for centuries, plundered it both of its manpower and its natural resources. It is high time for at least some of this African wealth to return to the country of its real origin. This, however, is not the point at issue for socialists.

The point at issue is the relationship, first of all, to one's own people, the very ones who made independence possible; secondly, to the underlying philosophy of freedom, which is not to be degraded to a changing tactic dependent on the relationship of forces with the enemy; and, thirdly, and, above all, to the world proletariat, which is equally desirous with the African to

(over 66)
April 1963 6703

(cont'd)

put an end to the crisis-ridden, capitalistic world that is presently hell-bent for nuclear destruction.

A "NO" HEARD 'ROUND THE WORLD

Of all the African socialists, Sekou Toure is the one who appeals most both to the left in Africa and in the United States because of the historic sweep of his deeds and the passion of his views. His little country's "No" to the mighty (but not almighty) De Gaulle France had electrified the world both with its daring and its challenging philosophy . . .

The confidence in the African masses—"all peoples are capable at any time of administering themselves and of developing their personality. There are no minor peoples, except under slavery or foreign oppression"—had the sweep of Lenin on the eve of the Russian Revolution when he maintained that "only from below" can the revolution become invincible. But, in the "re-discovery of its African personality", in contrast to the discovery of the genius of the Russian proletariat as "merely" the beginning of the international revolution, this great African leader excludes all "foreign" ideologies, of proletarian, socialist, or of oppressor: "Africa cannot agree, to the detriment of respect for her personality, her civilization and her proper structure, to become an organic structure of any system of states or ideologies whatsoever." As if Marxism were not the unity of theory and practice, he maintains that "philosophy does not interest us. We have concrete needs."

A NEW INTERNATIONAL

What Guinea accomplished with its daring "No" to De Gaulle France was to re-establish the human factor as decisive. This, this and nothing else, was new in action and new in thought. This, this and nothing else, was the humanism of Marxism, translated in our epoch first in the Hungarian Revolution, then in the Afro-Asian-Latin American worlds, and finally among the Negro American. This, this and nothing else, is what makes the politically "backward" American worker who has no mass labor party so militant in battling automation at the point of production itself. The American worker who wildcats, who demands human, not automatized, production relations, is ready for that same new dimension which is of the essence the world over if we are to avoid the nuclear holocaust threatening mankind's extinction . . .

Despite the Russian Communist attack on Hegel's mysticism, that mystic, under the impact of the French Revolution, anticipated the concrete reality of today when he wrote: "The self-determination in which alone the Idea is, is to hear itself speak."

Speak, then, independent Africa, untainted by two world power blocs fighting for world domination. You have gained your political self-determination, are struggling for economic independence, and are free to express also the self-determination of the Idea because the accumulated thought of centuries has been fulfilled by the elemental creativity of the masses, the revolutions of today. Even as the reach for freedom on the part of the Hungarian revolutionaries has made them—who had been raised on Marxian theory only to be betrayed by its usurpers—the theoretical Marxist-Humanists, so the plunge into freedom has made the African revolutionaries the activist Marxist-Humanists. The Marxist-Humanists of other lands are ready to listen, and with your help, establish a new international, free from state control, and aspiring to reconstruct the world.

April 1963

6704

May, 1963

AMERICAN CIVILIZATION ON TRIAL. Negro as Touchstone of History. Statement of the National Editorial Board, NEWS & LETTERS, 8751 Grand River, Detroit 4, Mich. 50c.

Freedom Occupies Consciousness

Two very opposite events, which reverberated around the world, first in 1957, and again in 1962, were held in unison in men's consciousness. In 1957, Sputnik No. 1 and Little Rock were the main headlines; in 1962, James Meredith's courageous attempt to enter the University of Mississippi took the lustre out of the spectacular six orbital flight of Astronaut Walter Schirra. An age in which "a little thing," like school desegregation, can hold in tow such scientific milestones is an age in which men's consciousness is preoccupied, not with science, but with human freedom.

Throughout history, all great turning points were characterized by "the progress in the consciousness of freedom." Under the impact of the great French Revolution, the German genius, G. W. F. Hegel, gave the most profound expression to the unity in the development of freedom and of thought. "Only that which is an object of freedom," he wrote, "can be called an idea." It is from such a Hegelian-Marxian point of view that the analysis of United States history is made in the above pamphlet, entitled American Civilization on Trial.

A brief review, such as this must be, cannot do justice to a study of 200 years of the contradictory development of the United States which has, moreover, been written so concisely as to fit into 36 pages. I shall limit myself therefore, to two aspects only: (1) the radical departure of this study from previous ones, both bourgeois and radical, and (2) the relationship of theory to practice as activity, and to practice as organizational form of a unifying philosophy.

A RADICAL DEPARTURE

Hitherto Negro struggles for freedom, where dealt with in histories at all, have been separated from the mainstream of American development. The present study, on the contrary, makes the Negro himself "the touchstone of history":

"Because slavery had stained American civilization as it wrenched freedom from Great Britain, the Negro could give the lie to its democracy. At first he was alone in so doing. But with the birth of Abolitionism, and for three stormy decades thereafter, American civilization was placed on trial by whites as well who focused on the antagonism between the ideal of freedom and the reality of slavery. The Negro became the touchstone of this class-ridden, color conscious, defaced civilization which had an ever-expanding frontier but no unifying philosophy."

This is not only a matter of setting the record straight. Negro historians have striven mightily, and in many cases successfully, in recording the accomplishments of the Negro. The true writing of Negro history, quintessential as that is, is not yet the true writing of American and world history unless (1) there is a dialectical grasp of the relationship of minority and labor struggles, and (2) the movement of history is seen, not so much as a progression of great men, as a progression of great masses of men. Where old radicals tried to do this, they detailed the oppression without seeing the creativity of the masses. American Civilization on Trial shows these as the subject, not the object, of historical development. We can gain a glance at these proper subjects of history, that is to say, its molders, by viewing the contents page of this pamphlet:

INTRODUCTION
 1—Of Patriots, Scoundrels and Slave Masters
 2—Compelling Issues at Stake

PART I—FROM THE FIRST THROUGH THE SECOND AMERICAN REVOLUTION
 1—Abolitionism. First Phase: From "Moral Suasion" to Harper's Ferry
 2—Abolitionism. Second Phase: The Unfinished Revolution

PART II—THE STILL UNFINISHED REVOLUTION
 1—Northern Labor Struggles to Break Capital's Stranglehold, 1837-97
 2—One and a Half Million Forgotten Negro Populists
 3—Populism and Intellectual Ferment

PART III—IMPERIALISM AND RACISM
 1—Rise of Monopoly Capital
 2—Racism and Plunge into Imperialism
 3—A New Awakening of Labor: the I.W.W.

PART IV—NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM
 1—The Negro Moves North
 2—Garveyism
 3—Marxism

PART V—FROM THE DEPRESSION THROUGH WORLD WAR II
 1—The CIO Changes the Face of the Nation and Makes a Break in Negro "Nationalism"
 2—March on Washington
 3—The Communists Oppose Independent Negro Movements

PART VI—THE NEGRO AS THE TOUCHSTONE OF HISTORY
 1—Urbanization of Negroes
 2—The Two-Way Road to African Revolutions

PART VII—FACING THE CHALLENGE, 1943-1963
 1—The Self-Determination of People and of Ideas
 2—The New Voices We Heard
 3—What We Stand For and Who We Are

THE "PSYCHOLOGY" OF JIM CROWISM
 Being the proper subject of history has nothing, of course, to do with the subjectivism of the psychological approach to Jim Crowism which points to the prejudices of white workers as "proof" that Jim Crowism is something apart from the class relationship between workers and capitalists. What these modern-day "analysts" forget is this: just as the "stigma" of slavery could not have persisted so long if its economic remains in cotton culture and share cropping had not been the natural consequence of the unfinished state of the Second American Revolution, so the psychology of Jim Crowism would not have persisted if it had not been re-introduced by the development of Northern industrialism into monopoly capitalism. The latter needed Southern racism for its plunge into imperialism even as it needed imperialism for its violent struggles against white labor's challenge to its exploitative rule. As we phrase it in the pamphlet:
 "The 'psychology of Jim Crowism' is itself the result, not the cause, of monopoly capital extending its tentacles into the Caribbean and the Pacific as it became transformed into imperialism, with the Spanish-American War.

THOUGHT AND PRACTICE AND THE FOUNDING OF NEWS & LETTERS
 A new form of mass revolt emerged during World War II. In Europe we witnessed the growth of the Resistance movements, and in the United States there was an outburst, in 1943, both of the first miners' strike and the first Negro demonstrations to take place right in the midst of a world war. The struggles in the United States nailed down the lie of workers' rights and full democracy propagated not only by the ruling class, but by the Communists, who, with the Nazi invasion of Russia, had become the most rabid "American patriots." They approved the no-strike pledge to chain workers to the war machine. They opposed any independent movement of Negroes for their democratic rights.

(cont'd) 6705

(world)

Witness the cynicism of The Daily Worker which wrote: "Hitler is the main enemy and the foes of Negro rights in this country should be considered as secondary." The Negroes had no need of the later vicious McCarthy type of anti-Communism; they knew the true nature of Communism and fought against it a full decade ahead of McCarthy's discovery for his own reactionary needs.

The period of new revolts which was initiated in 1943 was the period also of a great clarification of thought. Some of us who were later to found NEWS & LETTERS had developed the

following theoretical analyses: (1) Russia, which had long since stopped being a workers' state, had, with the outbreak of World War II, become a fully state-capitalist society which would challenge its present Allies for world domination. (2) By seeing this new stage of capitalist development--state-capitalism--as a world development, and relating it to new forms of mass revolt, we put ourselves on the alert both to the Middle East, Afro-Asian, Latin American revolutions against Western imperialism, and such phenomenal developments as the first revolt (East Germany, 1953) against Russian totalitarianism. (3) At the same time, by listening closely to the spontaneous remarks of miners in their struggle against the first appearance of Automation in 1950, as well as the continuous struggles of the Negroes, we were led to the discovery of the American and Humanist roots of Marxian philosophy, and therefore to the break with all old radicals.

These three preparatory stages permitted the founding of NEWS & LETTERS as the only paper edited by a production worker (who happened also to be a Negro) in a way in which it became a forum for the rank and file and was, simultaneously, the manifestation of a unique combination of workers and intellectuals. This led to the formation of NEWS & LETTERS Committees and the publication of such diverse books and pamphlets as Marxism and Freedom . . . from 1776 until today, and Workers Battle Automation; Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions, and Freedom Riders Speak For Themselves.

The latest pamphlet to come off the press, American Civilization on Trial, does not present itself as a "finished work," but as a living document that cannot be finished until the very foundations of the society it criticizes are uprooted and, in its place, there emerges a classless society on human foundations.

1943 to 1963 indeed comprise the most crucial decades of the 20th century. A new world has arisen in the economically underdeveloped countries, especially on the African continent. A great revolution on the European continent--in Hungary, 1956--so undermined Russian totalitarianism that even its successful bloody counter-revolution has not returned the Russian orbit to its status quo ante. Quite the contrary, the Sino-Soviet conflict first began in earnest. China too has been forced, by the blooming of the "100 Flowers,"* to see the first beginnings of the end of its monolithism.

In the United States, in this centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation, we witness a new stage of Negro struggles within the South itself which will not stop short of Freedom NOW.

All these objective events are reasons enough why, when we do talk of our own activities, whether as part of the rank and file worker's movement, or as participants in the Negro struggles, we present our analysis of American Civilization on Trial, not as a "finished work," but as a contribution to a dialogue with other Freedom Fighters. We ask all to participate with us in developing this dialogue on WHAT TO DO NOW as a dialogue which would refuse to separate theory from practice, and practice from theory, for only in their unity "can all man's innate talents first develop and gain a new dimension that puts an end once and for all to his pre-history in class societies."

*For an analysis of the voices of revolt in China see NEWS & LETTERS, Jan., 1962, special supplement on MAO-TSE TUNG.

May 1963

De-Stalinization — Ten Years After East German and Vorkuta Revolts

June 17 to July 17, 1953, the month of never-before-heard-of revolts against Communist totalitarianism, first in East Germany, then in the forced labor camps of Russia itself, shook Russian Communism to its foundations. All one has to do, to see that this is no exaggeration, is to look, on the one hand, at the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, and, on the other hand, at The Wall which the East German Government felt compelled to erect in 1961, eight years after the East German Revolt was crushed by Russian tanks.

Contrary to what both the East and the West have been writing, de-Stalinization began, not by Khrushchev in 1956, but by the East German workers in 1953, three and a half short months after Stalin's death. It is they who put an end to the myth of the invincibility of Russian Communism. It is they who raised the daring challenge and they who laid the foundations of revolutions to come. In a word, the revolt against Stalin came, not from the top, amongst Stalin's fighting heirs, but from below, among the enslaved millions of Stalin's empire, so zealously guarded by that "Collective Leadership," after de-Stalinization, as before.

President Kennedy's current visit to the Berlin Wall, no more than Eisenhower's condolences to Stalin's heirs, can stop this forward movement against capitalism, state or private. It is for this reason that we reprint what we wrote in 1953 during the Beria purge. For, contrary to all the pundits at the time, we not only did not bet on Malenkov, but pointed to Khrushchev as "a man to watch," and, above all, concentrated on the Russian workers: "All the pie in the sky, hydrogen bombs included," we wrote then, "will not thrust them back into their isolation now that the East German workers have revolted against these rulers and overnight filled the air with the stuff that makes dreams a reality."

September, 1953—The Beria Purge

THIEVES FALL OUT

"Today the ruling bureaucracy is not the integrated whole it was in 1938. It is split all ways between Zhdanov men, Malenkov men, Beria men, and—not to be forgotten although little known at present—Khrushchev men. Anyone who, like Nikita S. Khrushchev, has been boss over rebellious Ukraine, comes into Moscow as late as 1950, and by 1953 is in a position to have Malenkov "ask to be relieved" of the post of General Secretary of the omnipresent Communist Party, and himself steps into that post, is a man to be watched . . .

"Ever since the expulsion of Trotsky, Stalin has held undisputed power. Ever since 1938 he was so confident of his might and his politics that he knew he could mobilize for war, although he had executed the entire military staff. Hitler used to rave and rant to his lieutenants his envy and appreciation of the genius of Stalin who had the perspicacity and audacity to get rid of the general staff of the Red Army before launching a world war. He knew whereof he spoke for totalitarian economics has no room for a command divided between political and military needs. . . .

POWER WENT TO STALIN'S HEAD

"But by 1948, after two decades of undisputed power, topped by a military victory, Stalin, to use a phrase of his own on another occasion, was "dizzy with success." I am not using it as a psychological epithet. His exhilaration from success was a sign that he was no longer responsive to the objective needs requisite for a struggle for world power. Stalin failed to grasp the new situation—he had won a war, a mighty one, over Nazi Germany, yes. But he had yet to face the real contender for world power—the United States. Zhdanov was with him in not using the truce between wars for a breathing spell; he was ready to take the whole world on.

"Malenkov thought differently and, feeling that he could not win the argument since Stalin was evidently with Zhdanov, had Zhdanov poisoned. For the first time since Stalin came to power something had been done behind the back of the old master intriguer and murderer: no leader can long retain undisputed leadership under such circumstances, no matter what leader cults have been fashioned around his name. The bureaucracy whom Stalin had so long and so fully represented began to find him inadequate to the new situation created by the end of a world war which no one really won but which left each of the two state-capitalist giants so exhausted that a halt had to be called . . .

RESTLESS MASSES

"The restlessness of the Russian masses knew no bounds. If they were merely to go on in the same old way, keeping their noses to the grindstone, then at least it would not be in the god-forsaken Urals. The totalitarian Russian bureaucracy had all the power and all the force and all the laws it needed to enforce labor discipline, but absolutely nothing could stem the tide of returning Russians. The tide invalidated all laws. To have a labor force at all, the planners were compelled to make an unplanned declaration—an amnesty on all labor offenses committed during the war . . .

"But if Stalin had to be satisfied with something less than the 'abolition' of the difference between city and country, he was going full speed ahead towards a head-on collision with the United States—at least where he could get the Koreans and the Chinese to do the fighting for him. There was no breathing spell, let alone peace. The iron-fisted Stalin was clearly becoming a millstone around the neck of the bureaucracy which yearned for a truce between wars. He had to be gotten rid of. But no one dared. No one except Beria. He had to dare, for it was a question of either his neck or Stalin's and he preferred Stalin's.

Stalin and His Heirs

"Stalin had evidently begun to suspect the "naturalness" of Zhdanov's death. The wily Malenkov had beat Beria to the draw again and managed suddenly to uncover "the plot of the doctors-poisoners" who had indeed poisoned Zhdanov, thus laying the blame for a death he had engineered right at the doorstep of Beria's Ministry. While the 'lack of vigilance' campaign was raging in the country, Beria plotted his revenge, or, if you wish, his defense. For if there is anyone who knew Stalin it was his glorifier-biographer-historiographer, Beria.

"Six months before the death of Stalin, the power struggle reached a climax . . . One has to take but one glance at how quickly his whole program was scuttled: (1) The Korean War was stopped. (2) What the 19th Congress, the last which Stalin directed and the first to meet since 1939, had established in trying to widen somewhat the base of the bureaucracy has been shelved. The Praesidium once again consists not of 50 or 25, but "a less unwieldy one" of 10. (3) And they ran, like rats from a sinking ship, from the grandiose fundamental 'work of genius', Stalin's 'Economic Problems of Socialism of the U.S.S.R.' . . .

"If Stalin's Last Testament is pathetic, how much lower the sights of Malenkov. In his first major speech he used for morale building everything from 'elegant shoes' to hydrogen bombs! But there is nothing really decided in this power struggle as can be seen by the fact that no one has yet come out as the leader but each man must hide behind the 'collective' Central Committee which is about as unified as thieves who fall out.

RUSSIAN WORKERS NO LONGER ISOLATED

"There is no getting away from it, the Russian masses are not only ill-fed, ill-clad and ill-housed. They are rebellious.

"We are at the beginning of the end of Russian totalitarianism. That does not mean the state-capitalist bureaucracy will let go of its iron grip. Quite the contrary . . . What it does mean is that from the center of Russian production, from the periphery of the satellite countries oppressed by Russia, and from the inside of the Communist parties, all contradictions are moving to a head and the open struggle will be a merciless fight to the end.

"The biggest problem of Russia remains the low labor productivity. Totalitarian state-capitalism has invented no substitute for that. The Russian workers aren't producing enough, and the Russian peasants are keeping back a lot of what they are producing. And all the pie in the sky, hydrogen bombs included, will not thrust them back into their isolation now that the East German workers have revolted against these rulers and overnight filled the air with the stuff that makes dreams a reality."

June-July 1963

6 7 9 8
Aug.-Sept., 1963

Editorial

The Freedom Now Movement

The first edition of *American Civilization on Trial* came off the press on May 6, the same time that the events of the Birmingham Movement electrified the world. The second edition came off the press on Aug. 28 — the date of the March on Washington. In the intervening three months, the national Freedom NOW Movement was put to the test. The dangers revealed demanded that a new preface be added to the second edition of *American Civilization on Trial*. The new preface is reprinted in full below, not in place of our editorial, but as our editorial.

This second edition of "American Civilization on Trial" goes to press three months to the day after the first edition was put on sale. The popular demand for our pamphlet is due to the fact that we alone have written of past history and of history in the making as one continuous development of the vanguard role of the Negro. This heightened interest in analysis is due also to the fact that in the short time between the Birmingham events in May and the March on Washington in August the massiveness of the resistance, the many-sidedness of the demands for the Freedom NOW movement, the tremendous surge, courage and reason of this movement as against the barbarism of the Bull Connors with their hounds, hoses and murders have totally changed the objective situation in the United States.

Thus, the movement compelled the Kennedy Administration to admit a "rising tide of discontent" and execute an about-face with the introduction of a civil rights bill. In contrast to his original opposition to any March on Washington, on the alleged ground that Congress could not be forced, Kennedy came to support the March. Unfortunately it's the kind of support a rope gives a hanging man. Therein lies the danger to the Freedom NOW movement.

This has brought the movement to the crossroads. Though it is impossible to stop the momentum of the Negro struggle, its forward development can be impeded if the underlying philosophy for total freedom is in any way compromised. Here, precisely, are revealed both the strength and weakness of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The transforming events of Birmingham have revealed King's new stature both organizationally and philosophically. In his letter from a Birmingham jail to a group of "fellow clergymen," Dr. King rejected their attempt to confine the movement to legalisms. "We can never forget," he wrote, "that everything Hitler did in Germany was 'legal' and everything the Hungarian Freedom Fighters did in Hungary was 'illegal' . . . this calls for a confrontation with the power structure." Dr. King writes: "To use the words of Martin Buber, the great Jewish philosopher, segregation substitutes an 'I-it' relationship for the 'I-thou' relationship and ends up relegating persons to the status of things." But King himself makes an impersonal ethic rather than the living mass movement, the point of creative origin and forward march of humanity.

The Negro leadership is listening more to Kennedy's civil rights measures than to the full aspirations of the mass movement. They fail to see that the alleged detente in the cold war and the intensification of the Sino-Soviet conflict will actually free the hand of the Administration to bear down against both labor and the Negro movement. This is why we say openly that, so far, the Freedom NOW movement has combined reason and activity only to the extent of the immediate demands of desegregation, and not to the ultimate of total freedom from class society.

In this situation, a small organization like ours has a pivotal role to play both as a catalyst and a propellant.

NEWS & LETTERS COMMITTEES, which have participated in every phase of activity and struggle from the Montgomery Bus Boycott to the March on Washington, have one unique feature that distinguishes us from all other organizations. It is this: We have, from the very start, refused to separate theory from practice, or practice from theory. Take the need to change the role of white labor in the civil rights struggle.

WHITE LABOR has so far shown a sorry spectacle. The labor leaders, like Meany, Reuther, McDonald and Hoffa, have all spoken big, and some have even marched with mass Negro demonstrations in the North, as in Detroit and San Francisco, but not in the South. When it comes to their own unions, they have neither helped upgrade Negro workers nor accorded them leading union posts commensurate with numbers or skill, nor have they done anything to enable the white rank-and-file to participate in the Negro struggle as an integral part of their common continuing struggle against management.

NEGRO WORKERS from a Chevrolet local in Los Angeles rightly picketed the convention of the Urban League at which Walter Reuther was the featured speaker. They carried signs calling Reuther "HYPOCRITE!" In Detroit, Negro members of another General Motors local picketed the UAW's Solidarity House demanding the upgrading of Negroes in auto plants. Indeed, there isn't a plant in the country that doesn't reveal the tensions within labor.

Here, too, the Negro rank-and-file has shown its sensitivity by differentiating between the bureaucracy and the rank-and-file. Despite the appearance of leaders on marches, and despite individual situations, as at construction sites in Philadelphia and New York, where Negro pickets fought white workers, the Negro rank-and-file denounce the leadership and appeal to the white rank-and-file.

News & Letters, which has attacked the labor bureaucracy not only for its role in the civil rights struggle, but also for its failure to fight management on Automation, joined with the Negro and white rank-and-file to help forge the unity needed in the civil rights struggle. We also assisted in drafting a leaflet which soon made the rounds in Detroit factories. It was addressed to the labor leadership and said:

Hear ye then this—and learn your lessons from that Sunday March in Detroit and all the battles for Civil Rights, South and North. First, you are cutting your own throats because, without the unity of white and black workers, management can ride all over you, even as they did when you launched Operation Dixie and it proved to be just a still-birth.

Know ye, further, that the end of discrimination, even more than charity, must begin at home, and home for working people is the Union. BEGIN THERE.

Begin NOW to put an end to lily white departments. Begin NOW the retraining and upgrading of Negro workers who now, as before unionism, are still the last to be hired and the first to be fired.

Begin NOW to tell the white workers the truth of their own conditions of employment and unemployment. For the truth is that, while percentage-wise, Negroes have more unemployment than white, it is still they, the white workers, the majority of Americans, who are still the majority in absolute numbers of those unemployed.

Reuther, you have begun contract negotiations a year in advance, with management. How about beginning to talk to us, your black brothers, 25 years after we helped to create the CIO?

THE NEGRO LEADERSHIP, on the other hand, far from exposing the role of the labor bureaucracy has actually protected it from the ranks by playing up the lip-service and ostentatious checks with which the union leaders give token support to the struggle. The greatest danger, moreover, is the fact that the labor bureaucracy is at the beck and call of Kennedy—and especially in this situation where they yield to Kennedy on everything from unemployment to civil rights.

All the more reason to continue instead, with us, in the full tradition of the Abolitionist movement, in which was concentrated

every strand of struggle for freedom—abolition of slavery, woman's suffrage, labor movement—and thus released new human dimensions. Look at Sojourner Truth whose creative activity embraced not only the work with the Underground Railroad but also the woman's struggle. Look at the Marxist, Joseph Weydemeyer, who was both a general in the Union Army and editor of a Marxist journal in the United States (which published Marx's Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte 17 years before it was published in Europe).

We alone, in *Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves*, not only participated fully in the activity, but in making it possible for the Freedom Riders to speak for themselves have issued the only serious analysis, to date, of that great turning point and its continuity with what preceded and followed.

In the News & Letters Committees we have not only supported, reported, and participated in all the great actions, but have compelled world attention to focus on them as central to the global struggle for a new society.*

The Freedom NOW movement must not be stopped in its tracks nor derailed. It must be expanded and deepened so that it leads to the total reconstruction of society on new human beginnings.

It is no accident that this second edition of *American Civilization on Trial* comes out when the movement is being put to the test. The road ahead is not smooth or easy. With this edition we invite you to face the challenge and join the News & Letters Committees.

—National Editorial Board

* In addition to our list of publications it should be noted that *Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves* is being translated into French; *American Civilization on Trial* is being translated into Italian, and widely discussed among Japanese youth.

6708

Mao and De Gaulle Challenge K & K**The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
and the Sino-Soviet Conflict**

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman, National Editorial Board

The cynicism and tragic irony surrounding the nuclear test ban treaty of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain jut out all too visibly from the various statements aimed at getting approval from the U.S. Senate. Any one listening to Defense Secretary McNamara's stress on U.S. nuclear "superiority" over Russia, and/or Secretary of State Rusk's assurances that even Adenauer's Germany need have no fear of any challenge to its militarization, and/or Undersecretary of State Harriman's emphasis on United States "world leadership" (that is to say, limitless military aid to prop up falling governments all over the globe), would think that these "New Frontiersmen" were asking approval for a state of war preparedness instead of a treaty whose "principal aim" is supposed to be "the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament. . . ."

In order to get bi-partisan support, No. 1 Frontiersman eagerly gives General Eisenhower, rather than himself, credit for having been the one who "first proposed" some such treaty. Thousands upon thousands and upon thousands of words about the U.S. war potential are being poured out to get a majority vote on a test ban treaty of "800 refreshingly brief words." (TIME, Aug. 2) It speaks volumes for the state of corruption of capitalist society that this, precisely, is the emphasis required to gain Senate approval at a time when the 1964 elections loom ahead, and the Republican Party, already heavily infiltrated (if not fully taken over) by the Birchites, would rather play on the theme that Kennedy is "soft on Communism."

The Republicans cannot, however, oppose Kennedy's treaty on such grounds because the people's opposition to nuclear war would not tolerate such an excuse to violate this weak, limited test ban treaty which puts restrictions only on the poisoning of the atmosphere, but in no way delimits the preparations for war.

OPPOSITION TO WAR

The people's anti-war position is not limited to the United States, Russia, and Great Britain, "the originators" of the treaty. Nor is the opposition to war exhausted by including the greater part of the whole world whose governments have lined up to co-sign this treaty. So total is the opposition to nuclear war that the only two countries which dared openly oppose the treaty—Mao's China and De Gaulle's France—had to claim that they did so "in the name of peace."

Mao went so far as to offer counter-proposals for nothing short of "complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons." That did not prevent him from attacking the actual treaty not only as "a big fraud" and "betrayal of the Soviet people," but also as an exposure of "the servile features of those who warmly embrace imperialism. The exposure," he said, "of these freaks and monsters in their true colors is an excellent thing for the revolutionary struggle of the peoples and the

Continued on Page 8

Continued from Page 1
cause of world peace." (People's Daily, Aug 2)

Because the opposition of all the peoples of the world to nuclear war is total Khrushchev would like nothing better than to reduce all his differences with Mao to a disagreement on "peaceful co-existence." As Izvestia put it, Russia was not surprised that militarist, reactionary forces in the West were "atom mongers and madmen," but it was most "sadly" surprised to find that the "Chinese comrades" should join their voices to the screams of those madmen.

Now there is no doubt that China, not only in attacking the treaty, but in talking about "cowardice in the face of imperialism" during the missile confrontation between Khrushchev and Kennedy over Cuba last year—not to mention Mao's perennial references to the United States as only "a paper tiger"—has given the impression that China welcomes a nuclear holocaust. It alone has the audacity to speak of a time to follow a nuclear war when "socialism will be built on the ruins." Nevertheless, this is not the point in the Sino-Soviet conflict. To see what is, and how this affects world conflicts, it is necessary, first, to turn to the crushing of the Hungarian Revolution, and then to the new, third, Afro-Asian-Latin American world that came on the historic stage at the end of the 1950's, and especially in the "Africa year: 1960."

OF WARS AND REVOLUTIONS

The challenge to totalitarian power that was issued by the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 brought Russia and China closer together than they had ever been, either in Stalin's era or in Malenkov-Khrushchev's times. The class content of the counter-revolutionary crushing of the proletarian revolution is crucial to all else that has happened since. Directly after the show of solidarity with Russian imperialism against the Hungarian revolutionaries, China moved toward expanding its own state power.

China's recent attempts to exclude Russia from Asian and African meetings on racial grounds is only the culmination of something that began on the day, in 1949, when Mao came to power in mainland China, not on racial grounds, but on originality of "Mao's Thought." It had been obvious in all Mao's fights with Stalin, and as soon as the Chinese Communist Party took power it demanded that "Mao's Thought" become the underlying theory for all conquests of power in "colonial countries."

Let any one think that this makes Mao a "revolutionary Leninist" where Khrushchev is a "revisionist," not to mention "a coward in face of imperialism" (although Stalin has suddenly been appointed by Mao as a "true Leninist"), here are the actual developments of Mao's revolutionary thunder since he won power against Stalin's advice to maintain his coalition with Chiang Kai-shek:

1) China embarks on wars only when it is sure to win, as against Tibet first, and limited to incursions into borders of India now.

2) When it suits its purpose, China peacefully, or, more correctly, shrewdly "co-exists" with European imperialist outposts on its own territory, like Hong Kong and Macao.

3) If Mao, whose "Thought" could exclude nothing more original than "a four-class policy", is nevertheless more adept than Khrushchev in the use of Marxist terminology to hide his ter-

ritorial ambitions, he is no "braver" in facing a challenge from the greatest military power in the world—the United States. Mao has backed down more times, not only on Taiwan, but on Quemoy and Matsu, than did Khrushchev when he saw that Kennedy was actually ready to go to nuclear war over missiles in Cuba.

4) Despite his revolutionary thunder, in the abstract, Mao is, in the concrete, an expert in imperialist maneuvering and in dubbing even "fascist regimes" as "peace-loving." Thus, before the Sino-Indian war, Mao called the military regime in Pakistan "fascist", but the moment China was engaged in war with India, Mao lost no time in making a deal with Pakistan which had suddenly become a "peace-loving nation."

5) Nor does his "revolutionary defense" of the Afro-Asian world he hopes one day to dominate keep him from excluding other Communist lands whom he calls "revisionist" while including "the national bourgeoisie, and even certain kings, princes, and aristocrats who are patriotic."

RUSSIA AND CHINA AT WAR?

A shocking question faces us now: Can there be a war between two state-capitalist regimes calling themselves Communist?

Let us also not forget that the unity among the Communist state powers, during and after the crushing of the Hungarian Revolution, greatly surpassed that in the camp of Western imperialism during the Suez war. Not only did the United States fail to come to the aid of old-fashioned British imperialism (much less be swayed by France's support), but in the UN the United States was in so great a hurry to line up with Russia against Great Britain that it was impossible to get an immediate UN condemnation of Russia for its brutal suppression of the Hungarian Revolution.

In a word, not only was China with Russia in the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution, but the United States, too, considered this less obnoxious to its own imperialist ambitions than having its junior partner, Great Britain, strike out alone. Although it has since learned to be more silent on its disputes with France, this may change once again when China begins to use the same interval as France to develop its A-bomb.

After Khrushchev met Eisenhower at Camp David, however, Mao decided to bring the Sino-Soviet dispute into the open, at least in an "ideological" form. Toward that end China used the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth to launch its attack on Khrushchev's "revisionism" with the lengthy editorial "Long Live Leninism!" This time China was stopped in its tracks by the U.S. U-2 spy plane over Russia. Khrushchev took quick advantage of this. In the now famous shoe-pounding incident at the UN Khrushchev got his opportunity to announce to the whole world that he is not only master of the Communist world, but the only hope of the new world opened up by the African Revolutions.

On Dec. 7, 1960, Khrushchev convened the 81 Communist Parties for a conference in Moscow. There he transformed his UN speech into the new Communist Manifesto which declared Russia to be "the first country in history to be blazing a trail to communism for all mankind." The overwhelming majority of the Communist Parties present in Moscow demanded Mao sign

the Declaration so that a "unanimous" Communist front be shown American imperialism. Mao could not refuse to do so without exposing the fact that China considered Russia to be the enemy.

Mao signed, but continued his independent road not only in China but throughout the third Afro-Asian-Latin American world. It is for the benefit of this world that the power struggle between Russia and China is fought out in ideological terms, in "Marxist" language.

It is for the benefit of this new, third world, whose chief preoccupations are not "peaceful co-existence" and nuclear test ban treaties, but freedom and anti-colonialism, that Mao is presently willing to be "isolated" in an independent corner, though that be of an adventurer.

As we see, China's signature to the 1960 Moscow Manifesto did not stop its deviationary road along its own national interests any more than France's signature to NATO stopped De Gaulle from seeking his own glory road. The post-war world of the 1960's is, after all, a very different world from what it was in the late 1940's when both Europe and China lay in ruins, and each had to accept aid and, with it, the "philosophy" underlying the Marshall Plan and the Warsaw Pact respectively.

Mao is trying to do with a barrage of revolutionary phrases what De Gaulle is trying to achieve with spoutings about "French grandeur." In both cases, however, the split within their respective orbits is due to national ambitions for world expansion.

For the present, this is limited to the periods when the two nuclear titans are not confronting each other in a life and death struggle that "automatically" would "correctly" align these junior partners of "the East" and "the West." One thing, however is beyond the peradventure of any doubt: **THE NON-VIABILITY OF STATE CAPITALISM AS A "NEW" SOCIAL ORDER IS PROVEN BY THE SAME LAWS OF DEVELOPMENT AS THAT OF PRIVATE CAPITALISM, THAT IS TO SAY THE COMPULSION TO EXPLOIT THE MASSES AT HOME AND TO CARRY ON WARS ABROAD.**

Something did give pause to China's "independent" road of wars. Mao found out that, just as the Chinese masses resisted the militarization of labor in the misnamed "Communes" and forced that scheme to collapse about him, so the Indian masses suddenly found themselves nationally united against the Chinese invasion of their land. But, while this caused Mao to backtrack a bit, it only intensified his desire further to challenge Russia's leadership of International Communism which failed to come to his aid in the Sino-Indian War of 1962.

This does not, however, mean that a war between Russia and China is in the offing. While it is certainly not excluded in some distant future, there is no reason to anticipate one now—even if that does make "good copy" to gain reactionary senators' approval of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty with Russia. From Russia's side, this would make no sense not only because it is the "have" nation, but also because it certainly would break up the International Communist movement that still considers the State Plan as a fundamental division between itself and "the bourgeoisie."

From China's side, such a war would be suicidal not only because Mao isn't strong enough to challenge the Russian goal-

ath, but also because he is a firm believer in the infamous Dulles policy of negotiating from "positions of strength." Those he will not have unless he first wins to his side both the Asian Communist Parties which are in power (North Korea, North Viet Nam), and also the African non-Communist world—or that of Latin America.

Every ruling class has found it easy to support revolutions—abroad. But, whereas new ruling classes, when they first come on the historic scene, proved themselves full of vitality because they did have a wider support among the masses than the old ruling classes they overthrew, the State Planners of today, like all challengers from the "have-not powers", feel compelled to embark on wars before ever they have proved their right to historic existence on native soil.

The "new" element in this struggle between state-capitalist powers is that they live in a nuclear age. It is not that Mao is less scared of a nuclear holocaust than the rest of the world. It is that he does not allow the question mark this puts over the very survival of civilization to divert him from his feeling that this time the "have" nations—the United States and Russia—will first of all eliminate each other!

MAO, DE GAULLE AND IKEDA

Despite De Gaulle's derisive question, "The ideological split? Over what ideology?" his latest display of arrogance at his latest news conference (July 28) could not clothe his nuclear ambition as Mao does his. Its death features stood out in all their goriness: "France will not be diverted by the Moscow agreements from equipping herself with the means of immeasurable destruction, possessed by other powers."

By contrast, Mao was enabled to exorcise Khrushchev for "servilely meeting the needs of United States imperialism" by his agreement to a treaty which "undertakes . . . to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere . . ." This, said Mao, means "out and out betrayal" of "the socialist countries and all oppressed countries" since it would keep them "from acquiring nuclear weapons" while consolidating the United States' "position of nuclear monopoly."

Both Mao and De Gaulle chose 1963 as the crucial year to issue their challenges to their varying orbits. But, where De Gaulle has "a position of strength"—the Common Market in general and the Franco-German Treaty in particular—Mao has nothing but revolutionary thunder which, moreover, may have spent itself considerably in the Sino-Indian war. Nevertheless, this being the age also of the struggle for the minds of men, it is much easier to rebut the Franco-German Treaty as "at the heart of the universe" than it is to dismiss the appeal of Mao to the Afro-Asian-Latin American world.

A new kind of proof of this is coming out of the mouths of Japan's rulers. Today's (August 19th) newspapers speak of Premier Ikeda's search for "new ways" to function at the UN. He wishes to put into operation his interpretation of the "age of struggle for the minds of men" by being given room to maneuver in the Afro-Asian bloc. Thus he hopes that Japan as an "Asian nation" would acquire a new power with which to gain further concessions from Ameri-

6710

can imperialism. Since Kennedy too wants to militarize this most industrialized country in Asia, and make it an integral part of "the West" at the same time, he will no doubt help create a "neutral" role for Japan at the UN.

KENNEDY AND KHRUSHCHEV

As was abundantly clear from Kennedy's readiness to plunge the world into a nuclear war over Russian missiles in Cuba, nothing makes United States imperialism show its ugliest face as quickly as any threat to "this" hemisphere. At his recent press conference Kennedy expanded himself on the question of China all the way into the "1970's", by which time it will have acquired nuclear know-how and created "potentially a more dangerous situation than any we faced since the end of the second World War."

Although for different reasons, Kennedy and Khrushchev do see eye to eye on the one question of the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries. The partial test ban was undertaken with this in mind. The treaty will free each to have more time to align his own orbit. This is one aspect of the treaty.

The other, more crucial, aspect is that Kennedy and Khrushchev need elbow room not only to isolate Mao and De Gaulle respectively, but, above all, to bear down upon the class struggles and the civil rights struggles at home. The intensification of the class struggles and the national struggles will have the single advantage of revealing the two worlds that truly oppose each other not only tactically, or even strategically, but totally and from class foundations. The absolute contradiction is not between those of private capitalism and state-capitalism, with or without their restless junior partners whether or not any dub themselves "Communist." The two opposing worlds are those of workers and capitalists in each country.

THE TWO WORLDS IN THE USA

Already Kennedy has begun his attempts to divert Negro demands for full equality into narrow legalistic channels, even as he has threatened to have compulsory "arbitration" legislation enacted in order to force the railroad workers to capitulate to the management side of Automation. All the sadder that the AFL-CIO bureaucracy has just shackled the trade unions on the Automation front by refusing to back the March on Washington initiated by Negroes to fight for "Jobs and Freedom." Meany's fantastic excuse for the Executive Council's strike-breaking action—that AFL-CIO backing may keep some Congressmen from supporting the civil rights struggle—hardly fools even the bureaucrats themselves.

The one thing that is clear is this: the trade union bureaucracy has become an impediment in the way not only of the Negro Freedom Fighters, but of white labor's fight with management. All the more reason that, from below, white and Negro labor forge a unity in these crucial times when a detente in the Cold War abroad means heating up the class war at home.

White labor has never faced a more crucial challenge to separate itself from the ideology of the ruling class. If they do not meet this challenge openly and positively, it will be the whip of the counter-revolution that they'll next confront. The choice is between totalitarianism and freedom, not abroad, but at home.

Sartre's Search for a Method To Undermine Marxism

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

It is difficult to know what to make out of *Search For A Method*. In part, and only in part, this is due to the fact that it is Introduction to a work we do not have in English and which has, in any case, not yet been completed. Yet it is no accident that the book under consideration here had undergone three different types of publications before, in its sixth year, it came out as an independent work. Sartre himself felt that it "logically" belonged at the end of the *Critique* since it completed the method for which the *Critique* laid the foundations. As a philosopher, Sartre knows well that methodology is the most concentrated expression of theory, a result of a complex interaction of the spirit of the times, class base, theoretical analysis, practical activity, including a struggle with rival theories, rival praxis, rival methodologies. In a word, to use one that is a favorite with Sartre, it is a "totalization." By this it must be judged. And, indeed, the difficulty in understanding what Sartre is trying to say is, fundamentally, not related to the book being only an introduction to a work that is only half finished. Rather the difficulty arises from the fact that *Search For A Method* is weighted down by contradictory statements.

Take the central thesis, that Marxism, and only Marxism, is the philosophy of our age, while Existentialism is only "an ideology," "an enclave inside Marxism." (p. xxxiv) It is stated, Period. The argumentation that follows over the next 181 pages contradicts this either directly or indirectly. For, while Existentialism has, "in general," been demoted to a "parasitic system which lives on the margins of real science," specifically it has moved forward while "Marxism stopped." (p. 21) This is supposed to refer, not to the "Marxism of Marx" but to "today's Marxists." "Today's Marxists," a very loose expression at best, becomes, in the hands of Sartre, a cover-all not only of Communists, Trotskyists, ex-Trotskyists, and independent Marxists of all sorts, but of Marx himself insofar as this theory, says Sartre, is only "in its infancy." (p. 30)

The new Sartre proclaims himself a Marxist, properly de-Stalinized ("Stalinized Marxism assumes an air of immobility . . ." p. 125); properly condescending to "revisionism" ("As for 'revisionism,' this is either a truism or an absurdity." p. 7); and, in his own eyes, sufficiently de-existentialized: "I consider Marxism the one philosophy of our time we cannot go beyond." (p. xxxiv)

The central core of all of Sartre's criticism of "today's Marxists" rests on the accusation that they have become "dogmatists" who fail to see the particular individual, the given events, the facts, the concrete experience, the new; in a word, reality, and have therefore caused "the temporary arrest of Marxism." (p. 89) Since the essay was originally written in 1957 for a Polish periodical, we shall start with the reality of that historic period—the crushed Hungarian Revolution. It is, moreover, the only current event Sartre deals with; all the rest of the book concerns itself with such pressing realities as the Great French Revolution at the end of the 18th century, literature in general and Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* in particular, anthropology, microphysics, psychoanalysis, and other analyses by "today's Marxists"—or else it is on a subject "today's Marxists" have failed to analyze.

SARTRE'S DISTORTED VIEW OF REALITY

Although Sartre himself had opposed the bloody suppression of the Hungarian Revolution by Russian might, at least on the ground that it was "not necessary," nor enhanced the "security of socialism," he here pours forth his indignation, not against the Russian counter-revolutionaries, but those of "today's Marxists" whose "method in all its nakedness" was used to make a new category of the Workers' Councils as "a democratic institution": "one can even maintain that they bear within them the future of the socialist society," Sartre continued, "But this does not alter the fact that they did not exist in Hungary at the time of the first Soviet intervention; and their appearance during the Insurrection was much too brief and too troubled for us to be able to speak of an ORGANIZED democracy." (p. 24, my emphasis, RD)

Because the Workers' Councils were not an organized democracy, neatly packaged for the modern Kierkegaardian of the "unpassable opaqueness," (p. 8n) because the spontaneous, self-organization of the Councils had a life that "was much too brief and too troubled," (p. 24) this consequence of their forced suppression becomes the sufficient ground for the dramatist Sartre's preference of speaking about the Hungarian Revolution as "the tragedy" rather than the elemental creativity. Sartre wants us, not to build a philosophy of freedom on that reality, on that "unpassable singularity of the human adventure," on that unarmed mass facing the armed, organized, state might. We are supposed, instead, to follow Sartre in donning a full suit of administrative armor to cover up Existentialism's distorted view of reality, in all its nakedness.

We have already quoted Sartre's gratuitous remark on "revisionism." (1) The myriad of new tendencies—whether expressed by Hungarian revolutionaries or Polish non-revolutionaries, by intellectuals or workers, by youth newly aspiring to "socialist Humanism," or old Communists like Imre Nagy upon whom freedom fighters suddenly thrust new leadership—one and all of these living forces, the true human dimension, get head-shrunk into a non-differentiated category, "revisionism," and shrugged off with a "despite their good intentions . . ." The fact that the appellation was not theirs; but that of "Other," their tormentors, Khrushchev and Mao, who have long since transformed Marx's theory of liberation into state-capitalist enslavement does not seem to disturb the philosopher of existence. Though those who fought for freedom from Russian Communist overlordship were the real "existents" in the Poland of 1957 whom Sartre was

(Continued on page 7)

*Search For A Method by Jean-Paul Sartre. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes. (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1963, \$4.50.) In the French edition this is the introduction to *Critique de la Raison Dialectique* of which only one volume has thus far been published.

addressing, the philosopher of "the individual" didn't take time out to personalize a single one—unless the questionable choice of that time and that place for launching an attack on the only truly original Communist philosopher who finally got swept up by the revolution in his native land—George Lukacs—can be called "personalization": "It is not by chance that Lukacs—Lukacs who so often violates history—has found in 1956 the best definition of this frozen Marxism." (p. 28)**

It has taken Sartre some 17 years to return to the field of philosophy. No matter what one thought of BEING AND NOTHINGNESS—and this writer considers it a manifestation of the disintegration of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois thought under the blows of Depression, Fascism, and the Fall of France—the book was a carefully elaborated, closely argued work. This is not true of *Search For A Method*. Where not totally wrong, its argumentation is perfunctory. It jumps all over vast fields of thought—from philosophy to science, from literature to anthropology, from economics to psychoanalysis, from analyses of revolutions to those of the Proletariat (the capital P is Sartre's), and from history to the time of day. But it lands nowhere.

Its rootlessness leaves a deep gap in the book, which is not due to the fact that we have not seen the whole work. Rather it is of the essence to the whole work. The abyss opened up here (*Search For A Method*) will be the more glaring in *CRITIQUE DE LA RAISON DIALECTIQUE*, Vol. I. Let's follow the indications in the work we're reviewing. "Sade's pessimism," writes the uniquely equipped dramatist Sartre, "joins that of the manual laborer, to whom the bourgeois revolution gave nothing, and who perceived at about 1794 that he was excluded from the 'universal class.'" (p. 117)

SARTRE'S DISTORTED VIEW OF THE PROLETARIAT

Now, Sade's pessimism "joined" that of the manual laborer neither in theory, nor in life; neither in the specificity of the act, nor in the given situation. Nowhere, in fact, except in the head of the Existentialist Sartre could "the lived hope of a noble, outlawed by his class" (p. 118) "join" that of the manual laborer who by the very fact of being "excluded from the 'universal' class," would gain that "quest for true universality" which would lead him, not to sadism, but to revolution.

All that Sartre reveals by intellectually forcing the unification of the irreconcilables is that he is a true son of bourgeois society dominated by the dogmatism of the concept of the backwardness of the masses who are supposed to be incapable of thinking on their own, and therefore must be managed, led, and made to work the harder and produce the more. By his insistence on the particular against the general, the concrete—"incident by

(Cont'd)

6712 October, 1963

(cont'd)

incident"—as against the "abstract ideology of universality," the historic event against the a priori judgment, "absolute empiricism" as against dogmatism, Sartre may have destroyed as many dogmatisms as he claims. But one, unstated, yet all-pervading dogmatism continues to be the underlying motif of all Sartre thinks, writes, does. It is the dogmatism of the backwardness of the masses.

Sartre seems to revel in "revealing" that the Proletariat is not "an abstract ideology of universality," but a concrete separateness: "Wasn't Thermidor rendered possible by the growing dissension between the sans-culottes and controlling faction of the members of the Convention?" (pp. 120-1) And then the shocking conclusion: "It is true that the people supported the Revolution and true, too, that their distress had counter-revolutionary tendencies." (p. 121)

He sees "counter-revolutionary tendencies" everywhere—except, of course, in himself, and in the Communist Party, which even when it perpetrates actual counter-revolutionary acts, continues to remain "the only revolutionary Party." (2)

Falling to perceive alienations as manifestations of class contradictions, Sartre stands everything on its head and has alienations "give birth" to these contradictions: "In a socialist society, at a certain moment in its development, the worker is alienated from his production . . ." (p. 178) ". . . the new alienations which give birth to the contradictions of socialist society and which reveal to it its abandonment; that is, the incommensurability of existence and practical knowledge." (p. 179)

Why is this master of language so slippery, ambivalent, contradictory, confusing on the warp and woof of Hegelian and Marxian philosophy—the theory of alienation—where he should, as "a philosopher of existence" get along so swimmingly? The Humanism of Marxism is grounded on this theory. Here Marxism transcended Hegelian dialectics, stood Hegel "right side up," and at the same time separated itself from what Marx called "quite vulgar and unthinking communism" which was "only the logical expression of private property" and "completely negates the personality of man."

Since, to a philosopher, an "alienated existence" is an analytical phrase rather than an exploitative reality, it becomes easy for him to think that introducing another idea, such as the notion of "future," therefore means the achievement of a "synthetic transcendence" rather than the giving up of the today for the tomorrow. Thus, Sartre writes glibly: "For the man in China the future is more true than the present." (p. 97)

A NEW COMMUNIST METAPHYSIC

No doubt, for the author of Being and Nothingness who rooted man in desire, anguish, dread, finding "the root of the human—in need" is new. (p. 91) Moreover, this need is tied by Sartre to a "theory" of scarcity. (3) Sartre had insisted, from the beginning, that Marx's concept of freedom could not be realized "so long as the transformation of social relations and technical progress have not freed man from the yoke of scarcity." (p. 34)

Along with this view of scarcity Sartre has made a fetishism of the State Plan. "That the Marxists allow themselves to be duped by mechanical materialism is inexcusable," writes Sartre, "since they know and approve of large-scale socialist planning." (p. 97) Just as Smith and Ricardo, despite their discovery of labor as the source of value, became prisoners of "the fetishism

*We're sorry that, for space considerations we have to leave out good portions of this letter. But it can be bought as Political Letter, New Series, No. 7, 20c N&L, 8751 Grand River, Det. 4, Mich.

of commodities" because they could not see capitalism as anything but a "natural order," nor labor not only as "source" but as "subject," and there met their historic barrier, so Sartre met his in the State Plan.

And, as Smith and Ricardo tried explaining away labor alienation as a "feudal blemish," so Sartre seeks to explain away labor alienations under "socialism" by his "theory" of scarcity—scarcity in this over-productive, state-capitalist, automated, "microphysic," atomic age of ours! It may not be much of a theory to explain the ills of capitalism in the United States or Western Europe or even Japan. But, obviously, when he first dragged in the "yoke of scarcity" (p. 34) in talking of Marx's analysis of the reign of freedom and claiming that "we have no means, no intellectual instrument, no concrete experience which allows to conceive of this freedom or of this philosophy," Sartre was thinking of "socialist societies."

Before therefore we jump to the conclusion that Sartre's new theory of scarcity reveals more a scarcity of thought than a material scarcity, let's remember that new reality which did not confront Marx: the state-capitalist societies of Russia and China which he calls socialist. Consciously or unconsciously, it is for these he created the theory of scarcity.

Just as, in the 1930's, it was neither the sit-down strikes in France which destroyed the pretensions of fascism in his native land, nor the Spanish Revolution in the other Europe, but rather the proletarian defeats by German and Spanish fascism that set the mood for Being and Nothingness, so it is that, in the 1950's, it is neither the Hungarian Revolution from Communist totalitarianism, nor the African Revolutions from Western imperialism that set the mood. Rather it is the victories of the counter-revolutions that set the mood for Search For A Method and the Critique of Dialectical Reason . . .

The work at hand escapes from any need to resolve the conflict between his theory of individual freedom and his theory of human relations by shifting from man the individual to man in the mass. Here "Hell is other people" becomes "Hell is the practice-inerte." In a word, the division between the "passive" masses and the "active" elite which has stood capitalist production and its philosophy of rationalism so well from its beginnings to its state-capitalist stage is given a new coat of philosophic paint. This is the remorseless logic of the failure of seeing creativity in the proletariat.

The anti-Stalinist, anti-capitalist, contemporary petty-bourgeois intellectual, himself the victim of the absolute division between mental and manual labor, the climax of centuries of division between philosophers and workers, is all too ready to hand over the revolutionary role of their self-emancipation into the hands of the Communist Party and its philosophy of the elite who will continue "to lead" the workers while the latter must continue to labor as before, only harder. In the Critique Sartre creates a veritable mystique about the "political group" which fights the "inertia" of the masses; he even glorifies terror: "The communal freedom creates itself as Terror." The methodological foundation for the new Communist metaphysic has been laid by Sartre here in Search For A Method.

Footnotes

(1) Due appreciation for this is tendered Sartre by no less a personality than the chief philosopher for Polish Communism: "Sartre's ideas on revisionism are of interest. The term is, he says, either a truism or an absurdity." (p. 37) "This thought of Sartre goes far beyond the shallow but loud propaganda of the revisionist miracle-makers, and, in my opinion, deserves a deeper analysis. So we see that Sartre not only avows Marxist philosophy but attempts to defend it from attack." (p. 38) (Adam Schaff: A Philosophy of Man, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1963, \$3.25)

(2) "Materialism et revolution" (Les Temps Modernes: Vol. I, Nos. 9 and 10, June-July, 1948) In 1947 the old periodical, Politics, translated this essay on "Materialism and Revolution." It reappeared as Chapter 13 of Sartre's Literary and Philosophical Essays (New York, Criterion Books, Inc.) in 1955. This edition bears a footnote by Sartre, which reads: "As I have been unfairly reproached with not quoting Marx in this article, I should like to point that my criticisms are not directed against him, but against Marxist scholasticism of 1949. Or, if you prefer, against Marx through Neo-Stalinist Marxism." The truth, however, is that the article couldn't have referred to "the Marxist scholasticism" of 1949 since it was written in 1948. Nor could it have been directed against "Neo-Stalinist Marxism" which did not arise until after Stalin's death. Sartre, at the time of writing his original article in 1948, (which duly quoted Stalin as an authority on Marxism) was such a millennium away from thinking about "Neo-Stalinist Marxism" that the chief target of his was—Frederick Engels. Instead of being then wrought up about "Neo-Stalinism" which was yet to appear historically, he couldn't find it in himself to resist footnoting even the favorable mention of Marx's Humanism as follows: "It is, once again, Marx's point of view in 1844, that is, until the unfortunate meeting with Engels." It is one of the marks of our state-capitalist age that our intellectuals seem more adept at re-writing history, than at writing it.

(3) It needs no Marx to answer this excuse for class exploitation, the "scarcity theory"—basis of primitive societies—and the "buying cheap and selling dear" idea of pre-Industrial Revolution societies were answered by classical (bourgeois) political economy of Smith and Ricardo. The Marxian theory of surplus value, which said Marx, was really implicit in the Smith-Ricardo theory of value, is based on the assumption and the fact that the technological revolution put an end to any "theory" of scarcity as an excuse for the maldistribution of income or the cause of crisis.

6713 Oct 1963

The Standstill of Nehru's India

A recent study by Osmania University of Hyderabad has illuminated the shocking state of education, or rather lack of it, in the average Indian village, after 16 years of independence. Though the survey was a limited one, the village studied was a typical one since four-fifths of India's 450 million people still live in rural areas. This village, furthermore, is only 16 miles from Hyderabad, the fourth largest city of India. Yet in the village of 1,049 there was only one privately owned radio, only a single regular newspaper reader, no village library. Fully 89 per cent of those interviewed gave as "source of information" visits to Hyderabad, and 56 per cent of these said their information came from "gossip."

Although the villagers knew Gandhi had brought independence to India, one thought Nizama was still king of Hyderabad! As the study put it: "The common belief that the names of Gandhi and Nehru are household words even in far and remote parts of the country has been proved to be a myth by the present investigation." (1)

As against the myth of Gandhi and Nehru as household words, the average villager did know of Communist China's invasion of India last fall, but one villager referred to this invasion by Communist China as follows: "Some kings are fighting against us." It is all too easy to laugh uproariously at this and dismiss the remark as sheer ignorance. We would come closer to the truth, however, if we coupled this remark with another villager's identification of Nehru as "some Brammin" and were thereby compelled to take a second look at Nehru's India.

INDIA SINCE INDEPENDENCE

India was the first country to gain its independence from British imperialism and thus, in 1947, open a new third world that was to stretch from Asia to the Middle East, and from Africa to Latin America. Since all newly-independent countries born in the next decade, or 13 years, had all emerged out of national movements striving to free themselves from Western imperialism, the unifying link predominated over the divisions within this post-war world and seemed indeed capable of forging a new path for all mankind.

Both because it was one of the richest in culture and past traditions, and the first to gain its independence, India seemed destined to play a central role on the Asian continent. As the African continent also sought to use Gandhism (2), or the non-violent mass resistance method to gain freedom, India's world role shone so brightly that it dimmed the other truth, that no fundamental change in human relations followed independence. The dominant Congress Party, which had succeeded in uniting all classes in the struggle against foreign domination, first began showing its true class nature by leaving production relations, in the city or the country, basically unchanged.

India continued to be the land of villages, with an out-moded agriculture, overlaid with an entrenched landlord class, and a halting, partial industrialization that was grafted on top of the semi-feudal relations. It was further both overburdened and undermined by the Hindu caste system that has remained changeless through the millennia. Back in the 19th century, Hegel designated it as "the philosophy of unfreedom."

It is true that, politically, there was both independence from Britain, and a parliamentary democracy established so that, in law, caste is not "recognized." In life, unfortunately, it remains dominant so that slums in the city, with their countless unemployed; the hungry villages with their sacred cows and unsanctified disregard for human lives remain the most characteristic features of "the Indian way of life."

Every leader in the new third world seems to consider himself a "socialist"—from Nehru to Nasser, from Mao to Nkrumah, not to mention the "Marxist-Leninist-the-day-I-die" Castro. But, obviously, it is not the human difference these leaders are concerned with, but the State Plan and some statistics about the "rate of economic growth." Even that admirer of the Indian way of life, Barbara Ward, admits: "large programs of public investment under the Plans . . . has given Indian private enterprise the best decade in its history." (3) But the standard of life remains the lowest in the world—\$60 per capita per annum; the average span of life is a mere 20 years; and the unemployed are countless. Even with the lush profits, Indian investment is only about half of the Chinese rate of investment (and against 20% of national income).

TWO OPPOSING IDEOLOGIES?

Strangest of all blindfolds is the one that covers Nehru's vision. Now that his "neutrality" principle lies as shattered as Bandung's "Five Principles of Co-Existence," co-authored by himself and Chou En-lai, he has suddenly discovered that Mao wishes "to destroy the Indian way of life." He rolls that phrase off his moral lips as if it were some class-less phenomenon instead of so class-ridden and contradictory a chain over so unfinished a revolution that the strains and stresses in the Indian body politic gave Mao the illusion he could have as easy a victory within India as the military victory on its borders. The fact that the invasion, instead, united India as a nation should give no illusions to Nehru that the masses will forever be satisfied with a sham freedom and no bread.

The truth is that it was not the classlessness but the sameness of the class—that of State Planners—which united Mao and Nehru at Bandung. The respect for "sovereignty of nations" and "non-interference in internal affairs" meant no foreign interference in class relations within each country so long as the third world could be a single unit against "the West." Mao still thinks that, on that basis, he can get acquiescence to his grab of Indian territory by many of "the uncommitted nations," as indeed he seems to be doing at the Colombo conference meeting presently in Ceylon.

But if his imperialist ambitions are all too clear, do Nehru's lesser ambitions constitute a different class phenomenon? The moment of independence was the moment also of the fratricidal war with Pakistan. (That unresolved conflict was another element in the temptation of Mao to attack.)

There is no doubt that British imperialistic maneuvers and their eternal attempt to break up a country at the moment of independence so as to continue its rule over it helped set up the division between India and Pakistan. It is as true, however, that once the countries did separate each had a right to its own existence. Gandhi became a martyr when he fought to end the "holy war" and build up fraternal relations. Nehru chose Manon as his "holy man" to proclaim Pakistan "Enemy No. 1" for all of these 14 years, keep two-thirds of the Army at the Kashmir site while leaving the borders to China unprotected from that "ally."

Despite its "period of glory"—the 1947-48 Kashmir war, Nehru had not allowed the Army any decisive role in the Indian pattern of life. (4) Despite the fact that he allowed the ultra-conservative Sandhurst-educated officer class to have the Army under its command and play some old imperialistic roles—in Korea and in the Congo, Nehru's concept of the role of the army made it subordinate to the civil authorities. In this he fundamentally differs from Mao, who, even in the Communist (read: state-capitalist) orbit, holds to a special militaristic position. The Chinese Constitution is the only one where not only the "Party" but the Army is made synonymous with the state authority.

This one element that would have created at least the semblance of an ideology in opposition to that expounded in China is now itself in question since the Anglo-American aid will not only come with political strings attached but inevitably create its own image internally by raising the Indian Army to a new status. Since Nehru's good anti-military instincts were not backed up by a proletarian class position he will inevitably give way both to the Anglo-American advice and Indian Army ambitions.

INDIAN MASSES ARE PIVOTAL

It is true that he is still holding out one hope of not completely falling into the orbit of Western imperialism by counting on Russian aid, but insofar as the Indian masses are concerned, does it really matter whether it is the Russian or the American nuclear orbit? Even as a foreign policy, a military line is a derivative, rather than a determinant, of the class relations within the country. IN THIS LIES THE DANGER THAT INDIA MAY STILL CAPITULATE EITHER TO COMMUNIST TOTALITARIANISM OR TO A MILITARY CLIQUE.

Nehru's unique authority in India does not stem from his creation of new relations with the great mass of the Indian people who must bend both to his State Plans and to the private capitalist and entrenched landlord interests. He has been a leader of the struggle for independence from Britain and he has now been attacked by his Communist ally, and the Indian people have saved him from downfall. His desperate attempt first now to search for a new ideological banner and come up with "the

(cont'd)

November 1963

(cont'd)

Indian way of life" will create no new world apart from both poles of world capital—the Russo-Soviet or Anglo-American orbits—fighting for world domination. To cling to the class-ridden "Indian way of life" is only one more way of saying "the old cannot be changed"—and, by losing the struggle for the minds of men, losing both India and the new third world.

FOOTNOTES

- (1) Quoted in The New York Times (Oct. 27, 1963) summation of this survey.
- (2) Gandhism means both much more and much less, than passive non-violent mass resistance. From Gandhi's first introduction of satyagraha and the resulting British massacre at Amritsar in 1919, which coincided in world affairs with the Russian Revolution and the attempts in India to start a Marxist movement which he fought, to Gandhi's role in the post-World War II movement he finally led to victory and thus became the prototype of the new nationalistic revolutionary in Africa—there lies a quarter of a century in need of analysis. This is not the place to attempt it.
- (3) Barbara Ward, "The Rich Nations, the Poor Nations."
- (4) See Takasi Oka, "The Paradox of the Himalayas," The Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 28, 1962. One role for which Gandhi will go into history is hardly ever mentioned, and yet it will endear him more to future generations than the role he is famous for. This "hidden" role is his recognition that "the Party" in power is corruptible. Though he passed on his mantle of leadership to Nehru, he himself refused to take a position in power, and urged that others too must stay out of power and look at the ruling Congress Party, their own, with "outside" eyes.

Nov. 1963

6715

4170

6-7-1-6

Editorial Article

The Tragic Assassination of President Kennedy and the Urgency for Freedom Now

By RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA, Chairman
National Editorial Board

The fiendish assassination of President John F. Kennedy, on November 22, took place in the state of Texas, whose oil millions have supported every reactionary clique from the old China Lobby to the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and the present founder of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch. The murder was committed in the city of Dallas, which welcomed the infamous Mme. Nhu, but spat upon the U. S. Ambassador to the U. N., Adlai Stevenson. The foul deed took place in the southern region of the United States, which has remained true to one, and only one, tradition, that of the slavocracy.

Feeling that President Kennedy had become a martyr to the very cause for which President Lincoln had achieved martyrdom nearly 100 years ago pervaded a nation in mourning and grief. John Fitzgerald Kennedy had decreed that the entire year, 1963, as the centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation, be devoted to its celebration. The behavior of South U.S.A., however, showed what it celebrated when it unleashed savage hound dogs, backed up by high pressure hoses, and the use of cattle prods against human beings, children included, who were demonstrating for their constitutional rights. These barbaric actions, in the Deep South, culminated in the murders of William Moore, Medgar Evers, the four Negro children who were killed by a bomb while at prayer in Sunday school, not to mention the thou-

sands who have filled and are filling the jails of the South. In Texas, malevolence against the President extended from the racial front to the conduct of foreign affairs which might in any way ease cold war tensions.

Before John Fitzgerald Kennedy arrived in Dallas, Texas Birchers distributed leaflets which accused him of "treason." The hate-mongers so prepared the ground for assassination that the taking of the life of President Kennedy had the fateful air of the inevitability of a Greek tragedy. When the news of the assassination first came over the air waves, everyone, including those of the Far Right, had thought that the crime had been perpetrated by some one from one of the many ultra-right organizations.

THE CROCODILE TEARS OF THE FAR RIGHT

The minute, however, that circumstantial evidence began to pile up against the alleged assassin, Lee H. Oswald, as one who was connected somehow with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, that minute, suddenly, the crocodile tears from the Far Right for President Kennedy began to flow. Major General, Edwin Walker, who had, the week before, flown the American flag upside down as a distress signal, because the city of Dallas had apologized to Adlai Stevenson; and who, the day before, had announced that he would lead a demonstration against Kennedy, now spoke of his "grief." He then boarded a plane for Germany to tell his fascist friends there that he was

"not surprised" at the assassination which stunned the nation.

The only other person to whom this shocking, incredible act was "not a surprise" was that creator of the myth of the "heroism" of John Birch, Robert Welch. This coiner of the delirious allegation that President Eisenhower was a "Communist," did not let his "grief" stop him from charging that the assassination was the result of a "soft on Communism" policy.

Such other fomenters of hatred toward the very person of Kennedy as Governors Barnett of Mississippi and Wallace of Alabama rushed to Washington for the slain President's funeral. This gave them the opportunity to consult with their outposts in Congress who are not really moved by this outpouring of the millions who thought the only fitting memorial to President Kennedy would be the passage of the Civil Rights Bill. Soon the wily Smith, of Virginia, Chairman of the Rules Committee, who has had the bill bottled up, said he was opposed to "moving" any faster while there was an air of "hysteria," by which he did not mean the assassination of the President, but the call for brotherhood and passage of the bill!

Crocodile tears were shed also by "respectable" conservatives like Senator Goldwater, who had done all humanly possible to keep the cold war heated up, including rejection

(Continued on Page 5)

December 1963

(Continued from page 1)
of the limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty with Russia.
DALLAS, THE CITY OF BLACK GOLD AND WHITE HATE

Meanwhile, the police force of Dallas, that city of "black gold" and white hate where the income of an H. L. Hunt is a cool million dollars a day, was putting on display, for the nation and the whole world, the ultimate in incompetence, if not outright ineptitude:

1) In less than 48 hours after the assassination of the President, the main suspect, Lee Oswald, was himself murdered. This live murder, in full view of millions at home watching TV, and by relay satellite, to millions of others throughout the world, was committed though Oswald walked with police on either side of him—and all were inside the basement of police headquarters. Though the basement had been "thoroughly searched," and not once but "twice," and none but authorized personnel was supposed to be there, nevertheless one Jack Ruby, well known to Dallas police, was there and was armed. He shot Oswald dead while the police on either side of him were busy looking straight in front of them.

2) Dallas' Attorney General nevertheless promptly announced that, although Oswald had had no court trial, he was "the man who shot the President." He was sure that he could have sent Oswald to the electric chair since he had obtained 23 convictions out of 24 accusations; and all of them had gone to the electric chair on "less evidence" than he had accumulated against Oswald. The natural reaction of every man—even those who did not know that Texas had the highest per capita murder of any state, six times higher than that of New York—was that it was safer not to live in Texas. Or, as one conservative European paper put it: "High boots and ten gallon hats will never seem funny again."

3) Though nothing short of the assassination of a President was involved, the idiotic chief of police rushed to announce that, with the death of Oswald, "the case was closed."

No wonder that the whole world was by now convinced that the Dallas police force was itself involved in sealing Oswald's lips before his story could be heard in a court of law. Or that even if Oswald had committed that heinous assassination, he must have had accomplices, whom the police were shielding. Speculations ran riot after that. By now it is doubtful whether the report of the FBI that Lee Oswald was indeed the assassin, the lone assassin, without accomplices and without the conspiracy of any organization, will be believed abroad. Where the FBI is not sacrosanct, it is natural to ask: where was it, with all its dossiers on Oswald, before the President was assassinated?

Indeed, only some one fed on a steady diet of B-movies, and nightly non-live TV murders,

could possibly believe that the assassination and the murder, all happening in a crowded 48 hours, could have been the acts of individuals.

THE TV AND RADIO

However, so bereft of any historic sense and world view are our "intellectuals" that, when sinister plots were first hinted at, as the only possible explanation of the incredible set of events, some commentators, like Walter Cronkite of CBS, promptly labeled that interpretation "Communist." It soon became obvious that this interpretation, far from being either Russian or Communist, was the general analysis made by non-Communist as well as Communist sources, in Western Europe as well as in Russia, in India as well as in Africa.

No part of the world could conceive that a President could be assassinated, another murder committed, all in view of millions and that these could be followed up by a moronic set of statements from the Dallas officers in charge of the investigation, and all this be not a poor melodramatic script, but actual life as lived in the great world power, the United States of America. The technologically most advanced land seemed indeed to have a monopoly of but one item: underdeveloped intellectuals. The Federal Government immediately announced that the case was by no means closed; that a full-scale investigation by a special commission would first be conducted, and all the facts would be made public. The tune of the commentators changed at once.

THE BOURGEOIS PRESS

Three days of national mourning, dozens of eulogies by famous men in authority, hundreds of appeals "to continue" the work of the dead President by enacting the Civil Rights Bill as a "living memorial" failed, however, to make any appreciable dent in the rabid continuity of racism which had already poisoned the life-blood of the nation. Indeed, all that happened was that the respectable press simply played down what was happening. Thus:

1) In Dallas, Texas, a Methodist minister, Rev. Holmes, told his congregation that they must all bear blame for the President's assassination for "the spirit of assassination" had long flourished there. Rev. Holmes spoke of how the hate groups conditioned the citizenry, and the citizenry the children so that, at the first announcement of the assassination, some children in school had actually cheered. All he got for his candor was threats, and he had to leave his home.

So poisoned is the Dallas air that even Mayor Earle Cabell, who was whitewashing his police, was threatened just because he announced that he would attend the funeral of President Kennedy. "You're next" became the routine of these hate calls. As the secretary of the city's AFL-CIO Council, Allan Maley, put it: "Dallas is a sick city."

2) In Memphis, Tenn. on the day after the assassination, a meeting was held by a branch

of the White Citizens Councils, where a speaker dared gloat and utter slander, "The President died a tyrant's death." It is true that some walked out; it is true that others resigned in horror; it is also true that half remained to listen to the harangue of this irresponsible demagogue.

3) In Americus, Georgia, the ruling racist authorities continued with "business as usual." The day after the burial of President Kennedy, the authorities re-indicted the four civil rights workers who had been illegally arrested in the first place on a statute dating to slavery days, which had been declared null and void by a Federal District Court.

4) Nor were these kinds of reactionary acts and diatribes limited either to the Deep South or to the state of Texas, now that a hysteria was created around "Reds." Thus, the Northern paper with the largest national circulation, The New York Daily News wrote that "we think most Americans are going to go right on hating Reds . . . and the more so because one of the rodents killed a much-loved young U.S. President." In this they were joined by The New York Journal-American.

5) The ever-so-respectable, but equally reactionary columnist, Arthur Krock of The New York Times, said, in "cultured" terms, very nearly the same thing. Mr. Krock took issue with the orators who thought that "Mr. Kennedy's murder should be related to the area where it occurred because of the intensity there and the controversy over his policies. This implication especially lacks merit by reason of the only facts known about the suspect, Oswald. He was a Marxist; at least a sym-

pathizer with the religion of Communism; emigrated to and married in the Soviet Union; and was trying to return. This is certainly not the dossier of the 'Right Wing extremists,' a stigmatic label of Dallas, which some members of the Administration are too prone to affix." (New York Times, Nov. 26, 1963)

Finally, where the KKK, the White Citizens Councils, the Birchers, the Southern governors, and the double-tongued Southern press cried crocodile tears but did not pretend that they had changed their position on civil rights, the Northern press and mass media all so deliberately played down the continuing existence of these reactionary forces, that they thereby perpetuated the illusion about this "great democracy," its "stability," and "the triumph of the forces of law and order."

THIS WAS PRECISELY THE SAME SITUATION "WHEN ENGLAND SLEPT" AND ALL APPEASERS BOASTED THEY "COULD DO BUSINESS WITH HITLER."

THE "OTHER" PRESS

Not to be outdone by American propagandists, Russian Communist sources are now claiming that Oswald, when he did live in Russia, "spied for the United States." All too obviously, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, the self-preservation of the system which, as a by-product of its exploitation and crises, produces such lunatics as Oswald, predominates above all other considerations. The digging for the truth becomes secondary.

Unfortunately some "independent" Lefts would also rather judge by surface appearance that would confirm their
(Continued on page 8)

Dec 1963

Western Intellectuals Help K, Inc. Rebury Lenin's Philosophic Legacy

1963 marked the tenth anniversary of Stalin's death. Many academic journals, in the West at any rate, celebrated the event by taking stock of every aspect of life—from the economic to the literary, and from the political to the philosophical—in Khrushchev's Russia, concentrating on the period since the de-Stalinization Congress in February, 1956.

Newsmen, too, summarized the year 1963 as a turning point in the Cold War. Very obviously the thaw in the Cold War, which resulted not merely in an abstract, limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, but also a real, cash, multi-million dollar sale of American wheat to Russia, whetted their appetite for prediction. One NBC newsmen became so enraptured of his prescience that he denied the very existence of the Cold War.

The "principle of coexistence," announced with such fanfare at that de-Stalinization Congress, seemed to have become the very way of life of Russian Communists, if not of their Chinese counterpart. Here we are interested neither in the self-proclaimed de-Stalinization, nor in the much-touted "peaceful coexistence," but in one of the lesser known aspects of that famous 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party—the dictum on philosophy.

DEATH AND RESURRECTION

It will be recalled that First Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan had, in his de-Stalinization speech, followed his attack on the historians for having failed to produce "an accepted history of the party for two decades" (1) by declaring: "One should say something, if even only two words, with regard to our philosophers—more insolvent even than historians and economists." The ossification of philosophy in the Soviet Union was ascribed to "the cult of personality," which had done its dastardly, terroristic acts not only in the lives and politics of the country, but in the "suppression of the creative development of Marxism-Leninism." The 20th Congress then decided that "the cult of personality" had suppressed "Lenin's philosophic legacy," and so decreed "The Creative Development of Marxism-Leninism Based on the Fullest Exploitation of Lenin's Philosophic Legacy."

Just as the Stalinist, Khrushchev, decreed de-Stalinization, so the Stalinist philosophers were put in charge of "saving" Lenin's philosophic legacy, specifically his Philosophic Notebooks, from the deadening effect of Stalinism. And so began the rise in the Khrushchev hierarchy of the Stalinist philosophic clique of Miltin, Yudin, Rosental, Kanstalinov, Kedrov, Alexandrov and others.

By 1958 they produced a "new" textbook on philosophy, and Western intellectuals wrote "learned treatises" on the "differences" between philosophic productions under Stalin and under Khrushchev. Whether this new attention paid to Communist philosophers was to make up for the previous neglect, or reflected the natural state of ossification of philosophy on this as well as the other side of the Iron Curtain, the Western output was threadbare indeed. Moreover, this characterized not only the output of articles, but of "authoritative" books. (2)

Where, however the Western intellectuals were "satisfied" with the "new" output Propaganda Chief Ilychev, in 1960, castigated the philosophers for not carrying out the dictum of either the 20th or 21st Congress. By October, 1961, when the 22nd Congress of the Russian Communist Party first "disclosed" that Stalin held Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks in "disfavor," the Sino-Soviet Rift, still then cloaked as a debate over Albania, overshadowed not only the philosophic "disclosure" but the announced purpose of that Congress for which the drums had been beat for many months previous—the new Program, billed as a veritable new Communist Manifesto in the tradition of Karl Marx, which was to replace the one adopted in Lenin's time shortly after conquest of power.

THE WEST TO THE RESCUE?

Surely it should have been easy to dispel the newly-created little myth that, with, and only with, the 1956 de-Stalinization Congress did Lenin's "philosophic legacy," specifically his Philosophic Notebooks, first come into its own. That this nevertheless was an impossible feat for bourgeois intellectuals tells as much of the ossification of Western philosophy as it does of regimentation of Communist philosophy.

The hardest thing for an intellectual to comprehend is his own fragmentation. Not only does he seem to feel that only workers are subject to fragmentation because they work in factories, but he is more likely than not "to value" his specialization since it is allegedly due only to the infinite scope of knowledge. The one grain of truth in this is that the narrowness of vision of the intellectual is only in part due to specialization. Fundamentally it is rooted in the division between mental and manual labor. Or, more precisely put, to meet the specific point at issue, it is rooted in his isolation from reality.

THE "THEORETICAL" PRACTICE OF STALIN, KHRUSHCHEV, MAO

It is this which Stalin grasped at with all his might when he reduced theory to "practice," a word Stalin endowed with the allness and nothingness with which Humpty Dumpty endowed the word, glory: "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less." In the year 1929, when Stalin came face to face with the great agricultural crisis and declared himself to be the philosopher, "practice" meant the subordination of all abstract philosophy to the reality of the crisis and "therefore" the dictum "to liquidate the kulak as a class."

In his talk to the agronomists, Stalin took his first step in revising the Marxian theory of expanded reproduction, transforming the description of capitalist economy into the prescription for "socialist economy." What Stalin achieved in the 1930's with forced collectivization and the state-planned industry he crowned, in 1943, with another feat of revision, this time the Marxian theory of value, which included a break with the dialectic structure of CAPITAL.

Even as the 1947 Stalin-Zhdanov order to philosophers "to replace" the Hegelian law of objective contradiction with "a new dialectical law"—"criticism and self-criticism"—is presently reaching its ultimate in Mao's perennial "thought reform" campaigns, so it has not been overthrown by Khrushchev who allegedly wanted "to return" to the true Lenin philosophic legacy. Because this is so, the Stalinist philosophers not only survived de-Stalinization but rose in the Khrushchev hierarchy. Because, on the other hand, the non-Marxist intellectuals persist in identifying Communism with its opposite, Marxism, they fail to see the true ideological continuity in Stalin-Khrushchev-Mao. A sort of built-in deafness to Lenin's break with his own philosophic past further assures Western intellectual incapacity to deal with philosophical writings in Russia.

NEEDED: ANALYSIS OF CLASS NATURE OF COMMUNISM

Take the standard: Dialectical Materialism, A Historical and Systemic Survey of Philosophy in the Soviet Union, by Gustav A. Wetter, S.J., which had first been issued in Italy in 1948, extensively revised in 1952 for its German edition, and, once again extensively revised for its fourth German, and first English and American translation in 1958, in order "to take account of the changes wrought by the de-Stalinization campaign."

Wetter follows the Communist break-up of dialectical philosophy into two separate divisions: dialectical materialism and historical materialism, and further he limits his field of inquiry to "dialectical materialism." Having achieved that amputation of the wholeness of Marxian dialectics, there inevitably follows the exclusion of controversies on Marxian economics. We do not get a whiff of the most startling Stalinist revision of the Marxian theory of value in 1943. Since, however, Marxian political economy is indivisible from Marxian dialectical philosophy, which, in fact, imposed upon the Stalinist revisionists of the theory of value a break also with the dialectic structure of CAPITAL, Wetter has only succeeded in half-blinding himself in dealing seriously with the 1947 open break from Hegelian dialectics. The result is that when Wetter finally deals with Zhdanov's order to the philosophers to find a "new dialectical law"—"criticism and self-criticism"—to replace the objective law of contradiction as interpreted by Hegel and Marx, he can say nothing more illuminating than the fact that the 1947 and 1955 discussions of "criticism and self-criticism" first arose at the Fifteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (December 1927) which had proclaimed Stalin's victory over all opposition.

Precisely. This, however, needs to be understood, not as a mere listing of "facts," but as a qualitative transformation into opposite. Because Stalin's victory over all opposition meant the abolition of all factions within the Party as well as without; because his one truly original contribution to Communism is the monolithic party; because this victory spelled out not only

6718

January 1964 (cont'd)

priori judgments than face reality. Thus they tend to disregard entirely the fact that Oswald, if he was the assassin, was certainly no part of the Far Right. There is no doubt that this madman owed loyalty to no organization, and no organization is responsible for his acts. There is also no doubt that terrorist acts in general, and the assassin's acts in particular, solve no problems whatever but create a lot of them. The complexity of the reality, however, cannot be faced and fought rationally if we fail to face with sober senses that which is. Only through such confrontation can we expose the objective conditions which produce the Oswalds — the exploitative system which is constantly veering between depression and wars. Only through such confrontation can the Far Right be exposed as the fomenters of hatred and creator of "the spirit of assassination." What is of even graver consequence for the living is that these hate-mongers have every intention of continuing with their white counter-revolution.

OUR LIBERTIES AT STAKE

We are therefore compelled to ask: Once the investigation is concluded and the assassin "proven" to be "of the Left," will the present attitude of playing down the forces of reaction not prepare the ground for an unholy alliance not only of Far Right and "near-Right" but also of moderates against genuine political opposition, not just of the "outs" against the "ins," but of the opponents of the exploitative system of capitalism—private or state?

The real danger lies precisely in maintaining the status quo and putting the mark of virtue on mediocrity, creating at the same time a false camaraderie among all those who would maintain "the system," including the white counter-revolution!

This is why the Left must not paralyze itself by arguing on the same ground as the bourgeois and Communist press, each of which now claims that Oswald "belongs" to the other camp.

This is not a question of the insane Oswald, anymore than it was a question of the sane Eisenhower who was nevertheless called "Communist" by the irresponsible Robert Welch.

Nor is this only a question of "Far Right" as against "good conservatives." Nixon too, in the search for votes, could come up with "20 years of treason" directed against the Democrats. Nor do I mean to absolve the Democrat Truman who fought the label against his party successfully, but who signed into law what the loud McCarthy only yelled about.

In a word, the truth is that many of the laws in this country are the most reactionary to be found anywhere. Beginning with the start of World War II came the infamous Smith Act (by the very same racist Congressman Smith who heads the Rules Committee and keeps the Civil Rights Bill bottled up); by the end of the war came the anti-labor Taft-Hartley Law; and, with the Korean War, the McCarran Act.

There has hardly been a respite, a thaw against thought control. This, this precisely, paved the ground for the Far Right to be born, to be nourished and grow so fat and arrogant that not even so murderous an act as the assassination of the President stops them. Mayor Cabell of Dallas reported to the FBI that the

threatening telephone call he had received not only told him that he "was next," but that at President Kennedy's funeral "they" intended also to assassinate General De Gaulle. One day they may create just such an incident in order to provoke World War III!

It is no accident that, as soon as these reactionary "anti-subversive" laws were enacted, South U.S.A. began to use them against the N.A.A.C.P. and listed that civil rights organization as "subversive."

It is no accident that the FBI has never moved against the subversive Far Right, not even when murders were committed. To this day reactionary states' rights very obviously predominate over human rights.

It is no accident that the groundwork has been laid for an unholy alliance between the forces of reaction and the moderates, not only in Congress, but also in the press, to create a new hysteria about "Reds."

This is what must be stopped. This is the real tragedy. There is no surecase from the reactionary forces who, on this centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation, are trying to turn back the clock of history. The hatred is already in the lifeblood of this country. All the speeches (See p. 2 on the speech of Chief Justice Earl Warren) cannot change this precisely because they are only speeches.

Thus, although President Johnson has come out with the strongest — if rhetoric be strength — statement, demanding "action" on the Civil Rights Bill, there was not one concrete move on his part to change "the rules of the game" and abolish the filibuster. There was no taking away of any of

the reactionary, vested privileges of the rule of "seniority" so that the chairmanship of the key Congressional Committees remains in the hands of Southern segregationists.

If the bill ever gets out of the Rules Committee and on the floor for open debate, this, too, will be a sham, for there will be not only the filibuster by the Eastlands, the Smiths, the Russells and their ilk, but also by the supposedly liberal Southerners who are not exactly famous for courage in breaking their unholy alliance with reactionaries, Democrat and Republican, on the question of civil rights.

Finally, if even this bill, weakened by compromise to begin with, gets passed in a truncated form, there will neither be fundamental change in the South itself, nor will the date for action be firmly set. "Early action" is a far cry from real action, today, not tomorrow, a tomorrow that has lasted a century.

As for the Special Commission on the assassination itself, although it is headed by the liberal Chief Justice Earl Warren, it is still staffed by a sufficient number of Southerners, including that ubiquitous Senator Russell (whose protegee the new President Johnson once was) that there will be room enough for reactionary diversions to hunt for political opponents rather than the assassins, much less those who created the conditions for "the spirit of assassination" to thrive.

This is not to say either that Lyndon B. Johnson, now that he is President, and can no longer afford to think as a Texan, does not "wish" that the Civil Rights Bill be passed, or that the tragic death of Presi-

dent Kennedy was not a blow to the civil rights movement. As weak as is the Civil Rights Bill, the truth is that it is opposed by the South as well as reactionaries in the North. The original Emancipation Proclamation, too, was no more "emotional," as one famous historian put it, than "a bill of sale." Nevertheless, as Karl Marx said, 100 years ago, "All Lincoln's acts appear like the mean pettifogg conditions which one lawyer puts to his opposing lawyer. But this does not alter their historic content . . . The events over there are a world upheaval."

Here, then, is the issue. 100 years ago, when Lincoln was assassinated, a Radical Republi-

can Congress carried on the work of reconstruction of the South. The Congress today, in both its Republican and Democratic wings, is neither farsighted nor long on action. But it is equally true that the Freedom Now movement has no intention whatever to settle for a horrible co-existence with the likes of the Barnetts and Wallaces and their ilk, where the latter has all the power, and the masses have none. They will therefore continue and intensify their self-activity. Herein, and only herein, lies our strength.

THE ROAD AHEAD

What, therefore, becomes of paramount importance to Marxist-Humanists is to see that con-

tinuity is not the continuity of the unfinished revolution which the forces of reaction are determined to keep unfinished. Continuity is, rather, the continuity of the Humanist and American roots of Marxism in the full Abolitionist tradition that will, once and for all, act on the truth that time has indeed run out on all compromises, come they from the Far Right or only "near" Right. The road to embark on, the task to dedicate oneself to is the movement that will tear up-racism at its root in the capitalist exploitative system. For only the reconstruction of society on totally new, on truly human beginnings can make Freedom Now a reality.

*See 1963
6719*

(cont'd)

the transformation of philosophy into mere ideology, but the foundation for the centralized State Plan, the nationalized economy could, and did, create a state-capitalist ruling class.

Having been shown neither the class nature of Stalinism, nor the self-imposed blindness caused by specialization in the field of dialectics, Wetter finally brings us to the post-Stalin era and the "strictly" dialectic chapter — only to present the 1955 revision of the law of "the negation of negation" as a re-establishment of this nodal point of Hegelian and Marxian philosophy! The reason? The continuous use of quantitative measurements: (a) In his Short History of the CPSU (E), Stalin left out the law of the negation of the negation as one of the basic laws of the Hegelian dialectic. In Questions of Philosophy No. 3, '55 Karpushin mentions it. (Never mind that he attacks it and perverts Marx's analysis of it; the point is he does mention it and Stalin didn't!) (b) Also Karpushin mentions the fact that the Early Essays of Marx have been dropped from the Collected Works of Marx. (Again, never mind that he regrets this omission only because he singles it out for attack and revision; obviously the point with our unregimented philosophers is to have everything in its proper chronological order.)

Forgotten altogether is that the Karpushin attack on the Humanism of Marx was not just the revision of theory of past events, removed by 111 years, but preparation for next year's counter-revolutionary suppression of the Hungarian Revolution. (3)

(To be Continued in February Issue)

FOOTNOTES

(1) On that question see "Without A Past and Without A Future," NEWS & LETTERS, March 30, 1956.

(2) In the West, too, so-called Marxology has become so institutionalized — and not only by theologians in Italy, West Germany, Switzerland, Holland, but now even "radicals" in France prefer working with their theologians than be exposed to more fundamental opposition to Marxists who believe in the philosophy rather than merely specialize in it for pay—that an independent work does not get the attention and circulation it should. Thus Gustav A. Wetter's Dialectical Materialism, built mainly on secondary sources, becomes the "standard," while David Joravsky's Soviet Marxism and Natural Science, 1917-1932, solidly based on primary sources and dispelling many of the myths in the former, is shunted aside as only for academicians. Unfortunately, we cannot use much of it in this review since it deals with a different period than that which is our concern, but we recommend it highly.

(3) Here is what we wrote on this same Karpushin essay: "Nothing changed Marx's social vision: the vision of the future which Hegel called the Absolute and which Marx first called 'real Humanism' and later 'communism.' The road to both is by way of 'the negation of the negation' that is to say, the destruction of the existing system which had destroyed the previous system. That is what the Russian ruling class trembles at, as well it may, for it knows this movement not by the name 'negation of the negation' but by the reality of the revolution against it." (Marxism and Freedom, p. 66)

Jan 1964

6 7 2 1

Western Intellectuals Help K., Inc. Rebury Lenin's Philosophic Legacy

Part II

In Part I of this article on the state of ossification of philosophy, East and West, I mentioned the built-in deafness to Lenin's break with his own philosophic past which has led to the Western intellectual's inability to cope with the deliberate emasculation of Lenin's philosophic legacy by the Communist theoreticians. I shall now develop this point.

Even so objective a study as David Joravsky's *Soviet Marxism and Natural Science, 1917-1932*, cannot escape the consequences of the failure to grapple with Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks*, written at the time of the collapse of the Second International at the outbreak of the first World War, when Lenin felt compelled to return to the origins of Marxism in Hegelian philosophy.

Mr. Joravsky senses that Lenin's comments on Hegel's *Science of Logic* are " tantalizingly suggestive of a new turn in his thought" (p. 20). He profoundly exposes Stalin's transformation of Lenin's alleged "partyism" in the field of philosophy into pure Stalinist monolithism. He demonstrates that Lenin's aim, even in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, was "not to join the philosophical and political issues that Russian Marxists were arguing about; it was to separate them." (p. 34, emphasis added.) He proves conclusively that it is not only the Communist theoreticians that pretend that Stalinist monolithism is the natural and only possible result of Lenin's concept, but that:

"Non-Communist authors have contributed to the confusion by an excess of boldness, by the proclivity that many have shown towards magisterial judgments on the basis of insufficient evidence. One author, for example, writing in a scholarly journal, based a history of the theory of relativity in Soviet physics and philosophy on three 'sources', two of which were merely ambiguous passing references to Einstein's theory in Soviet articles on other subjects." (p. x) (The references is to Lewis S. Feuer's "Dialectical Materialism and Soviet Science," *Philosophy of Science*, April 1949.)

Nevertheless by excluding from his own work a serious analysis of Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks*, Mr. Joravsky leaves the door wide open for lesser scholars to write as if there was a straight philosophic line from Lenin to Stalin, instead of a transformation into opposite.

SHORT OF PHILISTINISM

I am referring here not only to the sophomoric essays by American "experts" whose arrogance matches their philistinism. George Lichtheim rightly calls the American contribution to Marxism by non-Marxists "a sort of intellectual counterpart to the late Mr. Dulles's weekly sermon on the evils of communism." (1) I am referring to Mr. Lichtheim himself and to such writers as Eugene Kamenka of Australia, whose *The Ethical Foundations of Marxism* places him in the sophisticated European tradition of non-Marxist analyses of Marxism.

Mr. Kamenka certainly appreciates the Humanism of Marxism and knows that Communist totalitarianism has nothing whatever to do with the Marxist theory of liberation. He has no organic anti-Leninist prejudices such as Mr. Lichtheim has. On the contrary, he sees in Lenin "a mind of the first order." Nevertheless, he feels that "philosophy was to him (Lenin) only of incidental interest" so that "the force of a first-class mind" needs to be discerned "through the frequent naive and distantism of his philosophical writings and notes." As if professionalisation of philosophy were synonymous with original philosophic thought, Mr. Kamenka claims that contemporary "reformulations of the classical philosophical disputes" has robbed "Lenin's insights of most of their immediate impact and relevance." (2)

All this is said in passing supposedly because the subject matter under consideration is current Soviet philosophy. Allegedly for the same reason, no attempt whatever is made to deal with the text of Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks*. And yet the allegations against him are made as if they were self-evident truths. We will see in a moment how the ravages of that cut into his expose of the superficialities of the Western treatment of Soviet philosophy.

First it should be stated that Mr. Kamenka magnificently exposes the ignorance of the learned. Needless to say, this is not his phrase. What other conclusion, however, can one draw from the following irrefutable facts? One, that for decades on end, the learned journal of the Royal Institute of Philosophy, edited by the illustrious Lord Acton carried not a single article on Soviet philosophy until January, 1963, when they published Mr. Kamenka's "Philosophy in the Soviet Union."

Two, even the specialized quarterly of the Institute of East-European Studies at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland—*Studies in Soviet Thought*, edited by the eminent Professor Bochenski—has been so preoccupied with purely quantitative phenomena like the number of writers, the number of words written, the compilation of bibliographies, that it has hardly had time to present "actual translations" of Soviet articles, much less seriously answering the Soviet claims.

And yet, Mr. Kamenka suddenly concludes that what is needed to start a serious dialogue between "Western" philosophers and their Russian counterparts is for the latter to "acquire something of the integrity and sophistication of genuine philosophical argument . . . from the West . . ."

It is impossible to expose Khrushchevite pretensions about "a return to Lenin" without tracing Leninist philosophy to its source, not excluding the quality in this heritage. This is not an intra-factional dispute of interest only to Marxists, or their opposite, Communists. It is impossible to meet the challenge to thought, to Western thought, unless one fully appreciates the significance of Lenin's 1914-15 break with his own philosophic past.

THE OBJECTIVE COMPULSION TO THOUGHT

The point is this: the compulsion to break with this philosophic past, with vulgar materialism, came from objective conditions. The compulsion to thought was brought about by a world war, the first world war, a crisis in Western civilization, a crisis in all men's lives. Our post-World War II situation, with its little wars, the Cold War, threat of nuclear holocaust, is a daily reminder of the deaththroes of an older order, the birth pangs of a new one, the near-insoluble problems of this titanic conflict. In that respect Lenin's *Notebooks* can shed greater light than the "sophisticated" theses of today that keep philosophy hemmed in a tight little circle of the learned isolated from "politics."

Far from being "dated," Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks*, as method, are as urgent as today's headlines. Far from being "Russian," they are as lacking in boundaries, in thought, as are the ICBM's in life. These are not only political problems. They are a challenge to thought as well as to life. As that encyclopedic mind of Hegel's said most profoundly when the philosophy of his day did not accept the challenge of changing times, did not grasp the French Revolution, as Idea, "it is the nature of truth to force its way to recognition." A philosophy that falls then to reorganize its very structure turns the learned into "representatives, who are like the dead burying the dead." (3)

Lacking such an attitude to objectivity, Western thought flounders and therefore falls into quantitative measurements instead of the measure of Man, the human aspiration, the thought that can lay the foundation for a reorganization of society. Khrushchev, and, yes, Mao,—have a state reason for burying Lenin's *Notebooks*—the preservation of their respective state-capitalist tyrannies demands that the idea of freedom be buried along with freedom. But where, at least on the surface, the learned of the West need not be state philosophers, is it not time to end their ignorance of Marxist philosophy? (4)

Naturally it is much easier to expose the superficiality of "the copy theory" of cognition expounded in Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. But is that sufficient reason for serious thinkers to turn away from the compulsion to seek the significance of Lenin's *Notebooks* on Hegel's *Science of Logic* till they grasp the meaning of Lenin's statement, "Man's cognition not only reflects the objective world, but creates it."

Instead of helping Khrushchev, in the 35th year since the first Russian publication of Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks*, once again, to perpetrate a live burial of those dialectic notes, isn't it high time finally to come to grips with their challenge to today's thought? Without such a meaningful encounter, the ossification of Western thought is sure "to outdistance" Communist putrefaction.

(Footnote next page)
February 1964

Feb 1964

FOOTNOTES

(1) "Western Marxist Literature, 1953-63" in Survey, Jan. '64. Mr. Lichtheim's remarks follow his reference to Robert Tucker's Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx. In casting the blame for such sophomoric performances on "the peculiarly American manner," Mr. Lichtheim conveniently disregards both Marxist-Humanism in the United States and the fact that the "sort of intellectual counterpart to the late Mr. Dulles's weekly sermons on the evils of communism" to which Mr. Lichtheim refers covers also the Sidney Hooks, Daniel Bells, Lewis S. Feuers as well as their European counterparts. Furthermore, there is little difference between the professional anti-Leninist and professional fellow-traveller a la Sarte when it comes to a confrontation with the philosophic legacy of Lenin in his Notebooks.

(2) "Soviet Philosophy Through Western Eyes," in Survey, Jan. '64.

(3) Hegel, The Phenomenology of Mind, p. 130.

(4) See Chapter X dealing with Lenin and the dialectic: a mind in action, in MARXISM AND FREEDOM as well as the new chapter "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung;" in the paperback edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM. Excerpts from it are reproduced on P. 7.

Marxism and Freedom

New Introduction to the Second Edition

"Only that which is an object of freedom can be called an idea."—Hegel

The first edition of *MARXISM AND FREEDOM* went to press as *Sputnik No. 1* went into orbit. That same year, 1957, the Little Rock riots shared headlines with the scientific phenomenon. In 1962, two different events were again held in unison in men's consciousness. This time James Meredith's courageous entry into the University of Mississippi took the lustre out of Walter Shirra's spectacular six-orbital entry into space. An age in which "a little thing," like school desegregation, can hold in tow such scientific milestones is an age in which men's consciousness is preoccupied, not with scientific conquest, but with human freedom.

This new edition appears when our life and times impart an urgency to the task of working out a new relationship of philosophy to reality. Thought and deed cannot forever stand apart. Somewhere, some time, they must meet. Throughout history the forces that have produced great social revolutions have also generated great philosophical revolutions. It was true when Hainsborough expressed the motive power of the English Revolution of 1648 as: "The poorest he in England hath a life to live as the greatest he." It is true when, in 1863, James Baldwin speaks of "a glimpse of another world . . . I speak of change not on the surface but in the depths—change in the sense of renewal." 17th century English Leveller fighting for equality, or 20th century Negro fighting for freedom now, pull strenuously at the intellectual tendency to resist the compulsion to original thought on the very eve of social revolutions that demand philosophic reconstructions.

The two features which characterize great periods of upheaval are, one, that a new subject is born to respond to the objective pull of history by making freedom and reason the reality of the day. And, two, a new relationship between theory and practice is forged. This is true for the past—Levellers in 17th century England; the sans culottes in the French Revolution of 1793-1795; the runaway slaves impelling the United States to the Civil War of 1861-1865; the St. Petersburg proletariat in the 1905 and 1917 Russian Revolutions. This is true for the present—in the Hungarian Revolution against Russian totalitarianism, no less than in the African Revolutions against Western imperialism. This does not mean that each of these historic periods has given birth to a totally new philosophy. An original philosophy is a rare creation, born after much travail only when called forth by a new stage in world consciousness of freedom. It does mean that a viable philosophy must be capable of meeting the challenge of human experience, of the new revolts symbolic of the lack of specific freedoms.

To this author it meant that, no matter what the reasons were that caused the transformation of the Marxian theory of liberation into its opposite after the Russian Revolutions failed to realize, that is to say, put into practice this philosophy of freedom (see Chapters XII and XIII), a return to the original form of the Humanism of Marxism became imperative. Because Marx's Humanist Essays were not available in English at the time *MARXISM AND FREEDOM* came off the press in 1958, I included these writings as an Appendix. Since that time there have been several English translations of these Essays as well as many commentaries on them. It soon became evident, however, that this was done, not to re-establish the integral unity of Marxian economics with his philosophical humanism, but only in order to exorcise the ghost of Karl Marx and then rebury him, this time as a Humanist. It cannot be done. Marxist Humanism will remain alive so long as a new world on truly new, human beginnings has not been established.

Totalitarian Communism understands this so well that the counter-revolutionary suppression of the Hungarian Revolution went hand-in-hand with the suppression of thought. The subsequent Khrushchev-Mao designation of Marxist Humanists as "revisionists" and the denunciation of "revisionism" as "the main danger" did not, however, deter the American "ideology specialists" from taking over the term, "revisionism," and similarly using it against the opponents of the ruling bureaucracies who had not only revised, but vilified, Marxism. The very intellectuals who had lost their collective tongue during the period of McCarthyism now found their individual tongues to attempt to fragmentize Marx.

The debate around the Essays degenerated into a question of first-edness as if it were a college debate held for scoring points. As I stated during the discussion in 1961: "The dispute over who was the first to translate Marx's 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts into English is a meaningful controversy only if it has a substantive relationship to the spirit of those Essays and of our times. I was compelled to be the first to publish these Essays in 1958 because for the fifteen years previous I had tried, in vain, to convince other scholars, writers, and publishers of the cogency of these Essays. When in the period between the East German Revolt and the Hungarian Revolution, the Russian Communists openly attacked those Essays (*Voprosy Filosofii*, #3, 1955), I once again began my round of publishers. This time the Essays were part of my book. I held that the Russian Communist attack on them was not academic, but a foreboding of revolutions to come. The following year the great Hungarian Revolution raised the Humanist flag clearly. Because Marxist Humanism, to me, is the only genuine ground from which to oppose Communist totalitarianism, I felt the compulsion to show that Humanism is not something invented by me, but came directly from Marx, who fought what he called "vulgar Communism," writing that 'communism, as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society.'

Skepticism also greeted my statement in the first edition, that the road to a new society, opened by the Hungarian Revolution, was no less illumined by the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Since then the Negro struggle has become all-rounded and so engulfed the North, as well as the South, that the phrase, "Negro Revolution," has become almost a cliché. Yet the fact that a revolution can be treated as a mere journalistic phrase only further reveals the failure to grapple with the truth that the American Negro has always been the touchstone of American civilization which had an ever-expanding frontier but no unifying philosophy. Nor has the challenge been met when the call for a unifying philosophy came from an altogether new source: the scientist (Dr. William E. Pickering) who first succeeded in sending the American Explorer into orbit. In speaking of the fact that mankind was now "only one-half hour away from total annihilation," Dr. Pickering said that mankind was in need, not of more destructive weapons that the scientists invent, but of "a new, unifying philosophy."

This same period saw the emergence of the African Revolutions under their own Humanist banner.** It was indeed the birth of this new world independent of the Communist orbit that both led to the Communist discovery of this "third world" and to the rift within its own orbit. (On the Sino-Soviet Rift see Chapter XVII.) Because the dynamism of ideas escapes American "ideology specialists," they do not pick up the gauntlet for the struggle for the minds of men. Instead, they act as if any ideological battle, if even it concerns the very survival of humanity, is only rhetoric. It is not that they do not know as well anybody that, far from rhetoric, this is the overriding fact in a world of H-bombs and ICBMs. Nor is it that they held their breath any less than the rest of us when, in October, 1962, J. F. Kennedy told N. S. Khrushchev that the United States was ready to unloose a nuclear holocaust unless Russia removed its missiles from Cuba. It is rather due to their belief that their aging views toward ideas would somehow magically dissipate the class struggle, and the racial struggle would thereby become bite size.

Where some reviewers wished to return Marx's Humanist Essays to the archives, others questioned my theory of state-

(Cont'd)

Feb. 1964

6723

(cont'd)

capitalism, saying that I had paid insufficient attention to the changed conditions in Russia since the ascent of Khrushchev to power. They pointed especially to "the abolition of the forced labor camps." Curiously enough, this criticism came, in large measure, from those who denied the very existence of the camps until Khrushchev declared them abolished. That the worst of the concentration camps have been eliminated does not mean that there are none. It only means that "corrective labor" has taken a different, a milder form. Neither United States "free enterprise" nor Russian "communism," has changed the fundamental Marxian theory of value and surplus value, or capitalism as an exploitative relationship of capital to labor. After the Russian admission, in 1943, that the law of value operates in Russia, there was no further point to continue the detailed analysis of their State Plans. My analysis of the Five Year Plans, therefore, stopped with World War II, and thereafter focused on the Russian assault on Marx's CAPITAL and his ECONOMIC-PHILOSOPHIC MANUSCRIPTS (see Chapters III and XII). There is no reason to revise my analysis.

What is fundamentally new now are the developments in the Sino-Soviet orbit. My analysis of the rift was originally elaborated in 1961 as part of a new book I am writing on world ideologies and the technologically underdeveloped countries. Because "The Challenge of Mao" has a special urgency for today I brought it up to date when Japanese friends asked to include it in the edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM they are preparing for publication in Tokyo. It is included as Chapter XVII in this new American edition as well. Both editions are going to press as we approach the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the International Working Men's Association in London, in 1864.

November 1, 1963
Detroit, Michigan

Raya Dunayevskaya

*That appendix has been dropped from this new edition because the Essays are now easily available in English. The official Moscow publication (1959) is marred by footnotes which flagrantly violate Marx's content and intent. The preferable translation is T. B. Bottomore which, with other primary materials, is included in Marx's Concept of Man by Erich Fromm. (Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1961.)
**See my pamphlet, Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions. (News & Letters, Detroit, 1959; Cambridge, England, 1961.)

Feb 1964

6724

A Forgotten Page of American History **Negro in the Populist Movement**

(Editor's Note—A reader writes as follows:

"I re-read my copy of *American Civilization on Trial*, and was struck once again with the amazing fact that your group—almost alone, pointed out that the Negro question was a 'national question' long before the Freedom Now movement forced everyone to recognize it.

"And now, it seems that you are again almost alone—among the 'experts' that is—in seeing that the critical link today is the link that must be made between the white workers and this independent Negro movement. . . . In *American Civilization on Trial*, you had a section on 'Black and White Unity' in the Populist Movement, and several years back, if I remember correctly, you ran a 'Two Worlds' column on that subject, which was excellent. Could you run that again sometime?"

We gladly reprint that "Two Worlds," originally published in *News & Letters*, February, 1959.)

As the latest crop of books from white Southern "liberals" once again proves, the plea for time to "readjust" (another civil war?) is based on the most popular white fetish that the South has "always" been solid on—"the race problem."

The truth is that one of the greatest pages of our history—the Populist movement—had its Southern chapter written by white and Negro acting together. "Never before or since," writes the historian, C. Vann Woodward*, "have the two races in the South come so close together as they did during the Populist struggles."

The simultaneous growth of monopoly and depression during the turbulent eighties and "heart-breaking" nineties found the agricultural South at the mercy of the city merchant and ground beneath the wheel of the railroads with their high tariffs, established by an unholy combination of railroad tycoons and the Government. In sheer self-defense, the farmers—white and black, middle class and poor, West and South—united to challenge not only the unbridled rule of Eastern capital, but also their own race prejudices.

One of the incidents during this period will show just how strong the unity of action between white and Negro was. A Negro Populist, H. S. Doyle, was confronted with a lynch threat. A white Populist leader, the Georgian, Tom Watson, then declared:

"We are determined in this free country that the humblest white or black man who wants to talk our doctrine shall do it, and the man doesn't live who shall touch a hair of his head, without fighting every man in the People's Party."

In those days Tom Watson meant what he said. He followed this declaration up by giving Doyle shelter and sending out riders on horseback for assistance. We have a description of this from the biographer of Tom Watson: "All night armed farmers roared into the village. The next morning the streets were lined with buggies and horses, foamed and fired with travel. All that day and the next night they continued to pour in until 'fully 2,000' Populists crowded the village—arms stacked on Watson's veranda."

POPULISM AND NEGRO SELF-ACTIVITY

Populism was a power to be reckoned with both in state and national politics. It was instrumental in the election of Populist governors as well as state and national representatives. The National Colored Farmers' Alliance alone numbered no less than 1 1/4 million. Although separately organized, from the white agrarians, it waged its battles together with them. At one blow the unity of white and black not only shattered the Solid South but threatened to do the same to the two party system.

Tom Watson gave expression to the Populist principle of a united front of white and Negro in these words:

"Now the People's Party says to these two men: 'You are kept apart that you may be separately fleeced of your earnings. You are made to hate each other because upon that hatred is rested the keystone of the arch of financial despotism which enslaves you both. You are deceived and blinded that you may not see how this race antagonism perpetuates a monetary system which hoggars both.'"

It is true that by the time of World War I the old Watson became a race-baiter. The greater truth, the one that will live in history, however, is that, under the impact of the objective situation, that man was spokesman for, and a practitioner of, black and white unity. Of course, he buckled under when the different classes within the agrarian movement separated. When industry won the battle over agriculture, planter and cotton picker found different class alignments. The irresistible power of an idea with a mass following was no longer irresistible when the mass—in this case the National Colored Farmers' Alliance—called for a general strike of Negro cotton pickers.

Poor and rich divided, and so did the South. The president of the National Alliance (white) advised the farmers "to leave their cotton in the field rather than pay more than 50c per hundred to have it picked." The schism within the movement made it easy for the industrialist to unite with the planter to thwart the strivings for a truly new social order.

The point is that while the Populist movement did sweep the country, it had found its most radical expression in the South. This was seen both in the white agrarians' attitude to the Negro, and in the Negro's trying to push the movement forward by mass action of the cotton pickers. As we have seen, at the very height of the prejudice-ridden post-Reconstruction period, when the South was supposedly solidly white in thought and action, the unity of white and black shattered both the Solid South and the two party system. In the same way, the self-activity of the Negroes foreshadowed the class struggles to come and which we are living through today.

* Prof. Vann Woodward is one of the very few white historians who have made a great contribution to the study of American history by not neglecting the role of the Negro. See especially his work, *TOM WATSON, Agrarian Rebel*, from which the quotations in this article are taken. (Rinehart & Co., New York, \$5.)

March 1964

APRIL, 1964

10c A Copy
6d in Great Britain

U.S. Support of Brazil's Military Coup Aids Forces of Repression

The Johnson Administration's unseemly haste, 12 short hours after a military coup took place in Brazil, to recognize its "constitutionality," heap praise upon its "moderation" although 7,000 oppositionists filled the jails before two weeks were over, and immediately guarantee the flow of dollars to it, brings into stark relief the "new" policy of America's infamous dollar imperialism rushing to prop up Latin American oligarchies that can support themselves only with the aid of the military.

In the present case, Secretary of State Rusk was quick to anoint the latest notorious "preventive" military coup on the ground that President Goulart planned a "left coup" to undermine constitutional government. Actually, all Goulart did was to announce that he meant to put into effect land reform, especially in the universally acknowledged poverty-

stricken Recife province. FEAR OF LAND REFORM REAL BASIS FOR COUP

In land mass Brazil is very nearly half of Latin America. In a vast land where 90% of the land is owned by 10% of the landowners, Goulart sought to reform conditions and provide some degree of relief from the misery of poverty. His program called for: 1) Government expropriation of the private untitled lands so that farms could be provided for the landless peasant; 2) Nationalization of private oil refineries; 3) Granting the vote to 20 million Brazilian illiterates; 4) Legalization of the Brazilian Communist Party; 5) Curtailment of loans by the Bank of Brazil; 6) Lifting of the ban on a second straight term for Brazil's Presidents.

This program was opposed by the big landowners, the big industrialists, the Catholic Church and the military forces. Thereupon, with the silent and not-so-silent aid of American imperialism, following the assurance by President Johnson's specialist on Latin American Affairs, Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann, that the Administration would no longer follow the Kennedy policy of withholding recognition from Latin American dictatorships, three governors, backed by their armies, forced President Goulart to flee the country.

THE MILITARY AND THE REPRESSIONS

It is the equivalent of the governors of Alabama, Mississippi and Texas calling out the National Guard of those states and marching on Washington to be welcomed with open arms by the residents of the Pentagon.

In Brazil it was Governor Ahemar de Barros of Sao Paulo, Governor Lacerda of Guanabara, the Army Chief of Staff Marshal Humberto Branco and others who planned and executed the revolt. In the process, another myth which the Johnson Administration propagated fell: that now these "moderate constitutional forces would clean up corruption." In fact, one of the main instigators of this coup, Governor de Barros, openly ran on the platform, "I may steal, but I get things done."

Among the "things they got done" was evidently assuring safe passage to President Goulart who, far from being a Communist, is himself a big landowner and could easily retire to Uruguay while the great masses who helped him in Brazil are once again, as with the previous president, Quadros, left to bear the brunt of the repressions the military will now carry out against worker and peasant alike.

When the right-wing gang hollers about "cleaning out the communists," they are talking about 127 Labor Party Deputies in Congress and 18 Senators out of 66 in the Senate. Former President Kubitschek stated, "There is no excuse for violence against property or personal liberty." At least three Rio newspapers gave strong backing to Kubitschek's warning to the military to avoid excesses. They protested that civil liberties were being violated by the police and the Army.

Nevertheless, on April 11, Gen. Branco, the mastermind of the revolt, was "elected" as provisional president to take over from the temporarily installed provisional president Mazilli. One of the last official acts of Mazilli was the cancellation of a Goulart land reform decree.

Branco will have power to set all government expenditures, may declare a state of siege without congressional approval, and will rule with all constitutional guarantees suspended for six months. His rule, to Jan. 31, 1966 will be the most authoritative since the 1946 Getulio Vargas dictatorship.

He will have the power arbitrarily to purge "suspected" Communists "and extremists" from all official agencies — Congress, the supreme court and all governmental departments included. Of the 7,000 thrown in jail within the first two weeks many are admittedly non-Communists.

ROLE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

For several years Brazil has been suffering from run-away inflation during which commodity prices rose over 300% in a single year, food was in short supply and interest rates of 40 percent were common.

Poverty and disease drove hundreds of thousands of starving people into the favela, the shanty-town that surrounds Rio. The names of the hills of Rio tell their own story: Hill of the Pig, Hill of the Dog, Hill of the Skeleton.

The conditions that exist in Latin America are rightly associated in the minds of men with United States domination over that area just as they associate the conditions in Africa with the European governments that dominated that continent for so long.

American governments have maintained an aggressive policy toward any Latin American government that has not suited them. Cuba was occupied in 1902, Panama was occupied in 1903 and set up as an independent country because Colombia dared deny Teddy Roosevelt imperialist rights for the building of a canal. The Spanish-American War tore Cuba from

Spain only to make it an American colony.

In 1959 the Cuban Revolution at first acted as a great inspiration for all of Latin America. As it turned from its original humanist program to state control, and finally, as the 1962 missile crisis showed, to becoming a satellite of Russia, this hope of independent revolution was dissipated.

Now, however, the present United States-approved military coup will help create more Communists—not only in Brazil but throughout Latin America—than Castro ever did, for

there seems to be no way out of the stranglehold of their own oligarchies when backed by American imperialism.

The progress of the "new" policy of American imperialism supporting all that is reactionary and backward in Latin America can be seen again in the Panama crisis.

PANAMA REVOLTS

The recent disturbances in Panama are the logical result of years of U. S. officials, as true imperialists, treating the Panamanian people as second class citizens in their own country. It has come to a head as the result of freedom movements here and the example of African independence. They are not seeking mere pay adjustments or the right to fly their own flag, they are demanding the right to run their own country, freedom from domination from Washington.

Discussions between Panama and the United States will be resumed, but with no guarantees from Washington that it feels any obligation to make concessions other than, perhaps, to increase the revenue collected by Panama.

EXPORTING 'DEMOCRACY'

Despite the fact that two and a half billion dollars have been invested by the U. S. under the Alliance for Progress, "democracy" has not been exported nor social reform seriously undertaken.

Where land reform has been undertaken, it has been a case of "giving" isolated wilderness land to the landless, far from markets, without operating machinery, irrigation or roads, a situation which only transfers the slums from the cities to the wilderness. The big estates have not been broken up and continue to produce the coffee, rubber and bananas, sugar and cotton for the export market. Most Latin American countries, Brazil included, still depend on either one crop or one mineral for their economic life. The profits are deposited in Swiss banks by the landowners.

FUTURE CONFLICTS

The next point of conflict could be Chile, where an election is to be held in September and the leading candidate for President is Senator Salvador Allende, candidate of the Popular Action Front. Allende could win the election if present trends continue in Chile and Washington does not intervene with a military coup beforehand.

In Peru, President Fernando Terry is trying to introduce land reform under the pressure of thousands of peasants who are seizing their own land in the highlands. His Congress is reluctant to grant any reform and will no doubt look upon the new Washington policy as their license to use force and violence against the peasants.

The pressure of the poverty stricken masses stands on one side and the resistance of the landowners and the Church stand on the other side of his middle of the road approach. Unless reform comes soon, the peasants as well as the miners will certainly begin to take matters into their own hands.

There is no other way out of the stranglehold of American imperialism, now once again returned to its old ways without benefit of even the meagre kind of "Alliance for Progress" Kennedy tried to initiate.

Malcolm X and the 'Old Radicals'

Malcolm X has announced the establishment of a new Muslim Mosque in Harlem after explaining that "Internal differences within the Nation of Islam forced me out of it. I did not leave of my own free will." Still tied to the false doctrine of "complete separation, with our people going back home, to our own African homeland," Malcolm X was nevertheless compelled to admit that "22 million of our people who are still here in America need better food, clothing, housing, education and jobs right now." (1)

WHY THE REVERSAL OF MALCOLM X'S POSITION?

A child should be able to see that it is precisely this fact—the millions and millions of Negro Americans who not only did not join the Black Muslims, but are actively fighting for the exact opposite, that is to say, integration — that compelled a total reversal of Malcolm X's professed philosophy. Despite the claim to have 100,000 members; despite the boldness of their "rejection" of existing Negro leaders, especially Rev. Martin Luther King at the very moment of his heading the mass Birmingham demonstrations when Bull Connor unleashed the savage hound dogs against them; despite the loud proclamations, from their safe Northern citadels, of the need for armed protection, the simple truth is that the Black Muslims were outside the mainstream of Negro revolt. (2)

Malcolm X does not refer to this objective compulsion for a change in the false Black Muslim doctrine of the separation of the races. Instead, he wants you to take his word for it that he will now collaborate with the civil rights movement; "my sincerity are my credentials." It is easy enough to understand why Malcolm X would wish to hide the reversal of his former position with appeals to his "sincerity." No one has yet invented a sincerometer. Neither sincerity nor insincerity, can reveal the objective basis for a change in policy. What his subjective attitude does permit Malcolm X to do is to play down the Negro Revolution since he cannot claim credit for it: "... it is nonsense to describe the civil-rights movement in America as a revolution... what has been called the 'Negro Revolution' in the United States is a deception practiced upon them (Negroes)..."

ENTER THE RADICALS

Leaving aside, for the moment, the so-far resulting tokenism, the fact still remains that the great mass movement that began with the sit-ins, has gone through the Freedom Rides, and has met in head-on collision with the white supremacist authorities in the South, in the North, and in Washington, D. C., is far from over. On the contrary, it is still gaining momentum. This will be a long, hot, critical summer in the development of the Negro Revolution. Nothing could be wronger than to discount its history by a dictum that until the day Malcolm X entered it, it was the victim of every sort of "deception". But now that Malcolm X has proclaimed that "we should form rifle clubs that can be used to defend our lives", the day of "true revolution" has arrived.

And yet this is precisely how the Old Radicals, the Trotskyists at their head, are behaving. This, despite the fact that Malcolm X is also proclaiming: "There can be no workers solidarity until there is first some racial solidarity." And this denial of common class struggle is followed by his definition of black nationalism—"the Negro must take political control of his community"—as signifying also "economic control" not only of jobs but, above all, the "business of his community." In a word, in place of class consciousness, white or black, he asks the Negro to become "business-conscious."

Along with those who have long since lost their sense of class consciousness, the Trotskyists too played up one slander circulated by Malcolm X even before his break with Elijah Muhammad: the claim that the unity in action of the NAACP, SCLC, CORE, SNCC, Urban League and Negro-American Labor Council "was engineered and financed by Kennedy" (sic)! But I have yet to see a word of true disclosures, easily obtainable: that the American Nazis are supporting the Black Muslims. The KKK in the past few weeks held a rally in Georgia to which they invited the Black Muslims and openly praised them as having a more "correct" philosophy (complete separation of the races) than the white mayor of Atlanta who is asking for at least some token integration. And this is all happening in a political tendency (Trotskyism) that was so sectarian during World War II that they opposed joining the National Resistance Movement because it was "only" for national liberation from Nazism and not yet for the Socialist United States of Europe!

VIOLENCE AND NON-VIOLENCE

One is tempted to conclude that the old radicals have taken leave of their senses and since their attitude to the Malcolm X brand of black nationalism is irrational, there is no point to discussing it. The truth, unfortunately, is much more complex than that; their madness has a method. It is the preoccupation with one technical aspect of social revolution: violence. Ever since Mao maintained himself in the vastness of China's mountains despite Chiang Kai-shek's destruction of the 1925-27 Revolution, old radicals and new aspirants for power without a mass movement have made a fetish of violence.

Contrary to both Lenin and Trotsky—who stressed the fact that November was very nearly a bloodless revolution; that the violence came from the bourgeoisie first in power and then in counter-revolution against proletarian power—today's old radicals have put themselves in the position of countering the Gandhian fetishism of non-violence by forcing a false identity between violence and revolution. As if we were still debating reform vs. revolution as it was fought at the turn of the century, they turn a deaf ear to the truly "new" established by the 1917 Revolution: the compelling need to answer what happens after the revolution has succeeded and a new bureaucracy arises which attempts to stifle the new society at its birth.

Although these radicals proclaim themselves "Leninists", they have yet to face what Lenin said was the new fact of the 20th century, that "The petty-bourgeoisie in a frenzy may also want as much" (3), i.e., to smash the state machine. Lenin's point was that this being so, the distinguishing principle of the new social order he was instrumental in establishing was: "We recognize only one road, changes from below, we wanted workers themselves to draw up, from below, the new principles of economic conditions." (4)

UNITY WITH WHITE LABOR FROM BELOW

Total blindness to this, just this, has produced the spectacle of today's Trotskyists running after those who would, and do, destroy them, whether that be Mao or Fidel. The magic word which catches Trotskyist support—whether that be for deStalinized Khrushchev or for the Stalinist glorifier, Mao; whether that be for those in power like Castro in Cuba, or those out of power like Malcolm X—is the recognition that United States imperialism is "enemy No. 1." This new variant of the infamous Social-Democratic "lesser evil theory", however, can no more transform "progressive position" into that of real revolutionary change as against tokenism, much less into proletarian revolution against American capitalism, than it can transform the state-capitalist societies of Russia and China into "socialism."

What is needed—to see that the Freedom Now movement does not get channelized into the legislative halls, whose very reason for existence is unprincipled compromise with the racism that has been the life-blood of this nation—is not yet one more half-way house between tokenism and social revolution. What is needed is a total philosophy, a theory of liberation in the full tradition of the Humanism of Marx and the Abolitionists, but on the level of today.

The Negro Revolution in the United States has been characterized by a struggle for integration, not separation. This, not Africa, is the Negro American's homeland. Of course, the Negro is job-conscious and it is this precisely which draws him to, not away from, white labor. Of greater significance than Malcolm X and/or Elijah Muhammad, with or without the old radicals, is the painful, slow, but nevertheless actually occurring movement from below of white labor toward the Negro Revolution. The act of the Hazard, Ky. miners who went to Frankfort to join the Freedom March, is worth more than all the "progressive policies", violent or otherwise, of Malcolm X and the radicals combined. (See report in News & Letters, March, 1964.)

The real significance of Malcolm X's break from Elijah Muhammad lies not in his politics. The real significance of the break lies in the Negro people's refusal to accept, in black form, what it refused in white form: RACISM. The compulsion for the break came from the masses who refused any and all "mediators," pretenders to the throne of "representation" of the Negro who wishes to speak for himself. It is high time to stop listening to the voices from above, and start listening to the voices from below. No other way can society be reconstructed on Humanist foundations.

FOOTNOTES

(1) The text of Malcolm X's statement at the March 12th New York press conference is reproduced in *The Militant*, March 23, 1964, while a special statement he made to *The Militant* appears in the March 18th issue. All quotations from Malcolm X, above, are from these two sources.

(2) See our analysis in *American Civilization on Trial*, especially p. 22: "Paradoxically enough, the demand for a separate territory for the black nation is the very basis of today's Black Muslim movement... It is the negative features of their program—of being anti-white—that wins them a following. Their positive program—whether it refers to the superiority of men over women, of Islam over Christianity, or their rejection of the very idea of integration—makes them only peripheral to the mainstream of the Negro struggle today rather than at the heart of it."

(3) Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p.337

(4) *Ibid.*, p.277

6 7 2 9

Guerrilla Tactics in Ideological Struggles: Study of Mao's Thought

Every day brings a "new" stage in the Sino-Soviet conflict in line with Mao's policy of neither peace nor war, but one of "permanent revolution" against "revisionism." The Maoist jargon that passes for "Marxism" is nothing more than the application of guerrilla tactics to ideological struggles. To those who wish to blind themselves to the underlying national interests, and mistake the struggle for leadership as a battle for the "correct theory," guerrilla warfare transferred to the field of ideas may give the appearance of a "question of world revolution." But the truth is that the Marxist theory of liberation no more underlies the Sino-Soviet rift than does the question of world revolution that of imperialist war.

Put more simply, the struggle for leadership within totalitarian Communism is a fight to be at the helm when mastery over the whole world is being decided in a war, not between Russia and China, but between the nuclear giants: Russia and the United States.

THE GREAT DEBATE OR THE GREAT WALL?

Take the latest point in dispute. On May 7th the Chinese Communist Party got around to answering, and rejecting, the Russian Communist Party proposal, made on March 7th, for a world conference of Communist Parties to be held this fall. The excuse was that it would take 4 or 5 years "if not longer" to prepare for such a conference.

Now this runs counter both to Mao's great hurry on other matters, especially the immediate exclusion of Russia from the planned second Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference, and his 1961 stand that Khrushchev had no right to attack Albania "without first consulting other fraternal Communist Parties." The implied demand was for a conference of world Communist Parties to take up the dispute within the Communist world.

This continued to be one of the many lines of attack on the domination, or "overlordship" (to use the favored Chinese phrase when referring to Russia) of the Russian Communist Party over the world Communist orbit. The latter was good guerrilla strategy when the opponent was too strong for a frontal attack. Since 1961, however, Mao has succeeded in splitting off factions from the established Communist Parties; the splinter groups, whether in Australia or in Chile, call themselves the true "Marxist-Leninist" parties even as 10 competing world journals consider themselves the "true" theoretical journals, and while this is still far from constituting "a majority," who knows what a difference 4 to 5 years "if not longer" will make?

In any case, these Maoist parties, groupings, journals have been following the "unanimity principle" propounded by one Chinese Communist Party in its Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement: "One should not emphasize 'who is in the majority' or 'who is in the minority' and bank on a so-called majority." Still, the spurious "unanimity principle" (or overlordship by a single veto) was worked out for use among "fraternal Communist Parties." Presently, however, it was used by the Chinese representative at a 22-nation preparatory conference to arrange for a new meeting of representatives of the underprivileged world, to be held next March 10th. It was used to veto the Indian proposal to invite Russia to the second Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference. Far from this building a "theoretical" foundation against Russian "revisionism," it set up a new Great Wall to exclude Russia from Asia.

The Sino-Soviet rift hangs over the Afro-Asian world like the Sword of Damocles. For though this third world won its liberation from Western imperialism with its own forces and its own philosophy, without any help from either Russia or China, the latter two are struggling to dominate it. Judging by the fact the first (1955) Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference, despite its "unanimous" espousal of "peaceful co-existence" did nothing to stop either the first (1959) or the second (1962) Sino-Indian War, we can expect neither peace nor "creative Marxism" to come out of the 1965 conference. But this is not the issue.

The issue is the gravitational pull* that Mao's China does exercise on the revolutionary impulse that has not yet been harnessed in the new, third world, China, as a have-not nation, seems to have more appeal, but both Russia and China know how to use, i.e., abuse, Marxist language to cover up their state-capitalist struggle for mastery over this newly-born world. The "West," on the other hand, remains blind to the struggle for the minds of men and therefore operates on the assumption that such a titanic battle can be won with the hollow slogans of democracy. The fact that the two totalitarian Communist regimes are fighting each other neither eliminates the West's bankruptcy of thought nor absolves it of its imperialist ambitions. What is needed is a theory of liberation which alone is capable of acting as a polarizing struggle for the freedom struggles the world over.

THE SIEGE AND KHRUSHCHEV'S DISCOVERY OF DEMOCRACY

Mao's policy of neither peace nor war, but separate "militant" operations in a never-ending battle of nerves means we are in for a long, hard siege not only in the Communist orbit
(Continued on Page 7)

* Ironically enough, the gravitational pull that Maoism exercises on established Trotskyism has led to a curious division within Trotskyism. The Trotskyist Lanka Sama Samaja Party in Ceylon is the only Trotskyist party that has a mass following. It finds itself, however, a minority in the Trotskyist Fourth International since the latter espouses a Maoist position and the Ceylonese Trotskyists support Khrushchev positions. (See both the Italian CP paper, L'Unita, of Oct. 23, 1963, and the special issue on "International Communism and the Sino-Soviet Conflict" in Problems of Communism, (March-April 1964).)

but in the world as a whole. While the Pravda editorials fought Russia's exclusion from Asian conference by stressing that the "multi-national Soviet Union" has an Asian part that is "almost twice as big as is the territory of China," Khrushchev departed for a trip to Egypt. In visiting the Aswan High-Dam, he was enabled to play up the massive economic aid Russia sometimes extends to the underdeveloped countries, and he was heard not only in Egypt but in North Africa, not only in Africa but in Latin America, and Asia. This disturbs Mao a great deal more than do Khrushchev's "revisionist" arguments.

At the same time Russian totalitarianism has suddenly discovered "democratic Communism." Currently, the Pravda has begun a series of "ideological" editorials which warn Communist Parties, East or West, about the new Stalin-type, Maoist disciplined, Communist International which Chinese Communism wants to build. In contrast to this dictatorial world it offers them "a voluntary union of like-minded people . . . with voluntary discipline." It may confidently be asserted that Mao will next come out with an "expose" as to how undemocratic Khrushchev was not only in his dealings with either China or Albania, but with the Russian people in Stalin's era and now. We will not be surprised if Mao's version of Russian history will now attribute all Stalin's "errors" to his subordinates at the head of whom stood Khrushchev. And being expert also at class collaboration, Mao may promise "creative democracy" not only for his "three-continents strategy," but also for his new ally, General de Gaulle, so long only as the latter recognizes, as "enemy No. 1, American imperialism."

Now, a war of nerves is no substitute for development of thought, though Mao works hard to make it appear so. Thus, just as the Constitution of Communist China is the only one which places the Army alongside the Party as the two poles of power, so he tries to impose his concept of guerrilla war not only as a substitute for social revolution but in place of a development in Marxist thought.

STATE-CAPITALISM

Our state-capitalist age, that began with the Great Depression's underpinning of private capitalism, called to the helm of power a bureaucracy whose administrative mentality fitted the State Plan. It also fitted the transformation of the armed struggle for power into a "theory of revolution." As against the World War I epoch, when the Great Divide in Marxism came over the question of the willingness to struggle for workers' power as against class collaborationism, in the post-World War II epoch, willingness to take power and class collaborationism were no longer opposites, as Mao proved conclusively through his own road to power.

May 1964

(cont'd)

(cont'd)

Far from being opposites that blocked power, class collaborationism and struggle for state power complemented each other. This was true both when Mao did not yet achieve power but nevertheless saved Chiang's life at the very moment when Chiang's own army mutinied against him at Sian, in December 1936, and when, in 1949, Mao drove the corrupt and disintegrating Kuomintang from mainland China.

As against the original Red Army, born in Russia in 1917 out of proletarian revolution, not vice versa, Mao's Red Army outflanked the cities and appealed to the "good" capitalists, "the good" landlords, "the honest" petty bourgeois intellectuals to remain part of "the people" and manage the Chinese economy.

Mao no doubt can prove, to those who hunger for state power though they have no base in a mass movement, no developing proletarian revolution and no emerging national liberation movement, that guerrilla war is "an assured" road to power. But it should be obvious that this road to state-capitalist power is not the road to a new, a viable, a revolutionary social order where destiny remains in the hands of the working people. Clothing the fight for political power in Marxist garb cannot, and has not, hidden Mao's imperial ambitions, whether this takes the form of invasion of India, or ideological siege of Russian Communism. All it can, and does do, is show that "Mao's Thought" generates guerrilla tactics for its ideological battles precisely because power politics dominates it.

THOUGHT & LIBERATION

Marxist-Humanism is not only the way to struggle against Communist totalitarianism. It is, above all, the path to actual freedom. No Iron Curtain, no Great Wall, Chinese or East German, can be erected to exclude Marxist-Humanism, as was shown in the East German Revolt of 1953, the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, the "Hundred Flowers and Hundred Schools of Thought" that bloomed and contended in China in 1957. Indeed, despite the present debates over "peaceful co-existence with the West," what bothers both Mao and Khrushchev is the not-so-peaceful co-existence of the ruling "intelligentsia" (totalitarianism's euphemistic name for oppressor) and the working people in "the East."

It is true that Mao has, ever since 1960, taken the initiative in bringing the Sino-Soviet conflict into the open, and has accused Khrushchev of moving "from fear of nuclear war to fear of revolution." It is also true that Khrushchev has hit back with "Only a child and an idiot do not fear war." Nevertheless, Mao's simulated revolutionary thunder does not aim at a new social order any more than does Khrushchev's policy of so-called peaceful co-existence. Each is a totalitarian ruler in his own country. Each wants to be sole ruler over the state-capitalist world they both call Communist. It is not Western imperialism that will bring down those regimes. It is the working people in those countries. And it will be done with the same philosophy of freedom as that needed to gain liberation from Western imperialism. In this way alone can thought too be liberated from the stranglehold of guerrilla warfare.

May 1964

June - July, 1964

Sino-Indian War Reveals Relationship of Ideology to State-Capitalist Imperialism

(Editor's Note: Because the death of Nehru gives a new urgency to reconsideration of the whole question of India, we reprint the Political Letter Raya Dunayevskaya wrote at the time of the China-India war.)

The sudden, spontaneous unity of the Indian people, born out of opposition to China's invasion of their borders, has no doubt been instrumental in staying the hand of Mao, at least temporarily. The fact that this may have coincided also with his original military plans to invade on two fronts, one for bargaining and gaining support from "the uncommitted nations," and the other front for keeping as part of China, can in no way diminish the significance of the new factor of Indian unity from below, united, and emerging despite the attempted brainwashing by the Nehru-Menon apologetics for Mao's China, over the entire period since independence.

In *The Christian Science Monitor* (11/27/62), Sharokh Sabavala writes: "Contributions to the defense fund in cash, gold, and work continue uninterrupted. On this front, it is interesting to note that it is the poorest in the land, the outcasts, the dispossessed, and the underemployed who lead the queues of contributors, giving, in many cases, all their meagre savings to prove that freedom, even without bread, is a most precious heritage." (My emphasis.)

This very love of freedom compels the drawing of a balance sheet of 15 years of Indian independence during which bourgeois India has proceeded in its plodding way, (as China has proceeded with "leaps") without regard for the creativity of the masses which made independence from imperialist rule possible, and is presently saving India from the collapse upon which Mao counted.

I do not mean immediate and utter collapse—not even Mao could consider a border war to cause a whole sub-continent to buckle under; I mean the kind of chaos and confusion which would have made possible "very fruitful work," within India, for the Maoist wing of the Indian Communist Party.

Instead, it brought about a national unity not seen except in the struggle for independence from British imperialism, and so popular a revulsion against China and a self-sustaining resistance, "even without bread," that not only Menon had to resign, but Nehru remains in power on the condition that instead of laying down (and erratically at that) Congress Party, he now follows it. In a word, it may consolidate capitalist India, bring it into the Anglo-American imperialist orbit, have a prolonged war with China, which, whether victorious or otherwise, would once again change nothing fundamental in the relations within the country, so that neither freedom nor bread will be the possessions of the courageous Indian people.

Whether in the American orbit, or the Chinese, or "neutral," India must answer the question: what happens after? Why did independence from British rule not lead to a non-exploitative society in India and fraternal international relations with the peoples of the world, instead of resulting in continued class rule and a "neutrality" that acquiesced in China's conquest of Tibet and all its consequences, ideologically and militarily. That has now made it possible for Mao to claim Ladakh as needed "defense" for his new road linking Tibet with China, not to mention the propaganda theme against India for "tying itself to the war chariot of United States imperialism."

The obvious aspects of the China-India war—the fact that China did the invading, and that India was compelled to go to "the West" for military aid (even as she is still trying to get some from Russia) cannot change the objective fact that the entry of American imperialism means that the Sino-Indian relations will never be the same whether or not the war is resumed.

The point at issue, however, is the class nature of India itself.

INDIA SINCE INDEPENDENCE
India was the first country to gain its independence from British imperialism and thus, in 1947, open a new third world that was to stretch from Asia to the Middle East, and from Africa to Latin America. Since all newly-independent countries born in the next decade, or 13 years, had all emerged out of national movements striving to free themselves from Western imperialism, the unifying link predominated over the divisions within this post-war world, and seemed indeed capable of forging a new path for all mankind.

Both because it was one of the richest in culture and past traditions, and the first to gain its independence, India seemed destined to play a central role on the Asian continent. As the African continent also sought to use Gandhism (1), or the non-violent mass

resistance method to gain freedom, India's world role shone so brightly that it dimmed the other truth, that no fundamental change in human relations followed independence. The dominant Congress Party (2), which had succeeded in uniting all classes in the struggle against foreign domination, first began showing its true class nature by leaving production relations, in the city or the country, basically unchanged.

India continued to be the land of villages, with an outmoded agriculture, overlaid with an entrenched landlord class, and a halting, partial industrialization that was grafted on top of the semi-feudal relations. It was further both overburdened and undermined by the Hindu caste system that has remained changeless

(Continued on Page 7)

(1) Gandhism means both much more, and much less, than passive non-violent mass resistance. From Gandhi's first introduction of *santugbara* and the resulting British massacre at Amritsar in 1919, which coincided in world affairs with the Russian Revolution and the attempts in India to start a Marxist movement which he fought, to Gandhi's role in the post-World War II movement he finally led to victory and thus became the prototype of the new nationalist revolutionary in Africa—there lies a quarter of a century in need of analysis. This is not the place to attempt it.

(2) One other role for which Gandhi will go into history is hardly ever mentioned, and yet it will endear him more to future generations than the role he is famous for. This "hidden" role is his recognition that "The Party" in power is corruptible. Though he passed on his mantle of leadership to Nehru, he himself refused to take a position of power, and urged that others too must stay out of power and look at the ruling Congress Party, their own, with "outside" eyes.

through the millennia. Back in the 19th century, Hegel designated it as "the philosophy of unfreedom."

It is true that, politically, there was both independence from Britain, and a parliamentary democracy established so that, in law, caste is not "recognized." In life, unfortunately, it remains dominant so that stunts in the city, with their countless unemployed; the hungry villages with their sacred cows and unsacred disregard for human lives remain the most characteristic features of "the Indian way of life."

Every leader in the new third world seems to consider himself a "socialist"—from Menon to Nasser, from Mao to Nkrumah, not to mention the "Marxist-Leninist-til-the-day-I-die" Castro. But, obviously, it is not the human difference these leaders are concerned with, but the State Plan and some statistics about the "rate of economic growth." Even that admirer of the Indian way of life, Barbara Ward, admits: "large programs of public investment under the Plans . . . has given Indian private enterprise the best decade in its history." (3) But the standard of life remains the lowest in the world—\$60 per capita per annum; the average span of life is a mere 20 years; and the unemployed are countless. Even with the lush profits, Indian investment is only about half of the Chinese rate of investment (10% as against 20% of national income) . . .

TWO OPPOSING IDEOLOGIES?
Strangest of all blindfolds is the one that covers Nehru's vision. Now that his "neutrality" principle lies as shattered as Bandung's "Five Principles of Co-Existence," co-authored by himself and Chou En-lai, he has suddenly discovered that Mao wishes "to destroy the Indian way of life." He rolls that phrase off his moral lips as if it were some class-less phenomenon instead of so class-ridden and contradictory a chain over so unfinished a revolution that the strains and stresses in the Indian body politic gave Mao the illusion he could have as easy a victory within India as the military victory on its borders. The fact that the invasion, instead, united India as a nation should give no illusions to Nehru that the mazes will forever be satisfied with a sham freedom and no bread.

The truth is that it was not the classlessness but the sameness of the class—that of State Planners—which united Mao and Nehru at Bandung. The respect for "sovereignty of nations" and "non-interference in internal affairs" mean no foreign interference in class relations within each country so long as the third world could be a single unit against "the West." Mao still thinks that, on that basis, he can get acquiescence in his grab of Indian territory by many of "the uncommitted nations," as indeed he seems to be doing at the Colombo conference meeting presently in Ceylon.

But if his imperialist ambitions are all too clear, do Nehru's lesser ambitions constitute a different class phenomenon? The moment of independence was the moment also of the fratricidal war with Pakistan. (That unresolved conflict was another element in the temptation of Mao to attack.)

6731

(cont'd)

(cont'd)

There is no doubt that British imperialistic maneuvers and their eternal attempt to break up a country at the moment of independence so as to continue its rule over it helped set up the division between India and Pakistan. It is as true, however, that once the countries did separate, each had a right to its own existence. Gandhi became a martyr when he fought to end the "holy war" and build up fraternal relations. Nehru chose Menon as his "holy man" to proclaim Pakistan "Enemy No. 1" for all these 14 years, keep two-thirds of the Army at the Kashmir site while leaving the borders to China unprotected from that "ally."

Despite its "period of glory"—the 1947-48 Kashmir war—Nehru had not allowed the Army any decisive role in the Indian pattern of life. Despite the fact that he allowed the ultra-conservative Sandhurst-educated officer class to have the Army under its command and play some old imperialist roles—in Korea and in the Congo—Nehru's concept of the role of the army made it subordinate to the civil authorities. In this he fundamentally differs from Mao, who, even in the Communist (read: state-capitalist) orbit holds to a special militaristic position. The Chinese Constitution is the only one where not only the "Party" but the Army is made synonymous with the state authority.

This one element that would have created at least the semblance of an ideology in opposition to that expounded in China is now itself a question since the Anglo-American aid will not only come with political strings attached but inevitably create its own image internally by raising the Indian Army to a new status. Since Nehru's good anti-military instincts were not backed up by a proletarian class position, he will inevitably give way both to the Anglo-American advice and Indian Army ambitions.

It is true that he is still holding out one hope of not completely falling into the orbit of Western imperialism by counting on Russian aid, but insofar as the Indian masses are concerned, does it really matter whether it is the Russian or the American nuclear orbit? Even as a foreign policy, a military line is a derivative, rather than determinant, of the class relations within the country. **IN THIS LIES THE DANGER THAT INDIA MAY STILL CAPITULATE EITHER TO COMMUNIST TOTALITARIANISM OR TO A MILITARY CLIQUE.**

Nehru's unique authority in India does not stem from his creation of new relations with the great mass of the Indian people who must bend both to his State Plans and to the private capitalist and entrenched landlord interests. He has been a leader of the struggle for independence from Britain, and he has now been attacked by his Communist ally, and the Indian people have saved him from downfall. His desperate attempt first now to search for a new ideological banner and come up with "the Indian way of life" will create no new world apart from both poles of world capital—the Russo-Soviet or Anglo-American orbits—fighting for world domination. To cling to the class-ridden "Indian way of life" is only one more way of saying "the old cannot be changed"—and, by losing the struggle for the minds of men, losing both India and the new third world.

It was no accident that in the 15 years since independence, in the 13-year alliance with Mao's China, in the 7 years of "Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference," plus the innumerable "neutralist" conferences since, Nehru failed to condemn Russia either for its counter-revolutionary role in putting down the Hungarian Revolt in 1956 or for its unilateral breaking of the nuclear moratorium; acquiesced in China's conquest of Tibet and bowed sufficiently to the

(3) Barbara Ward, "The Rich Nations, the Poor Nations."

UAR's stand on Israel not to open an embassy there, although he had been among the first to hail its independence. The opportunist, the short-sighted, the self-righteous, the ambivalent in foreign and military policies, was the counterpoint to the so-called socialist, but actually capitalist, exploitative relations internally. The Indian people who have pushed him off his "neutrality" for the Sino-Soviet orbit, must now see that he doesn't merely shift over to the Anglo-American orbit, leaving production relations and ideological banner as unchanged as the changeless caste system of "untouchdom."

June - July 1964

Introduction to New Japanese Edition of Marxism and Freedom

The plunge into freedom by the postwar youth of Japan presents a challenge to anyone who would write for such an audience. This author frankly admits that the great pleasure at this opportunity is not unmingled with trepidation. In a country where the link of continuity is so all-enveloping that even discontinuity appears to be only a form of continuity (as witness the initiation of Japan's industrialization and "modernization" in the last quarter of the 19th century via the Meiji Restoration), the present generation has made its break with the past so total that it has, literally, leaped over centuries.

JAPANESE "NEW LEFT" SEEKS PHILOSOPHIC FOUNDATIONS

Under the impact of the postwar labor struggles, the first genuine mass movement of students in Japanese history was no sooner (1948) born than it found itself challenging both capitalism and communism. By the end of the first decade of its existence, the mass protests led by the Zengakuren had inspired the growth of a New Left of many varied tendencies. In contrast to the European New Left which, despite its revulsion against Russia's crushing of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, had by now either found its way back to the Communist fold, or joined the pole of "Western" capitalism, Japan's New Left is pursuing its political differences to their philosophic foundations. Therein lies its strength, and thereby it has lit a beacon that extends far beyond its national frontiers. It has emboldened this writer to turn to this audience with a special edition of **MARXISM AND FREEDOM** which, from its publication in 1958, had as its aim the re-establishing of Marxian philosophy in its original form, designated by Marx himself as "a thoroughgoing Naturalism or Humanism."

From the beginning of my break with Leon Trotsky over "the Russian Question"—during the Hitler-Stalin Pact which gave the green light to the start of the Second World War—I became interested in the economic development of Japan. The reader will find brief references to this in Chapter XIII ("Russian State Capitalism vs. Workers' Revolt") where I show that neither the rate of economic growth nor "planning," in and of themselves, are synonymous with the existence of a workers' state. On the whole, however, **MARXISM AND FREEDOM**—a study of our machine age from its birth in the industrial, political and intellectual revolutions in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, to the freedom struggles of our age of Automation and the H-bomb—deals mainly with the United States, Europe, and Russia. It was natural, therefore, that the Japanese Marxist-Humanists would ask that my subsequent and separate analysis of Mao Tse-tung be published as a new appendix for the Japanese edition.

NON-VIABILITY OF STATE-CAPITALISM PROVED IN LIFE

At the end of the 1950's Mao's revolutionary abstractions could no longer cover up the reality of sweated, militarized, depersonalized labor in the so-called communes. By 1963 the fig-leaf of Marxist terminology can no longer cover up the power politics in the Sino-Soviet conflict. Thereby the non-viability of state-capitalism as any "new" social order has been exposed. "Mao's Thought" can act as a polarizing force only to one who begs to be intellectually raped. Thereby the revolutionary petty-bourgeois intellectual exposes that he bears the mark of our state-capitalist age, that, in and out of power, he would rather lean on some State power and State Plan than subject himself to the creativity of the proletariat and the compulsion to a unity of thought and practice which alone can release a new human dimension.

It is here that the tendencies within the Japanese New Left have broken new ground. For, in probing deeply into the philosophic foundations of socialism, they questioned, how could the Russia of the 1917 Revolutions have ventured into the Pacific war between the atomic destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

History will never absolve American imperialism for this wanton, inhuman, nuclear holocaust. Neither will it forget the degeneracy of international communism as the bombs fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, August 9th and August 9th, 1945. Listen to what Gares call itself L'Humanite on August 8, the day between the atomic explosions:

"The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima seems to have caused considerable destruction. American reports suggest nothing less than the disappearance from the face of the earth of a town of 300,000 inhabitants. The effect of the discovery is considerable. Nevertheless, the Vatican has been pleased to disapprove of it! May we be permitted to express our surprise, because when the Nazis had the privilege of waging total war with a total cruelty the Holy See was not equally indignant."

The Italian Communist paper, L'Unita on August 10, 1945: "The news that an atomic bomb was dropped by the American Air Force has made an enormous impression throughout the whole world and has been received on all sides with a sense of panic and words of condemnation. This shows, it seems to us, a curious psychological perversion and a doctrinaire obedience to a form of abstract humanitarianism . . . We do not share the sense of terror which has been expressed in certain press comments because we bear in mind the concrete use which was made of the fearful engine of destruction."

And finally The Daily Worker of Great Britain on August 14, the day before Japan surrendered unconditionally:

"There was no official hint of the length of delay that the Japanese are to be allowed before the full force of Allied power—including the atom bomb—is loosed against them in a blow intended to be final."

In providing as empty a shelter for mind, as the fall-out shelter is for the body, Communist state-capitalism is giving full proof of the schizoid Marx had long ago predicted for the decomposition of the capitalistic system. This has never been truer than since World War II ended with but two victors—the United States and Russia—each more degenerate than the other, outdoing each other in mounting phrases of peace while preparing the nuclear holocaust, each striving for world domination.

The fact that the proletariat is unarmed has never stood in its way as it opened new stages of freedom in humanity's development. Surely the nuclear titans have the power to destroy civilization as we have known it. But the nuclear age is also the epoch for the struggle of men's minds. To stay the nuclear hand by winning the minds of men—this is the road to human survival and to freedom.

"THE HIGHEST BEING FOR MAN IS MAN HIMSELF"

To rise to the challenge of the times requires altogether new banners. Marx was the first to see this in all its breadth and depth—as both a birth-time of history and the realization of philosophy. Because he had put the human being in the center of all his thoughts, he could unite theory and practice, idealism and materialism, and, unarmed, throw the gauntlet down to the armed bourgeoisie. When asked why he, a bourgeois intellectual had broken with his class and become a "radical," he replied that "to be a radical means to grasp something at its root. And the highest being for man is man himself." It still is.

The urgency that our epoch of necessity imparts to the Humanism of Marxism has brought Marx's struggles with vulgar materialism and vulgar communism as well as with private capitalism and reactionary idealism out of history and of theory and into the quintessential practices of the day.

Lenin did not know the Humanist Essays of Marx—they had remained in the vaults of the Second International until after the Russian Revolution pried them open—but he felt the compulsion to return to the philosophic foundations of Marxism in Hegel. The shock of betrayal made it manifestly impossible any longer to consider matters on a political plane alone. His break, indeed, was not only with those who betrayed, but with his own philosophical past. His Philosophic Notebooks laid new foundations for future revolutions, and permeated everything he was to write from then until his day of death, that is to say, from Imperialism and State and Revolution to his last speech to the Russian Communist Party's 9th Congress and his Will. Unfortunately, this remained a dead letter to the Marxists of the post-Lenin period. Not only was this true of those who, like Stalin, symbolized the transformation of the young workers' state into its opposite, but to those who, like Trotsky, lost his life fighting the Stalinist bureaucracy.

So total has been the void in the Marxist movement since the death of Lenin that one would think that Lenin's admonitions against the "administrative mentality" of Trotsky, as well as Nikolai Bukharin's failure to "fully understand the dialectic" were the words of an academician in an ivory tower instead of the words of a great revolutionist on his deathbed, warning about the downfall of the first workers' state and its "return backward to capitalism" unless one began not only with the removal of the "rude and dialoyal" Stalin but also with new philosophic perspectives: the shock of recognition of the Marxian dialectic in Hegel's Science of Logic which made Lenin note: "Practice in the theory of cognition. Alas: Man's cognition not only reflects the objective world, but creates it."

(cont'd)

Aug-Sept 1964 6733

(cont'd)

A TOTAL PHILOSOPHY AND A NEW THIRD WORLD

This is the task that confronts our age: how can the movement from theory meet the challenge of the movement from practice which strives to reconstruct society on totally new, truly human beginnings. The challenge is not to machines, but to men. The compulsion for a unity of theory and practice arises both from the impulses toward a new society and a total philosophy. It has now enveloped the whole globe. In Europe we have witnessed new tragic decades—from the 1937 Spanish Revolution which sought to combine politics with economics by at once taking over the factories, through the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, where Workers' Councils, Councils of Intellectuals, Councils of Revolutionary Youth, all sought to unite politics, economics and philosophy under a new banner of Humanism which the Communist totalitarians dared call "Revisionism."

This search for a total philosophy has disclosed a new, a third world in the post-war revolutions in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. It is this new, third Afro-Asian-Latin American world, which is at the root both of the struggle for world domination between Russia and the United States as well as within the Sino-Soviet orbit and within Western colonialism and neo-colonialism. And it is this world which opens the greatest challenge to the intellectuals as well as the proletariat of the most industrialized land of this third world—Japan. A country which could, from the ruins of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, have such an astonishing industrial development that its rate of growth now challenges both Russia and the United States, and at the same time, give birth to a generation that has totally broken with its past, is a country that is sure to produce the future theoreticians of genuine Marxism—Marxist-Humanists.

For what cannot be separated from this break was that it was not only a break with Japan's capitalistic and militaristic past, but a refusal to submit to any established authority, whether that be the American imperialist occupying power, or established Marxism, that is to say, the existing state—capitalist societies passing themselves off as "socialist." Hence the splits in the Zengakuren. The great demonstrations in 1960 proved all this beyond the peradventure of a doubt. A theoretical development to match the practical activities of youth and labor and women, all striving for a new society, is on the order of the day.

Revolutions do not arise in the fullness of time for the purpose of establishing a party machine; party-monolithism is there to throttle the revolution, not to release the creativity as well as the energies of the millions. Marxism is either a theory of liberation or it is nothing. In thought and in life, it lays the basis for achieving a new human dimension, without which no new society has viability. This author feels confident that the Japanese people—workers and revolutionary intellectuals—have an important role to play in the creative drama of human liberation.

August 6, 1963

Aug-Sept, 1964

6734

All Roads Still Lead to Berlin

Mao's Bomb and Khrushchev's Fall

By RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA,
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

In the short space of 18 hours the world scene has changed so radically that it's very nearly beyond recognition. Or is it? China has exploded its first atomic bomb and, like all other destructive agents from United States imperialism to Russian state-capitalism, from McMillan's Great Britain (now Labor) to De Gaulle France, the claim has been that this flirtation with nuclear holocaust has all been "in the interests of peace." At the same time China's atomic explosion followed so closely upon the heels of Khrushchev's fall from the seat of power that the Sino-Soviet conflict has overshadowed all other probable causes for the sudden shift in power from Khrushchev's exercise of total power to the new "collective leadership" of Leonid I. Brezhnev, as First Secretary of the Communist Party, and Alexei Kosygin as Premier.

No sooner had *The New York Times* gone to press, assuring its readers that "sources said . . . that a new leadership might well have decided, even before coming to power, to call off the meeting," scheduled for December 15th, with the ostensible purpose of expelling the Chinese Communists, than *Pravda* came off the press with the first official statement that the new Communist leaders are pressing for this meeting, and "expanding" its agenda to include also "problems of peace" and "national independence." An agenda so expanded can, of course, mean "yes" and "no" at one and the same time. It is meant not to illuminate, but to confuse.

THAT TRIP TO WEST GERMANY

What neither the Western experts nor the Communist totalitarians are talking about is the one thing that is truly new in the situation leading up to Khrushchev's removal from power—his sudden decision to try for a new rapprochement with West Germany. All one has to do to see how crucial it must have been in Khrushchev's downfall is to take a close look at the slogans released by the new ruling clique for the upcoming celebration of the November 7th Revolution. The central ones are those dealing with a demand for cessation of nuclear testing and for a "Free Berlin."

No sooner had the announcement been made of Khrushchev's removal from all posts of power allegedly because of "age and deteriorating health" than a new announcement was made as to the removal of Khrushchev's young and vigorous son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubel, from editorship of the official government newspaper, *Izvestia*. This was in no case a simple move against any possible nepotism on the part of the former ruler. Nor was it just a move against "general" policies.

Specifically, what was involved, though not openly stated, was the fact that the last important act of Mr. Adzhubel was his trip to West Germany to arrange for Khrushchev's visit there. Further-

more, Mr. Adzhubel then spread himself out in the paper he edited with a series of articles which raised the question of a new Soviet policy to West Germany, including "a new Rapallo." This reference was to the treaty in the early 1920's which initiated not only close economic collaboration between Russia and Germany but also a military flaunting of the conditions of the Versailles Treaty against German rearmament.

The Chinese Communist Party immediately charged Khrushchev with a "sell-out" of East Germany to the West. We must keep this in mind when we read the official announcement from Peking on its atomic explosion allegedly because "The United States is now putting nuclear weapons into the hands of the West German revanchists through the so-called multilateral nuclear force and thereby threatens the security of the German Democratic Republic and the other East European Socialist countries." It is to be doubted that East Europe will feel safe under Peking's "atomic umbrella," but Mao is not one to miss an opportunity to create distrust in Russia's readiness to protect "the socialist countries."

THE SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT

I am not trying to say that Khrushchev's attempts at rapprochement with West Germany is the only cause of his downfall. The Sino-Soviet rift, especially as it also led to "polycentrism" among the European Communist Parties, East and West, is a very important cause for the downfall. No doubt the Russian propagandists are at this very moment covering the length and breadth of the land, illuminating to the Party faithful what "harebrained scheming, immature conclusions and hasty decisions" means not only in relationship to the Sino-Soviet conflict but also on the domestic

scene, ranging from the "failure on consumer goods" and means of production, including the military, to "phrasemongering" on the virgin land program and the 20 Year Plan for "constructing full communism."

What I am saying is that, for Russia, Germany has always been the key to the international situation. This was so in Lenin's day when he banked all on the German Revolution to save Russia from its backwardness and isolation. It was so when Stalin transformed into opposite this total reliance on revolution, and banked, instead, on collaboration with Nazi Germany—the infamous Hitler-Stalin Pact which gave the green light to World War II. And it was so when Hitler attacked Russia and Stalin had to reverse himself. Since de-Stalinization Khrushchev always knew how to heat up the Cold War: create a crisis over Berlin.

Nor can we forget that an important reason for the downfall of Beria was his call for a new "international detente." Of course, the furthest thing away from the mind of that police chief was a detente such as the East German Revolt of June 17, 1953, which led to his downfall, even as the furthest thing from the mind of Khrushchev when he embarked on de-Stalinization was the Hungarian Revolution which nearly caused his downfall. That it now came from in-fighting rather than revolution speaks volumes for the type of state-capitalist society Russia is.

THE NEW POWER STRUGGLE

Whatever induced Khrushchev to reverse himself here and attempt a new type of relationship with West Germany, it couldn't have been very popular either in Russia or in East Germany or in Poland. Indeed, no policy so quickly unites not only Communists in Europe but Europe as a whole as fear of a rearm West Germany. Any change, any change whatever, in the relationship with West Germany would have created the opportunity his opponents within the ruling clique would have wished for. Khrushchev never commanded the undivided authority Stalin had. His defeat of the "anti-party group" in 1957, did not mean the elimination of the conditions for a new power struggle. On the contrary, he himself had laid down the conditions for new apparatus men, with no part in the Russian Revolution of 1917, to come to power and wish to move faster and "more efficiently" down the state-capitalist path.

The new power struggle in Russia is, at the same time, a new stage for the struggle for world power, beginning with dominance over the Communist world. While it by no means excludes a rapprochement with China, this is quite unlikely at the moment. The point is that, again, all roads lead to Berlin.

This is an issue that can unite the Communist Parties of both East and West Europe who have been balking at the call for a meeting that would be exclusively concerned with expelling the Chinese Communist Party and thus reestablishing Russian monolithic control over them. The "expanded agenda," which now calls for discussion not only of "Communist unity" but also "problems of peace" and "national independence," will now not only give a new impetus to the meeting but a new expose of Chinese "adventurism"—should the Chinese Communist Party still refuse to come. Thus all roads leading to Moscow, through Berlin, are both open and closed.

The irony of this is that the European Communist parties so value the little independence they have gained by the Sino-Soviet rift not being settled that they are now questioning the method of Khrushchev's removal. Such a skeptical attitude is hardly what Brezhnev counted on as a response to his first major public speech on Oct. 19, in which he promised that the party is striving for the unity of "the Socialist countries on a fully equal footing." What the attitude, and the promise, do reveal is that the rise of the new ruling clique is only the beginning, not the end, of the divisive forces at work.

*In 1953 I was the only one who thus related Beria's downfall to the East German Revolt. In 1956 Seweryn Bialer, who had been a member of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party but then fled to the West, revealed that a document for internal circulation about the fall of Beria had spoken of this, accusing Beria of proposing a policy which would have led to the abandonment of East Germany. Is this accusation now being refurbished for the "trial" against Khrushchev?

Oct 1964

6735

NOVEMBER, 1964

10c A Copy
6d In Great Britain

China's Entry Into Nuclear Age Opens One More Big Road to War

By Peter Mallory

The kingdom of Cambodia was the only formally non-aligned nation that hurried to congratulate Communist China as, on October 17th, she set off her first atomic explosion. Universal fear at the opening of still one more road to nuclear war was evident also from the fact that the only Communist governments that congratulated China were, like Cambodia, geographically nearest to the already large Asian military giant.

One of the most significant reactions to the Chinese bomb is important by its absence: the failure of the leading sections of the Communist parties of the world to congratulate Mao for his bomb is not merely a part of the Sino-Soviet dispute, but a response to the world wide anti-war feeling among the workers of the world.

THE "DEFENSIVE" BOMB

No amount of Chinese double-talk about the "defensive" nature of China's entry into the imperialist nuclear club can possibly change the fact that the bomb breakthrough was achieved at the expense of the teeming millions who barely eke out an existence 15 years after the Communists took power.

Nor can the fact that "the spokesman for American imperialism," President Johnson, all too eagerly took advantage of the low standard of living of the Chinese masses to shed crocodile tears for them be used to hide the greater truth that socialism was, after all, never intended to divert the energies of a people into the path of nuclear destruction and war while their living standards do lag decades upon decades behind the industrially advanced lands.

The compulsion to ape United States and/or Russian nuclear might proves one thing, and one thing only: China is part and parcel of state-capitalism, not socialism. (For background material see *id* page 3).

CROSS AND DOUBLECROSS

The world, 18 hours before Mao exploded his bomb, heard the explosion in the Kremlin as Khrushchev was suddenly removed from power by the new self-appointed clique of Brezhnev and Kosygin. Within the week, the trip projected earlier by Khrushchev to West Germany was cancelled, and a new axis in international politics was forged. De Gaulle France quickly signed a trade pact with the new Soviet rulers. Undoubtedly this was started by Khrushchev, but the haste with which it was signed by the new leadership was meant to signal new alignments.

It was a very good deal for the Soviet Union. The regime concluded a five-year trade pact for the exchange of \$1.5 billion in goods which provided Russia

with \$350 million in credits on their purchases and provided De Gaulle with markets for over \$300 millions in industrial plants to be exported to the Soviet Union.

West Germany expressed regrets that France had broken the Berne agreement of the West European nations — which the Tory government of Britain had already broken by granting a 15 year loan to the Soviet Union for \$84 million to buy a Siberian fiber plant.

The Soviet Union will benefit by acquiring chemical, synthetic rubber, textile, paper, food and other factory equipment, which the U.S. has refused to export, in exchange for goods which Russia has in surplus.

(Continued from Page 1)

The attitude of DeGaulle permits him to disregard the Franco-German axis, threaten to leave the European Common Market if Germany does not cease to support its agricultural products at the expense of the French farmers, and to pursue his (glory) "third" road.

In striking out on all fronts at once, DeGaulle also chose this moment to threaten to leave the NATO alliance and not participate in the multilateral nuclear naval force planned by Washington. The increasing national arrogance of DeGaulle France found its counterpart in the me-tooism of Mao Tse-tung, with whom he found common ground and concluded another agreement to sell them one million tons of wheat.

DeGaulle had stood alone in the nuclear club for war as the only possessor of nuclear bombs who has refused to sign the nuclear test ban. He is now joined by Mao, whose me-tooism makes him the second member of the team. Together they call for a new conference, to set new terms to make a propaganda play.

DeGaulle will be the one next to contaminate the atmosphere of the world with deadly nuclear fallout, since he has planned tests in the section of the Equator of the Pacific Ocean which will carry the fallout over the regions of the world that are the most heavily inhabited.

THE MEASURE OF CHINA

The explosion of a nuclear de-

vice by the Peking government touched off a mixed reaction throughout the world. There were those who said it meant nothing since it would be years before they could stockpile enough bombs to be dangerous or to develop the means for delivering the bomb over long distances. Others, including U.S. Secretary of State Rusk, indicated that everything had changed since China started with plutonium in its first bomb, a stage that the U.S. did not reach with its initial bomb.

Capability for bomb delivery can be debated in military circles, but the impact of the event, in political circles, is another matter. There is no doubt that the countries surrounding China are deeply disturbed over the prospect of China's nuclear potential. There is no doubt that the Japanese government will demand that the U.S. furnish it with a stockpile of nuclear weapons to offset the potential threat of China. Less affluent nations will become increasingly reluctant to offer opposition to the demands of Peking. There exists a current in India which demands that India "catch up" in nuclear know-how and match China's military power step by step.

Other countries are impressed that China was able to continue the work in the nuclear field, started by the Russians but brought to a conclusion in less than four years after the Russians withdrew from the program.

Professor Martin Summerfield, of Aero-space Propulsion Labs at Princeton University and former editor of the Journal of the American Rocket Society, says, "We in the United States tend to think of the ballistic missile industry as prohibitively expensive. . . . This is not necessarily so, if the initial objective is merely to develop a medium range strategic system of only moderate accuracy and in moderate numbers.

"China can buy on the world market every type of instrument, metal, chemical and component needed to build its rockets. . . . As for rocket secrets, there are none, either in theory or design. All one needs is a reading knowl-

6736

edge of English, French or German and a good collection of recent technical journals, patent literature, etc.

"It is inconceivable that the Chinese started a program of warhead development without having started a simultaneous rocket program and without having planned to fit the two together at the right time in the timetable. . . . In fewer years than they think, China will have nuclear weapons that can reach all the points of current United States interest in Asia."

SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE

The ouster of Khrushchev has caused a speculation that a way would soon be found to end the dispute. Nothing could be further from the truth. None of the basic differences between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung are resolved by the removal of Khrushchev. The new leadership of the Soviet Union is, to all appearances, continuing with the basic policies of Khrushchev's "peaceful co-existence," and above all, the struggle to maintain first place as the leader of the Communist parties of the world.

Mao will not be forgiven for splitting the Communist parties in almost every country. His plan to have the East replace the West as the center of the world is aimed not only at the United States, but against the Soviet Union.

Mao has not given up his claims on either Soviet or Indian territory and there is no indication that Khrushchev's policies in that regard are not shared by the present Soviet leadership.

The visit to Moscow of Chou En-lai may result in postponing the Dec. 15 meeting of the Communist parties of the world, which were scheduled to read the Chinese Communist Party out of the family of respectable communists, but the postponement of the meeting will allow only for the thinnest veneer of "comradeship," while each coun-

try seeks quietly, rather than with Khrushchev's bolsterousness, to achieve its national ends. From the first to last, Chou En-lai has made it clear that the price of lasting peace in the Communist International will be the abandonment of Russian leadership.

Despite the claims and pretenses of Mao Tse-tung that the main bone of contention between himself and the Soviet Union is his claim to be the one and only one calling for world revolution, he has done everything within his power to attain the bomb, which, to say the least, is not the weapon of the masses in their revolutionary street battles. Nuclear weapons are instruments of power politics of capitalism, state or private. One cannot even exclude a possibility that Mao will use it as well in the power struggle within the power bloc of the state-capitalists who call themselves Communist

THE MORROR OF IT ALL

The world is upon the achievement of China with horror. The student movement in Japan, which is called Communist by the American bourgeois press, the Zengakuren, which demonstrated against Eisenhower, in part demonstrated and picketed the Chinese Embassy in Tokyo when the Chinese announced their bomb test.

Shastri, in India, denounced the test and called it a menace to the world, despite demands from his bourgeoisie that he emulate the effort. Shastri may denounce, but the effort cannot be excluded.

Cairo too had to declare that nothing in nuclear tests could help attain either African freedom or help the future economic development of that continent.

In Latin America, sympathy might lie with an underdeveloped country which succeeds in breaking the nuclear power monopoly, yet no words of praise came from there. The totality of destructive nuclear power knows neither color nor state of the economy.

Indeed, the "smallness" of China's bomb, the underdeveloped state of its industrialization despite the scientific breakthrough, the "intermediate" range of any nuclear capacity it has cannot possibly be fatal to the United States, but can be to the countries nearest to China's borders—and to China herself.

There is no doubt whatever that the Chinese masses know this, and like the Japanese people, and the Africans, and the workers of the nuclear giants as well, are totally opposed to this new road to war. The Japanese demonstrations against China's bomb, against the United States nuclearly armed ships, berthing there have shown the only way out—to stop the hands that would unloose a nuclear holocaust.

November 1964

6737

Conglomerate Mergers - or Big Business Gets Bigger

So popular are attacks on Big Government that the most reactionary segments of capitalism itself -- big and little, oil-rich and racist-white--have engaged in these attacks as if Big Business is not the very foundation for Big Government. Daily this red, white and blue banner of "rugged individualism" is being ostentatiously waved by Big Business itself.

In anticipation, however, of any possible release by the Administration of the proof of the concentration of economic power in the hands of a small minority of manufacturing corporations, the National Association of Manufacturers hurried to send out its own "press release": "There is no way . . . that the government can assume that everyone who wants to be a small business proprietor can be successful regardless of his ability, and it's about time to give up trying."

All that this gratuitous release failed to mention was that it is not the unsuccessful business enterprise being gobbled up, but the successful one. Nor is it the government that is doing the gobbling up; it is Big Business; big capital eating up little capital. To see just how bloated big capital is, just how high the pyramid on which the top ten corporations are sitting and lording it over the nation's economy, including Big Government, we must turn to the hearings before the Senate Anti-trust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

BIG, BIGGER, BIGGEST

Dr. Gardiner C. Mean, who co-authored the classic *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*, thought the people would be shocked to hear that the concentration of economic power, so graphically described in the old Temporary National Economic Committee (TNEC) reports, had experienced "a very sizable increase in concentration since 1929. I estimate that the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in 1962 controlled at least . . . 58 per cent of the net capital assets -- the net land, buildings, and equipment of all manufacturing corporations."

As we move from the top 100 manufacturing corporations to the top 20, the concentration of economic power becomes more centralized still. The director of the Federal Trade Commission's Bureau of Economics, Willard F. Mueller, testified that the 20 titans among all manufacturing corporations in 1962 controlled 25 per cent of all assets.

And what about the small businessmen? Well, they -- the 419,000 smallest manufacturers combined -- controlled a like percentage. This is not the exception, but the rule. The 20 biggest companies in each group of manufacturers account for 50 per cent or more of all sales, net capital assets and profits after taxes. As Mr. Mueller put it, "regardless of the measure used, a relatively few immense corporations hold the great bulk of the financial resources of American manufacturing."

It gets even more exciting as we move to the top of the pyramid. Here are the assets of the top 10:

1. Standard Oil (NJ)--\$11.5 billion
2. General Motors--\$10.2 billion
3. Ford--\$5.4 billion
4. U.S. Steel--\$5 billion
5. Gulf Oil--\$4.2 billion
6. Texaco--\$4.16 billion
7. Socony Mobil Oil--\$4.13 billion
8. Standard Oil (Calif.)--\$3.4 billion
9. Standard Oil (Ind.)--\$3.1 billion
10. E. I. DuPont--\$3 billion

By now all the readers will have noted that 6 out of the 10 are oil companies who benefit from a munificent 27.5% depreciation allowance loophole. Though President Johnson is not about to close up that loophole, the oil tycoons want to make sure that their monopolies can become conglomerates as well. Conglomeration, or, as these titans like to refer to their type of totalitarian hold on the whole economy "diversification" deserves a second look.

THE NEW IN ECONOMIC POWER

As Goldwater hoped to ride to power by "attacking" Big Government, so many a politician since Roosevelt (both Theodore and Franklin Delano) had ridden to power on the popular slogans of "trust busting", "driving the economic royalists out of the temple." Nevertheless, the trusts, far from having been broken, become even bigger. As against the phase of monopoly growth by way of buying out ruined businesses during the depression, the new post-World War II growth is by way of mergers with profitable companies who nevertheless deal with only a single product. Between 1951-63 the 200 largest corporations thus acquired no less than 1,956 businesses. Mr. Mueller had testified before Senator Hart's monopoly subcommittee that in the last five years corporations in the lucky \$10 million plus class gobbled up no less than 80 corporations a year whose earnings were 7.5 per cent annually.

In a word, the growth of economic power was not internal growth, much less through "free competition," but by taking over small, and quiet alien businesses. That is to say, the mergers were neither horizontal by one steel company taking over another, nor even vertical by taking over related industries like Ford making its own steel or parts, but by taking over all sorts of "diversified" industries.

Thus GM doesn't just make cars, it makes refrigerators and diesel locomotives. As Dr. Walter W. Adams, of Michigan State University pointed out, Olin Mathieson sells everything from farm chemicals to sporting goods and toothpaste. There are some conglomerates that produce everything from helicopters to chicken feed.

PROFIT IS KING OR IS HE?

Nothing so proves the lie of the claim that we live in a "high consumer economy" as so-called "price leadership", that is to say, the high, monopoly "administered price" that stays high, no matter what the "law of supply and demand" might say it should be, no matter if even there is a recession, as during the Eisenhower years when prices, not only remained high, but rose. If there is anything "price leadership" does more efficiently than curtailing competition and not buckling to lack of demand, it is the assuring of excessive profits.

One of the favorite pastimes of private capital proving state capital's inefficiency was to show how a state like Russia allegedly disregards the profit motive, subsidizes industries that couldn't stand up in "fair competition", just because it might decide that inducing growth of that industry was in "the nation's interest." There is no doubt that private capital would do nothing so rash as to sacrifice its profit in the nation's interest. But it is all too ready to do it in its own monopoly interest. Senator Philip A. Hart complained before the American Bar Association that "The conglomerate merger allows profits from one line of operations to subsidize a market attack on a single-line manufacturer who must rely on that single line to stay in business . . . To have competition we must have competitors."

The chief economist of the Antitrust subcommittee, Dr. John M. Blair, said "The concern over the large conglomerate corporation stems from its ability to use monopoly profits made in industries in which it has substantial monopoly power to destroy competition in other industries in which it is engaged." Senator Hart said he "would deplore a trend toward greater state control in this economic section . . . and while competition must be free, we cannot allow predatory practices to eliminate competition . . ."

Naturally Goldwater was too busy revealing "state secrets" on control of nuclear weapons to worry about Big Government's concern over Big Business. Nor can we expect any assault on monopoly power from Johnson either. As I stated in *Marxism and Freedom* (p. 258): "War or peace, the State does not diminish monopolies and trusts, nor does it diminish its own interference."

November 1964

6738

DECEMBER, 1964

Editorial Article

J. Edgar Hoover and Civil Rights

By Raya Dunayevskaya

The venom, hate, racism and police-state mentality of J. Edgar Hoover burst into the open this November 18th as he addressed a conclave of women reporters rather than the more sophisticated and more inclusive regular news conference of Washington reporters and columnists who may have challenged some of his more fanciful lies. But from the built-in aura of his office and the quiet women sipping coffee, he could rock the rafters with gratuitous statements from his padded brain cells.

Designating the Warren Commission's Report as "the most classic example of Monday morning quarterbacking I have ever read," Hoover let it be known that he considered most judges, Superior Court Justices included, as "bleeding hearts" for not handing out adult punishments to "juvenile delinquents."

ATTACK ON KING
The FBI Director's greatest display of spleen was reserved, however, for the civil rights movement and one of its leaders, Rev. Martin Luther King, whom he dared to call "the most notorious liar in the country."

That this was by no means only a personal vendetta against Rev. King became clear as Hoover expanded himself. (See Newsweek, Nov. 30, 1964.)

As against his vitriolic attack on Rev. King, Hoover singled out for praise none other than the racist Governor of that magnolia jungle, the state of Mississippi: "I cannot speak in too high terms of his (Paul Johnson's) maturity." This considered judgment of the ruler of a state where they get away, literally, with murder very nearly every day of the year, where even the FBI itself was finally busy exposing both conspiracy to murder, and actual lynch mob murder of Negro and white civil rights workers, sums up more incisively the harebrained analysis characteristic of the FBI chief than any of his critics could have done.

The impulse for self-immolation on the part of the sacrosanct FBI head impelled him to expound his views in a way that exposed their affinity to the Bourbon outlook further by his criticism of the Department of Justice, legally the parent body of the FBI. "I have been one of these states' righters all my life," continued Hoover in his Newsweek statement. "I have had difficulty in Mississippi during the last few years; it was due to the rather harsh approach to the Mississippi situation by the authorities here in Washington, by the Department of Justice."

Finally, in contrast to his softness on the Bourbon South, Hoover had this to say on the mass killings in Albany, Georgia: "We simply can't wet nurse everybody who goes down to try to reform or re-educate the

population of the South," he certainly did nothing to re-educate a storm trooper who wore the badge of a law-enforcement agent—Sheriff D. C. Campbell of Dougherty County. Campbell interpreted this as a license to cane a Negro lawyer, C. B. King, who had come down that July 28, 1962, to discuss the beating in jail of a white worker. The sheriff said the lawyer had interfered with business! The non-bleeding heart, non-wet nurse, very talkative Hoover, could not find his tongue to comment on such atrocities. He was too busy shooting his mouth off on another King—Rev. Martin Luther King.

The restraint with which Rev. King answered Hoover's absurd attack could only have come from one who is conscious that he represents a mass movement that is out for something more basic in the structure of society than the scalp of one man, even though that man be as strategically placed for harassment of a movement as is Hoover.

Asserting that Hoover "has apparently faltered under the awesome burdens, complexities and responsibilities of his office" to have made "such an irresponsible accusation," Rev. King proceeded to point out that the ineffectiveness of the FBI "in racial incidents, particularly where bombings and brutalities against Negroes are at issue" was not a question as to whether the individual agents were or were not "Southern born." Rather it was a fact of affinity to "the power structure of the South."

THE PRESS
And so, overnight, "The FBI That Nobody Knows," became known to everybody, and not as the sacred cow no one dares touch, but as a tarnished brass calf that, far from deserving worship and genuflection, should be exposed as a fetish. Such a conservative paper as The New York Herald-Tribune was aghast at Hoover's blast, stating that he "has a cavalier recklessness with fact and fancy."

The New York Times editorialized about the need for Hoover to step down from his high office on his 70th birthday, the legal age of retirement for all other Federal jobholders.

The press that criticized Hoover's present fantastic outburst against the serious criticism by the civil rights movement for his do-nothingness, and the mild criticism of the Warren Commission about the FBI taking "an unduly restrictive view of its role in preventive intelligence work" and thus having done nothing to help avert the assassination of President Kennedy, sidestepped, however, the entire issue of how Hoover became sacrosanct.

Had the press delved into his past, its own shameful role in creating the national hysteria during and after the first world war would, of necessity, also have come to light, and showed that the press itself played no small role in creating the legend of Hoover, and creating it out of whole cloth.

THE PAST OPEN SHOP OFFENSIVE

J. Edgar Hoover got his start as the right-hand man of the notorious Attorney-General Palmer who instituted the lawless reign of terror in 1920 which saw thousands of "Reds and foreigners" deported. The real basis for the national hysteria had nothing to do either with "Reds" or "foreigners." It had everything to do with American workers trying to unionize on an industrial basis, and better their conditions of labor and life.

The 1919 Seattle General Strike as well as the great strikes that year in steel and coal, and the rise of the first mass Negro organization (Garveyism), were the reasons why capitalism wanted to build up a secret police which differs in no fundamental sense from that in totalitarian lands.

Indeed, "Red Summer 1919" is a description, not of the extension of the Russian Revolution, but of the blood that flowed on American streets. Caused by the KKK that followed the Negro North, there were a fantastic number of race riots—no less than 28 in the last months of 1919. The Negroes did not take all this lying down. They built an organization of millions—the first mass organization of Negroes in this country—under the leadership of Marcus Garvey.

Dec 1964

(over)

6739

(cont'd)

And, where the majority, were searching for a nationalist philosophy, others, like Ben Fletcher, joined the I.W.W., and still others, like A. Phillip Randolph, the Socialists. The national hysteria created by the press, the lawless Palmer raids, and isolationism headed by Big Business were the foundations of the open shop offensive. It took a Depression and a very nearly endless series of strikes finally to break the stranglehold of Big Capital, and establish the C.I.O. in 1936-37.

Justice Charles Evans Hughes summed up the situation on June 21, 1920: "We may well wonder, in view of the precedents now established, whether constitutional government, as heretofore maintained in this republic, could survive another great war even victoriously waged."

THE PRESENT OFFENSIVE

To the extent that not all the lawlessness of the former era has been recreated, it is due, not to the fact that Hoover's FBI has since become "a respectable, investigative agency," but to the political maturity of the American working class, on the one hand, and, above all, to the fact that the Negro has stayed South and still organized himself into a most potent freedom movement which has gained a momentum that no white terror can stop. It is this which has J. Edgar Hoover completely befuddled.

We had, indeed, a repetition of terror during World War II, only this time the brunt fell on the Americans of Japanese descent who were herded into concentration camps. The fact that these were called "relocation centers" in no way attenuates either for their illegality or brutality.

Ever since 1946, as his letter to Attorney General Clark on Sept. 24 revealed, Hoover has been trying to withdraw from the civil rights field. The 1940s were followed by the 1950s, at

which time Hoover was too busy being a good friend of Senator Joseph McCarthy to carry on his task of investigating complaints of police brutality. Between January 1958 to June 30, 1960, the FBI did investigate 461 cases of civil rights violations, but not a single case resulted in a conviction. Supposedly, it is this local atmosphere, in the region which Hoover himself described as "filled with water moccasins, rattlesnakes, and red-neck sheriffs, and they are all in the same category, as far as I am concerned," which accounts for the Bureau's lack of enthusiasm in investigating violations of civil rights.

The truth is that Hoover has

been on a private rampage against the civil rights movement ever since President Kennedy, in 1961, set up a Civil Rights Commission which reported on the lackadaisical nature of the FBI's work in the South, and Attorney General Robert Kennedy tried softly, to remind Hoover that though his Bureau eats up fully half of the Department of Justice's annual budget, it is supposed to be subordinate to the Department. The result was that, instead of the racists whose sadism is part of Southern "culture" feeling any fear of the FBI presence, it was the Freedom movement that felt a veritable new conspiracy arise against it.

HOOVER, THE ZEALOT

So, finally, though they have not yet, a year after the event, found the bombers who destroyed the Negro church in Alabama, and killed four Negro children in it, the FBI has arrested the conspirators and savage murderers of the three civil rights workers — James Chaney, Michael Schwerner, and Andrew Goodman. The Negro community, however, still rightly feels that this is only a way for President Johnson to get J. Edgar Hoover off the hook:

1. Not only had Hoover not

withdrawn any of his statements at the infamous Nov. 18 diatribe to women reporters; he rushed the following week to Chicago to blast off, at Loyola University against "zealots and pressure groups" which he claimed are "spearheaded at times by Communists and moral degenerates." Any one acquainted with Hoover's loose use of the word, "Communist" (he said Rev. King showed "a tendency toward Communism") knows that this is his standard description for any and all who dare criticize him.

As the editorial in the *Afro-American* (Dec. 5, 1964) put it: "His diatribe against 'pressure groups' . . . gives further credence to the belief that the FBI chief has a foggy notion that, where Goldwater failed, he can succeed in tearing down public sympathy for the civil rights revolution and its dedicated leaders."

2. As a prime architect of the political strategy of American reaction from the 1920s on, Hoover can hardly be expected suddenly to become, instead, a prime architect of civil rights, in the South or elsewhere in the country.

3. He did not embark on even so elementary a step as opening an office in Jackson, Miss., until President Johnson instituted a special investigation, headed by

the former head of the CIA, Allen Dulles, who recommended it. Even then, showman Hoover, who flew down there himself to open the office amidst great fanfare, had not one word to say there on civil rights, attributing the need to expand the FBI's activities to "the growth of the state."

4. Gov. Paul Johnson, whose "maturity" Hoover praised, and relied upon to carry through with murder indictments, has not bothered to prefer charges against the conspirators and killers. The U.S. Commissioner in Mississippi designated the FBI's statement that they had a signed confession from one of the lynchers as "hearsay evidence," and dismissed the charges.

No wonder the Negroes expect little to come from the FBI's presentation to the grand jury which meets in January. They have no faith at all that the racist grand jury will convict the white assassins.

MASS ACTIVITY

President Johnson is, of course, busy getting Hoover off the hook and he has, unfortunately, also succeeded in making Rev. King privy to it. Nevertheless, despite Rev. King's interview with Hoover, and the desire of some of the leaders of the civil rights movement to hold their fire now, the youth who must work in the South have spoken out openly.

Thus the SNCC organ in Atlanta, Georgia, *The Student Voice* spoke out editorially: "The FBI under Hoover has come to mean an organization that stands and watches as Negroes are beaten in Selma, Ala., because it is an 'investigatory agency.'

"The FBI under Hoover has come to mean, 'the man' and the police state to Southern Negroes."

They rightly feel that it is only the self-activity of the masses that will assure their gaining freedom. It is by no accident that it was "the Negro Question" that forced Hoover to speak out his mind, thereby shattering this sacrosanct petty idol of reaction. The Negro has always been the touchstone of American history, revealing the hollowness of its democracy, and impelling the movement for true freedom forward.

6740

Dec 1964

Editorial Article

FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT AND 'THE COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS'

By Raya Dunayevskaya

PART ONE

On Dec. 2, 800 students in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley sat-in at Sproul Hall to protest against the University Administration's curtailment of free speech and freedom of action in behalf of civil rights and political principles.

On Dec. 3, Governor Pat Brown dispatched 643 police to effect the 800 sit-inners who, in self defense, as well as for their belief in non-violence, went limp. None too gently the non-violent demonstrators were dragged down the stairs and thrown into police patrol wagons headed for jail. During the 12 hours of this operation the building was closed to the faculty. But TV coverage of the police force's invasion of the university grounds and the subsequent fingerprinting and mugging of the students as if they were common criminals, did more to galvanize the majority of the student body to action than all the speeches and actions of the FSM had been able to achieve in the three months since the start of its struggle:

STUDENTS TAKE FREEDOM INTO THEIR OWN HANDS

The "moderates" became "leftists," the apolitical political, and the political students called for a strike. On December 4, 15,000 students stayed away from classes.

This put an end to the myth, perpetrated by the University Administration, the Governor and the press, that "a small hard core of Leftists" (if not outright "Communists"), who were "non-students", to boot — estimated by President Clark Kerr to be no more than "30 to 40," and by the spokesman for the truly hard-core minority of the faculty, Mr. Lewis S. Feuer, to be "170"—constituted the Free Speech Movement. In truth, not only did a majority of the vast student body now support the FSM, but the overwhelming majority of the faculty likewise now sprang to action of their own in its support.

Two departments canceled classes and many professors honored the picket lines. The chairmen of all departments constituted themselves as a Council of Chairmen, met with President Kerr and tried to work out a compromise. At the same time 200 professors met to plan strategy to present to the Academic Senate to endorse complete political freedom and amnesty. The Academic Freedom Committee and the Chairmen's Council endorsed the proposals. On Dec. 8, the Academic Senate voted, 324 to 115, to endorse the Resolution of the Academic Freedom Committee.

To find out how it was possible for the allegedly most apolitical student body in the world—the American—to open a new chapter of mass action for freedom, applying tactics never before used in any university anywhere in the world, it becomes necessary to trace the dialectic of revolt from its beginning. (1)

UNDER THE WHIP OF COUNTER-REVOLUTION

On Sept. 17, a united front of organizations as far apart on the political and civil rights spectrum as SNCC, CORE, SLATE, YSA, SDS, and the Du Bois Clubs, on the one hand, and the Young Democrats, Young Republicans, and even some Students for Goldwater, on the other hand, united to oppose the arbitrary Sept. 14 ruling issued by Dean Kathryn Towle which curtailed the content of, and areas for, free speech as well as fund solicitations and recruitment by civil rights and political organizations.

The University of California's sudden "discovery" that the area heretofore used by these organizations, and for which city permits had been obtained, was university property came about through the prodding of forces outside the academic community, forces whose only concern with education lay in the attempt to extend McCarthyite tactics against both academic freedom and civil rights. These reactionary forces had, in summer, gathered in convention to capture the presidential nomination of the Republican Party for Goldwater. They stood aghast at the students and other civil rights workers who were demonstrating before the hall.

The old leaders of this new fashioned neo-fascistic fringe of American politics had memories that were as long as they were abysmally deep in the backward look. They recalled that this was the city, and these youth the fighters against the "open" hearings that the House UnAmerican Activities Committee chose to conduct in San Francisco in 1960, the very year in which Negro youth began their revolution down South.

And here they were again, despite the fact that the film made of the 1960 demonstration and police measures against it, plus the fascistic rhetoric of Fulton Lewis Jr. extolling the forces of "law and order and anti-Communism," had succeeded in forging a new brand of college conservatives—Goldwaterites, Birchites, and even Wallaceite racists. At the height of their power, about to capture a major political party, they were being challenged by still a newer and greater national force, since the Negro Revolution had not only extended itself from South to North but aligned itself with new white youth.

There is no way, of course, of knowing whether plans against the Berkeley students were hatched there and then, or whether these forces felt too cocky with big power politics to do more than store the sight of the youth in the back of their heads for future use.

What we do know beyond the peradventure of any doubt is that

one of this extreme Right had a personal vendetta to settle, since the paper he published had been picketed by these same university youth who protested his unfair hiring practices. This man—erstwhile U.S. Senator, erstwhile Governor, and California Campaign Chairman of Goldwater for President, and publisher of the Oakland Tribune, William Knowland—was a local resident and could take his time about deciding when to launch his campaign against the students.

No doubt Mr. Knowland felt doubly armed since this time, as against 1960, there were "court convictions" of the students for the spring actions at the Sheraton Plaza and Automobile Row, and he knew the right section of Big Business to put pressure on the fund raisers in the UC Administration. Moreover the University would float a bond issue in November and he had a paper at his command to use to propagandize for or against. It was he who made sure that the Administration "discovered" the property belonged to them. The fall semester had no sooner opened than the students were confronted by the new ruling. It hit the newly returned Mississippi Freedom Summer participants, like Mario Savio, especially hard since they knew just how the Southern Freedom Fighters depended on the North for both human allies and financial assistance. That is why the first of the 19 organizations in the united front to man the tables in a challenge of the ruling were SNCC, CORE, SDS, Du Bois Clubs and SLATE, and these were the first organizations warned by the Administration about their violations of the arbitrary ruling. The warnings were followed by the indefinite suspension of eight students.

The first head-on collision which imparted an altogether new quality to the battle between students and university administrators occurred when, once again, an outside force entered the fray.

Fifteen minutes before a scheduled rally of students to protest the suspensions, at 11:45 a.m. on Oct. 1, Dean Van Houten approached the CORE table that was being manned by a "non-student," Jack Weinberg (who was a recent graduate), and attempted to have him arrested. Spontaneously, the students moved to surround the police car and block it from removing Weinberg. Mario Savio, head of the Friends of SNCC, emerged as leader as he addressed the crowd. The struggle now extended to a sit-in in Sproul Hall.

The movement gained momentum and the protest demonstration grew. Late that evening about 100 fraternity men assembled and hurled eggs and lighted cigarettes on the hundreds sitting in the plaza. This violence, however, was not answered with violence by the students sitting-in, who maintained the highest of disciplines — self-discipline. It was this discipline plus the appeal of a Catholic chaplain that finally caused the hecklers to disperse after many tense hours.

The new momentum, plus the intervention of a group of faculty members who convinced President Kerr to meet with the students that afternoon, led the following day to an agreement. This included, submitting rules to a tripartite study committee of administration, faculty and students, submitting suspensions to a Committee of the Academic Senate, and taking steps to deed the free speech sidewalk to the city. This was Oct. 2. On Oct. 3-4 the united front of student organizations constituted itself as the Free Speech Movement.

THE TURNING POINT

Chancellor Strong, without waiting for recommendations from either students or faculty, appointed 10 of the 12 men who were to serve on the Campus Committee on Political Activity, (CCPA)

January 1965

(cont'd)

and announced also that his appointed Faculty Committee on Student Conduct, and not a Committee of the Academic Senate, would hear the cases of the eight suspended students. The FSM stated that if the Administration continued its refusal "to sit down and discuss issues" on the different interpretations of the Oct. 2 agreement, which they considered Chancellor Strong had violated, they planned to end the moratorium on demonstrations.

At this point 600 unaffiliated students, called "Independents," expressed their support of the FSM. They chose five to serve on the executive committee. President Kerr reversed Chancellor Strong's interpretation insofar as the committee to whom the cases of the suspended students were to be submitted, and expanded the CCPA to include four from FSM. However, he remained adamant on his interpretation of what constituted "unlawful acts," while the students contended that the question of legality and illegality were for the courts to decide. A move "to exercise our constitutional rights" was made by the students who resumed manning tables.

Chancellor Strong disbanded the CCPA and the Dean's Office sent a letter to 70 students, citing violations. A new force then joined the FSM: a newly organized teaching assistants' association. The Dean's Office now moved against the graduate students. The FSM was busy collecting signatures on petitions which urged the Board of Regents to leave the question of "advocacy" to the courts to decide. On Nov. 20 the Regents seemed to side with President Kerr on the question of "illegal" advocacy. When this was followed, during the Thanksgiving holidays, by suddenly resuming disciplinary action against Savio and others, the gathering storm broke loose. After a mass rally, on Dec. 2, 800 moved into Sproul Hall for a new sit-in. The move of the Administration to use police to settle its dispute with the students, the intervention of the Governor, the arrest of the student demonstrators, as we saw, brought about the student strike, and such massive support from the faculty, that it became the turning point for all concerned.

Just as the faculty was propelled into the student dispute with the Administration, so the civil rights movement found that it was by no accident bound up with the issue of academic freedom. The FSM itself had reached a new stage of development, for the dialectic of revolt is inseparable from the dialectic of ideas. All the participants suddenly found that the whole struggle, victory included, was but prologue to the unfolding drama which would first reveal differing attitudes not merely to the role of youth in a university, but to ideas and to reality. The right to free speech became a discussion on alienation in society as a whole. The right to discipline became a question of human relationships. The dialogue on concrete questions became a search for a total philosophy.

THE BANKRUPTCY OF THOUGHT: PROFILES OF CLARK KERR AND LEWIS FEUER

Long before the Berkeley battle broke out, UC President Kerr wrote of the university as a "multiversity" with government research, business, the military, and scientific institutes all being part of the "new" academic complex. Both in his Godkin lectures at Harvard in 1963, *The Uses of the University*, and in his other book, *Industrialism and Industrial Man* (2), he wrote of the "irresponsibility" of intellectuals and the need to do away with ivory towers so that the university can become part of "society," i.e., the staffed militarized economy run by responsible "managers."

Now, whether as he claims he was merely describing what is, not advocating what should be, the point is that, once the actual student revolt began in "his" university, and once society showed itself not to be a monolithic unit, but rent in twain by class struggles, civil rights struggles, academic as well as economic and political crises, President Kerr showed which part of "society" he was for, and which was the "enemy" and thereby not part of his concept of society. It turned out to be the students and even the faculty.

The students, on the other hand, considered "society" to be the struggles for civil rights and freedom of thought, especially since the only struggle possible in the nuclear world is the struggle for the minds of men — and they hunger to participate in that conflict. They rejected Kerr's concept of the "multiversity" along with its IBM cataloguing of students as if they were mere numbers. Their feeling of alienation can be sensed from one of the placards which read: "I'm a UC student. Please don't bend, fold, splindle or mutilate me."

Professor Lewis S. Feuer rushed into print with a pompous analysis of the events at Berkeley. He thinks that by coining a new word, "nulliversity" in place of "multiversity," and speaking of a so-called community of scholars, he has thereby put himself to the left of President Kerr. As it turns out, he is to the right of him. In the manner of "patriots" who used to ask: "If you don't like this country, why don't you go back where you came from?" Professor Feuer asks: If the students don't like the large campuses, why don't they go to smaller colleges? Why do they flock to Berkeley?

Dr. Feuer thought it a big joke for Savio to have introduced the question of alienation in his speeches. He also thought that he had really dug up the root of evil in the "multiversity." "Extremes do meet," he wrote. "The astonishing thing is that both Clark Kerr and Mario Savio agree about the nature of the modern university."

Between Feuer who has elected himself a sort of spokesman for the minority of the faculty, and Kerr who speaks for the majority of the university administrators, it is hard to decide who is more adept in degrading the world of learning. Both have emasculated language of its meaning. "Non-student" has become, for both, a sort of substitute for "subversive." The hallowed word, alumni, has been dropped altogether, now that some turned out to be part of the FSM. Instead we hear about "a hidden community" who live "off campus" and who, Kerr says, resemble "the Paris left bank." (He says it like a man announcing that he has found "foreigners" and "guerillas" hidden beneath every campus bush.)

Feuer, who is a master of Stalinist-type of amalgam, here goes the whole hog: "undergraduate Goldwaterites and graduate Maoists," "forlorn crackpot and rejected revolutionist," "lumpen beatniks and lumpen agitators." And while he is within sound of the syllable, "nik," he creates a new term with which to deride practitioners of non-violence who go limp rather than actively resist the armed police: "lispnik."

President Kerr will not, however, let himself be put completely in the shade in innuendos against the aims and tactics of the student revolt. His tone in referring to the tactics of non-violence as "civil disobedience" has the sound of a military man who has just informed a defense plant about which grounds must be restricted areas. Evidently President Kerr thinks we are at war and "civil

(Continued on Page 6)

Jan 1965

6742

FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT AND 'THE COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS'

BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA
PART TWO

The apparent lull in the student revolt at the University of California in Berkeley, occasioned both by the naming of a new acting chancellor, Martin Meyerson, and the need to resolve the question of the infamous arrest of some 800 students who sat-in at Sproul Hall in December, presents an opportunity for a second look at the significance of the Free Speech Movement. Both as an action and as a serious challenge to thought, the FSM has shaken up not only the academic community but the world outside it. Just as the continuous Negro struggle for equality exposes the hollowness of American democracy, so the student revolt at Berkeley exposes the hollowness of academic freedom.

Professor Hook from New York University who, during the McCarthy period, found reasons why academic freedom should be restricted within the context of the Cold War, now tells us that academic freedom in any case, was never meant to apply to students who are there only to learn.⁽¹⁾ He failed to explain exactly how the police invasion of the campus contributed to the University of California being a citadel of learning. Another academician of the same stripe—Professor Feuer—commended the police for their "moderation." Before the University Administration decides to elaborate this myth into a legend, it is necessary, first of all, to re-establish the facts of the case.

EYEWITNESS REPORT

The only reporter who was in Sproul Hall, Joel L. Pimsleur, has a very different story to tell: (2)

"The only way to purge the nightmare of that black Thursday is by getting the ugly images out of my brain and down on paper . . . The question might well be asked, why do you need 600 cops to cope with 700 passively resisting kids? This was no prison riot; yet from the police response, you would have thought they were handling convicts, not students . . . Make no mistake, the cops weren't just doing their duty . . .

"(The students) were deliberately hauled down the stairs on their backs and tailbones, arms and wrists were twisted, hair and ears were pulled—all to the immense amusement of the Oakland police. And lest anyone think I exaggerate, listen to the cops themselves: . . . 'Hey, don't drag 'em down so fast—they ride on their heels. Take 'em down a little slower—they bounce more than way.' . . . 'We should do like they do in them foreign countries; beat 'em senseless first, then throw 'em in the bus.' . . . The cops (were) charging up the curving stairs to the second floor, hurling the kids down the stairs, some head first, some feet first, stepping on them with their boots, billyclubbing a couple out of the way, and getting the big microphone . . .

"Since when do the cops get the right to plaster papers over windows so reporters can't see what's going on? That's a new one: newspapers used as a device to keep newspapermen from getting the truth . . . 'Law and order must be preserved' contend the authorities (Mulford, Brown, Knowland, McAteer, the newspapers, the Administration, etc., etc.) But are law and order really civilization's ultimate virtues—or are freedom and justice? Indeed, law and order are maintained with brilliant efficiency in totalitarian states . . .

"There is a final point. The old 'Red-inspired' 'left wing dupes' interpretation has already been raised . . . Since when is free speech a Communist idea, or the right to mount political and social action a Communist concept? I thought precisely the opposite . . .

"If any good comes out of this (and I'm still naive enough to think it will) at least one lesson has emerged that must not be missed: You can crush the idealist, but you cannot crush the idea. You cannot kick it, you cannot step on it. You cannot break it, you cannot beat it with a billy club, you cannot twist its arms, you cannot drag it down the stairs, you cannot hide it behind a screen, you cannot bury it in the basement, you cannot put it in jail, and you cannot silence it. Ultimately, if it's any good, it is more powerful than its enemies—because it is more important than its advocates."

This, precisely this, is the point the UC administration chooses to forget. As Jack Weinberg, head of the campus CORE chapter and a leader of the FSM, expresses it: "Unfortunately, it seems that at those rare times when the students are not treated as things, they are treated as children."

BACK TO KERR AND FEUER

When we last wrote (See Part One in News & Letters, January issue) UC President Kerr and Professor Feuer were trading insults, mild though they were. Now they are trading high compliments. This is no accident and no surprise. Far from Feuer's spurious

contention that there was something akin in President Kerr's and Student Savio's concept of the university, the organic kinship is between Kerr and Feuer. "I congratulate Professor Feuer," writes Kerr, "on his perceptive analysis of the psychodynamics and social context which apparently motivated much of the student action at Berkeley."

And Feuer replies in kind: "Clark Kerr's book is, to my mind, the most powerful analysis of the modern university which has been written in the United States. It is more searching (sic!) than Veblen's classical *The Higher Learning in America* . . . Kerr has been an outstanding president because in practice he has usually acted not as a mediator as his book would have him, but as a leader . . . Kerr is making a valiant effort to create new environments . . . (he) foresaw the coming of the student revolt against the Multiversity. We have seen the advent of what we might well call 'the politics of the absurd.' Will the university community have the wisdom and foresight to prevent their recurrence?"⁽³⁾

Now that the alleged proponent of a "community of scholars," and the "technomanagerial realist," find cohabitation so pleasant, we must not only pray for the student body, but for the state of scholarship in the United States.⁽⁴⁾ Fortunately, not only do ideas have a dialectic of their own, but, above all, the specific human beings involved in the student revolt have both a perceptivity and an intellectual integrity so sadly lacking in their elders. Thus Stephan Weissman, one of the leaders of the student revolt, wrote in anticipation of the concerted attack against free thought: "Dialogue will not be stifled by the anticipated red-baiting, nor by the probable resurgence of the manipulated consensus with which President Kerr for so long directed the university."⁽⁵⁾

ALIENATION AND FREEDOM

The trouble with the elders, even when they are for the student revolt, is that they do not listen to the new voices. It was ever so. The Humanism of Karl Marx was the only vision that held as one, thought and action, mental and manual labor. It was the only one that saw the negative feeling of estrangement as the path to freedom; the only one that saw the positive in the negative not only as a philosophic abstraction, but as a human force for the reconstruction of society.

Deriving the concept of alienation from Hegel, Marx did more than place it upright on materialistic foundations. He opposed the communists who vulgarized the materialism and rejected "bourgeois idealism." Marx's main opposition to Hegel was not his idealism; it was his dehumanization of the idea as if it were not part of man's body, as if ideas could, indeed, float outside of the human being. Or, as Marx himself put it, and put in strictly Hegelian terms, Hegel "separated thinking from the subject," even as capitalism has put "in place of all the physical and spiritual senses . . . the sense of possession, which is the simple alienation of all these senses. To such absolute poverty has human essence had to be reduced in order to give birth to its inner wealth!"⁽⁶⁾

In a word, Marx saw alienation as an essential dimension of history, characteristic of all class societies—based as they are on the division between mental and manual labor—and gaining its most monstrous form under capitalism: it is under "machinofacture" where the laborer becomes but a cog in the machine, so that not only his product is alienated from him, but so is his very activity. Once this is achieved, it is not only labor that suffers; all of society is demeaned and degraded, including its thought. The only way out is to reconstruct society on totally new beginnings: "To be radical is to grasp something at its roots. But for man the root is man himself."

It still is. And it is this precisely which the students have got hold of and are fighting for. The one element about which both participants and opponents of the FSM do agree is this: The feeling of alienation felt by the student body was the point of affinity to the ideas of the FSM which brought the students into it en masse, including not only those who had not previously expressed any interest in civil rights, but also those who had not even been interested in free speech per se.

This spirit of alienation characterizes the whole fabric of our state-capitalist society, in its stage of automation, in its racist aspects, in its bureaucratic mentality whether it belongs to a manager of industry or an administrator of a university.

This is what Mario Savio saw, in Berkeley as in Mississippi: "Last summer I went to Mississippi to join the struggle for civil rights. This fall I am engaged in another phase of the same struggle," he told his fellow sit-inners in Sproul Hall. "The most crucial problems facing the United States today are the problems of automation and the problem of racial injustice . . . Many students here at the university, many people in society, are wandering aimlessly about. Strangers in their own lives, there is no place for them. They are people who have not learned to compromise . . . The 'futures' and 'careers' for which American students now prepare are for the most part intellectual and moral wastelands . . . But an important minority of men and women coming to the front today have shown that they

6743

Feb. 1965

(cont'd)

(cont'd)

will die rather than be standardized, replaceable and irrelevant."⁽⁷⁾ Jack Weinberg expressed a similar point: "One of the greatest social ills of this nation is the absolute refusal by almost all of its members to examine seriously the presuppositions of the establishment . . . It is their marginal social status which has allowed students to become active in the civil rights movement and which has allowed them to create the Free Speech Movement . . . They become activists and a new generation, a generation of radicals, emerges."⁽⁸⁾

What needs to be stressed now is that a new generation of radicals is born not only through such activities as the sit-in, the picket line, the strike, but also through the activity of thinking. It should be unnecessary to add that the mental alertness and social aspiration, more than the marginal social status, impelled the students into the FSM and such new bold forms of revolt as "civil disobedience." Of course, they "took it" from the civil rights movement, but placing it on a university campus, means that the whole so-called academic community, and not only at Berkeley, will never be the same.

The philosophic aspect, moreover, adds a new dimension to the very movement which gave the FSM its impetus: the civil rights movement. It is this which must not be reconfinned, not even in activism.

Our age of state-capitalism with the administrative mentality so inherent in it, shows us, over and over again, that, despite the appearance of opposites, reconfinement and activism can and do meet to form the evasion so characteristic of modern intellectuals, including those who do see the ills of the world and do oppose the status quo.

Even an intellectual of the stature of Jean-Paul Sartre found it much easier to declare the Communist Party to be "the only revolutionary party"⁽⁹⁾—and that, though he was witness to the outright counter-revolutionary suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956!—than to undertake the challenge to thought once it was designated as "political." This, moreover, is not only due to the fact that it is easier to shift responsibility for leadership "to the party." It is, above all, due to the fact that it doesn't soil the intellectual's hands who would otherwise have to go below, to the source of ideas, to the masses, and not only for "inspiration," but to work out the seminal ideas in their manifold historic and philosophic, as well as urgently creative, aspects of today-ness.

Now that the students have experienced the urgency of freedom's call, and have given the struggles their own stamp, a new path to Marx's Humanism has been opened up; today's young Abolitionists are acting out the truth of Wendell Phillips' admonition: "Never again be ours the fastidious scholarship that shrinks from rude contact with the masses."⁽¹⁰⁾

(FOR FOOTNOTES SEE P. 7, COLS. 1 AND 2)

FOOTNOTES FOR "FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT," pp. 1 and 5.

(1) "Freedom to Learn But Not to Riot" by Sidney Hock (The New York Times Magazine, January 3, 1965).

(2) "Conflict at Berkeley: An Inside Story" by Joel L. Pimsleur (Columbia Daily Spectator, Dec. 18, 1964).

(3) These pleasantries are exchanged in The New Leader, 1-18-65.

(4) Other than analyzing Feuer's "scholarship" in the specific instance of his scurrilous writings on the Berkeley revolt as we did in Part One, (N&L, January, 1965) at least passing reference must be made to his scholarship as analyzed by learned sources long before he wrote of issues in which he was a participant. Thus, Professor David Joravsky, the one historian who has written the best documented and truly scholarly work on Soviet Marxism and Natural Science, 1917-1932, had to show that Communist authors did not go unaided, "in accordance with their shibboleths," to create confusion:

"Non-Communist authors have contributed to the confusion by an excess of boldness, by the proclivity that many have shown towards magisterial judgments on the basis of insufficient evidence. One author, for example, writing in a scholarly journal, based a history of the theory of relativity in Soviet physics and philosophy on three 'sources' two of which were merely ambiguous passing references to Einstein's theory in Soviet articles on other subjects." The author referred to is none other than Lewis S. Feuer.

Since that was written, Feuer was nevertheless sent as part of the cultural exchange with Russia and since his few months' stay there he has written endlessly (and so have they against him: See Voprosy Filosofii, 11-65) and just as ignorantly so that, once again, he has aroused the ire of specialists in the Russian field. Thus, Professor Joseph Reucek has had to write to the Slavic Review (12-64), complaining that Feuer "is either unacquainted with such studies, or unwilling to acknowledge that they exist" and, after citing about a dozen that deal with the same subject as Feuer, Reucek concludes: "Shall I go on? I can produce other studies. There is nothing particularly wrong if his article is to be only his personal impressions. But since his footnote refers to a few 'other' works in that field, I am wondering whether this is exactly fair to the whole idea of scholarship."

And this is the representative of "the West" that is supposed to win the struggle for the minds of men away from Communism!

(5) "What the Students Want" by Steplian Weissman, The New Leader, 1-4-65.

(6) I'm using my own translation of the Humanist Essays which first appeared as Appendices to the 1958 edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM, but these essays can also be gotten in paperback edition of Erich Fromm's Marx's Concept of Man.

(7) The speech was printed in Humanity, No. 2, Dec. '64, under title of "An End to History."

(8) "The Free Speech Movement and Civil Rights" by Jack Weinberg, The Campus Core—Later, Jan. 1965.

(9) For a detailed development of Sartre's philosophic works, see my Sartre's Search for Method to Undermine Marxism, News & Letters, Detroit, Mich.

(10) Quoted in American Civilization on Trial, A Statement by the National Editorial Board of News & Letters (Detroit, Mich. 48204).

Feb 1965

6744
8070

EDITORIAL**End the War in Viet Nam!**

The bombings of North Viet Nam by American planes did more than escalate the war in Viet Nam. They were actually steps toward a new world war. So strong is the anti-war feeling throughout the world that this is one time that the Communists were not alone in their demonstrations protesting the provocative actions of the United States. Throughout the world, including the United States, thousands and tens of thousands demanded an end to the plunge toward war.

CONSPIRACY BY WHOM?

The Administration's pretense that it "had to" retaliate the Vietcong infiltration of a U. S. air base at Pleiku, South Viet Nam, because "the Hanoi regime" was testing its "will and purpose" fails to answer: why the United States changed the rules of the war by formally equating the Vietcong with Hanoi? And how did it "happen" that three carriers of the Seventh Fleet were so conveniently in the South China Sea just when they were needed for "reprisals against unwarranted attacks"? Since the Administration's own description of the Vietcong mortar attack shows that the South Vietnamese guerrillas could not have possibly entered the American military base without the active cooperation of the people of South Viet Nam, isn't it obvious that the South Vietnamese are not desirous of American "protection"?

NEWS & LETTERS got this letter directly after Wilson's visit to Johnson in January which was followed by Britain landing 50,000 troops in Malaysia: "If we knew more about the talks between Wilson and Johnson, we would probably be shocked. Wilson must have had some kind of guarantee about help in Malaysia in exchange for support for the war effort in Viet Nam and other parts of Asia."

Indeed, only one thing matches the shock of the Administration's actions in not only extending the war in Viet Nam but risking war with China and Russia, and that is the British Labor Government's support of the American actions.

Yet the truth is that by now the war in Viet Nam is not so much a war between North and South Viet Nam as a civil war of the South Vietnamese people against their government, a military dictatorship propped up by American imperialism for which the people never voted. Unless the unwanted American imperialist presence ends now, the point of no return will have been reached. We are on the edge of a world war.

NEO-COLONIALISM AND THE IMPOTENCE OF THE UN

The talkative President Johnson has become more quiet than silent Cal Coolidge of another era, but he carries an even bigger stick than Theodore Roosevelt of "manifest destiny" notoriety. "The Great Society" does not show much forward movement in the United States or abroad. Instead, we are confronted with unyielding unemployment and unyielding Southern racists corroding this nation while the military are trying to push us over the edge into the abyss of a possible nuclear war. The uneasy balance is backed up by trying to foist upon the newly emergent nations of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America a new type of imperialist rule: neo-colonialism.

In face both of the mass demonstrations against the American action and the request on the part of even some capitalists for negotiations, the British Government told the Russian Government that negotiations could not be started unless the Vietcong attacks on the American military in South Viet Nam were first stopped!

The liberal New Statesman went as hysterically far in London as any jingoistic talk in Washington when, in a front page editorial, it wrote: "The road to New Dehli lies through Saigon." Following the infamous domino theory that if Viet Nam "goes," so does Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, India, it exposed the actual worry of the British establishment: "The Communists and their allies could move into Malaysia from the north, to reinforce their assaults from the south."

Now it is true that the New Statesman is calling, not for war, but for "an entirely new conference." But so is Pope Paul and U Thant, the latter generously conceding that negotiation could be started "inside or outside" the UN. All that he fails to add is that the UN is very nearly as dead as the old League of Nations. He cannot admit the truth without revealing that such unlikely bedfellows as Gromyko and de Gaulle have brought about UN's impotence by so simple a device as not paying "dues." And hardly any one has noticed that, though we are closer to world war than at any time since Korea, the elaborate "peace-keeping machinery" has collapsed.

THE SINO-SOVIET ORBIT

The confusion in the Western imperialist world moving to war but babbling about peace is matched by that in the Sino-Soviet orbit. While fantastic explanations are made in this country about the Sino-Soviet conflict as if it were tailor made in the U.S. to assure "a balance" between East and West, Russia and China are not only reaffirming their "Friendship Treaty" on this, its 15th anniversary, and "the socialist unity" with Hanoi, but China has also announced that "no force on earth" can tear it away from Russia. Meanwhile they have not undertaken a single act to help Hanoi.

Naturally, there is nothing permanent about this situation. Naturally the U.S. knows that mere affirmation of friendship can easily become actual attack on the United States positions in Viet Nam or anywhere in Asia. The struggle for world power between private and state-capitalism has not ended with the declaration for "peaceful co-existence." And this is one moment in history when the Sino-Soviet orbit would have the sympathy of greater masses of non-Communists than they have had since the days they led popular revolutions in their own countries. Then why the seeming inaction?

It is important to remember that China did not come to the aid of North Viet Nam during the Gulf of Tonkin incident last year, and it is as adept in big deal politics as any big power. What then happens to all the newly emergent nations? Is it the lull before the holocaust? Or the lull before the sell-out?

Why did Premier Kosygin's visit to Hanoi, to North Korea and to Peking result in nothing more than talk, the greater part of which we do not know? What intra conflicts, ideological as well as territorial, military as well as industrial stir that world on the eve of a conference, sponsored by Russia and opposed by China, which is supposed to bring all Communist powers to Russia in March? If that lime-table has once again been upset, this time not by the removal of a Khrushchev, but by U. S. imperialism moving wildy, trying to hack its way into Asia, will Russia and China unite to face their "main enemy"?

**NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR PEKING;
NEITHER MOSCOW NOR LONDON**

There is no way for us to know the promises made, to be broken, or otherwise. The working people can expect nothing but exploitation from any pole of world capital, private or state, "East" or "West." No one will "bring" self-determination to the Vietnamese people South or North. Neither Washington nor Peking; neither Moscow nor London, nor, for that matter, Hanoi. The people will be free when they themselves take it, confident also of the solidarity of the working people of the world.

There is not a single big power that can be trusted at this turning point in the Viet Nam war. Each has its own dreams of conquest. The smaller, newly-independent nations are caught in the squeeze of big power struggles — and fear of world war. The American working people must speak out not only against the extension of the Viet Name war, not only against the struggle over Asia, not only against secret deals, but for control over their own lives, beginning with the conditions of labor, the equality of all races, the freedom of thought and decision on the question of war and peace. No one must decide for the people. They must decide for themselves. It is their lives that are at stake, and it is they who must have the final vote.

— Raya Dunayevskaya

Feb-1965 6745

March 1965

NEWS & LETTERS

8751 Grand River Ave., Detroit, Mich. 48204

Ty8-7053

SPECIAL LETTER TO SUBSCRIBERS

Selma, Alabama -- From Sunday, March 7 to Sunday, March 14 -- Where Now?

Dear Reader:

The barbarism which passes for civilization in South USA reached such a stage of savagery on Sunday, March 7, with the gassing and clubbing of unarmed Negroes -- men, women and children -- that it set into motion thousands of new forces for the freedom movement. Many had never before been roused to action, even by the brutal murders of Schwerner, Chaney and Goodman in Mississippi last summer. But those who had kept their eyes closed to Magnolia Jungle justice by blaming it on "individuals" found they could no longer do so, when the storm troopers, under direct order of Gov. Wallace displayed their bestiality as the arm of "the law". Coming directly after the death of Jimmy Lee Jackson, shot in the stomach by one of these storm troopers, the March 7 atrocity became the act that aroused the conscience of the nation. The courage and determination of John Lewis, SNCC Chairman, and leader of the march, who had been clubbed and beaten and yet rose to ask for another march, became a crucible out of which was forged new forces for the Freedom Movement Now.

At the same time counter forces were at work. We do not mean the openly counter-revolutionary actions of Gov. Wallace, who had planned the Selma outrage. We refer to the many ways in which the Washington Administration began its attempts "to correct the American image" abroad by trying "to stop bloodshed". This did not mean trying to stop the storm troopers who were shedding it, but the non-violent masses whose blood was being shed as they fought for their elemental rights. Thus, first the Administration advised against a new demonstration; then it inspired the Federal court order to stop it; then there was an open appeal from the President; and when it became quite clear that nothing could stop the newly mobilized forces and that Rev. King would lead a new march of 2500, the Administration persuaded Rev. King to follow a Federal plan -- an agreement unknown to most of the demonstrators who had flocked to Selma to continue the struggle.

When Rev. James Reeb was clubbed to death, from behind, by white racists after the peaceful march, the great new demonstrations that followed across the land were in large measure unled. New forms were spontaneously evolved -- such as the sit-in at the White House, the lay-down on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C., and the all-night vigils in such widely separated places as Selma, Alabama in the streets in front of Brown's Chapel, which lasted for five long days and nights, and in Los Angeles before the Federal Building. These demonstrations also revealed that the violence of "law and order" is very little different North or South.

The yellow roses from the President, and the crocodile tears from Selma's City Council to the widow of the murdered Rev. James Reeb, cannot becloud the urgency for the civil rights movement to evaluate the new stage the freedom struggles have reached, and the ever-renewed pressure of the Administration to channelize them into legal traps. There have been too many martyrs, too many memorials, there has been too much achieved in daring, self-activity and momentum, for the movement to entangle itself once again in legalisms. Rev. King is tied up in a court case at the very moment when, from below, there are both mass outpourings, and smaller vigils which demonstrate the unflagging determination of the ranks to continue. In Selma, freedom fighters have spent days and nights out in bitter rain on hard sidewalks, surrounded

not only by armed police, but by what they immediately named "the Berlin rope", strung up by Selma's "Public Safety Director" to keep them in one single place. Throughout the country the ranks are devising new forms of revolt -- while the Administration keeps trying to divert everything to the enactment of still one more bill.

The pattern is all too familiar now. After Bull Connor's display of brutality, use of fire-hoses, vicious police dogs and cattle prods against the mass demonstrators in Birmingham in 1963, we got the Civil Rights Bill passed in 1964. This was deemed sufficient for some civil rights leaders to call off mass demonstrations and to concentrate on "voting for Johnson". But the counter-revolution did not stop for a single instant in its concerted attempt to turn back the clock of history. Though the Mississippi murders might horrify others, they knew the killers would be acquitted by Federal district judges on the fantastic ground that the heinous crimes were State, not Federal violations. Now t. y Alabama storm troopers and possemen, led by Al Lingo and Sheriff Clark, have unloosed, against unarmed Negro men women and children, gas which has left serious chemical burns, bull whips which beat them as they ran back, clubs which beat them as they fell, and horses which trampled into the ground. And the Governor who created this new bloodshed, not only dared ask the President to stop the civil rights "agitators" from interfering with his "law and order", but after meeting with the President, dared continue with his ordered defiance -- and called the shots against the very same type of police brutality in the North.

The revulsion against the latest outrages has forced even the moderate Roy Wilkins to state that there is a limit to patience and non-violence, that if the Administration can't establish order, the Negro will have to, for it is "American to protect oneself when attacked." But -- now that the President has spoken out "strongly" and presented us with still one more bill on voting (nearly a century after the 14th and 15th amendments, following a civil war, had already established that elementary right) -- the question is: Will the movement which demands freedom now once again be diverted?

This is the turning point which must become a point of departure for weighing carefully and elaborating daringly, not ways to pause, but ways to unite thought with action, to work out a theory of liberation which will meet the challenge of this movement from below, from the actual struggles for freedom.

The proof that this is what the movement is searching for is that so many youth, South and North, are not waiting for any leadership to call for some specific act before embarking on it themselves. This week-end saw mass demonstrations which reached more and more thousands in more and more cities across the country; and alongside these mass outpourings, have appeared smaller groups who have devised new ways of continuous challenge, not only to State but to Federal authorities, acting on their own rather than under any established civil rights leadership. From Selma to Los Angeles, from Washington D.C. to Wisconsin, they are continuing the struggle with or without official sanction -- and they are continuing discussion as well, not only in meeting halls, but in small huddles on all-night vigils.

The fact that not only the civil rights movement, but the general public feels that legalisms are insufficient, is proved by their near-disregard of the Supreme Court decision which has just struck down Louisiana literacy laws as "a trap". A decade ago the Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the schools was hailed as a "milestone". Today, the new "historic" decision brought hardly a notice from anyone. The Administration is well aware of the public feeling that one more law means only one more loophole for the Southern lawyers. That is why

the Administration is trying to present the new bill as something self-triggering -- but it cannot trigger any new social order in South USA, since the South is, in fact, the material product of Northern capital.

The leadership of the civil rights movement may think that it is only by not facing that fact that they have attractéd the new allies who have turned out by the thousands. In part this is true, but only in part. The greater truth is that this numerically highest point is, at the same time, a turning point for the civil rights movement, which is now faced with possible isolation from its own militant ranks and those outside who are taking independent action, as well as carrying on discussion on various theories of liberation. Unless the leadership listens to these new voices and recognizes that the momentum of the movement will not allow for any retreat to legalisms; unless it becomes a participant in the elaboration of an underlying philosophy instead of merely using it as a slogan, the leadership itself will be left by the wayside. What is needed now is a unity of theory and practice in which the masses are not only participants in action, but in thought. Instead of a never-ending dialogue with the Administration, it is time that the leadership of the civil rights movement started one with its own ranks.

The dialogue must no longer be put off on the grounds that "we are an activity organization." Thinking, too, is an activity. An awareness of the significance of an action is itself a step toward total freedom. It is imperative that what has been implicit in the freedom struggles all along, now become explicit. Dialogue with the ranks involved in direct actions can make it so. Nothing else will fully arm them in their struggle against the forces of reaction. Nothing else will transform the goal of freedom into a reality.

-- THE NATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD

For extra copies of this letter, and sample copies of News & Letters, write:
News & Letters
8751 Grand River Ave.
Detroit, Mich.
48204

6748

April 1965

THEORY OF ALIENATION: Marx's Debt to Hegel

(I have just returned from a national lecture tour that took me to Canada as well. One of the main topics everywhere—not only among student youth in revolt, but in the Negro Revolution as well; not only among intellectuals in peace movements, but among workers battling Automation—was the relationship of the theory of alienation to the concept of freedom. I reproduce part of a speech I made on the relationship of a philosophy of freedom to the struggles for freedom.—R.D.)

The topic "Marx's Debt to Hegel" is neither merely academic, nor does it pertain only to the historical period of Marx's lifetime. From the Hungarian revolt to the African revolutions; from the student demonstrations in Japan to the Negro Revolution in the U.S., the struggle for freedom has transformed reality and pulled Hegelian dialectics out of the academic halls and philosophy books on to the living stage of history.

It is true that this transformation of Hegel into a contemporary has been via Marx. It is no accident, however, that Russian Communism's attack on Marx has been via Hegel. Because they recognize in the so-called mystical Absolute "the negation of the negation", the revolution against themselves, Hegel remains so alive and worrisome to the Russian rulers today. Ever since Zhdanov in 1947 demanded that the Russian philosophers find nothing short of "a new dialectical law", or rather declare "Criticism and Self-Criticism" to be that alleged new dialectical law to replace the Hegelian and objective law of development through contradiction, up to the 21st Congress of the Russian Communist Party where the special philosophic sessions declared Khrushchev to be "the true humanist," the attack on both the young Marx and the mystic Hegel has been continuous. It reached a climax in the 1955 attacks on Marx's Early Essays in theory. In actuality it came to life in the Hungarian Revolution.

One thing these intellectual bureaucrats sense correctly: Hegel's Concept of the Absolute and the international struggle for freedom are not as far apart as would appear on the surface.

I. THE IDEAL AND THE REAL ARE NEVER FAR APART.

It is this which Marx gained from Hegel. It is this which enabled the young Marx, once he broke from bourgeois society, to break also with the vulgar communists of his day who thought that one negation—the abolition of private property—would end all the ills of the old society and be the new communal society.

Marx insisted on what is central to Hegelian philosophy, the theory of alienation, from which he concluded that the alienation of man does not end with the abolition of private property—UNLESS what is most alien of all in bourgeois society, the alienation of man's labor from the activity of self-development into an appendage to a machine, is abrogated. In the place of the alienation of labor, Marx placed, not a new property form, but "the full and free development of the individual."

The pluri-dimensional in Hegel, his presupposition of the infinite capacities of man to grasp through to the "Absolute," not as something isolated in heaven, but as a dimension of the human being, reveals what a great distance humanity had traveled from Aristotle's Absolutes.

Because Aristotle lived in a society based on slavery, his Absolutes ended in "Pure Form"—mind of man would meet mind of God and contemplate how wondrous things are.

Because Hegel's Absolutes emerged out of the French Revolution which put an end to serfdom, Hegel's Absolutes breathed the air, the earthly air of freedom. Even when one reads Absolute Mind as God, one cannot escape the earthly quality of the unity of theory and practice and grasp through to the Absolute Reality as man's attainment of total freedom, inner and outer and temporal. The bondsman, having, through his labor gained, as Hegel put it, "a mind of his own," becomes part of the struggle between "consciousness-in-itself" and "consciousness-for-itself." Or, more popularly stated, the struggle against alienation becomes the attainment of freedom.

Freedom, to Hegel, was not only his point of departure. It was his point of return. This is what makes him so contemporary. This was the bridge not only to Marx but to our day, and it was built by Hegel himself.

As Lenin was to discover when he returned to the Marxian philosophic foundations in Hegel during World War I, the revolutionary spirit of the dialectic was not super-imposed upon Hegel by Marx; it is in Hegel.

II. MARX'S CRITIQUE OF, AND INDEBTEDNESS TO, THE HEGELIAN DIALECTIC.

The Communists are not the only ones who try to spirit away the integrality of Marxian and Hegelian philosophy. Academicians also think that Marx is so strange a progeny that he has transformed Hegelian dialectics to the point of non-recognition, if not outright perversion. Whether what Herbert Melville called "the shock of recognition" will come upon us at the end of this discussion remains to be seen, but it is clearly discernible in Marx.

Marx's intellectual development reveals two basic stages of internalizing and transcending Hegel. The first took place during the period of his break with the Young Hegelians, and thrusts at them the accusation that they were dehumanizing the Idea. It was the period when he wrote both his Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right, and the Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic.

There was nothing mechanical about Marx's new materialist outlook. Social existence determines consciousness, but it is not a confining wall that prevents one's sensing and even seeing the elements of the new society.

In Hegel, too, not only continuity as relation between past and present, but as attraction exerted by the future on the present, and by the whole, even when it does not yet exist, on its parts, is the mainspring of the dialectic.

It helped the young Marx to find a new stage of world consciousness of the proletariat, in seeing that the material base was not what Marx called "vulgar," but, on the contrary, released the subject striving to remake the world.

Marx was not one to forget his intellectual indebtedness either to classical political economy or philosophy. Although he had transformed both into a new world outlook, rooted solidly in the actual struggles of the day, the sources remained the law of value of Smith and Ricardo, and Hegelian dialectics. Of course Marx criticized Hegel sharply for treating objective history as if that were the development of some world-spirit, and analyzing self-development of mind as if ideas floated somewhere between heaven and earth, as if the brain was not in the head of the body of man living in a certain environment and at a specific historic period. Indeed Hegel himself would be incomprehensible if we did not keep in front of our minds the historic period in which he lived—that of the French Revolution and Napoleon. And, no matter how abstract the language, Hegel indeed had his pulse on human history.

Marx's Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic is at the same time a critique of the materialist critics of Hegel, including Feuerbach who had treated "the negation of the negation only as the contradiction of philosophy with itself."

Marx reveals, contrarily, that principle to be the expression of the movement of history itself, albeit in abstract form.

III. THE HUMAN DIMENSION

Of course it is true that Hegel worked out all the contradictions in thought alone while in life all contradictions remained, multiplied, intensified. Of course where the class struggle did not abolish contradictions, those contradictions plagued not only the economy, but its thinkers. Of course, Marx wrote, that beginning with the first capitalist crisis, the ideologists turned into "prize-fighters for capitalism."

But, first and foremost, Marx did not separate ideology and economics as if the latter were the only fundamental, and the former nothing but "show." Marx maintains that they are both as real as life. Throughout his greatest theoretic work, Capital, (I'm jumping ahead for the moment to the second stage of Marx's relationship to the dialectic of Hegel)—throughout that great work, Marx castigates "the fetishism of commodities" not only because relations of men at production appear as "things," but especially because human relations under capitalism are so perverse that that is not appearance; that is indeed what they really are: Machine is master of man; not man of machine.

Marx's main point was that the driving force of the dialectic was man himself, not just his thought, but the Whole of man, beginning with the alienated man at the point of production; and that, whereas bourgeois ideologists, because of their place in production have a false ideology because they must defend the status quo and are "prisoners of the fetishism of commodities," the proletariat, because of his place in production is the "negative principle" driving to a resolution of contradictions.

In the History of Philosophy Hegel had written "It is not so much from as through slavery that man acquired freedom." Again we see that "Praxis" was not Marx's discovery, but Hegel's. What Marx did was to designate practice as the class struggle activity of

(cont'd)

the proletariat. In Hegel's theory, too, praxis stands higher than the "Ideal of Cognition" because it has "not only the dignity of the universal but is the simply actual."

It is true that Hegel himself threw a mystical veil over his philosophy by treating it as a closed ontological system. But it would be a complete misreading of Hegel's philosophy were we to think that his Absolute is either a mere reflection of the separation between philosopher and the world of material production, or that his Absolute is the empty absolute of pure or intellectual intuition of the subjective idealists from Fichte through Jacobi to Schelling, whose type of bare unity of subject and object—as Prof. Bailie has so brilliantly phrased it—"possessed objectivity at the price of being inarticulate."

Whether, as with Hegel, Christianity is taken as the point of departure, or whether—as with Marx—the point of departure is the material condition for freedom created by the Industrial Revolution, the essential element is self-evident: man has to fight to gain freedom; thereby is revealed "the negative character" of modern society.

Now the principle of negativity was not Marx's discovery; he merely named it "the living work"; the discovery of the principle was Hegel's. In the end, Spirit itself finds that it no longer is antagonistic to the world, but is indeed the indwelling spirit of the community. As Hegel put it in his early writings, "The absolute moral totality is nothing else than a people . . . (and) the people who receive such an element as a natural principle have the mission of applying it."

The humanism of Hegel may not be the most obvious characteristic of that most complex philosophy, and, in part, it was hidden even from Marx, although Lenin in his day caught it even in the simple description of the Doctrine of the Notion "as the realm of Subjectivity OR freedom." Or man achieving freedom not as a "possession," but a dimension of his being.

It is this dimension of the human personality which Marx saw in the historical struggles of the proletariat that would once and for all put an end to all class divisions and open up the vast potentialities of the human being so alienated in class societies, so degraded by the division of mental and manual labor that not only is the worker made into an appendage of a machine, but the scientist builds on a principle which would lead society to the edge of an abyss.

One hundred years before Hiroshima, Marx wrote "To have one basis for science and other for life is a priori, a lie." We have lived this lie for so long that the fate of civilization, not merely rhetorically, but literally, is within orbit of a nuclear holocaust. Since the very survival of mankind hangs in the balance between the East's and the West's nuclear terror, we must, this time, under the penalty of death, unite theory and practice in the struggle for freedom, thereby abolishing the division between philosophy and reality and giving ear to the urgency of "realizing" philosophy, that is to say, making freedom a reality.

6750

April 1965

Mao Sides With Nasser on Israel

Chinese Communism's agility in accommodating itself to Arab nationalism is something new in the ever-changing yet ever-the-same Communist foreign policy of all-out anti-Americanism. One of the proofs of Khrushchev's revisionism used to consist in showing that he let the Egyptian Communists rot in Nasser's jails while Khrushchev "collaborated with the bourgeois nationalist, Nasser." Presently, however, the desire to get Nasser into an all-out anti-United States stance has produced one of the many Maoist miraculous, instant transformations of "bourgeois nationalism" into the "the just struggle of the Arab peoples", which—so Chou En-lai assures the editor-in-chief of the Middle East News Agency (1)—"will certainly be crowned with final victory."

The great "socialist" aim for which Chou is predicting "final victory" turns out to be the diversion of the River Jordan from Israel: "U.S. imperialism is exerting all-round military political and economic pressure on Arab countries in an attempt to force them to give up projects for diverting the River Jordan tributaries. But the great Arab people cannot be frightened . . ."

The paid press of Mao's China proceeds to find kinship between this and the national liberation struggles of Asia and Africa: "The protracted struggle of the Arab people of Palestine and other Arab peoples against U.S. imperialism and its tool of aggression, Israel, is a just one and is part of the common struggle of the Asian and African peoples against imperialism headed by the U.S." To which Chou adds: "Of late, the U.S. has flagrantly stepped up arming Israel in collusion with West German militarism . . ."

Whether dealing with "Trotskyism", "German militarism", "U.S. imperialism" or "Russian revisionism", "Mao's Thought" thrives on just such amalgams. Chou's theme is repeated in the Kwangming Daily: "U.S. imperialism is wire-puller behind the collusion between West Germany and Israel in their attitude towards the Arab countries."

None of this display of dissolution of the class struggle into "the just struggle of the Arab people"—and on such an issue as the diversion of Jordan River from Israel as part of Nasser's chauvinist attempt to "drive Israel into the sea"—has detracted from Mao's appeal not only among his Communist, but his so-called Independent Left, followers.

It would be easy to conclude from this that Maoism's adherents are irrational. And, in fact, one student of the Japanese scene considers Maoism's conquest of the Japanese Communist Party at the very time of Mao's opposition to the nuclear test-ban treaty as beyond rational explanations. (2) It is, however, necessary to take a second look at the Maoist blend of nationalism and anti-U.S. imperialism which passes for "internationalism", this time on the question of the proposed treaty between Korea and Japan.

"PATRIOTISM", KOREAN, JAPANESE, CHINESE

Here the double-tongued polemic is at its confrontational best as Mao's China goes all out in opposition to the ROK-Japan Basic Treaty and, all out in praise of "patriotism"—Korean and Japanese. It seems that, on March 1, at a mass rally in Peking in opposition to the treaty, the main address was delivered by the Vice Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress and Chairman of the China Peace Committee—Kuo Mo-jo. Conveniently forgetting China's conquest of Tibet and invasion of China, "Asian fighting Asian" is now shown to be a sinister, U.S. plot. Referring to the proposed treaty, the Communist leader said: "All this shows that U.S. imperialism is stepping up its vicious plan to make Asians fight Asians." But, continued Kuo, "Asia today is a revolutionary Asia against U.S. imperialism, an Asia of storms and thunder." (3)

Despite the revolutionary thunder, however, the Chinese Communist appealed, not for revolution, but for "patriotism" and nationalism not only on the part of the Koreans but also the Japanese! To arouse the Koreans' patriotism, which needed no chauvinistic appeal from China, Kuo Mo-jo spoke of Japan today as of Tojo's Japan which subjugated Korea: "the Japanese militarist forces are now attempting to resume the old path of aggression against Korea, China and Asia and revive the dream of a 'Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.'"

Having thus set the line for the Korean Communists to use, this "peace" leader went on also to praise Japanese patriots: "The Japanese people's patriotic anti-U.S. struggle is surging forward." No militarist, however, need to fear that the designation of the patriotic struggle as a "people's struggle" would exclude him. Ever since China threw down the gauntlet to Russia for leadership of the Communist world, the concept, "the people," has been expanded to include "also the patriotic national bourgeoisie, and even certain kings, princes, and aristocrats who are patriotic." (4) All one has to do to get anointed "patriot" is to join the "anti-U.S. struggle."

It would appear that Mao's "internationalism" is pure and simple "anti-U.S. struggle." While this is central to Mao's concept of "international solidarity," it is not the whole of the story: most assuredly not insofar as his non-Chinese adherents are concerned. It is to these we wish to turn.

A SHORT CUT TO THEORY?

Elsewhere (4) I have analyzed in detail Mao's rise to power from the revolutionary he was in 1925-27, through the military genius he became in his protracted guerrilla warfare against Chiang Kai-shek, to the state-capitalist ruler he is now. What is known as "Mao's Thought" inspires guerrilla warfare as substitute for social revolution and, thrives, in easy, short, mathematical-type catechisms and slogans as a sort of guerrilla short-cut to thought as if theory, like a city, can be outflanked.

It is here that the "non-ideologist"—be he pragmatic "Westerner" or "mystic" Easterner—stands enthralled. It is here that the petty-bourgeois revolutionary's desire for a short-cut to power finds succor. So characteristic of our state-capitalist age is the administrative mentality (out for quick solutions from above where only a radical reconstruction from below will do) that it is here that even some who would be "Marxists" find it possible to co-habitate with state-capitalists, chauvinists, betrayers of the proletarian revolutions—all for "instant power" and "instant Communism."

With the anti-U.S. imperialism slogan, they have never had it so easy, since at no time in history has U.S. imperialism been more detested. And not only abroad but right here, as the opposition to the U.S. war in Viet Nam shows. But this also shows the second America, the U.S. of the Negro Revolution and the labor strikes, the America which is out to reconstruct the warmongering one on totally new foundations. It is this other America that refuses to be taken in by the anti-U.S. struggle—or any struggle that tells you only what it is against, and not what it is for.

Too many revolutions have soured after power was gained and principles forgotten. It is high time to end the division between theory and practice, and to face reality not one-sidedly, or with readiness to accept substitutes (like nationalized for private property), but with demands that, in place of any property form, the self-development of the individual become the motive force of society. There is no other way to achieve full freedom, neither in any single country nor in the world as a whole. The spurious argument that, since U.S. imperialism's aims are global, its loudest opponents—the Chinese Communists—are ipso facto, "true internationalists" must be sent to rest alongside the notorious theory of "the lesser evil"—in the dustbin of history.

Footnotes:

- (1) The quotations from the Chinese press are culled from the article "China and Arabs" by Dorothy Woodman in the New Statesman, April 23, 1965.
- (2) Donald S. Zagoria in Survey, January 1965, wholly devoted to "International Communism: The end of an epoch."
- (3) All the quotations on Korea and Asia are from Peking Review, March 5, 1965.
- (4) See the new chapter, "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung," in Marxism and Freedom. (Ad on p. 7)

May 1965

Editorial Article**The Inhumanity of the U. S. Occupation of Dominica**

By Raya Dunayevskaya

The new stage of degeneracy of U.S. imperialism's occupation of Santo Domingo is its total disregard of human life. Having, first, inspired Gen. Wessin y Wessin to unloose a counter-revolution against the very nearly bloodless and very nearly successful April 24 revolution, via the strafing of the capital and the loss of 1,000 lives on the ground, President Johnson took to the air waves and spoke unctuously of "a popular democratic revolution committed to democracy and social justice." This was but prelude to announcing that it had overnight turned into a near "Communist takeover" and "therefore" required overnight dispatch of U.S. marines.

THE OAS PARROTS WHAT US DICTATES

The next stage of this cynically directed counter-revolution called for acquiring an OAS figleaf irrespective of the U.S. violation of its charter, not to mention the violation of the sovereignty of the Dominican Republic. Our wily President got approval for an "inter-American peace force" by the votes of such sterling democracies as Haiti and the CIA's military brainchild, Guatemala.

Presently the OAS figleaf of U.S. occupation of Dominica has fallen off as "its peace force" — mainly American paratroopers now that the marines have been sent home — shot its way deep into rebel territory, killing 75 mostly non-combatants, wounding 200, taking 500 prisoners, hacking its way into private homes, and then declaring, as "its," 50 blocks of the rebel zone.

This was followed by the OAS going into the countryside where they found uncounted grisly murders in shallow graves exactly at the spot where the Dominican people, who had bitterly and persistently complained of its military junta's atrocities, said they would be located. Despite this proof of the Nazi demeanor of the U.S.-supported Imbert junta, the OAS has thus far dared declare that there was "no proof" as to who committed the massacre of all who stood in the junta's way — including a two-year-old child and one man who was so badly mutilated that no identification of any sort was possible.

The U.S. government remains silent about the brutalities of the Imbert men, even when this concerns an American citizen. If it happened in North Vietnam, we would have an unending atrocity story about it. And yet, in Santo Domingo, on May 31, an American citizen, Andres Gilbert Garcia, of Hato Bey, Puerto Rico, found his way back to the American lines only after he had been kept for 15 days in a cell about 6 by 8 feet in which 12 people were crowded against and even on top of each other. They were beaten, made to sleep on concrete floors, and one man was wounded so badly that he died. Their crime was that they were accused of being Communists; most of them were as Communist as Garcia, whose protestation that he was an American citizen merely got the reply: "You dirty Communist."

In all, said Garcia, more than 5000 prisoners were being held under "bestial conditions." He himself had received injuries on the head and the body. Yet no action was taken on this, and the reporter from LA-Times, Washington Post News Service who wired the story had to add: "It was not immediately known if the United States will protest to the Imbert regime."

THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF

Outside of the lie that it was "only after" President Johnson had "proof" of "Communist domination" of the popular revolt

that U.S. marines were dispatched to the Dominican Republic, U.S. imperialism's return to gunboat diplomacy can be seen from the fact that the President vetoed his own aide's proposals for a coalition government with representatives of the "popular democratic revolution committed to democracy and social justice."

Obviously, if even so rightwing and trustworthy an insider as McGeorge Bundy can be so infected with the democratic air in Santo Domingo as to believe the President's hypocritical speeches and follow the thesis through to its logical conclusion, then the only sure place to set U.S. policy, in its occupation as well as in its invasion phases, is in the inner recesses of the Pentagon. The tragedy is that the modern Uriah Heep, armed to the teeth not merely with ambition, but with the most destructive weapons in the world is our Commander-in-Chief.

To those who followed developments it was clear, from the start, that the very day of the near-success of the people's revolt—April 25—was the day of U.S. Imperialism's decision that it should not succeed, no matter what it took either to cover up U.S. intervention or, if this did not work, not to be ashamed to stand before the world stark naked. The oily hypocritical speeches of President Johnson cannot hide the fact that his true aim in Dominica is to carry on a war of attrition against the people, to "finish off" their discontent with U.S.-supported Trujilloism without Trujillo. And Johnson cares little for the means he uses to achieve this unholy goal. (Those wishing to read the Administration's precise maneuvers for coverup should read "The Roots of the Dominican Crisis" by Theodore Draper—no wild radical he—in the May 24th issue of The New Leader, which is not exactly a Communist publication. In its June 21st issue it also carried Juan Bosch's story, "A Tale of Two Nations.")

Far from being discomfited by the wild corruption of the military juntas that have transformed the highest echelons into millionaires overnight, but kept the people in abject and permanent poverty, President Johnson has been all too happy to use them for his own ends, and insists on foisting them on the Dominican people. Not having succeeded with Wessin y Wessin, he next installed Trujillo's assassin, Imbert, who was the architect of Trujilloism without Trujillo.

Washington is setting up a new balloon — Ballanguer for president, the same Ballanguer who was president both under Trujillo and for his assassins. President Johnson will try anything, anything at all, except that which the Dominican people want—a return to Constitutional government and the only Dominican president (Juan Bosch) who was ever duly elected there—elected against overwhelming odds of the combined forces of the military junta then in power, the landowning oligarchy that is equally rich and equally corrupt, Pentagon support, and a vicious slander campaign charging "Communism" — elected by the peasants, the urban poor, the lower middle class; elected overwhelmingly.

Neither the fact that Juan Bosch, in his seven months of power, did nothing to unseat the military and thus paved the way for his own downfall, nor the fact that he is but the palest of liberals, will square him in the eyes of either the Dominican military junta who resented both his mild reforms and his own integrity, or in the eyes of the U.S. Commander-in-Chief, who likes to bet only on true-blue reactionary militarists.

In the U.S., as in Dominica, nothing scares a ruling class more than arms in the hands of civilians, and these the people now have, something they didn't have under Bosch. It is not that the arms are any match for U.S. might. It is that they are a symbol of a people relying only on their own mass strength. Destiny in the hands of the masses themselves in any Latin American country—how that could electrify all of Latin America! Rather than risk such an eventuality, our Commander-in-Chief prefers closing all avenues for a genuine social revolution, carrying on a war of attrition in Dominica, even if thereby he becomes a greater breeder of Communism in this hemisphere than Castro ever was.

June July 1965

6752 (cont'd)

(cont'd)

"SPHERES OF INFLUENCE AND PROTEST MOVEMENTS"

Washington is also banking on the fact that other Big Powers will let it get away with the counter-revolutionary act in Dominica even as it let Russia get away with it in Hungary, and China in Tibet. Because each Big Power has its recognized "sphere of influence," a power grab in that sphere is protested by the other in words only, and no action follows the words. Unless the point of contention is either an integral element of its national interests or becomes pivotal to the global struggle for power, as Viet Nam has become, the merely nominal protest unfortunately affects also the protest movements within the "aggressor country." Thus, where the demonstrations, marches, teach-ins against the war in Viet Nam are numerous, powerful, vocal, that is to say, loud and effective, whether voiced or written, those against the war in the Dominican Republic, which is totally unjustified but not pivotal to global power, are hardly more than whispered postscripts. Yet it is by this, just this, protest which would thereby become an act of inter-American class solidarity that history will make its judgment on American revolutionaries.

Outside of direct struggles, such as strikes for different conditions of labor and Negro struggles for full equality, no struggles for freedom are more challenging to the American ruling class than the struggles in Latin America. For it is by its imperialist adventures and not just by "the expanding frontier" that American capitalism was enabled to deprive the workers of the industrial unionism they had won in Europe at the turn of the century, but had not won here until Depression hit the United States itself. America's plunge into imperialism at the end of the 19th century marked also its victory over Populism. Above all, its imperialist adventures, as that of all the West, was brilliantly white, and thus fastened on the Negro an inferior status North as well as South. (See American Civilization on Trial, pp. 14-16). By now Latin America, to U.S. imperialism, has become the proving ground

against any and all freedom struggles, East or West, North or South, in fact and in thought. Therefore, we must turn back to some aspects of the history of the Latin American continent.

LATIN AMERICA, PAST AND PRESENT

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

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

Liberated from Spain and Portugal the Latin American masses were only to be exploited as ruthlessly by a native ruling class. Indeed, the native ruling classes were and are themselves foreigners. The land owning class is generally Spanish. In any case, it has managed to be to the right of even such mild reforms as the Alliance for Progress "recommend." This is not to say that United States imperialism is not the main reason for its economic backwardness. After a century of exploitation, including the so-called Good Neighbor Policy of 1933 which was supposed to have promised the end of gunboat diplomacy that Johnson has once again violated, and after the "New Frontier's" Alliance for

Progress, Latin America today is at almost total economic stagnation, with its economic "growth" being at a slower pace than even Africa, Asia or the Middle East; its per capita food allotment is less than it was in 1960, with more than 50 percent of the families in rural areas living below bare subsistence level; and the housing shortage is so staggering that fully 45 million Latin Americans have no place to live at all. (See the 1964 study made by the Economic Commission for Latin America of the UN.)

What we did mean to stress in pointing to the ruthlessness of the native ruling class is that now that President Johnson is relying totally on it and the military to put down people's revolutions, any millions that the Administration will pour into Latin America will all go to line the pockets of the rulers, who may even indulge at odd moments, in some anti-Americanism on their own. All the more important, therefore, are the acts of inter-American class solidarity from this end of the continent.

**INTER-AMERICAN SOLIDARITY
MUST BEGIN WITH THE WORKING PEOPLE**

From Guatemala to Panama, from Brazil to Bolivia, and from Peru to Dominica we seem to be witnessing the reversal of the trend to popular revolutions in the post-World War II period which got rid of military juntas and bloated oligarchies and began the road to independence. At the same time, a dynamism of socialist ideas energized life itself, while thought in the United States plummeted downward into McCarthyite reaction. In a word, it became crystal clear that while Latin America may be economically underdeveloped, it was the United States that had a monopoly of underdeveloped intellectuals.

Today, on the other hand, the United States is once again asserting its domination. By forcing the O.A.S. which had always been its puppet, into a new stage of outright armed intervention, it has not only violated the sovereignty of the Dominican Republic, but undermined the very foundation of any Latin American country's independence. All this must be stopped right here and now!

True inter-American solidarity must begin with the working people. Moreover, Dominica is, essentially, a Negro republic, and we draw a parallel between the freedom struggles in South USA, and in Dominica. In both instances the need is clear: destiny must be in the hands of the people themselves. In Dominica there must be an immediate withdrawal of all American troops, and not just the U.S. marines, but all the armed forces, whether wearing U.S. or OAS bands!

**THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION
CANNOT FIGHT "COMMUNISM"**

Unfolding the banner of the Humanism of Marxism as the theory of liberation that it is, is the only way to fight Communism, which is but a euphemism for state-capitalism. Capitalist tyranny, private or state, cannot eliminate either the native semi-feudal landholding oligarchy or U.S. imperialism; only the self-activity of the masses in Latin America, supported by the American working people, can achieve genuine independence, that would not leave the American exploitative orbit only to fall into the Sino-Soviet orbit. It is high time that the plundered continent regained its natural resources along with the destiny in the hands of the people. Let it begin with the Dominican people deciding their own fate.

Since true freedom cannot be assured in any other way either in Dominica or Latin America or the United States, so long as any U.S. troops remain, what is of the essence at the moment is that fraternal relations be established between the American troops and the rebels.

June July 65

6753

Ramifications of the Watts Revolt

(Editor's Note: The column below is excerpted from a Perspectives Report delivered to a Conference of News & Letters Committees held over the Labor Day week-end. Copies of the entire report may be obtained for 50 cents by writing to News & Letters, 8751 Grand River, Detroit, Michigan, 48204.)

From all sides we are hearing a great deal these days about just how "isolated" Watts was. What all the analysts fail to grasp is that the Negroes in Watts gained their strength, not because they were isolated, but because they acted collectively. It was a disciplined strength. Thus, despite all talk against "Whitey" (and some beatings) not a single white who happened into the area was shot at, excluding, of course, the cops, but then these are the most hated representatives of the exploitative, prejudiced, vicious power structure.

CLASS AND RACE

No, it was not the Negro who was isolated; it was the white power structure that was isolated. And within the Negro population, it was the middle class Negro, not the Negro mass, who stood isolated, even as it was the Negro leadership, who, precisely because they were outsiders, felt isolated.

There is good reason, however, to be suspicious of the word, "class," when it becomes very nearly a cliché in an outpouring of analyses by bourgeois ideologists. One is compelled to question the sudden embrace of "class" analyses. It certainly was not the result of a conversion to Marxism. The very opposite is the case. The sudden discovery of "class not race" as the basic cause of Negro self-activity is only the latest manifestation of how the vanquished always try to worm their way back in. When Karl Marx, after the Paris Commune, was confronted with the situation that every conceivable political tendency wanted to become part of the first Working Men's International Association, he wrote: "The old always tries to reconstitute itself inside the new forms." And so it is with the present misuse of the concept, "class."

The Watts revolt was certainly and unmistakably a class question. It was equally a race question. It will not do to try to separate what the actual events have welded together.

It was not for purposes of releasing the creativity of the masses—class and race—that the class structure of society was suddenly "discovered." Rather, it was an adventurist attempt to make the people who were in revolt forget what was new: the self-discovery of their own creativity; the confidence in mass power; the differentiation from all others—the Negro middle class as well as the absentee landlords, the absentee-grocery owner as well as the self-appointed but equally absent leaders.

In a word, the new discoverers of the class basis of revolt aimed at nothing less than to stop the mass search for new beginnings in leadership, in action, in theory.

NEW BEGINNINGS IN THEORY

Yes, theory. Listen:

"We don't belong to any organization. We meet in the street and talk. When it happened, we knew what we wanted and we knew what we would do about it. We'll start all over again if we don't get it."

"We haven't lost a thing, and now we know where it hurts Whitey."

"I would do it all over again even if my own house burns alongside Whitey's store; my house was no good nohow."

"We have the power to upset the city, break it wide open. We got the power."

The revolt was both spontaneous and conscious of itself. Moreover, where, in the revolt in Harlem, which likewise was spontaneous (although not as thoroughgoing), Maoists at least tried to claim credit, in Watts they were nowhere around. Nor were the Du Bois clubs. Nor, for that matter, were the established civil rights organizations, although these, at least, showed after the events.

Yes, the revolt was a stride toward theory. It ended one phase of activity and began a new one. The new stage is far more fundamental than a question of violence vs. non-violence as a method of struggle. The genuine leap was not in the tactics of struggle but in the achievement of consciousness of self, of being able to make generalizations like "we know now where Whitey hurts" and thus to take the first step in the construction of universals about a new society. But it is a first step only, and, though a gigantic stride, it is not the end but a beginning. The point at issue now is not so much: what is next in activity, but what is next in thought. Without being able to make what philosophers call a category out of their experience, that is to say, to be able to conclude that it is not just an experience, but a stage in cognition. In ideas, the experience itself will not become part of an emerging revolution either in fact or in thought.

The experience otherwise can be taken over by others, by those who thirst to lead, or perhaps I should say, to "mislead," not because they are "bad men," but because they are moved by forces ready to substitute for the workers' accumulation of their historic experience, actions that have no relationship whatever to what the masses want, their quest for universality, i.e. for total freedom.

THE THIRST "TO LEAD"

No doubt the established Negro leadership also wants to resume its role, and it too is moved by an ideology which may very well end in an apology for the status quo. But so long as the momentum of the struggle continues, the movement can easily replace this leadership. It is not easy to bypass the "radical" leaders, because they come out of the womb of one revolution and still use its language.

The overriding purpose of those who thirst to lead is to make sure that the masses are as much as the disposal of "the party" as the proletariat is at the disposal of capital.

Earlier I spoke of my opposition to absentee leaders. Let me assure you they are worse when they are present. And let me further assure you that, in my analysis of these leaders, I used the word, "the Party," advisedly. This does not mean that all the intellectuals are Party men. I know very well that many of them never belonged. But what is of the essence is not whether one has a Party card, but whether one is firmly guided by its dogma that the masses are backward and it is therefore necessary "to lead them." Theory remains a prerogative of the leadership. In that way these intellectuals bring into whatever organization they belong to, the capitalistic division between mental and manual labor.

Instead of this, what is of the essence if we are to realize freedom, not in a distant tomorrow, but in an approaching today, is an attitude that is adamant against being rent asunder between theory and practice, and is intent not only in demolishing the status quo, but in reconstructing society. It is this which motivated our refusal to be in any way diverted from participation in the Negro Revolution, why we state in our Perspectives:

Since the postwar strikes, that is to say, very nearly two decades, nothing has happened on the American scene that can in any way compare with the Negro Revolution that began in earnest with the 1960 sit-ins and has gained momentum ever since. This is the most important development not only for an American Revolution but also for world developments since it touches both the basic relationship of a proletarian West to the East and a black revolution's impact on, and relationship to, the Afro-Asian-Latin American world. Therefore, to divert in any way from this development is, Marxistically speaking, criminal.

Aug Sept 65

6754

Editorial

China and the India-Pakistan War

Every ruler from Johnson of the U.S. to Mao of China, from Kossygin of Russia to Shastri of India, and from Ayub Kahn of Pakistan to U Thant of the UN is trying to cover up the naked power struggle in Asia with ideological embellishments.

If you'd listen to President Johnson, you would think that his barbarous acts in Vietnam are only ways to make Vietnam—and North as well as South—part of the "great society."

On the other hand, were you to listen to China's broadsheets following the ultimatum to India to dismantle its border posts or suffer "the consequences," you would think that the latest extension of the India-Pakistan war over Kashmir was the world ideological struggle, and not only against American imperialism, but also against Russian "revisionism." Thus, on Sept. 17, the New China News Agency blared out the following editorial:

"The Soviet leaders and U.S. imperialism treat the India reactionaries as their darling child, and not just today. Kennedy, Khrushchev and Nehru long ago became partners in a company. Two of the three founders of Kennedy, Khrushchev, Nehru & Co. are dead and the third has fallen from power.

"Their successors are trying hard to keep the failing concern going."

POWER IN ASIA

At the same time, Premier Kossygin, who hadn't yet informed the Russian people about China's ultimatum to India, had invited both Shastri and Kahn to come to Russia and discuss "peaceful co-existence" which is supposed to solve all problems left unsolved both by hot and cold wars.

As for Shastri, he has become as adept in fashioning a winged phrase as any ruler, East or West, and it is thus in the name of "democracy against fascism" that he is depriving the people of Kashmir of their right to self-determination!

Not to be outdone, Ayub Kahn is playing the game of being on all sides at the same time, from "American democracy" to "Chinese socialism"; whether in collusion with China or not, he is allegedly engaging in a war with India only for the latter's "glory" for "India cannot be a great power in Asia without Pakistan." (See "Our Life and Times," p. 8.)

Power in Asia is the question. Whether you take Vietnam or Kashmir as point of departure, it is the riches of the continent, and not the ideologies used to justify war, that are at stake. The aim of the ruling powers is to oppress the Asian peoples for the glory of private and/or state capital, and not to liberate them from the oppression of either. The India-Pakistan war over Kashmir is yet one more reminder that the national movements, like World War II itself, did not solve the fundamental problem of reconstructing society on non-exploitative foundations.

The only thing that is new in China's loud-mouthed threat to broaden this conflict by its own incursions into Indian territory is the care with which it makes sure not to attack the real world power—United States. Ever since the Korean war ended, it has more often than not backed off from a direct confrontation with the United States, be that over Quemoy and Matsu islands or Vietnam and India.

MAO GLORIFIES WAR

In his attempt to reduce social revolution to military conquest—"political power grows out of the barrel of a gun"—Mao has had his Minister of Defense, Marshal Liu Piao, attempt to transform Mao's military theory of encircling the cities into a universally applicable strategic concept: "Taking the entire globe, if North American and Western Europe can be called 'the cities of the world,' then Asia, Africa, and Latin America constitute 'the rural areas of the world.' . . . Everything is divisible. And so is this colossus of U.S. imperialism. It can be split up and defeated. The peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions can

destroy it piece by piece, some striking at its head and others at its feet. . . . War can temper the people and push history forward."

Underlying the hallucination of "encircling" the United States as well as the eagerness to help "war push history forward" is Mao's total lack of confidence in the proletarian revolution: "Since World War II the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in the North American and West European capitalist countries, while the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been growing vigorously. In a sense, the contemporary world revolution presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas."

In the concept of "people's" revolution, Mao includes "also the national bourgeoisie and other patriotic and anti-imperialist democrats." Considering the vigor of the proletarian revolts in state-capitalist societies calling themselves Communist, beginning shortly after the death of Stalin, with the June 17, 1953 East German revolt, through the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, and "the strikes and trouble-making incidents" within China itself, it is no wonder Mao prefers dealing with such sterling democrats as the King of Nepal and General Ayub Kahn of Pakistan as the greater "patriots." (Some one ought to tell him that "the Negro people's revolution" in America is 80 per cent working class in composition.)

Where Mao's eyes are not glued on the United States, they are on Russia. And so we now hear that it is evidently not he who retreated just now in India, but that the "Khrushchev revisionists" have come to the rescue of U.S. imperialism just when it is most panic-stricken and helpless in its efforts to cope with people's war. . . . They submit to the nuclear blackmail of the U.S. imperialists. . . . and (have fond dream of Soviet-U.S. cooperation to dominate the world. . . . In diametrical opposition to the Khrushchev revisionists. . . . the revolutionary people never take a gloomy view of war."

WARS AND REVOLUTIONS ARE NOT SYNONYMOUS

Marxist theory notwithstanding, wars and revolutions are not synonymous. They are opposites. Wars are the natural outcome of exploitative social orders and only prove that state-capitalism in China differs in no basic way from private capitalism in the United States. Although China has, for the moment, stepped back from expanding the India-Pakistan war into a general Asian war, there is nothing to stop some other incident from unloosing World War III.

On the other hand, a social revolution tears the old exploitative order out, root and branch. Thus the idea of freedom and the struggle for it become indivisible. Such a way of life, and only such a way of life, has no need of wars to assure revolution's victory, and put destiny in the hands of the working people themselves. —R.D.

Aug Sept '65

6755

OCTOBER, 1965

Editorial Article

REVOLT IN INDONESIA: WHAT NEXT IN ASIA?

By Raya Dunayevskaya

So anxious was the English press to present the Oct. 1 Army counter-coup in Indonesia not only as an anti-Communist victory, but a victory for "the West" that the staid London Times hurried to declare that President Sukarno had "ceased to be a factor in the Indonesian political scene." This, despite the fact that both Lieutenant Colonel Untung, who staged the Sept. 30 coup, as well as General Nasution, who led the counter-coup, felt it necessary to declare themselves "for" President Sukarno. And 48 hours later Sukarno himself broadcast that he was not only "well," but "carrying out leadership of the state and the government."

As for the American press, whose gloating was of a more controlled kind, the New York Herald Tribune, in reporting the action of the Moslem mobs who were burning down the Communist headquarters and shouting "Kill Aidit" (Communist chairman), couldn't resist the temptation to hint darkly about that "discreetly absent leader."

10 FATEFUL DAYS

The simple fact was that Communist China was at that very moment celebrating the 16th anniversary of its coming to power, and Aidit was in Peking getting the red carpet treatment accorded to all fighters against "revisionism." While this does not necessarily absolve the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) of all complicity in the coup, the more important truth is that opportunism is so deeply ingrained in the policies of the PKI over the past decade, and especially so during the past three years as the PKI both sided with Peking in the Sino-Soviet conflict AND became the most enthusiastic adherent of Sukarno's "crush Malaysia" campaign, that all its energies were directed, not to overthrow, but "to integrate into" the Sukarno regime.

Naturally, the biased reports are not the only reason for the difficulty in assessing the bewildering events of the past ten days. Thus, the "September 30th Movement," as the first coup called itself, had never been heard of either before, or after, that single day on which they beheaded six generals and proclaimed the establishment of "revolutionary councils." These failed to materialize. Very obviously, the coup had no mass support. And the Communist paper, Harian Rakyat, that first proclaimed the coup "a patriotic and revolutionary action," later called it "an internal affair of the Army." This did not save it from being closed down by the counter-coup of the regular army.

Thus, although President Sukarno called for "no revenge, no reprisals against Communists," Djakarta Radio, now back in the hands of the government, or rather the Army, carried on an endless series of broadcasts calling for the banning of the PKI; looked the other way as its headquarters and the home of Aidit were burned to the ground; and proceeded to arrest Communist leaders that were allegedly implicated in the coup. Nor did the Army stop there. It also rounded up "other leftists." A total of 1,000 were jailed.

In view of the fact that the Socialist Party had long been banned, and just this month Sukarno with the enthusiastic approval of the PKI, had also banned the Murba (Proletarian) Party of Marxists who opposed the official Communist and Sukarno direction toward making Indonesia into a satellite of, and/or partner with Peking. It is impossible not to conclude that the generals are out to silence any voice of protest to their reactionary moves. Not many Leftists could operate freely under President Sukarno's "guided democracy." Fewer will be able to do so now.

The latest reports say that Colonel Untung has been captured. General Nasution, who escaped an assassination attempt (that resulted in the murder of his five-year-old daughter), and who is now leading the "mop-up," is not listening to Sukarno's appeals for "calm." Although Sukarno is not likely to succeed in his skillful balancing act, playing off the Communists against the Army and vice versa, we must take a closer look at his history. If we are to try to understand the situation in Indonesia.

SUKARNO THE NATIONALIST

Whether we take as our point of departure the year 1927, when the Indonesian Nationalist Party was founded and Sukarno became its Chairman, (and soon landed in a Dutch jail), or we

take the year 1942, when the Japanese occupied what was then the Dutch East Indies (and freed Sukarno), the one unchanging element in the quixotic behavior of Sukarno is his nationalism. He saw nothing wrong in collaborating with the Japanese. But he also worked with the underground movement. On Aug. 17, 1945, he proclaimed the independence of the archipelago. It took four more years of guerrilla war and negotiations plus support by the UN, before Holland finally recognized the independence of the Republic of Indonesia. This ended the 1940's.

Beginning with 1955, the year of the national elections in Indonesia in which no less than 30 parties participated, and also the year of the Asian-African Solidarity Conference, we witness the birth of consciousness of a third world. Although the conference met at Bandung, it was not Sukarno, but Chou En-lai and Nehru, who were the dominant personalities, each trying to be the authentic voice of Asia.

The following year Sukarno travelled both to America and Europe and to Russia and China. It was obvious that the single party state appealed to him. In trying to find an indigenous basis for it, he came up with "guided democracy." "I propose that the leaders of the people confer and decide to bury all parties," he declared. He blamed "free-fight liberalism" for the multiplicity of parties, for the lack of economic progress in the country, for the standstill of the national revolution.

Instead of going deeper into the masses, or even continuing with his famous "gotong royong" (mutual cooperation), he proceeded to establish a National Planning Board: "Guided democracy is a democracy to implement this blueprint and in implementing this blueprint there should be guidance, the guidance of really expert men... Let us

(cont'd)

Oct '65
6756

(cont'd)

cling to our own characteristics, let us cling to the only right standpoint for guided democracy, namely, no voting."

By 1959, he dissolved Parliament, reinstated the early and more vague Constitution of 1945, and declared himself President, Prime Minister, Commander-in-Chief, Great Leader of Revolution, not to mention also "Chief Pioneer." Nevertheless, on the whole, during the 1950s he considered himself a neutralist, and though he leaned heavily on the PKI, he also had the support of the Army, especially so General Nasution who, in putting down the army revolt of 1958, showed that he was more than just an anti-Communist. In any case, Sukarno knew how to use both the Army and the PKI.

What he didn't know how to do, or more correctly, didn't want to do, was deepen the revolution within Indonesia, set up an active relationship with the masses in his own country who had won independence from Dutch imperialism, but found little enough freedom and socialism in their own lives. What they did find was a state of bureaucracy and an Army that was becoming as corrupt as any other military force, although its origins were in guerrilla warfare for the freedom of their country. And the National Plan didn't stop the deteriorating economic conditions either in the countryside or in the cities. In the 1960s, Sukarno embarked on a most adventurous foreign policy.

SUKARNO THE "IDEOLOGUE"

With characteristic gall, Sukarno moved against Socialists, Trotskyists, Marxists as if he were doing so from the left in the name of "genuine instead of the false Marxism." Thus, on May 23 of this year, at the PKI 45th anniversary rally, here is how he explained his original invention of NASAKOM (was standing for nationalism, a for the religious groups, and kom for Communists): "Some Indonesians asked me why did Bung (Brother) Karno pursue the policy of uniting all the anti-imperialist forces and all the revolutionary forces that were called NASAKOM? Why did Bung Karno not use the word "nasa-mar" or "nassos" but used the word, "nasakom"? The word which is most often unlawfully used by political scoundrels and political cockroaches is the word Marxism. Brothers and sisters, you all know the banned Indonesian Socialist Party . . . I say that they are not Marxists, they are usurpers of Marxism. Therefore, I do not use the word "na-

samar" . . . they are in fact, counter-revolutionaries . . . out and out revisionists . . . I repeat once more, "kom". Yes, be genuine Communists and not false Communists."

Demagogue would, no doubt, be a more precise word than ideologue to describe the eclectic Sukarno. The point is that the masses in his own country, no matter how aroused to "crush Malaysia," were more concerned with labor conditions in their own country, with their lives. 16 years after independence, this formerly rice-surplus area had to import rice. It was short all foodstuffs. There was little industry, in many respects less than before independence when you consider the decline in oil, and the near standstill in tin and rubber. And in the countryside, where the overwhelming majority of Indonesians live, there was little enough of "musjawarah" and "mufakat" (communal deliberations and decisions), but a great deal of plain old exploitation. The class divisions, moreover, were not only native, but also "foreign"; the Chinese landlords and merchants still play their old roles. The peasants and students and youth who rioted during Chou En-lai's visit saw this, just this, and not any "permanent revolution," in the word, China.

All in all, 1965 was a very bad year for Sukarno. Not only had his "crush Malaysia" campaign failed, but his loud boast to do so "by the time the cock crows on January 1, 1965," was simply ludicrous.

Although Sukarno's Jan. 8

speech, "Quit the UN" was highly acclaimed in Mao's China as "a revolutionary action which resounds throughout the world as the first spring thunder of 1965" none of the the Afro-Asian nations followed that "spring thunder"! The African nations had had their experience with the Chinese "revolutionary thunder" so bent on fighting "Russian revisionism" that it was in a most unseemly haste to recognize Boumediene's overthrow of Ben Bella. And so, while many did consider Malaysia a symbol of neo-colonialism, they failed to see the creation of any possible Indonesia-China axis as the answer to the world crises any

more than they accepted US imperialism's rationale for the dirty war in Vietnam.

WHAT NOW?

Worst of all for Sukarno were the food riots in Java.

Whether the Communists were planning to take advantage of the critical situation — and of the fear that Sukarno might die before he passed his mantle on to them, or the right wing in the Army tried to use Oct. 5, Army day, to stage a coup "with CIA aid," as Col. Untung who staged "the preventive coup" on Sept. 30, claimed; whether the 3 million strong Communist Party will collapse like the proverbial house of cards (as the more real Communist and Socialist Parties col-

lapsed when Hitler came to power), or go into the hills to carry on guerrilla war; whether Sukarno becomes a mere figurehead or retains sufficient power to stop the counter-coup from becoming a full-fledged counter-revolution and militaristic move to collaborate with "the West" — the tragic truth is that class collaborationism in Indonesia and world adventures with Mao's theory of "encirclement" of the industrialized world and American imperialism with "people's wars" from the underdeveloped worlds, has resulted not only in moves to the right in Indonesia, but in strengthening the hand of U.S. imperialism in Southeast Asia.

Oct '65

Indonesian Communism: A Case of World Communism's Decomposition

It is impossible at this moment (Oct. 5) to know whether the coup on Sept. 30, and the counter-coup on Oct. 1, were manifestations of nothing more than divisions within the armed forces in Indonesia, or were indicative of class divisions within the population. There is no doubt that the masses are fed up with a government that, in the 16 years of independence, has failed to make any serious dent in the prevailing poverty, or to achieve basic land reforms, much less carry through an agrarian revolution. Nor has there been any serious industrialization, much less any radical change in the conditions of labor.

The fact that both the rebels and the regular armed forces stressed that President Sukarno is "well" shows how non-revolutionary the attempted coup was. Whether or not the Communists were involved in it, it is they whom the masses will rightly hold to blame for the failure to dislodge Sukarno since the Communists too have, ever since the 1950's, always kowtowed to him. For their one and overpowering desire for state power is based on the concept of "boring from within." This managerial concept of "taking over" power, the root cause of what successes national Communism has achieved, from Stalin to Mao, is here the root cause of its failure.

The PKI (Indonesian Communist Party) is the proof that (1) when it comes to desiring state power at all costs, there not only is no fundamental difference between the "revolutionary" Peking line and the "revisionist" Moscow line, but the multiplicity of roads to be embarked upon is very nearly endless; (2) so capitalist is their joint mentality that the one and only road that is completely ruled out is that of proletarian revolution; and that (3) the shift from the proletariat through the peasantry to the army as the motive force of "revolution" has, in the case of Indonesia, led to the end of the very concept of theory, with the resulting eclecticism producing the wild gyrations from the adventurist, abortive revolt of 1948 to the current policy of "integrating" the Communists into the Sukarno regime.

AIDIT'S "FIVE DEVILS"

D. N. Aidit, Chairman of the PKI, was, characteristically enough, in Peking at the time of the latest coup. And, characteristically from the Chinese side, the head of the Chinese delegation to the 45th anniversary celebration of the founding of the Indonesian Communist Party—Peng Chen—neatly skipped 31 years (1) of that period and began his interpretation after Aidit's return from Peking in 1950: "Since 1951 the PKI has had a Marxist-Leninist nucleus of leadership headed by Com. Aidit at its centre. . . . It stands steadfast in the forefront of the fight . . . against modern revisionism." And, just to make sure that standing "steadfast in the forefront" means Aidit's choice of Peking, not only in the Sino-Soviet conflict, but on all foreign policy issues, Peng Chen threw in some anti-Semitism as well: "Comrades, the present international situation is excellent . . . United States imperialism, the chieftain of world imperialism . . . is using Israel to threaten the security of the Arab countries . . . The Indonesian Communists are at once patriots and proletarian internationalists . . ." (My emphasis.)

Just how patriotic D. N. Aidit is can be gleaned from his speech (2) at that same May 23rd mass rally in Djakarta which began as follows: "Your Excellency, President of the Indonesian Republic, the great leader of the Indonesian revolution, beloved Bung (Brother) Karno! . . . If there is still poverty in Indonesia, which I do not deny, it is . . . because of the existence of the remnants of imperialism and feudalism and the existence of bureaucratic-capitalists as well as village and off-shore devils." Obviously, though the Communists "were unanimously determined to implement still more resolutely the revolutionary general line . . . to realize the national and democratic revolution and march forward to Indonesian socialism," they cannot do so until they overcome the "five devils: 1) Malaysia; 2) the seven village evils; 3) world devil, U.S. imperialism; 4) bureaucrat-capitalists, and 5) modern revisionism."

It turns out, not accidentally, that, since one of the "five devils," is a "world devil," the Indonesian masses must continue to work the harder and "launch more frequent and more stubborn struggles against U.S. imperialism, the world devil and ringleader of all imperialists." And, while approving the "steps taken by President Sukarno and the Indonesian Government against the Trotskyite personalities," (3) the Communist Party, "thanks to its loyalty to the NASAKOM (4) idea . . . has good comrades-in-arms among nationalist and religious believers," not to mention the "two-in-one relations between our people and the armed forces . . ."

Having thus well "integrated" the Communists into the ruling power, Aidit elaborated on the PKI's growth, which, from "less than 3,000 members in 1951, the year of its rebirth, now has more than 3 million members. By adding the 3 million Communist youth of the People's Youth League, the number is more than 6 million. There are about 20 million sympathizers of the Indonesian Communist Party throughout Indonesia. . . . The Indonesian Communist Party belongs not only to the Indonesian Communists but also to the entire people and nation."

The Indonesian masses may rightly question what they ever got out of that: 16 years after independence from Dutch rule, food is still rationed; ten years of friendship with "revolutionary" China, but the Chinese in Indonesia remain the exploitative landlords and usurious merchants. No wonder that in May 1963, just when Chou En-lai was visiting Sukarno and Sukarno was expressing his "enduring friendship," the students and youth of Indonesia rose in spontaneous ANTI-Chinese demonstrations! For, while Aidit may attribute class suffering to "devils," and chose one among these—U.S. imperialism—as the supreme manifestation, THEY know the DIRECT oppressors. Aidit's only answer was "politics moves to the left but the stomach to the right."

AGAINST THE PROLETARIAT WITH THE "PROGRESSIVE" ELEMENTS

Aidit's conception of "left" politics is that which gives the widest room for maneuverability to the Communist Party thirsting for power. In 1953 when PKI backed the strongly nationalist Sasroamijoyo cabinet, it not only saddled the SOBSI (central trade union federation) with a no-strike pledge, but it actually expelled Tan Ling Djie, a party functionary and general secretary of SOBSI's largest affiliated trade union, the Plantation Workers' Union, for his opposition to the no-strike pledge. A decade later, when the PKI became Peking's strongest backer, Aidit maintained that "the proletariat plus revisionism constitute a mighty strength of the bourgeoisie." Not that Aidit was in a hurry to overthrow the Indonesian bourgeoisie. On the contrary. So long as the bourgeoisie was "national" and "patriotic" it was welcomed into the NASAKOM.

Indeed the "progressive" elements included also the rich peasantry who, though they exploit those to whom they lease their land, and are usurers besides, do perform "some" work and "can also help the struggle against imperialism." This, despite the fact that none described better the actual conditions of the poor peasants: "The Indonesian peasants, who comprise 70 per cent of the population, are still in a position of slavery, living a poverty-stricken and backward life under the oppression of the landlords and usurers. . . . The non-participation of the peasants means the non-participation of the majority of the Indonesian people, and this is a very great weakness in our united national front . . . Because of this, the primary task of the Communists is to . . . eliminate the survivals of feudalism, to develop the anti-feudal agrarian revolution. . . ."

Lest any one take this agrarian revolution seriously, however, our expert in doubletalk once again reiterated that one must "first" oppose the "five devils," and "above that," . . . "the world devil," meanwhile, and for a long while to come, even into the "People's Democratic Government": "The lands and other property of the rich peasants do not come under confiscation; the lands and other property of the middle peasants will be protected by the government." (6).

Only those who have short memories and have conveniently forgotten that this was the road also of Mao to power can possibly think that Aidit will be expelled, and especially so by those fire-breathing Chinese "revolutionaries." The truth is that ever since Stalin's rise to power and the transformation of the young workers' state of Russia into its opposite—a state-capitalist society—Communism has been a euphemism for a new stage of capitalistic state-power.

Oct + Nov 1965

(contd)
6758

(over 'a)

With his concept of the "bloc of four classes," Stalin helped kill the 1925-27 Chinese Revolution. Mao, who never knew much about genuine Marxism, took over this Stalinist legacy, adding a perversion of his own: where Lenin laid the theoretical and practical basis for an alliance of the revolutionary proletariat of Russia in particular and Europe in general with the revolutionary nationalist and peasant forces in the "East," Mao raised the guerrilla army to such primacy that he shattered the alliance of proletariat and peasantry, and, in the process, debased internationalism to racism.

It is this racism which has won Mao not only Aidit but Sukarno, who, during World War II, saw nothing wrong in collaborating with the Japanese when they occupied what was then the Dutch East Indies, and, tomorrow, may see nothing wrong in choosing to side with his army against Mao. The overriding truth about Maoism, however, is that it itself is the consequence, not the cause, of the decomposition of world communism into its national component parts. What began with Stalin when he christened his nationalism "socialism in one country" reached a new low with "Mao's Thought," which anoints racism and wars as internationalism and revolution.

Aidit's "original" contribution to this debasement was the cynicism evident in his use of the word, "proximity," when he first explained why he chose the Peking side in the Sino-Soviet conflict. What Aidit wants, above all else, is state power. What he distrusts, above all else, is revolution, masses in motion, spontaneously that he neither can anticipate nor control. The class collaborationism this opportunist indulged in in Indonesia has made Khrushchev's goulash Communism look very nearly Marxist. Since, however, the one and only criterion Mao uses is whether the party in question follows his foreign policy—anti-Americanism and anti-revisionism being its two poles—Aidit was pictured as a sterling revolutionary and President Sukarno as "an anti-imperialist fighter" who was very nearly a Marxist. The Peking Review of June 4 put it all in bold headlines: "Great Victories of Indonesian C.P.'s Marxist-Leninist Line."

WHAT PRICE "INTEGRATION"

The tragicomic aspects of "integration," of "boring from within," is seen nowhere more clearly than in asking Sukarno to establish a "people's militia" and also introducing "political commissars" into the army! Once, however, you eliminate the comic aspects of trying to get the fruits of power without the necessary revolution, the tragedy is unrelieved, totally encompassing the whole of this nation of 100 million that has fought and won its independence from Dutch imperialism only to exude from within itself a gangrenous combination of strident nationalism and unprincipled national-Peking Communism.

Here was but yesterday the largest mass Communist Party anywhere in the non-Communist world, and second only to Peking and Moscow where Communism is the state-power and you belong because you have to, not because you want to. To the three million members in the PKI and three more million in the youth movement you must add that it controlled also the main trade union federation as well as the peasant organization. No less than 22 million voted Communist before voting was abolished to be substituted by Sukarno's corporative "guided democracy."

All this was used not to move the national revolution into the socialist one, but to go on with endless demonstrations "against U.S. imperialism," direct actions "as such"—like taking over British owned companies not to establish workers' control over them, but to give them over to Sukarno's state—approval of all actions that move toward an axis with Peking, including persecution of Trotskyists, Socialists, and the banning of the neo-Trotskyist Murba (Proletarian) Party which opposed becoming a satellite of China. And just as the Communists helped to discipline labor by using the trade unions only when the policy of struggling for better conditions did not upset Sukarno's "anti-imperialist policy" and erratic balancing of Communists against army and vice versa, so it helped the army and military policy "to maintain law and order" during the "crush Malaysia" campaign. If now—and the situation is changing daily as I write this—Sukarno has failed in his balancing act, and must now bow to the army, where does that leave the masses of Indonesia, except to become the victims of another reactionary axis with U.S.-British imperialism, now?

In the immediate post-war period in Europe when the Communist Parties in Italy had become mass parties, the saying was that all Stalin had to do to get power was to raise his telephone and give the proper order. Only he never picked up that telephone because, while he wanted power, he was as scared as any capitalist ruler of power in the streets, power he could not control with his "Red Army," power therefore that might really be in the hands of the masses themselves. Whether, for Indonesia, Mao did finally pick up that telephone or not, for him, too, the masses could not be trusted unless his "Red Army" was nearby and the Communist Party led them, preferably with Sukarno's aid, but in no case should a spontaneous revolution develop which might escape their control.

The result has been precisely that which it was in Western Europe: capitalism has gotten its second wind and is poising for new alignments in World War III. And now not only Indonesia, but all of Asia, will move to the right, unless the masses, once and for all, release themselves from the hold of Parties "out to lead" and take destiny into their own hands.

FOOTNOTES

(1) Fundamentally, of course, there is nothing whatever in common between the Communist Party founded in 1920 (under the impact of the Russian Revolution of 1917, and the work done there by the Dutch Marxist, Hendrik Sneevliet, before the Revolution and in the early years after it) which stood for a socialist reconstruction of society, and the present opportunist Communist Party. Peng Chen, be it noted, is skipping not only this early Leninist period, but also the Stalinist period beginning with 1928. Obviously, history for him begins only when the Communists came to power in China.

(2) "Intensify Revolutionary Offensive and First Oppose 'Five Devils'" appears in Peking Review, June 4, 1965, which also printed Peng Chen's speech as well as excerpts from President Sukarno's address, "Indonesian C.P. Is a Thoroughly Progressive, Revolutionary Party."

(3) Tan Malaka, one of the early founders of the PKI, broke with the Comintern in 1928, when he attacked Bukharin's program and was called by him a "Trotskyite." He carried on revolutionary work in Indonesia, building a new revolutionary party. It was strongly suspected by the Trotskyists that the Communists were responsible for his murder. In any case, the "Trotskyite personalities" Aidit now refers to are probably the banned Murba (Proletarian) Party, for a new attack on genuine Marxists was begun by Sukarno in 1964-65. For Tan Malaka's position at the 4th Congress of the CI, see the Abridged Report, published in Great Britain, 1923.

(4) NASAKOM, the "popular front" now in existence, represents "nas" (nationalists), "a" (religious groups), and "kom" (Communists). Since Sukarno has done away with parliament, asking that "all parties be buried," the manner in which this "popular front" operates actually depends on Sukarno and whom he chooses to include in his "inner cabinet."

(5) In the full speech, New Year's 1964, Aidit evidently was concerned arguing against "dogmatists and revisionists who hold that a good communist party cannot possibly exist without a strong proletariat as its basis." He wished to show that the peasantry is more revolutionary than the proletariat. Nevertheless, the only possible conclusion one could draw is that the proletariat ("plus revisionism," it is true) constituted "a mighty strength for the bourgeoisie." See two interesting articles on Indonesian Communism, one by Donald S. Zagoria, and the other by Ruth McVey in the January 1965 issue of Survey devoted to "International Communism: The End of an Epoch."

(6) Quoted by J. S. Van der Kroef in "Communism in Indonesia" in Problems of Communism, Nov.-Dec. 1958.

(7) The confused story of that period led to Sukarno's being first branded by Communists in 1945 as a "fascist collaboratorist," but later presented as one who collaborated only with the express agreement of the underground movement. See Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia by George McT. Kahin. It is the most scholarly work on the subject and has the advantage also of being an eye-witness report for the critical 1948-49 period. The work was published in 1952, and should therefore be supplemented by a 1965 work, Mohammed, Marx and Marhaen, The Roots of Indonesian Socialism, by Jeanne S. Mintz. Neither work deals with theory in a serious way and must therefore be supplemented by "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung" in Marxism and Freedom.

(Oct + Nov - 1965

Why Philosophy? Why Now?

Twenty years after the end of World War II—a full generation has grown up!—and yet look at our “new,” nonfascist world: 20 years after the British Empire began its dissolution with India winning its independence; 16 years after Tito broke from Stalin, and Mao won power in China; over a decade since the end of the Korean War and true deStalinization was begun by the East German workers, who first put an end to the myth of invincibility of Russian totalitarianism—a new stage of freedom which was climaxed in that orbit by the 1956 Hungarian Revolution; some 8 years since a whole new world was opened by the African Revolutions that so enveloped whole continents that even in the mightiest imperialist empire—the United States—Cuba tore away free, not to mention the Negro Revolutions right within this country; all these world-shaking events, and yet, and yet, capitalism is still so firmly in the saddle that it can exude a new form of reaction.

In Europe there is DeGaulism; in the United States, Birchism; the Sino-Soviet conflict signifies, not a break FROM state-capitalism but WITHIN it, for the domination over the new third world of newly independent countries aspiring to establish themselves on new foundations. During the same period, the Cuban Revolution was so diverted from its humanist channels that Cuba is now hardly more than a satellite of Russia.

Must we then in the United States nevertheless fall victim to the gravitational pull of pseudo-revolutionism—Maoism, Trotskyism, Fidelismo, “pure” CPism? This, indeed, is the only alternative WHEN one looks for escape, instead of true liberation, which can only be achieved where there is a unity of the movement of liberation and the philosophy of liberation.

PHILOSOPHY BECOMES THE IMPERATIVE

Just as it was no accident that in liberated France after World War II Hegelian dialectics and Marx's humanism became the urgent questions of the day, so in our day the answer to: What Now? rests in the rediscovery of Marxist-Humanism. It is not necessary, in order to expose the void, to return to the death of Lenin and the disarray in the Marxist movement. The need for a philosophy is felt by others than Marxists. While it is true that the question was one of life and death for the Hungarian Freedom Fighters who spoke in Marxist terms, it was raised as poignantly by the African revolutionaries who spoke, instead, of “Negritude,” independent African socialism. Humanism has now become the imperative for the Negro Revolution, for the young intellectual, white and Negro, who sees that “the power structure” will not let it be, and yet considers it sufficient to meet each situation as it arises without having any “preconceived notions.”

In order to grasp the need for an underlying Marxist-Humanist philosophy, however, what is necessary is to see philosophy not only “in general,” but most concretely and profoundly as the link in the forward movement of humanity. Even for seeing the fork in the road ahead, it is necessary, first of all, to clear away the intellectual debris, the “undogmatic,” no less than the “dogmatic.”

A piecemeal policy is incapable of disclosing the historic link, the continuity in the struggle for freedom, much less anticipate the future course of revolution as it overcomes the counter-revolution that has always appeared at critical moments just when victory seemed in sight. Lessons of history cannot be dismissed with a shrug of the shoulders while one continues to live only for the moment. Unfinished revolutions have ever been the source for the new breath the old class society draws to keep on existing.

Sometimes it even appears as “new”—as the democratic Weimar Republic did when compared to the Kaiser regime that preceded it. Yet July (Kornilov's attempted counter-revolution) was not just a date on the calendar, nor only a Russian phenomenon that intervened between February (overthrow of Tsar) and October (workers' state). February would never have “gone on” to October without the Bolsheviks. As in Germany in 1919, the Russian Revolution would have been beheaded by the counter-revolution just beneath the surface that rose to the surface on all sides to challenge the workers' power that had been achieved.

History is full of examples of “dead” societies that live on, only to exude a new reaction. Between the defeated 1923 German Revolution and triumphant Nazism a whole decade passed, but the seeds of counter-revolution were present in the murders of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, and in the first Nazi beer-hall putsch, which failed in the early 1920's but was also not transformed into any new October. Theory is needed not only to discern the counter-revolution, but to overcome it. History may repeat itself, but a missed revolutionary moment perishes into the old decadent society.

MARXISM AND OUR OWN PERIOD

When Hegel complained that philosophy had not responded to the challenge of the French Revolution, he didn't mean that it would have done so if thought “corresponded” to reality. He meant thought too would have to transform reality. It is this, just this, principle of dialectic which Marx drove beyond the limits of philosophy when he wrote: “Philosophers have interpreted the world. The point is to change it.” Far from this meaning only material change, it meant change also in consciousness, in thought, in the minds of the “educators” as well as those “to be educated.” From the moment when Marx first stated that in 1845, to the last breath of life he drew in 1883, it would be hard to find a division between his theory and his practice, a let up in either the development of theory or in participation of revolutionary class struggles, national and international. His theory lives after him because it not only reflected the period in which he lived, but our own period.

By introducing the wage laborer into economics, Marx transformed it from a science of things dealing with profits and wages,

to one of production relations, concerned with laborers and capitalists at the point of production. By introducing Man into Hegelian dialectics, which had concerned itself with development of consciousness and self-consciousness, Marx put an end to the dehumanization of philosophy. By making the masses the subject of history, he did away with the utopianism of socialism, the bringing in of an “ism” by utopian planners from the outside, instead of seeing the masses themselves reshaping history from the material foundations to its ideas. Only the whole is the truth.

For the Humanism of Marxism, man as creativity became the point of departure and the point of return, the transformed reality and the insight into the future. As Marx reshaped Capital under the impact of the American Civil War and the struggle for the shortening of the working day, theory itself was transformed from an intellectual debate to a reflection not only of the class struggles, but of the pull of the future.

RELATIONSHIP OF THOUGHT AND FREEDOM

The relationship of thought to freedom hit Lenin with such extraordinary force when the Second International proved impotent in the face of the challenge of World War I that this greatest of all realists wrote excitedly, idealistically, approvingly: this paraphrase of the mystic Hegel: “Cognition not only reflects the world, but creates it.” And indeed this became not just an ideal, but the actual preparation for the Russian Revolution. Without such an underlying philosophy, Lenin could not have written “State and Revolution” and made this both the preparation for revolution and the foundation for what happens afterwards to assure the needed breakdown of the division between mental and manual labor, if ever a truly new society was to be created.

The historic continuity was lost with Trotskyism. Having failed to become a polarizing force for any new Marxist regroupment, however, there was no necessity in the 1950's to destroy all its pretensions to historic continuity. With the Sino-Soviet conflict out in the open in the 1960's, however, Maoism is exercising a gravitational pull on the left, and Trotskyism, which is tailing it, is just the non-Stalinist whitewash needed to make Mao's “uninterrupted revolution” and Trotsky's “permanent revolution” the way to “revolutionary seizure of power” as if our whole state capitalist age wasn't proof that willingness to take power and class collaborationism are no longer opposites.

Moreover, for the purposes of the civil rights movement in the U.S., the revolutionary sound is heard above the underlying class collaborationism and therefore can act as a polarizing force for the intellectual left which thinks it can live very well without a total philosophy. The theoretic destruction of Trotskyism has become a necessity because in our life and times there is a danger that the whole forward movement of humanity will once again be stopped in midpoint.

The further digging into philosophic roots, the reformulation of this philosophy of freedom for our epoch in ever new forms must be done by us. Neither Marx nor Lenin could have, in the concrete, seen the problems of our age. This is our task. Therein lies the uniqueness of Marxist-Humanism. Just as it is no accident that six weeks before the East German workers tore down the myth of Communist totalitarian invincibility, we concretized “the Absolute Idea” for our age by showing that the movement is not only from theory to practice, but from practice to theory, and this decided the structure of Marxism and Freedom, so the concretization of “the second negativity,” that is to say, not only the overthrow

Dec 1965 6760 (cont'd)

(cont'd)

of the old but the creation and continuity of the new, will determine the structure of a new book.

No one else has even posed the working out of a new relationship of theory to practice demanded by our age. The reestablishment of the Humanist and Abolitionist roots of Marxism, which were the goals of Marxism and Freedom—and which were concretized on the American scene by American Civilization on Trial, and on the world scene by the chapter on Mao in the new edition of Marxism and Freedom—must be extended so that both organizationally and philosophically the spontaneous movements on a world scale can rediscover the missing link, the historic continuity with the freedom struggles and once and for all have freedom be, individually, socially, totally.

From Pro Comm. Bulletin #1, July 1964
 "The Turnkey Point"

6761

The Humanism of Marx Is the Basic Foundation for Anti-Stalinism Today

(As a contribution to the developing discussion on anti-Stalinism, the following article was submitted to Tokyo's Waseda University student newspaper by the author during her recent lecture tour of Japan.)

The death of Stalin, in March, 1953, marked the end of an era. DeStalinization began almost at once, not by Khrushchev from above, but by the East Berlin workers from below, who, on June 17, rose in spontaneous revolt for "Bread and Freedom" and against raising "work norms" (speed-ups). Within weeks the East German revolt was followed by one in the forced labor camps in Vorkuta inside Russia itself. (1) When the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, in February, 1956, finally embarked on de-Stalinization, it brought to the surface the seething undercurrents of revolt throughout Eastern Europe, and, by October, 1956, Russian Communism was faced with a proletarian revolution in Hungary that demanded freedom from its overlordship. By the time the Sino-Soviet conflict reached the point of no return, in 1963, Mao Tse-tung was boasting of the fact that it was he who initiated the Russian armed intervention.

Thus did the Russian-Chinese counter-revolution begin and, hand in hand with it, came the campaign of slander against the Hungarian revolutionaries as "revisionists." However, because the revolutionary, creative restatement of Marxism for our age came from an elemental surge forward, and because the Humanist banner was soon seen also in Latin America, in Africa, in the whole new third world fighting for freedom from Western imperialism as well, it was impossible any longer to consign the Humanist Essays of Marx to unreachable library shelves.

Philistines there are, in 1965, who declare that we should never have awakened the ECONOMIC-PHILOSOPHIC MANUSCRIPTS, 1844 from their century-old slumber. Serious thinkers, on the other hand, know that no other writing anywhere, at any time, has made history as have Marx's now-famous essays on "Private Property and Communism," "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic," and "Alienated Labor." To look, even just cursorily, at the 121-year history of these essays is to embark on a journey of adventure which reveals the grandeur, the tragedy, and the challenge of our times.

It is true that when the young Marx left his manuscripts "to the stinging criticism of the mice," it forbade no tragedy because the living Marx kept concretizing and developing his concept of alienation as it developed into the proletariat's "quest for universality." (2) This vision of "all-round" man was an integral part of the very organism of Marx, both as theoretician—be the theory that of revolution, the Paris Commune, or that of "the economic laws" of Capital—and as activist, as General Secretary of the first International Workingmen's Association.

LENIN'S INDEPENDENT PHILOSOPHIC BREAKTHROUGH

Altogether different was the fate of those Humanist essays when the official heirs of Marx and Engels—the German Social Democrats—kept them sealed in vaults and thus deprived themselves of the concept of a new human dimension. With the outbreak of the first World War and the collapse of the German Social Democracy, Lenin had to recapture the unity of the ideal and the material through a painstaking return to the philosophic origins of Marx in Hegel, and only then moving it forward to the new historic plane, 1917, when the population "to a man" (3) would not only abolish private capitalism, but would run production and the state, and thus initiate the break-down of the division between mental and manual labor that characterizes all class societies.

It took a Russian Revolution PLUS the tireless efforts of the great Marxist scholar, Ryazanov, PLUS money to pry the 1844 manuscripts out of the vaults of the Second International. But, once again, reaction intervened to rob the proletariat of its philosophic heritage. In Russia, the triumph of Stalin meant the beginning of the end of "the realization of philosophy", the Marxian concept of theory and of freedom. In Germany, the victory of Hitler marked the height of capitalist barbarism, the holocaust of World War II, the bankruptcy of bourgeois thought. Thrown into the savage inhumanity of a Buchenwald, who could think of philosophy?

And yet, World War II had no sooner drawn to a gory end with American imperialism's atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, than, throughout Western Europe, every one, from the Catholic theologians to the atheistic Existentialists, re-discovered Silesian weavers: "The Silesian uprisings began where the French

those precious Humanist Essays. But the Communists were powerful enough to keep the debate confined in academic channels. The reality is this: yet another generation was born to face the challenge. No matter how young and new the present generation of anti-Stalinist revolutionary Marxists are, they must come face to face with these two overpowering facts: (1) World War II had come and gone without resulting in any successful proletarian revolution, and without starting a new stage in thought comparable to the one begun by Lenin at the time of World War I and his return to the Marxian origins in Hegel; and (2) nothing but a stillbirth had resulted from Leon Trotsky's gigantic labors to build an anti-Stalinist Marxist International. This, despite the fact that only Lenin had stood higher than Leon Trotsky in the leadership of the Russian October; despite the fact that Trotsky had tried to keep the Marxist banner unsullied by Stalin's betrayals and perversions of Marxism; despite the fact that he spent all the remainder of his life trying to build a revolutionary "vanguard party"; and despite, finally, the fact that he had succeeded in getting a few other outstanding revolutionary internationalists, such as the Dutch Marxist, Hendrik Sneevliet, to sign the Manifesto of the Fourth International.

TROTSKY'S PHILOSOPHIC FAILURE

To this writer it has become all too obvious that Leon Trotsky

(Continued on Page 7)

- (1) See Vorkuta by Dr. Joseph Scholmer
- (2) Karl Marx, Poverty of Philosophy

failed because he had not been the theoretician that Lenin had been, had not prepared himself either for 1917, or for 1939, in the manner Lenin had or would have; that is to say, Trotsky had not met the twin political-philosophic challenges that each generation of Marxists must answer for itself: (1) what new stage of production, and with it, relations in production, had we reached? And (2) what new stage of workers' revolt and new, related underlying philosophy will now emerge? But, whether or not you, the readers, single out the Humanism of Marx as the theory of liberation for our state-capitalist age, you must find the link of historic continuity. If history has rejected Trotskyism—and the fact that the Fourth International has proved to be a still-birth seems to bear this out—then the new anti-Stalinist revolutionary forces must find the "why" of the failure of the first appearance of anti-Stalinist Marxism.

Not only is it impossible "to skip" historic stages, but one must face reality and note that, where the movement from theory to revolution proved a still-birth, the movement from practice did not. Quite the contrary. Whether you begin with the Hungarian Revolution openly unfolding the banner of Marx's Humanism (3) as a movement of freedom from Communism, or with Fidel Castro in Cuba, who, in fighting against American imperialism and its puppet Batista, claimed his revolution was both against capitalist exploitation and "communist political tyranny", was "humanist" (4); whether, instead, you begin with the year, 1960, "Africa's Year" when no less than 19 nations gained their independence from Western imperialism, again under the banner of Humanism (5), or use that year as the new point of departure because of the mass demonstrations in Japan against the American Security Pact—and, indeed, those marvelous "snake dancers" the TV screens brought us, the second America, the America of the proletariat, the youth, the Negro Revolution, the anti-Vietnam war fighters, promptly built an international bridge of solidarity between you and us—one truth stands out: everywhere the masses were in motion, and, from below, there was a dynamism of ideas unmatched in grandeur by the movement from theory that is bound to an elitist "vanguard" party.

THEORETIC VOID DENIES HISTORIC ACTION

No sadder commentary can be made about the 40 year theoretic void left by the death of Lenin than by quoting Chou Yang and realizing that his downgrading of the Humanism of Marxism reflects the views of some who call themselves anti-Stalinists: "The modern revisionists and some bourgeois scholars try to describe Marxism as humanism and call Marx a humanist . . . This, of course, is futile . . ." (6)

If a serious discussion on an international scale is to be started among anti-Stalinist Marxists, then we must begin here, just here. Chou Yang notwithstanding, it is not some "bourgeois scholars" who brought Marx's Humanism onto the historic stage, but masses in motion—masses in motion against established Communism, masses in motion against American imperialism, masses in motion against British, French, Belgian imperialism, masses in motion against all existing societies. The Marx of 1844 who could write of the Catholic theologians to the atheistic Existentialists, re-discovered Silesian weavers: "The Silesian uprisings began where the French

January 1966 6762 (cont'd)

1 6 7 6 3

(cont'd)

and English uprisings ended, with the consciousness of the proletariat as a class", needs no lessons in class struggle from a representative of state power in China. Stalinism, be it in Russian or Chinese garb, should not be allowed to sully Marx's concept of revolution and vision of the "all-round" man.

It is the concept of individual as well as social freedom, the conditions of class society that had to be undermined, abolished, transcended. It is this we must now recapture, unfold, develop on the new historic plane of the 1960's.

BASIS FOR A NEW REVOLUTIONARY INTERNATIONAL

There must be no more Hiroshimas and Nagasakis. And something a great deal less honorary than "a degenerated workers' state" should be reserved for retrogressionists, for any who expound the barbarous view that a "new civilization" can first be built on the ruins of what would be left of the world after a thermonuclear war. (7) In a nuclear age where the only war that can be won is the battle for the minds of men, it is high time for Marxists and other freedom fighters to clear their heads, and, in opposing both Western imperialism and private capital as well as state-capitalism that calls itself Communism, East and West, unfurl a banner of a classless society and begin laying the foundation for a new revolutionary Marxist International.

Tokyo, Dec. 28, 1965

Raya Dunayevskaya

- (3) See especially Imre Nagy on Communism and Tibor Dery's writings as well as Po Prostu for the whole year, 1956.
- (4) Fidel Castro, *History Will Absolve Me*
- (5) See both Leopold Sedar Senghor, *African Socialism*, and Sekou Toure, *Africa's Path in History*
- (6) Chou Yang, *The Fighting Task Confronting Workers in Philosophy and the Social Sciences*, Peking, 1963.
- (7) For a more detailed analysis of Mao's position on thermonuclear war, see the chapter, "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung" in *MARXISM AND FREEDOM*

Jan 1966

6763

Editorial Article

French Elections Intensify NATO Disarray

The American bourgeois press was all too eager to gloat over the recent near-defeat of De Gaulle. By the time the popular opposition to De Gaulle made it clear that the General would have to undergo a run-off election, a reader of the daily press might have been led to believe that Frenchmen repudiated De Gaulle's "foreign policy, especially his opposition to NATO." The truth was that what the French proletariat was rejecting was, not De Gaulle's anti-Americanism, but his internal policy of keeping wages down, as well as agricultural policies which have led to recession in the country. As his announced trip to Russia shows the General will continue with his attacks on NATO.

Following what has now become his annual custom, De Gaulle has once again derisively challenged U.S. nuclear diplomacy in his pursuit of French grandeur, or Europe on the Gaullist plan.

By threatening to kick over the NATO house of cards he has once again forced the State Department and the White House to back down on declared opposition to De Gaulle's "force de frappe" (nuclear striking force) and actually help him develop it.

By threatening to pull out of the Common Market, he has once again forced W. Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg to bow down to his encroaching demands for economic and political supremacy over them.

His only opposition so far has been the resistance of the French working class. His main target remains to divert, immobilize and suppress this massive deterrent to his totalitarian ambitions. What is especially terrifying is that De Gaulle finds his allies among the strangest bed-fellows. These include the traditionally fascist officers' corps of the French army, on whom he bases himself. But they also include Communists of both the Moscow and Peking persuasion, old Social-Democrats and new "Great Society" democrats.

• In January 1963 — two years after his first atomic

tests in the Sahara, De Gaulle wrecked Kennedy's "Grand Design" for NATO by excluding Britain from the Common Market and rejecting a U.S. offer of Polaris missiles.

Nine days later, he and Adenauer signed a Franco-German treaty whereby West German industrial might was harnessed to De Gaulle's ambition. The shades of the 1940 Berlin-Vichy axis reappeared in the new Paris-Bonn axis. Gen. De Gaulle stepped into Hitler's shoes, and Adenauer into Marshall Pétain's.

That was the very month when De Gaulle also reached a security agreement with Franco-Spain for the reciprocal suppression of political opponents. As a result of this bit of grandeur, two Spanish anarchists living in French exile were betrayed to Spain's military police, convicted in secret trial, and executed in the medieval torture of garrotting—that is, strangled in an iron collar bolted to a post by the slow turn of a screw.

It also resulted in the arrest by French police, at the behest of Spanish authorities, of more than 50 alleged anti-Franco exiles in a half dozen French cities.

Only the French workers that year knew how to take De Gaulle's measure. In a March-long strike, 200,000 miners shut down the nationalized coal pits. They ignored his threats of dire reprisal and defied his angry order to go back to work. They were joined in sympathetic strikes and demonstrations by hundreds of thousands of iron, steel, electrical, railroad and clerical workers in the nationalized — that is, the openly state-capitalist — sector of the French economy.

By month's end, with the support of virtually the entire mass population of France, two million workers were on the verge of a general strike. If he has never forgiven, they have never forgotten.

• In January 1964 — De Gaulle recognized Mao's China to whom he sold 1.4 billion dollars worth of surplus French wheat which his Common Market partners were forced to pay a \$40 million subsidy.

Having shown what he

could do within the NATO Alliance, he cast his visionary eye upon the Alliance for Progress with an autumn tour of Latin America. It was anything but a triumph. Being a man of all seasons, however, he followed up with this new year's announcement that in 1967 he will move his nuclear test site from the Algerian Sahara to French Guiana on the northern coast of South America. Some 2,500 miles southeast of Florida, Cape de Gaulle will be about 2,000 miles closer to Cape Kennedy than to Paris.

Though Washington strategists may sneer at De Gaulle's "force de farce" for having only a 3-megaton capacity compared with the multi-thousand megatons the U.S. has deployed in W. Germany alone, those three megatons were powerful enough to scuttle the multi-nuclear force in NATO and win major concessions from the White House at the very time that he is flirting for a rapprochement with the Kremlin.

So great are the NATO rifts, that three years before its official termination in 1969, it is, if not in tatters, certainly tottering.

It was flawed from the start. Created in 1949 under the impact of Stalin's seizure of Czechoslovakia, it planned the state-capitalist reconstruction of national economies based upon America's awesome nuclear monopoly—which ended only a month later when Stalin exploded his first A-bomb.

Far from reviving old fashioned nationalism De Gaulle has successfully revived old fashioned imperialist plunder with the ominously new feature of authoritarian state planning supported by nuclear power. His Four Year Plans since coming to power in 1958 clearly show this.

It is this which the French masses are rejecting.

This renewal of working class strength is the real "third force" for a new unified Europe. It is the only truly democratic creative force not only for human survival but for humanist revival and the lasting reconstruction of a free world forever free from tension, torment and tyranny.

Feb. 1966

EDITORIAL

LBJ-Ky 'Summit' A Combination of Jingoism and Hypocrisy

President Johnson went off to Honolulu to devise one more form of LBJ hypocrisy which talks of "a better life" for the Vietnamese peasant while putting the seal of the presidency at the disposal of that admirer of Hitler whom no Vietnamese elected to head his state—General Ky.

Just as President Johnson had ordered a temporary cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam so that his various "peace emissaries" would have time to cover the globe in order to line up those who would follow him in a new, escalated stage of bombing; and just as he then resumed bombing of the North while unctuously asking the UN to bring the warring parties to the "negotiating table," so he now thinks he can anoint his puppet with a sudden interest in "agricultural reform."

Our double-tongued, Janus-faced Commander-in-Chief deludes only himself if he thinks anyone will take seriously his pompous statements about building "a new society" when the acts he approves result in a scorched earth policy of SOUTH VIETNAM, spraying poison on the rice fields, putting their homes to the torch, killing civilians.

COMMITMENT TO WHAT?

We are now face to face not only with the escalation of the war in Vietnam, South and North, but with its expansion into other Southeast Asian lands, whose ramifications might very well set off World War III. It is high time therefore to take a comprehensive look at what America is "committed" to.

The favorite word in the lexicon of Secretary of State Dean Rusk is "commitment." Even those in the U.S. Senate who oppose the Vietnam war are nevertheless allowing the Johnson Administration to get away with the implication that "commitment" refers to the 1964 Senate Resolution which authorized the President to take "all necessary steps" to resist the aggression "evident" in the Gulf of Tonkin incident. Thus, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. William Fulbright, though he is conducting public hearings into U.S. conduct in the Vietnam war, says he is "not at all proud" of the part he played in getting that resolution passed — as if a change in that resolution would get us out of the war. No wonder "the great debate" is turning out to be an expose, not of what Sen. Morse calls "the illegal war," but only of the common ground from which both the "doves" and the "hawks" argue: defense of American capitalism, its commitment to neo-colonialism.

The year of that commitment was not 1964, but 1954. The commitment was not to "others", but to U.S. imperialism's new role of "containing communism" even where that spelled out creating new forms of colonialism. Thus, although General MacArthur's passion for crossing the Yalu River had been contained, John Foster Dulles' theory of the "containment of communism" was given full reign. He walked out of the Geneva Conference and created SEATO. Threats of "massive retaliation" jibed well with McCarthyite witch-hunting, and the refusal to sign the Geneva accord which ended the bitter Indochina war, went hand in hand with the choice of Ngo Dinh Diem as the man to back.

What that commitment to neo-colonialism did not count on was that the authoritarian, semi-feudal, corrupt, exploitative regime of the Diem family would succeed in creating what Ho Chi Minh could not create — a genuine grass roots, mass opposition to Diem's rule. Where, in 1954, no less than a million ran from North Vietnam's totalitarianism, by 1959, Diem's terror against any and all opposition very nearly united the Vietnamese population, to a man, in a fight against his tyrannical rule.

It was only then that the Vietcong won the countryside. It was only then that the underground Communist movement in South Vietnam finally succeeded in getting Hanoi to come to its assistance. It was only then that Mao's China began to be heard more sympathetically than Khrushchev's Russia in Hanoi.

Ten military coups and 18 months after Diem's overthrow has brought no fundamental changes to South Vietnam, while U.S. "commitment" has become so total that it is propping up the latest military junta with the lives of 200,000 American troops!

OPPOSITION IN AND OUT OF CONGRESS

Congressional opposition to this all-out commitment to neo-colonialism is important only from the point of view that it reflects a much more fundamental anti-war position on the part of the American people. The voice of this vast majority is, however, not heard in the decisive manner in which, by the millions upon millions, it expressed its opposition to Goldwater and his proposals for escalating the Vietnam War. The question is: why? Why does the radical anti-war opposition appear to be so isolated from this vast majority?

It would be short sighted indeed if, for the sake of appearance, of unity in anti-war positions, we failed to reveal the only principled stand, and unfurl not only a banner against war but for a totally new social order which alone could win the struggle for the minds of men, without which no anti-war position can succeed in actually staying the hand of the imperialists who have their hands on the nuclear trigger, West and East.

To do otherwise would be to continue isolation from those who do not join the anti-war struggle because they think that the type of opposition to U.S. policy they hear means favoring Peking or Russia or Hanoi. Let the people of Vietnam, South and North, decide their own fate. At a time when Castro is compelled to say that Mao's China uses "methods and procedures" that are "exactly the same as the ones used by the United States . . . in frank violation of the sovereignty of our country," it becomes imperative to take a second look at all aspects of the anti-Vietnam war struggles. It is high time for Marxists to do all they can to see that the struggle against Western imperialism doesn't become a trap for favoring Chinese or Russian state-capitalism which likewise oppose the Vietnam war for their own reasons.

Nothing must stand in the way of fighting Johnson and Ky's pretensions to speak "for" the people of South Vietnam. But neither do Brezhnev and Mao. Let the people speak for themselves. Only they can deflate that sawdust Hitler. Vice-President Humphrey may consider Ky a "partner in social progress"; but the Vietnamese

peasants know the semi-feudal exploitation which has made them form the Vietcong. Let us therefore turn the calendar back to the day the Vietminh, as a united land, defeated their French overlords.

HANOI AND THE RUSSIA-CHINA ORBIT

The day after the Vietminh defeated French imperialism at Dien Bien Phu, it was pressured by its two "socialist allies", Russia and China, to go to Geneva—and lose at the negotiating table what it had won on the battlefield: a united Vietnam. Post-Stalin Russia had, the previous year, hurried to conclude the Korean War, and now hungered for "peaceful co-existence" in order to have time to solve the crisis Stalin bequeathed it. China, likewise, was anxious to turn its attention to industrialization, undeterred by wars not only with the U.S. but the presence of the French Army in the Red River Delta.

In 1954 the Sino-Soviet conflict was nowhere on the horizon. The counter-revolutionary unity of that orbit was further cemented in 1956 by the action against the Hungarian Revolution. Nearly three more years was to elapse before, on the one hand, the mass opposition to Diem from below assumed the proportions of both a national liberation front and a guerrilla army, and, on the other hand, a Russian-American detente brought conflict into the Sino-Soviet orbit. The critical year for all independent mass movements was 1960, when an entirely new, third world of independent African states was born. It is the contest for the domination over this world that split the Sino-Soviet orbit apart.

Despite its geographic proximity to China, Hanoi first tried to maintain neutrality. Even when it did finally align with Peking, it neither gave up all its freedom of movement nor refused Russian aid. Just as the struggle against the U.S. neo-colonialist role in Vietnam must not get bogged down in the type of timid opposition shown in the U.S. Senate, so it must not fall into the trap of being for any other ruling class orbit which opposes U.S. imperialism only in order itself to dominate the world.

WHAT NOW?

Thought, too, is an event. To unfold a banner of freedom, to disclose a vision of a world on truly class-less, human foundations is the only way to win the struggle for the minds of men. This is so in the U.S. where the opposition to U.S. imperialism's war in Vietnam can develop into a mass movement only when we stop dividing the "immediate struggle" from the "ultimate" aim of total freedom. And it is so on the battlefields of Vietnam where the struggle for freedom cannot be won without an underlying philosophy of freedom.

(cont'd)

Where these two inseparables are separated, as they were in 1954 and thereafter, the battle won did not signify a new social order not only because it was lost at the negotiating table, but, above all, because North Vietnam didn't practice freedom the day after the battle was won. This was evident not only "the day after" when there was a mass exodus from North Vietnam, but again in 1957 in the country when both small peasant and intellectual revolts were put down as ruthlessly as in China.

The struggle for freedom in South Vietnam arose from below, and independent of any aid, in theory as well as in fact, from North Vietnam. Where it aids it now, as it should, it must not be allowed to decide "for" the liberation movement in the South. Only the South Vietnamese themselves must have the right to decide their own fate. It is toward that end that the anti-Vietnam war struggles in the United States, and the world over, must be directed.

Feb 1966

6766

Early Marxist-Humanist Analysis of Viet Nam Predicted War Moves

(Editor's Note: A reader in Boston writes: "I have just been re-reading some of Raya Dunayevskaya's POLITICAL LETTERS, and was amazed at the accuracy with which she predicted what has happened in Vietnam, though she wrote of it in 1961, when most of us did not yet know such a place even existed. I wish you could print that letter in a future issue. It certainly testifies to the power of the Marxist-Humanist method of analysis." We print below the letter to which our Boston reader refers.)

October 9, 1961
Hidden in the inside pages of the local press of Friday and Saturday (October 6th and 7th) was a brief AP dispatch which stated: "State Department sources revealed privately yesterday that sending troops to South Viet Nam is under consideration." The same day one of the Alsop brothers wrote a column which, at one and the same time, tried claiming that the most important aspects of Kennedy's speech before the UN had been the references to Laos and South Viet Nam, and played down the idea of commitment of U.S. troops to "the defense of South Viet Nam" on the ground that these were not so much for combat as for "training." Obviously, however, the "training" would be on live human beings!

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

UNDECLARED WARS OF IMPERIALISM

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

Let's bring it out into the open. If the Berlin crisis was manufactured in Moscow, the one in South Viet Nam is being manufactured in Washington, D.C.—and for the same reason. That is to say, the struggle for world domination means, first and foremost, a struggle against the working people in one's own country AND the countries one dominates. In the case of South Viet Nam, the so-called "democratic regime" of Ngo Dinh Diem has so steadily moved to the right that it is little distinguished either from the old-fashioned mandarin regime, or the French puppet regime of Emperor Bao Dai, except that this one's bills are paid by the United States.

The agrarian reforms promised and haltingly begun when Ngo Dinh Diem first won the presidency have in each case given way to the old landlord rule and even when a new project is begun, it is the old landlord who becomes the new administrator. The peasant masses rightfully see no difference from the old ruling class. Neither do the petty-bourgeois revolutionary intellectuals that originally helped the country created in 1954 see any of its civil liberties restored, or even the corruption cleared up, now that the corruption has moved from the religious sects to the family of the aristocratic president.

The victories of the guerrillas are not "foreign" but mass supported. In the seven years existence of South Viet Nam, Ngo Dinh Diem has lost what support he had when he fought France and its puppet, Bao Dai. When South Viet Nam was first established, nearly a million refugees from Communist North Viet Nam moved in. At the moment of the regime's total isolation from the masses, however, the "liberal" intellectuals around the young, vigorous, smart man in the White House think it is time to rally around the flag (though the flag be that of a tottering though new semi-feudalism).

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

THE THEORY OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

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

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

These two elements fired the imagination of the colonial masses in our era and won the Trotskyists members, especially during the periods when the Communists were in one of their right-wing zigzags of being for "all four classes," or of slavishly following the Russian foreign policy at a moment when the national revolution in any one country demanded a totally different policy. Thus in 1936 during the Blum regime in France which gave Indo China some political freedoms, while the Stalinist "anti-fascist" policy within the colonies made it unite with the middle-class, the Trotskyists won a Saigon municipal election which put the Communists in the shade.

Continued on page 7

*See Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolution, pp20-22.

Even during World War II when all political freedoms were once again removed, the Trotskyist participation in the resistance to the Japanese occupation kept it stronger than the CP. When, however, at the end of the war the Trotskyists became part of the Vietminh and a provisional government, with Ho Chi Minh as president, was established, the duality in the theory of the permanent revolution aided the Communists in gaining power. The Communists do not take chances with anyone who questions their monolithism. Whether it was the great figure of Leon Trotsky himself whom Stalin made sure to murder during World War II, or the Trotskyist leader in Viet Nam, Tu Thu Thau, whom the Communists assassinated as World War II ended, the Communists made sure that no polarizing independent Marxist force remained alive for long.

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

THE "NEW" STATE CAPITALIST ADMINISTRATORS

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

In 1958, before the rightist coup in Laos I had written to a friend specializing in the study of Southeast Asia about the moment in history when the Communist tide had been stopped—and not by arms: "What is this totally new phenomenon? . . . Could the refugees from Communism tell? Could living with Vietnamese at

March
April 1966 (cont'd)

(cont'd)

this point of history reveal the new and dramatic that may be so vital to the whole 20th Century struggle for the mind of man? All I know is that what is abstract in Hegel in the Absolute Idea, like 'Self-determination in which alone the Idea is to hear itself speak,' was made concrete in Lenin's time by the speech of the Irish Revolution which Lenin immediately embraced as not just 'ordinary principle of self-determination of nations' but as the 'backbone of socialist revolution.' Can we try to be that daring and bold in the philosophic approach needed in our day? . . ."

THE DESIRE FOR WORLD DOMINATION

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

Nevertheless, the Russian (and Chinese) variety wish to remake the world in their own image and therefore open up for the intelligentsia the vista of being the new ruling class while the American private capitalists are lazy enough to want to dominate by pure identification with the old ruling class and thus open no vista to any section of the population that would gain from the overthrow of the status quo.

It is this which makes Kennedy resort back to the mailed fist, the old Eisenhower-Dulles policy variant of it: whether it is West Germany and the re-establishment of the Krupps that gave birth to Nazism, or it is South Viet Nam and the re-establishment of the rule of the mandarins. In this way the young bright intellectuals around Kennedy expose their total bankruptcy. In less than a year of rule we face the possible commitment of U.S. troops in Southeast Asia. But the American people are not about to consent to another Korea, nor to another brainwashing, whether it comes from the full state-capitalists, or those only on the road to state-capitalism. What we as a group need to do while this still is in the discussion stage, and the State Department is still busy denying it means actual combat duty, is to show that no event, no matter how minute, can be analyzed, or acted upon, except as a totality of philosophic, economic, political and organizational outlook such as Marxist-Humanism is.

March
April 1966

6768

MAY, 1966

Editorial Article

ARE THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA HEADED TOWARD WAR?

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman, National Editorial Board

The labour unions of South Vietnam gave the anti-American struggle there an altogether new quality by the May 1st march on the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. In China, on the other hand, Chou En-lai's welcome to the Albanian delegation was distinguished, not by its attack on U.S. imperialism, but by the virulence of its attack directed against Russia. Thus we see that, just as the United States' imperial designs in Vietnam blind it to any aspect of the Sino-Soviet conflict other than that it allegedly gives the U.S. "a free hand" in its barbarous war, so Mao's China narrows all world crises, including the Vietnam war,

to its own conflict with Russia.

Neither source casts any illumination on the true state of the Vietnam war, much less whether it is leading to a war of the United States with China, or with Russia, or both — or a war of China against Russia. To disentangle the contradictory statements and the contradictory actions, we need to discern the global aims of each.

"COMMUNIST INFILTRATION"

The White House, the Pentagon, the State Department — all have an easy answer to everything happening in Vietnam: "Communist infiltration." The Buddhist leadership of the six-weeks long demonstrations against that admirer of Hitler and protégé of President Johnson, General Ky, was "Communist infiltrated."

When the Buddhists called off the demonstration, but university students in Dalat continued with their demonstrations, those were "Communist infiltrated."

When the labor unions march against inflation and for an end to the war, too, these are, "of course," "Communist infiltrated." Needless to say the same charge is levelled against the Buddhist students for distributing leaflets, appealing for "peace, independence, national sovereignty and labor rights."

And, though the Catholics are the "good guys" when they march in support of the military clique, they, too, are "Communist infiltrated" when the lay Catholic journals are even mildly critical. Thus Song Dao and Hanh Trinh were suppressed last year long before the underlying discontent of all segments of the South Vietnamese population burst into the open in these mass demonstrations in Danang, in Hue, in Saigon — and in the tens and tens of thousands in the countryside who evade the draft because they consider this war to have become one for the recolonization of their country by U.S. imperialism.

THAT SAWDUST GENERAL KY

In truth, it was America's military puppet, General Ky, and not "Communist infiltration," which very nearly resulted in genocide of a nation by its own military clique. It was Ky who was bent on re-enacting the worst days of the Diem regime when Mme. Nhu, in her own savage fashion, declaimed: "I would clap at seeing another monk barbecue show." Ky's way of showing that he was not only the power "behind" the throne, but the front man himself, was to substitute for "clapping hands," the order that marines be flown to Danang, "to liberate" it from "Communist infiltrators!"

The American military obliged by transporting these storm troopers to the city that dared resist LBJ's latest protégé. Had it not been for the actions of the Vietnamese people, the shock of the world, and the disciplined semi-retreat of the Buddhist leaders, America's boundless ambition to destroy where it cannot dominate would have led to that stark tragedy being played out to its bitter end!

On the matter of the Buddhists, too, Ky and the American occupiers have shown the same disregard for truth as characterized the infamous Mme Nhu's description of their leader, Thich Tri Quang, as "a Red in yellow robes."

THE BUDDHISTS

The real question to be asked of Tri Quang is: why had he ordered the demonstration stopped just when the masses displayed such strength that they both compelled the loudmouth, Ky, to agree to elections and a civilian government and brought to a halt the awesome military might of the U.S.?

Why did Quang retreat when power lay at his feet?

Why did he call a halt to what both friend and foe agreed was the eve of a civil war?

Did he not thereby show that he, too, feared a social revolution,

and wanted to channelize it into a mere pressure force that would allow him, "from a position of strength," to bargain, with all aspirants for power, foreign as well as domestic?

All we need to do to get the answers to these questions is to contrast the loud and unequivocal statements of Thich Tri Quang: "I never said that the U.S. should leave. But I am against U.S. actions that clearly benefit the Communists . . . the ideology they possess is much more dangerous than the guns they possess."

It is true that, where U.S. imperialism relies entirely on its military might, the Buddhists appreciate the power of ideas. The point is: What ideas do they fear?

Allegedly, it is religion, or rather lack of it, on the part of the Vietcong, that motivates the Buddhist opposition. In fact, it is uncertain as to which of the two powers in the Sino-Soviet conflict controls the dominant faction in the Vietcong — the Russians who may favor "neutrality" for Vietnam, or the Chinese who are all too eager to continue the war till the last Vietnamese? The Buddhist dilemma is compounded by the American never-ending escalation of the Vietnam war without regard to the possible consequences of a war with China or even triggering World War III.

Our double-tongued Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, for example, had no sooner issued statements about the need for new relations with China than he rushed to proclaim "no sanctuary" for Chinese planes; and this reckless provocation of an Asian war was done on the basis of a single pilot's statement that "possibly" a Chinese plane was involved in a dog fight over North Vietnam.

This may be the way a Millicent becomes a war hawk—and, clearly some hawks are itching for a war with China—but it is no way for a nuclear power "to gain the confidence" of those to

May '66

whom it offers the protection of "a nuclear" umbrella. Secretary of State Rusk should have learned at least that much from De Gaulle's protestations. But so preoccupied is American imperialism with the Vietnam war that it has deafened itself both to the "friendly" advice of a Western power, and even to the altogether new quality of the Sino-Soviet conflict and a possible new Franco-Russian alliance on Germany, still the key to the world situation.

The consensus that Johnson enjoyed when he won the presidency over Goldwater and the latter's policy of escalating the Vietnam war has long since dissipated itself. Not only does the youth oppose the Johnson war, engaging in everything from individually burning draft cards to mass demonstration, but the fourth of the nation, white and Negro, who are still ill-fed, ill-clad, ill-paid and ill-housed in this "affluent society" rightly look upon war expenditures as the monster devouring "the great society" that constantly eludes them. Although the anti-war opposition here assumes a different form, there is no doubt that this second America also opposes the Vietnam war.

Indeed, even some war hawks, like Senator Russell, are beginning to question the Vietnam misadventure and raise the question of a possible withdrawal. At the same time, the intellectual community both as a whole, and the part specializing in Chinese studies, are calling for a review of America's policy in China.

It is true that their arguments are not very likely "to win over policy makers," especially when they have no sooner declared that we should not discount a unified Russian-Chinese policy than Premier Chou En-lai unleashed a virulent attack on Russia. It is true, also, that actions speak louder than words, and even scholars must face the fact that U.S. bombing of North Vietnam is now a year old, and Russia and China have not once united to help their "socialist ally." Nevertheless in its own way, the intellectual community reveals how all sections of the population are permeated, through and through with anti-Vietnam war attitudes.

And, at the Vietnam end, the Buddhists worry why the American military is not worried over the belligerent attitude of the Chinese. Here, too, they show a superior knowledge to that of the American war hawks who seem to think that the virulence of the Sino-Soviet conflict will mean that Russia and China will war

against each other. The Buddhists know how adept is the Sino-Soviet orbit, in or out of conflict, in experimenting with the lives of its "socialist allies."

THE SINO-SOVIET ORBIT

Consider, for example, how, at the negotiating table in Geneva, Vietnam was robbed of the victory it won at Dien Bien Phu. As against the Asian colonies, from India to Indonesia, who won their freedom from Western imperialism, Vietnam had to consent to a division of their country. This was so not because American imperialism was beginning to take over the role of French colonialism and running to create new imperialist realignment with SEATO, but because its "socialist allies"—Russia and China—then opted for "peaceful co-existence" with the West. And when "peaceful co-existence" with the West, following the Korean and Indo-Chinese wars, led to conflict within the Sino-Soviet orbit, it still meant no peace for Vietnam; it now became a double pawn.

The delusion of American imperialism that the Sino-Soviet conflict means they will war with each other is on a par with the Chinese accusation that there is "possible coordination of Soviet actions in the north of China with aggressive war of the United States against the Chinese People's Republic."

The truth is that, whereas, in June, 1963, at the height of the ideological struggle between those two state-capitalist societies calling themselves Communist, China's challenge to Russia for leadership over the Communist world limited itself to accusations of "possible," "theoretical" betrayals, the accusation of actual betrayal first appeared in the statement of Defense Minister, Chen Yi, quoted above, and it was first made on Sept. 29, 1965.

It transformed the Sino-Soviet conflict not only from an ideological level, but also from a national power plane, into one of different global aims. Note the date, Sept. 29. It is the eve of the Sept. 30 coup in Indonesia, which China, not Russia, hoped would result in a Djakarta-Peking axis, a new world axis as against either the one from the West or from Russia.

The fact that the counter-coup, not the coup, succeeded; that the greatest outright massacre of Communists and all opponents of the military, put an end to any Djakarta-Peking axis, seems not to have deterred Mao's China from vying with Russia, or the United States, for world domination, any more than De Gaulle has been deterred by American nuclear might from challenging its domination of NATO and vying with it not only in Europe but

throughout the world.

China's failure to create a Djakarta-Peking axis has only intensified its determination to create an axis with itself as center. Thus, on Nov. 11 Mao's China declared: "We must be prepared at any time to ward off a combined attack from U.S. imperialism, modern revisionism, and the reactionaries of various countries."

It has played this theme so consistently that, by March, 1966, it could refuse to attend the 23rd Congress of the Russian Communist Party with these words: "Despite the tricks you have been playing to deceive people, you are pursuing United States-Soviet collaboration for the domination of the world with your whole heart and soul."

For its part Russia allowed its secret letter to the Communist Parties of the world to leak to the press on the very day, March 23, when China's letter of refusal was published. In that "secret" letter the Russian Communist Party spoke bluntly enough (which is why Brezhnev could be publicly soft spoken).

The letter contains the true attitude. It states: "The subdivision of the world into two contrasting systems, the socialist and the capitalist, has disappeared from the materials of the Chinese press . . ."

"The facts show that the CCP leaders today are directing their foreign political activity not so

much against the imperialists but against the Soviet Union . . ."

"From all this it becomes clear that the Chinese leaders need a lengthy Vietnam war to maintain international tensions, to represent China as a 'besieged fortress'. There is every reason to assert that it is one of the goals of the policy of the Chinese leadership in the Vietnam question to originate a military conflict between the USSR and the U.S. so that they may, as they say themselves, 'sit on the mountain and watch the fight of the tigers'."

Imagine the dilemma of the Buddhists as they attempt to use the Sino-Soviet conflict as a wedge into the Vietcong, only to be told brusquely by the American occupiers that the Buddhist demonstrations "can only help the Vietcong." It is impossible for American imperialism to face the truth that it is the greatest breeder of Chinese Communism when it writes "No Exit" on all roads to independence.

Such is the way of the capitalist world, East, West, North, South. Its exploitative nature has not changed from its competitive youth, through its decadent monopoly maturity when it embarked

upon its imperialist adventures, to its present state-capitalist senility which will not let the new third world of Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America alone, much less allow its own working class to engage in social revolution to work out new human relations."

WHICH WAY OUT

What is crucial is that there is no escaping recolonization except through social revolution—but that is precisely the way the Buddhists do not intend to solve their dilemma. The only way out for the people is through their own self-activity, relying only on the world's working people for outside support.

At the same time, under no circumstances, must we separate our anti-Vietnam war activities from total opposition to both American capitalism and to all state-capitalist alternatives even when these dub themselves as "revolutionary." A choice of a "lesser evil" only leads to the victory of the "greater evil." Just as the Negro revolution gained momentum because it would not stop short at the door marked "new civil rights bills," so the battle for the minds of men (and it is the only type of battle that can be won in a nuclear age) cannot stop short at the doors marked "East" and/or "West". It is a struggle aimed at reconstructing society, at home, and on a world scale.

6770 66

ALIENATION AND REVOLUTION A Hong Kong Interview

"There is no word in the Chinese language that is the exact equivalent for the word, alienation. The ideograms spell out: separation and distance." The young refugee from mainland China hesitated as she searched for words to describe what was happening there, and why she had fled to Hong Kong.

Let's call this refugee Jade, and let me admit at once that, in a few instances, Jade is a composite of several people I interviewed. This method of reporting the discussion with refugees serves as protection for them. Moreover, many of the stories do fit one into another since they are typical of those who, though they are now refugees, had not streamed out of China when the Communists first came to power.

WENT BACK TO CHINA

On the contrary, in the early 1950's they went back to what they considered to be their homeland: "We wanted to do something for our country. We wanted to live as free men and women. No one who has to live all his life in a colony can feel free. Even when he has the proper credentials to stay in Europe, or in the United States, he remains, always an outsider, a foreign student."

"A Chinese," continued Jade, "I couldn't stand living in this colony where citizenship was denied me."

"Peking (Peking University) was my dream. We all felt ourselves the children of the May 4 (1919) Movement. Its new name was communism, but I do not think that most of us were communists. Humanist tendencies are very strong among the Chinese. I think the intellectuals went with Mao against the nationalists because of his democratic ideas; we all thought of communism as the truest democracy. In any case, I disliked, intensely, the merchant class. Almost everyone in Hong Kong sells something, and I certainly didn't want to be any sort of tradesman."

Jade's enthusiasm for the Maoist regime had not begun to wane until mid-1956. I asked her what impact the Hungarian Revolution had made on China. She replied: "I don't think the Hungarian Revolution was in the consciousness of the masses. There were dissatisfactions with conditions in China. Many, especially the older ones—at least at first it was the older ones—felt that after seven years of strict military rule it was time to relax the control. I had also heard that in Yu-men there was a strike of some oil workers. I had heard it from Lin Hsi-ling, the most famous student critic at Peking University. She was all the rage among us during the 'let one hundred flowers bloom, let one hundred schools of thought contend' debates in the spring of 1957. She was a very powerful orator and kept us spellbound for three and even four hours at a time. She could speak for that long a stretch of time. We would laugh when she derided the superior air of Communist Party members and the system of ranks in the Party."

"It was she who told us that a book critical of the Stalin era had been published, but it was sold only to cadres above the 11th rank. It's true she also mentioned the Hungarian Revolution, but if I remember right, this came only after the Party began accusing its critics of wanting 'to imitate Hungary.' But Lin Hsi-ling herself had drawn a distinction between the Russian Communist Party, which put down the Hungarian Revolt, and the Chinese Communist Party, which initiated the hundred flowers discussion. As I remember it, what she complained of mostly was that the 'contending and blooming' was confined to the upper strata, insisting that only when the masses are free to air their views can the problems that beset us be solved. But all this was said in order to assure our road to genuine socialism."

"Insofar as I was concerned I still thought that was exactly where we were going. Nor did I think it wrong to make some university lecturers clean spittoons. To me it was a sign of breaking down mandarin society that had always plagued Chinese civilization. Thus I participated actively in the anti-Rightist campaign in mid-1957—I was then in Shanghai. In 1958, when the Great Leap Forward was launched, I volunteered for work on one of the big dams. It was only there that my disillusion began."

"ALL LABOR WAS FORCED LABOR"

She stopped talking and seemed suddenly to be far, far away. I looked at this intense young woman who was less than five feet tall, and weighed about 85 pounds. I asked her how could she do the arduous and menial work of building a dam. She replied, "It isn't the menial work that upset me. It was the utter human waste, the bureaucratism, the inefficiency. We were transported by truck, and when we reached the place, we found that nothing was ready for us. Neither a place to live nor even the tools with which to work. It was the most primitive labor imaginable, as if we were to build the whole dam by hand. We lacked even such simple devices as a block and tackle to lift heavy rocks. These had to be pushed into place by sheer brute force."

"Also, although work didn't start until ten in the morning, we had to get up as early as five o'clock because we had no less than 20 miles to walk daily from where we slept to where we worked. All we had when we stopped for lunch was some bread. We did eat better when we finished work at sundown, but we had to reassemble for meetings. We didn't know which was the hardest to bear—the labor, the food or the meetings. We had to describe what we did that day, and we had to speak about our attitude to what we did."

"Although I had volunteered for the job, I now began to feel as if all our labor was forced labor. I kept my tongue, but you couldn't always keep quiet since, if you kept silent, your team leader would see you afterwards and ask what was the matter. I began to feel like I was nothing more than an ant, and that not only because of the unthinking mass labor, but because you so often said, yes, when you meant, no, that you lost all confidence

in yourself. Everyday it got harder to think any thoughts of your own. There was many a day when I wanted to bury myself in that dam."

"Finally, my health began to break down. I got what they call a nervous stomach. It got so that I couldn't eat the food at all. After a few months I couldn't bear it any longer and asked to be returned to Peking. Surprisingly, my team leader agreed to that on the condition I wouldn't immediately return to the university and that I shouldn't reveal that I quit. She said I really needed some rest before returning to school."

"For the first time since I had been so actively engaged in the anti-Rightist campaign I began to realize what they—I had now begun to put a distance between myself and the regime—feared most was the reaction of the youth. Of all the surprises during the hundred flowers campaign what must have shocked them most was the attitude of the youth, for the very generation that was a product of the new People's Republic had become its severest critics."

"In my opinion," Jade concluded, stressing the word, my, as if the counterposition of an individual's view to that of the state and the Party was the highest possible daring, "in my opinion," she repeated, "the designations of the Right and Left were used only afterwards. At the beginning of the hundred flowers debates it was so obvious that the most brilliant students, those who had been the most dedicated Communists and who had been the most prized by the regime, and who themselves kept stressing that they were Communists and wanted no return to the old, had nevertheless become the most severe critics. As I told you, I volunteered for the building of the dam and I truly thought that it was a way not only of building up my country, but of 'uniting' mental and manual work. But now every one of my bones ached, and my brain, too, was tired, tired, tired."

STUDIED "MAO'S THOUGHT," BUT NOT MARXISM

Jade stopped talking. I felt that the telling of the story of the dam was an actual reliving of that shattering experience, and I didn't wish to break the silence. After a few moments she resumed talking, this time about how she used the period of rest to begin studying Marxism. Paradoxical as it may sound, it seems that Marxism was not taught to one and all; it was reserved for "the cadre"—the Communist Party and Communist youth members: "Well, you know, not everybody did consider himself a Communist. Actually only a very small percentage of the Chinese people are Communist Party members. We all, of course, had to know the latest pronouncements of the Communist Party and be acquainted with 'Mao's Thought' on current subjects, but as for serious study of Marxism, that's a different matter."

"I was peeved. I had not been taught Marxism in Hong Kong or in the United States, and I was determined to study it by myself now. Business men, for example, could attend the Democratic People's After Hours Political Education School, and in four months come out as experts in Marxism, but it was not easy for me to get into a class that studied the original works of Marx."

Pei + Judy 1961

6771

"I found out what the ten basic books were, and I asked for these from the library: four volumes of Mao's Selected Works; two pamphlets by Lenin—Imperialism, and State and Revolution; two books by Stalin—Foundations of Leninism and History of the Communist Party of the USSR; and two volumes of the Selected Works by Marx and Engels. There are not many Chinese translations available of the original works of Marx. It is, however, possible to buy some books in the bookstores on the famous Wang Fu Chin Avenue in Peking if you can read a foreign language, and if you have the money. It is fun to go into those bookstores.

"I was told I should concentrate on Mao's Thought; that theoretically, the two most important essays are On Practice, and On Contradiction, as well as one of the latest, On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People. These, plus Stalin's The History of the Communist Party of the USSR, where the sum total of what constituted to them 'Marxism-Leninism.' The trouble was, the more I read, the more I began to doubt some of Mao's statements, because my own experience which kept intruding into my study didn't jibe either with his practice or theory. But I didn't dare to say so out loud, not even to myself.

SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT ERUPTS

"I had first heard about disagreements late in 1958, when Pan Tzu-nien, an editor of Hsinhau (the official news agency), listed ten points on which Soviet Russia disagreed with the People's Republic. He had begun reciting them off as the Great Leap Forward, the Three Red Banners, the 'non-dialectical' approach to technicians who, the Russians said, should be judged not on how 'Red' they are, but how expert they are, and so forth and so on.

"However, the real shockers did not occur until 1960—and those we heard first, not officially, but through the grape-vine—and those concerned an exchange of gunfire between Chinese and Russian border guards, and the departure of the Russian technicians with their blueprints. All work had to stop. The campaign then began full force against the Russians. We had no specific love for them; there had actually been very little contact between Russians and Chinese, but the regime itself had always played up the Russians as the greatest friends we had, and Stalin's History of the CP had been studied as much as any work by Mao. And now all we heard about them was that they were 'revisionists.' Somehow, instead of hatred against the Russians, a feeling of utter isolation descended upon all of us.

"Then something else took place that set me thinking. African students began coming to our university. We were very interested in them, their countries, their revolutions, but we were not permitted to fraternize with them. They were ghettoized both as to living quarters and any socializing. Meanwhile, living conditions in China had become so difficult that we wanted to ask these new arrivals for things we were short of, like soap. And we were stopped from doing that. So once again, we felt very frustrated. I felt more strongly than ever that things were reeling backwards. At the same time my health hadn't improved much; it seems I was now stuck with a bleeding ulcer. I wanted to flee. I began to plan my escape. It took me two years to achieve it, and yet . . .

Jade stopped and looked at the mountain at the top of which one could see the radar of mainland China. She resumed talking as if she was talking only to herself: "And yet, I wasn't back in Hong Kong very long—I only came last year, you know—when I began to feel all the old alienations that drove me from this island to the mainland. I'm referring not only to the British colonial administration, but the so-called independent British scholars—and they are not as poor a breed as the Americans who seem to have so exhausted themselves in learning the Chinese language that they do not bother to learn anything about the Chinese people. "It's funny, their attitude to their 'specialty, China,' seems to be like that to a skill, like oil drilling. People exist for them as so many millions—a figure, a figure they wish they could cut, that's all. They don't exist as people with feelings, thoughts, aspirations. Not a single one of them is a Marxist, for example. OK, I can understand that. What I cannot understand is their cynicism. It seems to be one big joke for them, but Marxism isn't one big joke to the Chinese people. No wonder Mao feels so sure that no outsiders will ever get to first base in China, much less win the leadership over the Chinese."

MAOISM IS RETROGRESSIONISM, NOT REVOLUTIONARY

Heretofore I had intervened only in order to ask questions, but I felt it necessary at this point to make my own position clear. I told her that what she knew about me was that I was an American, what she didn't know was that I was a Marxist-Humanist. And as a Marxist-Humanist I wish to state most categorically that Mao was no sort of Marxist. Quite the contrary. Were it not for the fact that he had state power over a vast land of 700 million human beings, no one would pay any attention to his sophomoric essays—On Practice, On Contradiction—much less consider them original contributions to the Marxism of our age. As for How to Handle Contradictions Among the People, that is not only a revision of Marxism, it is the pronouncement of an exploitative tyrant who is so drunk with power that he thinks that the objective contradictions of capitalist production can be abolished by fiat. Mao decrees so, and so it is.

The shocker, to me, I concluded, was not the power conflict between those two state-capitalist societies, Russia and China, that euphemistically call themselves Communist. The shocker was ingrained in Mao's contention that "for decades" — and "even a century" — the class struggle would continue "in all socialist countries . . . as an objective law independent of man's will." Far from being a new theory of revolution, that is the most sinister of all theories of retrogression.

At this Jade fairly jumped out of her seat, exclaiming: "Retrogression, that's it. That really is it. Mao is a retrogressionist! That's the word that escaped me when I said everything seemed to be reeling backwards. That word never came into my consciousness because I was afraid to face its consequences, though I had felt for some time that Mao was the real revisionist. Retrogression, that really sums up 'Mao's Thought.'" Jade took my book out of my hands and began glancing at the chapter, "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung," saying "I must translate this and get it into the mainland." She kept stressing, over and over again, that Mao was the retrogressionist, not the Chinese masses: "Marx's Humanism will raise their spirits once more, and then history can move forward. The youth stands ready to make a new revolution."

No wonder, I thought to myself as the interview drew to a close, that some Chinese refugees consider the American scholar no more than a new form of the CIA. It is, after all, impossible to bridge the gulf between a tired exponent of "the end of ideology" age and the energetic revolutionary who had suffered through more than a decade of "Mao's Thought" and hard labor and still dreams of new revolutions. No doubt Jade exaggerated the proximity between philosophy and revolution. But the Maos fear their youth, and not those who bemoan their fate at the hands of "the gods that failed." For the dreams and energies of youth are the stuff revolutions are made of, totalitarianisms undermined, Maos overthrown.

June + July 1966

AUG.-SEPT., 1966

EDITORIAL ARTICLE

American Civilization on Trial

The decay and degeneration of American civilization can be seen these days in every facet of life, from the barbaric war in Vietnam, to Luci Baines Johnson's insensitive, mindless and willful choice of that day of infamy (when the United States dropped the A-bomb on Hiroshima) as her wedding day.

From Nero fiddling while Rome was burning to the tall Texan now occupying the White House and ordering napalm bombings of other men's lands the frivolity and ennui that begin oozing out of the pores of an established order bear witness, not to its stability, but to the gradual crumbling to pieces of mighty empires.

And, with it, comes the disgust of part of the ruling class itself. Thus we hear voices of dissent to the Vietnam war from the halls of Congress, and so respectable a bourgeois critic as Walter Lippman felt compelled to write: "The Administration has gone off whoring after false gods in the pursuit of world power." (Newsweek, August 1, 1966).

THE BIG LIE

The Big Lie has characterized every pronouncement of the Administration, from the 1953 assurance by Secretary of Defense McNamara that the GIs in Vietnam would be brought home and the military tasks "can be completed by the end of December 1965," to the very latest (August 16) denial, in Washington, D.C., by Marine Commandant Gen. Wallace M. Greene Jr. that he said what he said in Saigon, that American troops must be boosted to 750,000 and even then it would take from 5 to 8 years "to win."

Nor are the lies and the hypocrisy limited to the halls of the White House, the Pentagon and the State Department. Congress has now unloosed that infamous House Un-American Activities Committee to try to still the voice of anti-war protestors while it itself keeps lowering the amounts allotted for "the war on poverty," upping the amounts it votes to spend on the war in Vietnam, and, while talking of "limited objectives," actually flirts with the idea of "knocking out the nuclear installations" in China! Toward that end they are scuttling any and all programs affecting the Negro. Witness the disgraceful spectacle the sanctimonious Senate is staging against open housing.

JOHNSON'S AMERICA

The recent explosions in the black ghettos of the big cities are but one manifestation of the revolt against a society where the poor get poorer all the time and the unemployment, which persists at "less than 4% average," actually jumps to from 20 to 40% for Negro unemployed. At a time when the estimated war cost for fiscal year 1967 is \$10.5 billion, the President's budget not only cut \$1.6 billion from the amounts for so-called great society projects, but also cut in half old government public works, not to mention the scuttling of any idea of "direct income transfers to the poor."

President Johnson, who took time out from his war hatchlings, to make gratuitous attacks on the Negro outbursts, had not a word to say either when white mobsters threw a knife at Rev. King which felled of its mark and followed it up with a rock that felled him to his knees, or even when they unfurled a swastika as the symbol of their assault on the civil rights marchers for open housing. The time when the talkative Texan talked on and the time when he chose to keep his mouth shut are symptomatic of the values, or, more correctly, lack of values that dictate US foreign policy.

THE SECOND AMERICA

There is, of course, a second America. The Negro Revolution is its most important, spontaneous, massive expression. It has gained so great a momentum of its own that even its divisions, far from manifesting disintegration, are signs of growth and political maturity.

With this Negro Revolution stand those white freedom fighters who know how to put first things first—struggling for rights in America. Simultaneously they fight also against America's war in Vietnam. As throughout the world, so throughout these United States they marched by the thousands August 6 to August 9 both in protest against the war in Vietnam and in honor of those who died at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

These marches are a good beginning. But it isn't the beginning of the anti-war struggles.

Ever since 1963 when American "advisers" became combatants, the American people have shown their opposition to this unholy war, first, by defeating Goldwater who would extend it, then by showing their growing dissatisfaction with Johnson who did extend it. All polls show that a majority of Americans oppose the war, and yet the anti-war movement is a minority, and a small minority at that.

Why? Why have not a significant number of those who opposed the war taken to the streets? Why have they shied away from the existing movement? Is it because "they do not understand?"

To think so would prove that the Left too is bound by that capitalistic conception that "the masses are backward." The truth is the masses demand some answers, not because "they do not understand," but because they understand very well that the "unity" of the anti-Vietnam war forces is fictitious.

Who doesn't know that US imperialism has been as brazen in its bombardment of North Vietnam as it has been because it has no reason to fear a joint Russo-Chinese defense of their ally? Who doesn't know that Mao's China would rather fight this war till the last Vietnamese?

The Left should know more than that. They should know that this lack of elementary solidarity is proof of Communism's global ambitions. It will not do to close one's eyes to the fact that United States imperialism is not alone in its global ambitions. Vietnam was divided into North and South precisely because, with the Korean war ended, both Russia and China wanted "peacefully to co-exist" with the West and compelled the Viet Minh to accept the division. In turn, North Vietnam paid no attention to the South Vietnamese struggle against Diem; the Vietcong was quite alone and without allies until the 1960s when the now irreconcilably divided China and Russia each finally supported the Vietcong's fight against the American colossus for its own national reasons.

LORD RUSSELL

This much, and more, is recognized by the anti-Stalinist Left of Japan. (See Statements by Zenshin and Zengakuren, p. 7.) But the American Left acts as if American civilization is on trial because Lord Russell is preparing to stage a "War Crimes Tribunal", rather than because the freedom movement in the United States has put American civilization to the test.

Precisely because capitalism is a world phenomenon which includes not only private capitalism (the United States), but state capitalism (Russia and China), it will not do either to bury one's head in the sand regarding the struggle between the nuclear titans for world domination, or to act as if the Vietnam war was only for "private profit" instead of also for global strategic positions.

Lord Russell's present anti-capitalist stance notwithstanding, he is ignorant of Marxism as the philosophy of freedom against both private and state-capitalism and for that new human dimension which only the end of class society, with its division between mental and manual labor, can bring about.

Unfortunately, the saddest example of how this division between mental and manual labor dwarfs the mind of the intellectual, even when he possesses neither capital nor state power, is Lord Russell himself. Just listen how, in his desire to equate Johnson with Hitler, and Nazism with American imperialism, Lord Russell offhandedly dismisses the extermination of a whole race!

"With the exception of the extermination of the Jews, however," writes the callous professor, "everything that the Germans did in Eastern Europe has been repeated by the United States in Vietnam on a scale which is larger and with an efficiency which is more terrible and complete." Just as, at the end of World War II, he called for a preventive war against Stalin's Russia, so now he seems bent on calling for one against Johnson's America.

No, far from helping the revolutionary forces within the United States, Lord Russell can only hinder our anti-war struggles. As one Britisher put it: "He (Lord Russell) tells us that the demand for peace is empty. On the contrary, the demand for peace is full of desperate longing of the peasants." (See letter of Peter Cadogan, of the Committee of 100 in Readers Views.)

As we see, intellectuals are always ready to decide "for" the:

masses. The truth, however, is that, just as the rigged elections-to-be under Ky's military dictatorship cannot possibly bring either peace or self-determination, so the anti-war struggles will not become massive enough to help end the war unless we make it clear that the opposition to the Vietnam war is opposition to ALL state powers that wish to exploit Vietnam, for whatever purpose, with the inevitable end of abridging the right of the South Vietnamese to decide their own fate. The "Yankees Come Home!" slogan must be joined with Self-Determination for South Vietnam, free from all outside interference.

Neither Washington nor Peking; neither Moscow nor Hanoi. Give South Vietnam back to the South Vietnamese! Destiny must be in the hands of the masses themselves, Vietnamese as well as Americans, Russians as well as French, Africans as well as Latin Americans.

BACK TO JOHNSON'S WAR

Every day brings news of more atrocities and more "accidents." Not only is South Vietnam, as a whole, being subjected to the destruction of its land, but there is hardly a day when the bad morale of the American air men doesn't show itself by the accidental dropping of bombs on civilians in villages that are supposed to be "safe."

The war hawk mentality is so all-pervasive in the Johnson Administration that even when the State Department "wants to" re-establish diplomatic relations with Cambodia, the military manages to redraw the map to show that Cambodian territory "is" South Vietnamese territory, and then proceeds to bomb those villages that are allegedly "sanctuaries" for the Vietcong.

And what about the Vietcong? Isn't it true that, even according to official American statistics, the North Vietnamese army constitutes at most 10% of the force fighting the military dictatorship of Ky and his American troops? Isn't it true that in the Spring of this year the Vietcong was recruiting no less than 3,500 men a month inside South Vietnam?

80 per cent of Vietnamese still live in the rice paddies, and it is there, and not in North Vietnam, or China, or Russia, that the war is being lost, even as it is in the second America that American civilization has lost. It cannot be otherwise, either at home or abroad, for all freedom fighters aim to reconstruct society on totally new, truly human foundations.

—Raya Dunayevskaya,
Chairman National Editorial Board

Aug-Sept 1966

6774

Once Again — Theory and Practice

It is no accident that in the past few years a veritable avalanche of books has appeared about the young Marx. With the sole exception of *Marxism and Freedom*, which included the first English translation of Marx's early essays because the author aimed at re-establishing the Humanism of Marxism, these books stretched Marx's Humanism to the point of non-recognition. They were written by "pros"—old radicals or professors—who stamped their imprint, ranging from totalitarian Communism to Zen Buddhism, and from psychology to technology, on Marx's early writings.

This is a repetition of what took place in Western Europe at the end of World War II, when everyone, from the Catholics to the Existentialists, were busy "discovering" the young Marx, and putting their imprint on his writings. Thereby, the Humanism of Marx, that is to say, the theory of alienation which is inseparable from the quest for universality, became degraded either to a theory of alienation of "the soul," or a preoccupation with the existent.

A NEW SYNTHESIS IS REQUIRED

History must not repeat itself. The young Marx must speak for himself. The alien clamor around him must be muffled so that we can hear him, see the plural-dimensional in his outlook, grasp not merely the sense of alienation, but the act of liberation. The new left can help make this happen, provided it turns seriously to theory and begins to lay the foundation for a new synthesis of theory and practice.

Too long has established Marxism violated the very essence of this most profound theoretician of freedom — Karl Marx, the young and the old. "Marx," wrote Karl Kautsky when he was still the recognized head of the International, "proclaimed no philosophy, but the end of all philosophy." This misreading of Marx's statement that philosophy must be "realized" had no little to do with Kautsky's failure to publish Marx's Humanist Essays. It took a world war and the Russian Revolution, plus years of bargaining, to pry these manuscripts loose from the vaults kept by the literary heirs, to whom Friedrich Engels had entrusted them when he died in 1895.

ORIGINS IN HEGEL

The collapse of the established Socialist International had left Lenin without a philosophic foundation for his revolutionary thinking and compelled him to return to the origins of Marx in Hegelianism. It was only then that he first understood that it was impossible to understand the mature Marx, to comprehend, as he put it, even the first chapter of Capital unless one has studied "the whole of Hegel's Logic."

In unmistakable terms Lenin broke with his leader, Plekhanov: "Plekhanov wrote probably nearly 1,000 pages (Belov + against Bogdanov + against Kantians + basic questions, etc., etc. on philosophy (dialectic.) There is nil in them about the Larger Logic, its thoughts (i.e., dialectic proper, as a philosophic science) nil!" And in the conclusion of this criticism of Plekhanov, he included all 20th century Marxists, that is to say, his own generation: "At the beginning of the 20th century Marxists criticized the Kantians and Humanists more in a Feuerbachian . . . than in a Hegelian, manner."

Unfortunately, Lenin's break with his own philosophic past remained "a private affair" not only because he had not published his Philosophic Notebooks of 1914-15, but also because he continued to recommend his own earlier works as well as those of Plekhanov on philosophy. Nothing else was available since neither his Notebooks, nor Marx's Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts had yet been published.

Thus Lenin left a dual philosophic heritage. The duality made it easy for the Communist theoreticians of Stalin's Russia to keep writing, after Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks and Marx's Manuscripts were finally published in the late 1920's, as if the Lenin of Materialism and Empiro-Criticism, which gave the green light to vulgar materialism in 1908, and the Lenin of the Philosophic Notebooks, which helped form the underlying philosophy of the 1917 Revolution by re-establishing the unity of the ideal and the material, were one and the same.

So prevalent is this attitude among all present-day writers — Russian Communists as well as Maoists, Titoists and assorted modern Kautskyans, Trotskyists and even American pragmatists — that no modern philosopher has yet attempted seriously to grapple with this statement from Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks: "Man's cognition not only reflects the objective world, but creates it."

Marxism is a philosophy of human activity—the labor of hand and mind. For our age of absolutes, which invests everything with its opposite, so that even counter-revolution parades about as revolution, it cannot be stressed too strongly that Marx did not oppose idealism. What the Humanism of Marx does oppose are these:

(1) the de-humanization of ideas in Hegel, who dealt with the various stages of consciousness and self-consciousness as if those existed outside of the human body;

(2) capitalism, which is a class society based on the exploitation of man by man—of those who labor by those who control the means of production, so that all labor, even when it is freed from chattel slavery and serfdom remains "forced labor"; and

(3) "vulgar communism," which thinks all ills of capitalism are abolished the moment private property is abolished when, in truth, no new society can arise unless that which is most degrading in class societies, and is the source of all that is perverse in capitalism—the division between mental and manual labor—is rooted out totally.

ALL REVOLVED AROUND FREEDOM

The writings of the young Hegel, as, later, those of the young Marx, were not published until after World War I. The fact, however, that Marx was unaware of these writings did not keep him from penetrating through the de-humanization of Hegel's philosophy as Hegel had retreated to his ivory tower, and discovering the revolutionary nature of the Hegelian dialectic, and also its humanist origins. Because freedom is the point of departure, and the point of return, for both Marx and Hegel, the daring of the young Hegel, who wrote under the impact of the French Revolution of 1789, is breath-taking even today:

"Only that which is an object of freedom may be called an idea. We must, therefore, transcend the State. For every State is bound to treat free men as cogs in a machine. And this is precisely what it ought not to do: hence the State must perish."

It is this concept of freedom that enabled Marx, who developed his views on the eve of proletarian struggles of the 1840's, to concretize the abstract in Hegel, and thereby to transcend him. The 1848 revolutions that covered the whole of Europe, disclosed to Marx how "to realize philosophy," that is to say, to make freedom real. The heart, brain, and spirit of his philosophy all pointed to one truth: the driving force of "the dialectic," "the absolute negativity" of development through contradiction, was man himself, not just his thought, but the whole of man; not just alienated man "in general," but the alienated workers specifically, at the point of production.

Marx maintained that bourgeois theoreticians, because of their place in production and their compulsion outside it to defend the status quo, have a false ideology, are "prisoners of the fetishism of commodities." The worker, on the other hand, because of his place in the production is the "negative principle," the force which will resolve the contradictions of capitalism.

INDIVIDUALITY IS ESSENCE

The unity of theory and practice is, as Lukacs phrased it, "only the other face of the historical social situation which makes self-knowledge and knowledge coincide. Thus the proletariat is both the subject and object of its proper knowledge." Indeed, as Lukacs correctly puts it, Marx accused Hegel of not having truly transcended the duality of thought and being, of theory and practice, of subject and object, "that Hegel had not gone beyond Kant on this decisive point, that his dialectic was a simple appearance and not the actual, interior dialectic of the historic process" and that he, Marx, was carrying to its concrete, actual meaning the Hegelian conception of a "spirit-phenomenon."

To grasp the spirit of our age, to participate in the freedom struggle of today, to gain a new dimension in thought as well as in action, and thus to end class divisions, discrimination against minorities, the alienation of youth, it becomes imperative to recapture the inner essence of Marxist-Humanism—the individualistic element, which is its warp and woof. That individualism is not the petty-bourgeois individualism preoccupied with its own ego. Just as Hegel had conceived individuality to be "purified of all that interferes with its universalism, i.e., with freedom itself" so Marx defined freedom as "the free development of each (which) is the condition for the free development of all." Precisely because our age of state-capitalism, neo-colonialism and nuclear blackmail affects even the Left with an administrative mentality and a thirst "to lead," it becomes imperative to begin the discussion of a freedom philosophy on this, just this level.

OCTOBER, 1966

The A Copy
ed in Great Britain

OF WORLD SIGNIFICANCE

CHINA'S SELF-CREATED TURMOIL

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman, National Editorial Board

"Bombard the headquarters (of the Communist Party locals) and you bombard the handful of people in power who are taking the capitalistic road." So spoke Chairman Mao Tse-tung's heir apparent, Defense Minister Lin Biao, at a mass rally in Peking on Sept. 15. The bombast against a self-created "enemy" fitted in well with the audience — the so-called Red Guards who had suddenly sprung up, fully organized, from the plotting of the self-same Defense Minister, chosen by him to administer shock-troop treatment to hitherto orthodox interpreters of "Mao's Thought" by embarking on a three-week rampage of self-perpetuating disorders.

It would have been a tragic enough spectacle had these vigilante teen-agers, "armed with Mao's Thought," imprinted on millions of leaflets, pamphlets, posters, been told that their work was finished now that every office, workshop, store, home, railroad coach, bus and taxi had the proper size photo of Chairman Mao; now that the proper "bourgeois individuals" had been sufficiently harassed and humiliated, thus easing the road for the Party to demote the allegedly dissident Communist Party officials; and now that the noisy mass demonstration around the Soviet Embassy which succeeded in renaming the street, "Struggle Against Revisionism," had extended itself into forcing individual Chinese "revisionists" to wear posters reading, "I oppose the Chinese revolution."

Clearly, the life-span of the Red Guards was not finished and the job of eradicating the influence of "the West," had to go beyond cutting trousers of passers-by, or gaining conformity in haircuts, or ransacking the homes of "bourgeois individuals," including the home of Mme. Sun Yat-sen, where not only "bourgeois" furniture was carted off, but historic documents were destroyed, or in the banning of the sales of "foreign books" (except Albanian) as well as the playing of "Western music," since Bach, Beethoven and Shostakovich were now declared to be "feudal-bourgeois-revisionist," not to mention the desecration of statues from Pushkin to Confucius.

THE PROLETARIAN CULTURAL REVOLUTION

Indeed, the "Red Guards" are being canonized as the expression of "a great proletarian cultural revolution unprecedented in history." Unprecedented also was the timing of their appearance, shortly after the conclusion of the meeting of the most powerful ruling body—the plenum of the Central Committee (CC) of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). Called together for the first time in four years, it is supposed to have created a body

outside of its own existing youth organization, and obviously not subject to any governmental body, but only to the will of Chairman Mao through his "stand-in," Defense Minister Lin. Or is it vice-versa?

Why is this extra-legal organ needed in a land that is legally Communist? Why, with the largest land army in the world, does its commander-in-chief need yet another instrument of teen-age supporters? Is an intervention in the Vietnam war planned? All of these questions are interrelated and some clues to the answers can be gleaned from the plenum decisions.

To the plenum of the CCP, held Aug. 1-12, came "the cultural revolutionary groups of the CC." These were not, however, called the "Red Guards"—not yet. They appeared afterwards.

"In the name of what," asked Pravda, on Sept. 16, "was it found necessary in China to take over the functions of the legal organs of the people's power, to violate the Constitution, and the elementary principles of law?" After describing the "mass outrages" of the "Red Guards," the Russian Communist official newspaper further hit the nail on the head, when it thus questioned the Chinese euphemism, the great proletarian cultural revolution: "Why is the 'proletarian' movement . . . going on without any participation by the working class?"

For Russian Communism to be able to answer that question, it would have had to admit that its own society, even as the Chinese, is an exploitative one, so that the destiny of the proletariat is not, and cannot be, in its own hands. Indeed, the nearest parallel to the 1966 "proletarian cultural revolution" in China is Stalin's 1943 revisions in the Marxian theory of value, which still dominate both Russia and China.

Then, as now, the students rebelled against the hypocrisy of teaching the Marxian theory of freedom, but practicing state-capitalist tyranny. Then, as now,

the answer of the ruling powers was, first, to stop teaching Marxian economics, and then to revise Marxism itself. Where the Russian Communists revised Marxian economics, the Chinese revise Marxian philosophy, rejecting in toto the Humanism of Marxism.

The distinguishing feature of the wholesale revision of Marxism in the two countries does not, however, reside in whether one country centered its perversion of Marxism in the economic or in the philosophic field, for in the Marxian theory of liberation the two are inseparable, but in the fact that, in 1943, Stalin could rely on the Party intelligentsia to do the job, whereas Mao, in addition to preferring the Army as the perpetuating organ of Communist rule, must create an extra-legal instrument to enforce intellectual conformity.

MAO'S OR LIN'S ARMY?

A veritable deification of Mao seemed to be the principal attribute of the CCP plenary statement.* The claim is made that "Comrade Mao Tse-tung is the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our era . . . Mao Tse-tung's thought is the Marxism-Leninism of the era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing to worldwide victory." Mao's "brilliant policies" during the four year period between this, the 11th, and the previous, the 10th, plenum are attested to, stress being put on his (a) "call for the whole party to grasp military affairs and for everybody to be a soldier," and (b) "call for the People's Liberation Army and all factories and villages, schools, commercial departments, service trades and party and Government organizations to become great schools of revolution."

Yet a careful reading cannot help but note that, simultaneously with this adulation, what is sin-

*Excerpted in New York Times, Aug. 14, 1966.

6776

(cont'd)

gled out for emulation is this: "Comrade Lin Piao's call on the People's Liberation Army to launch a mass movement in the army to study Comrade Mao Tse-tung's Thought has set a brilliant example for the whole party and the whole nation."

Prior to this statement the communiqué had stressed that, in conjunction with, the 1963 "programmatic document" (which had challenged Russia's leadership) and which had been "drawn up under the personal leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung." Lin Piao's "Long Live the Victory of People's War" must be studied, for, together, the two documents "give scientific Marxist-Leninist analyses of a series of important questions concerning the world revolution of our time . . ."

The discerning reader cannot help but wonder whether Mao is being deified—or mummified. Is Lin living in the reflected glory of Mao, as the press holds, or is Mao being allowed to live out his remaining years as a deity only because he transferred total authority to Lin, head of the Army?

Whether, in the turmoil in China, we are witness to a new form of Bonapartism, or allegedly participating in a "school of revolution," the point is that what is immediately involved is the life of the Vietnamese people.

THE VIETNAM WAR

Naturally the bourgeois press is delighted with this development, as it diverts attention from the pressure on them by the anti-Vietnam war fighters. These continuous struggles in the 1960's have been hampered by the developing Sino-Soviet conflict which has made united front action against U.S. imperialism impossible. The Communist world had been further shaken up by the calamitous defeat in October, 1965, of the Indonesian Communist Party which had followed a Maoist line.

Those Communist Parties in the Chinese orbit began declaring their independence. By Aug. 13, 1960, the North Korean Communist Party, the very one to whose aid the CCP had come during the Korean war, now declared its independence, stating " . . . for the sake of the anti-imperialist joint action and the united front, common ground should be sought, first of all, on this fundamental question, shelving all other questions for the time being."

The following day the CCP Statement was published: "The Plenary session maintains that to oppose imperialism, it is imperative to oppose modern revisionism. There is no middle road whatsoever . . . it is im-

perative resolutely to expose their (Russian Communists) true features as scabs. It is impossible to have 'united action' with them."

For the first time since the fall of Khrushchev, the Russian Communist Party, on August 31, answered back in kind: "In conditions when imperialism is stepping up its efforts in the struggle against the revolutionary movement, is expanding the dirty war in Vietnam, such a step ("mass outrage in front of Russian Embassy") renders a particularly big service to imperialism and reaction."

This in-fighting in the so-called Communist world cannot but hearten U.S. imperialism which feels free to go on with its wanton bombing of North Vietnam as well as its scorched earth policy for South Vietnam whom it is supposed to be "defending."

THE ARMY VS. YOUTH

The Constitution of the People's Republic of China is the only one in the Communist world that lists the Army along with the Party as the two instruments of power. Naturally this is no accident. Long before Mao won state power, as he was escaping Chiang Kai-shek's murderous counter-revolution, Mao developed an original, for Marxists, view of the Army—first of a guerrilla army, and then just of the Army. This is Mao's one original contribution to "Marxism-Leninism", or more precisely put, to the perversion of Marxism, since his concept was for continuous guerrilla warfare to develop irrespective of any relationship to a mass movement which, to genuine Marxism, would be its only reason for being. If now the Army should have slipped away also from Mao's control, it would only show that theory has a logic of its own, irrespective of a relationship to the theoretician.

Once this army has an objective basis for being—state power—nothing can keep it from being the expression of the exploitative ruling class and its global ambitions. It is not that Mao disagrees with these: he is anxious to contend with other great powers for world domination. It is, rather, that he does also have a concept of "the vanguard role of the Party to lead", which now, however, has been absorbed in the stress on "politics must take command".

Far from the activities of the "Red Guards" inflating "a second revolution," China's "proletarian cultural revolution" is so devoid of any proletarian participation, or peasant or student youth for that matter, that (1) all universities were ordered closed for six months, and (2) the Red Guards were ordered "not to go to factories, enter-

prises and Government organization below the country level, not to rural people's communes . . ." In a word, they must not interfere with production, neither in the factories, nor on the farms.

No doubt, Mao is hoping to use them against the rebellious students in the cities, but success is by no means assured. Quite the contrary. For the truth is that the foremost voices of revolt against Mao's rule during the 100 Flowers campaign were those of the youth. And it is they, again, who had brought about a very modified version of it in 1961. The fact that Mao felt compelled to order the closing of the schools bespeaks the restlessness of the Chinese youth. Those confident of the rule of their thinking do not go about shutting down schools of higher learning.

State-capitalism calling itself Communism is as anxious to dull the sense of youth as any ruling class fearing the daring of youth compelled to live in a world they did not make. The Chinese youth will yet teach Mao the lesson begun by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters: that you cannot brainwash a people by totalitarian rule.

GLOBAL AMBITIONS VS. PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

Even a cursory look at the actual, instead of the imagined, developments in Mao's China will show that power in the People's Republic does not lie in the hands of the people; it isn't even in the hands of the "vanguard," the Communist Party. It took Mao over a decade after the conquest of power before he bothered to convene a Congress of the Chinese Communist Party. Furthermore, all apologists for China as a "land of socialism" notwithstanding, that Congress designated China as state-capitalist.

Naturally, Communism held that "State-capitalism under control of a state led by the working class is different in nature from state-capitalism under bourgeois rule." But this does not change the fact that even the Chinese Communists, as late as September, 1956, called the country by its right name, state-capitalism.

What happened then to change everything very nearly overnight? Where it took 11 years to convene a Congress, why did it take less than a year for the Politburo to proclaim that not only could China industrialize faster than "the West," but that it was out-

(cont'd) 6777 Oct 1966

distancing "socialist" Russia by going directly (sic) to "communism"?

This was no "second revolution." It was an outright counter-revolution. Unlike the elemental outpouring of the masses against the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek regime, this time "the mass line" meant the mass sweat and blood that would be needed to take the fantastic "Great Leap Forward" — into what they knew not. What shocked Mao's China beyond any rational reaction one short month after the Communist Congress was the first great proletarian revolution for freedom from Communism. It happened in Hungary, and it shook the whole Communist world to its foundations.

Mao's counter-revolutionary role was not exhausted in his urging Khrushchev to rush Russian tanks to put down the revolution. No, so afraid was Mao that a genuine proletarian revolution might also occur in China, that, first, he tried winning over the Chinese intellectuals through a "thaw" called "let 100 flowers bloom" campaign. Then, when the voices of protest to his rule could be heard from all layers of the population, the youth in particular, he clamped down their protest, and ordered, instead, the so-called Great Leap Forward, which brought the country to near-famine conditions.

Outside of guerrilla warfare and "organization, organization, organization," Mao has a sheer genius for miscalculation. The 1956 Congress on state-capitalism and the 1958 Great Leap Forward disaster are not the only ones. Greater still in its world impact was the tragedy of cosmic proportion which resulted from his adventurism for a new axis of world power, as against the West, and Russia—the planned Peking-Djakarta axis.

This is not the place to go into the fall of the Indonesian Communist Party which had been following a Maoist line*. Suffice it to say here that the very collapse of any Peking-Djakarta axis seemed to have hardened Chinese Communism's concept of itself alone as the center of the universe.

It is true that this concept is not that of the old Empire, but of new Communism. But the fact remains that China's present concept of "a new era of world revolution" rests wholly on this being led solely and exclusively by Chinese Communism. It is no accident that Mao's maps of China, just as Chiang Kai-shek's, show China not as it is, but as it was in the days of great empire when China was the center of the universe.

The big power chauvinism that so disturbed Castro, obviously had no visible effect on those of Mao's Western admirers, one of whom has actually dubbed the present turmoil in China "Mao's Second Revolution."**The failure to see through Mao's global ambitions is not due to any difficulty in detecting them. On the contrary. They protrude everywhere, even in Chinese Communism's embrace of the "black power" slogan in the United States in the vain hope that sufficient chaos would result from it as to pave the way for China's leadership of this movement too.

The trouble with Mao's apologists is that they share his concept of the "backwardness" of the masses, hence the need for extra-legal organs to assure allegedly revolutionary succession. Having no confidence that the proletarians could gain freedom by their own mass strength, and

holding U.S. imperialism to be very nearly invincible, they prefer to lean on some state power.

It is this which has made them subject to the alchemy with which Mao transforms China as a nation into a proletarian class, and further expands this magic into having China "represent" all exploited minorities. And it is this that has blinded them from seeing the sinister role China is playing in the Vietnam war, and, instead, to present China as "the vanguard of the resistance to the Pax Americana." As Cuba has learned, nothing could be further from the truth.

Of course, United States imperialism is the main escalator of the Vietnam war. Of course, this is part of its strategy against China itself. Of course, it is out for world domination. But the way to undermine this barbarism is not by siding with China (or Russia) who have their own global aims.

The Negro Revolution has done more to shake up American capitalism than all the thunderous statements of China and its all-too cautious actions. To think otherwise is to play power politics and to block the road to freedom. The only way to achieve freedom is through the release of the elemental creativity of the oppressed masses, Chinese included.

**See "Mao's Second Revolution" by K. S. Karol, *New Statesman*, September 9, 1966.

Oct 1966

EDITORIAL**Shame of a Nation: White Racism**

President Johnson's premeditated murder of his own Civil Rights Bill began with his very first political junket this year. As the Nazi-led white mobs rioted against equal housing for Negroes, the tall Texan chose then to warn the civil rights movement against "violence": "all the best work will be undone." The Congress got the cue.

WHITE SUPREMACY IN CONGRESS

By the end of September, it wasn't only the Southern bigot, Senator Mendel Rivers (S.C.), who dared call U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II, "a Communist . . . an idiot" for planning to execute desegregation in schools. It was "liberal" Northerner, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, who had the gall to call the token desegregation in schools "too fast." No one went for his pretense that he was "misquoted", "that he really meant to say "desegregation of schools was not going fast enough. If anything it is too slow."

Minority Leader, Senator Dirksen, who needs no extra lessons in double-talk, took immediate advantage of the back-stepping among Democrats. Where, before this, he openly claimed credit for killing the Civil Rights Bill by opposing its so-called open-housing section, he now spoke the truth: "Where was Hubert? Where was the President? Had the Democrats in the Senate truly wished it, the bill would have passed."

Not only did neither the President nor Congress, Democrat and Republican, want the Civil Rights Bill; they wanted nothing but Uncle Toms "representing" the Negroes in Congress, and moved to "curb the powers" of Adam Clayton Powell. While many Negroes have their own disagreements with many of Powell's activities, his record "shines" in comparison to many of his fellow Congressmen — and the racism behind the action, initiated by a white Democrat from Florida, is so evident that no one can deny it.

DEPTH OF BRUTALITY

Meanwhile, the white racists reached such new depths of brutality that, from one end of the country to the other, they have proved that it is not the Negroes who are on a "rampage"—but the whites.

In Grenada, Miss., the whole world was a witness to the sight of small Negro children being mobbed and beaten by grown white men, while white mothers cheered them on. Clubbed with ax handles, chains and lead pipes, these children were forced to run the gauntlet. One 12 year old was beaten until his leg was broken, and then forced to run on it. Others were hit with rocks and cut with flying glass.

In Chicago, where Negroes and whites have been marching for open occupancy all summer long, the self-styled American Hitler, George Rockwell, called for white racists to buy guns and teach their wives and children to use them, and for a march against the Jews who were "financing" the civil rights movement. Arrested and released the same day—the usual procedure for white racists—he regretted that Hitler had killed only six million Jews in the gas chambers of Germany.

KILLER COPS SET OFF RIOTS

In Atlanta, Georgia, the phoney "racial harmony" of that "progressive" city was exposed and exploded in two separate riots within one week. The first was precipitated by the wanton shooting of a Negro "suspect" by the police, and resulted in the arrest of Stokely Carmichael on charges of "inciting" it. The police tear gassed the area viciously, shooting gas directly into homes and into the faces of people sitting on porches on side-streets.

While a large section of the Negro community did not identify their aims with Carmichael during this first riot—indeed, Julian Bond resigned as SNCC publicity director, and other Negroes asked SNCC workers to leave their neighborhood—the brutal murder of a teenage Negro, and the critical wounding of his companion several days later by a white man from a moving car, removed all doubts as to what and who "caused" the outburst that followed. From his jail cell, Carmichael sent a telling message to the mayor: "Who are you going to blame this time?"

It is telling also that Carmichael's bond was set at \$10,000, while Rockwell's was set at \$400, just as it is telling that the white brutes arrested in Mississippi for the beating of the Negro children were all released on personal bonds at once—while CORE's Chicago chairman, Robert Lucas was jailed to pay off a fine at \$5 a day, released when Rev. King's SCLC paid the sum, and then immediately rearrested on another charge.

Nor are killer-cop-caused riots restricted to the South. The latest in San Francisco was set off in precisely the same way when a cop killed a 16 year old boy fleeing from a car that was reported stolen after the boy had been shot dead.

BLACK POVERTY AND THE WHITE PRESS

The truth is what? The truth of every single so-called riot lies in absolutely impossible living conditions. Go to any black ghetto in any Northern city and you will find conditions of overcrowding, high unemployment, poverty that should remind any well-traveled liberal of the "backward, underdeveloped" countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America.

Instead of admitting this simple truth — that affluent America does not include the Negro; that "liberal" America does not want a Negro as a neighbor; that, once the Negro Revolution moved from South to North, the liberal showed both his class colors and his white racism — the press has taken off on a rhetorical lynching campaign against the "black power" slogan.

We happen to prefer "workers' power" as the right slogan to rid us of rotting capitalism. But it is the other side of Hitler's big lie — that the Jews were responsible for all ills — to claim that the "black power" slogan has, "in a few months, done more damage to a just cause than a century of inaction by Northern liberals and reaction by Southern bigots." (The Evening Star, Sept. 29, Washington, D.C.)

AX-HANDLE MADDOX WINS

The proof of this big lie is seen in Lester Maddox's victory in Georgia by a plurality of 70,000. Does the pistol brandishing ignoramus who sold ax-handles to his Klansmen customers to wield against Negroes represent only "the lunatic fringe" — or the true majority of whites?

And what about the victory of the Baltimore racist George P. Mahoney? And what about the fact that the Klu Klux Klan has experienced its biggest growth this year in the North? And what about Lyndon himself?

The fifth in the American social fabric has become so great it is there for all to see. The stench of capitalism's rottenness is there for all to smell. Any one who cannot smell the stench has lost all other senses, as well.

ITS TIME HAS COME

It will take much more than the defeat of a Civil Rights bill, however, to defeat the Negro Revolution. When a twelve year old girl, in Grenada, Miss., can tell the world through her tears that she will go to her school, if they kill her for it, it is clear that nothing will stop the movement for full freedom.

Racist politicians do not understand what a statement like this child's means. They do not understand that nothing can save this rotten society, because its time is up. And nothing can stop the idea of freedom, because its time has come.

OCTOBER, 1966

6779

China Has Missile—and Red Guard

On October 27, 1966, China successfully conducted . . . a guided missile nuclear weapon test," read the official communique. It goes without saying that the extraordinarily rapid development of missiles as well as of A-bombs should have dwarfed the significance of the appearance of the "Red Guards", with whose actions we dealt last month. (N&L, October, 1966). Nevertheless, its significance cannot be measured outside of its relationship to what does distinguish China from the other nuclear powers — the creation of the extra-legal, extra-Party, extra-Army force — the "Red Guards," and what the plenary statement mysteriously referred to as "breaking down foreign conventions."

Since all three phenomena — missiles, "Red Guards", and "breaking down foreign conventions" — distinguish this plenum from the last one they had held back in 1962, and since all are related to the Vietnam war, we must, first, of all, try to gauge the effect of these unprecedented phenomena on the war itself.

THE VIETNAM WAR

For a whole generation now, the Vietnamese people have known nothing but war. And, because of their country's geographic position in the fight between military giants out for world domination, their lives are still being put to the stake.

Enter now the "Red Guards!" The sound of their words would make one think that they are ready to make good China's umptieth (but thus far hollow) expression of "socialist solidarity." Not only that, they seem to be extending the idea of social revolution to a world scale. In truth, however, up to now, everyone involved "knew" at least that China would intervene in the war if the U.S. dared to invade North Vietnam.

Now, China's accusation of Russia's "abetting the U.S. in its scheme to force peace talks on Vietnam through bombing" is being read, with sufficient ground, as a warning, not so much to the U.S. or Russia, but rather to Hanoi itself, should it dare to engage in peace negotiations! The foundation for this fear lies in the method in which the CCP Statement handles the question, not of Vietnam, but of what it calls "breaking down foreign conventions."

"BREAKING DOWN FOREIGN CONVENTIONS"

Of the two features that set the current plenary statement off from both the 1962 statement and the 1963 challenge to Russia for leadership of the Communist world, one—the entry into the ominous exclusive world "nuclear club" — is a self-evident great achievement. Therefore there is nothing unusual to see the CCP statement raising "the success of the three nuclear tests," this "scientific experimentation," to nothing short of one of "three

great revolutionary movements" (sic). (The others are "the class struggle" and "the struggle for production.")

The other distinguishing feature of the Statement is something else again. Though it is totally new, it isn't made self-evident. On the contrary, it is so stated as to be deliberately confusing. We're referring to the expression, "breaking down foreign conventions . . ." First thing to be noted is the use of the word, foreign. It does not refer to the West, or to imperialism, or to "revisionism." What is implied in the rest of that sentence—"and following our own road of industrial development"—would appear to refer to the "Great Leap Forward". This is certainly one time that they did follow their "own road of industrial development." The truth, however, is that it is the one thing they are not following this year, but, instead, are reverting, in the initiation of their Third Five Year Plan, to a Russian-style planning.

No, the truth is, that the re-

jection of "foreign conventions" can, and does have, one meaning, and only one meaning. It is the rejection of the "other" world communist movement, specifically the 1960 Statement of the 81 Communist Parties which Mao had signed, as he had the previous (1957) "Declaration and Peace Manifesto." Heretofore China and Russia vied with each other in claiming that each, and each alone, had remained faithful to those world declarations, while the other "betrayed." Now, on the other hand, what is singled out, as proof of "Mao's brilliant policies", is "the breaking down of foreign conventions."

No doubt, the deliberate obscurity which shrouds this new, this "brilliant policy", is there to give China room for maneuverability, should it become, tactically, necessary to engage in any such united front with the other CP's.

GOING IT ALONE

But the strategic line is set, and is immovable. Just as, in 1957, when confronted with loud

voices of revolt against his rule, he moved, not to compromise with them, much less to let the "100 schools of thought" keep contending, but rather to tighten his grip and order the disastrous "Great Leap Forward", so in 1966, when confronted with silent voices of protest internationally, he is moving, not toward compromise, but to "going it alone" not only in respect to the "West" and Russia, but to the rest of the Communist world.

Thus, when Cuba balked at accepting China as the sole leader of the Communist world, Chinese Communism went directly to the Cuban Army and bombarded it with propaganda. Whereupon Castro accused China of violating its sovereignty, adding: ". . . those methods and procedures were exactly the same as the ones used by the United States Embassy in our country . . . our country had liberated itself from the imperialism 80 miles from our shores and it was not willing to permit another powerful state to come 20,000 kilometers to impose similar practices on us . . ." The rupture with Cuba came on the very eve of the convening of the Tri-Continental Conference in January, 1966, the last "foreign convention" China attended.

WHAT NOW?

What now, now that anti-Americanism is no longer the unifying cement holding together the Communist world?

How can genuine Marxists established their independence from both U.S. imperialism and the Sino-Soviet state-capitalist orbit, now split in twain? All other problems fade into insignificance before this monumental task because without it—as the souring of the Russian and Chinese Revolutions have proven—no society on humanist foundations can be created. Without it, nuclear-powered politics—whether or not also "armed with Mao's Thought"—can wreak total destruction, and nothing else. It cannot build anew. Therein lies the ominous significance of the self-created and self-perpetuating disorder in Communist China on the 17th anniversary of its conquest of power.

NOVEMBER, 1966

EDITORIAL

Manila Conclave Exposes Imperialist Shift of U.S. from Europe to Asia

Not a single truly independent large Asian nation was present at the Manila "summit." Since it was called "to contain Communist China", it goes without saying that she was not present. But neither was India nor Japan, nor Indochina, nor Pakistan. This fact, in itself, is condemnation enough of the U.S.-instigated conclave.

Nor did a single little country that is directly in the war zone but trying to stay neutral — Laos, Cambodia, Burma — attend that elite gathering. Even if it weren't true that an Asian conference without China is as representative of that continent as calling a North American conference without the presence of the U.S. would be, we still could not evade the reality that neither the large nor the small countries trying to stay out of the war attended that conference. Calling the Manila gathering a Pacific rather than Asian, as LBJ referred to it — doesn't give a serious answer to the question: what and whom did it represent?

THOSE WHO WERE THERE — PLUS AMBULANCES

Of the seven nations present, only four were Asian. In each of these, either a civil war is going on at this very moment (South Vietnam), or is in the making (Thailand), or has been put down only after a full decade of militarism (Malaya and the Philippines). As for South Korea, it took the military junta that had put down the very masses who overthrew that tyrant, Syngman Rhee, plus outright prohibition of demonstrations plus all the school children lining the streets (not to mention the "hidden" U.S. troops still there, 13 years after armistice was signed) to achieve the miracle of a ride by President Johnson that didn't bring out vigorous anti-U.S. demonstrations.

Everywhere else there were anti-war demonstrations — and the ambulances carrying away the wounded plus some dead.

Thus did the Army and police prove their democratic attitude to the people who came out to express their true feelings about the barbaric war in Vietnam, even as it took just such a white imperialist war to convince Australia and New Zealand that they were "Asians, not Europeans."

On a par with President Johnson's imperialist concerns was his vulgarly, clearest expressed when he was with the GIs in South Vietnam whom he told to "Come home with that coonskin on the wall." This white Texas joke was delivered a few hours after he signed the Manila communique which proclaimed that not only did the "7 equals" yearn for peace, but they were also bent on nothing short than the miraculous reconstruction of the old order, toward which end they would "forge a social revolution even as the conflict continues."

Farcical as talk of "social revolution" sounds on the lips of the lying Texan, this is no time for laughter. It is true, of course, that the unrepresentative character of the conference stamps it as a fiasco. It is also true that the conceit of Big Brother (who wouldn't be believed if he told any one in Asia the time of day) is unbounded when he dares to ask Asia to believe that he would withdraw the U.S. troops. And it is most certainly true that this was no peace conference, but one for the extension of war.

But that is precisely why there is nothing amusing about the Conclave. The extension of war may not, in and by itself, refer to the Vietnam war. Though not likely, that may be "negotiated", and still not change the fact that the plans elaborated at Manila laid the foundation for Pacific war, for Asian war, for fighting ideas with military weapons.

THE MANY FACES OF LBJ

On Sept. 22, UN Ambassador Goldberg spoke of peace as "phased withdrawal" of the U.S. troops from South Vietnam as well as readiness to negotiate with all parties. The implication was that this includes the National Liberation Front since it, after all, still controls the greater part of South Vietnam.

Unfortunately, (or, fortunately, depending on whether Johnson wanted to show two of his faces on one and the same day) Defense Secretary McNamara chose then to announce a 30 per cent increase in warplanes production as of next July; (2) an increase in U.S. forces in Vietnam from the already phenomenal 350,000 to somewhere between 400,000 and 425,000; and (3) that Congress would be asked, after the November elections, for a "supplemental" appropriation of between \$10 to \$12 billion dollars.

NOVEMBER, 1966

In deference to the alleged peace aims of the Manila Conference, the President left his Defense Secretary at home when he embarked on his Asian tour. On the other hand, he brought with him still another puppet, General Ky. It may be that for the few moments that it took to sign the Manila communique, Ky made the proper peace noises. After all, it shouldn't be too hard for that admirer of Hitler to say "peace" and mean "unconditional surrender."

And that is indeed precisely what the seven meant when they told North Vietnam, against whom no one has declared war, that it has to withdraw from South Vietnam and some six months after, there would first begin a phased withdrawal of United States troops. In any case, Ky no sooner returned to South Vietnam than he repeated his standard formula — "No! Never with the Communists!"—when he means in fact, "No, never with the Buddhists! Above all, No, never with the people!"

The tone for Ky's pronouncements had been set by none other than "Number 7"—the Texan himself—who proclaimed: "If anyone doubts the basis of our commitment, they will find that we have more troops in Vietnam than there are words in Webster's New Dictionary." Since no one doubted the "commitment"—and four faces are quite enough for even Big Brother — it would have appeared that the purposes of the Asian tour had been exhausted.

But, no, LBJ came not to talk with "six equals" — but to tell all other Asian nations not there that this pilgrimage east wasn't his first out of office by any accident. Rather, it involved a historic shift of imperialist interest, from West to East, and the Orient better listen to this nuclear titan.

The occasion to tell Asia just how carefully it must listen to U.S. imperialism arose when Mao's China chose that moment to detonate an A-bomb, missile-carried. Big Brother at once offered one and all his nuclear umbrella, and they did then prick up their ears.

THE ELECTIONS AND AFTER

The first words out of LBJ's mouth upon landing in Washington, D.C., demanded "unity." Unity for what? For actual nuclear war?

The next day the President announced that he will not elector. That is to say, he refused to submit his Vietnam policy, at last elaborated in Manila, to the test.

And, finally and frantically, he called Defense Secretary McNamara down to his Texas ranch to have him, of all people, announce a "cutback in the draft call." That no one believed either of them was all too clear on election day when the people, wherever they could, rejected LBJ's party and its policies. Since, however, they had little enough to choose from between Democrats and Republicans, the vote is clear only in its rejection of what is, not in what it should be.

Here, the more important, though nowhere as massive, portent were the days of protest, November 5 to 8, of demonstrations and teach-ins that greeted him upon his return even as they greeted him throughout his Asian tour, and throughout Western Europe where he has not yet dared set foot, although he is now three years in office.

The protests too must face reality for it is only now that the elections are over that the Johnson Administration will put its cards on the table both as to the callup of men and the digging for taxes and real cutback in poverty program that never did get off the ground. It has been estimated that the so-called foreign aid (read: military expansion to establish the U.S. as THE Pacific power) would cost nothing short of a trillion dollars, thus \$1,000,000,000,000!

Therefore, of the essence for the second America, the America of anti-war protestors, of the Negro Revolution, of rank and file labor, of youth resistance to going to Vietnam, is to expand its protests, to make its actions effective, to act not only in solidarity with the anti-war fighters abroad, but also to clear us of allies that would play the same game as U.S. imperialism — Russia and/or China. For it is only when we speak for a genuine social revolution, and speak of it on a world scale, that we will be able to displace the madmen who now rule the world and are ready to thrust all of humanity into a nuclear holocaust. — Raya Dunayevskaya

JANUARY, 1967

'Black Power', Race and Class

(Ed. Note: Several readers who are active in the civil rights movement have requested that we print the following excerpt from the "Perspectives Report" given to News & Letters Committees at our Convention in September 1966. The full report is available for 35c from News & Letters, 8751 Grand River, Det. Mich. 48204.)

At the present crucial moment of world history, when the third world of underdeveloped countries has become the bone of contention, not only between "East" and "West," but also within the so-called East, the Sino-Soviet orbit, it is imperative that the Negro maintain his independence from any state power, and its ideas. Presently, many of these have jumped on the bandwagon of the "black power" slogan. It therefore must be closely examined.

The SNCC statement, which evidently SNCC had been discussing for months before its publication by others, is not outside of a certain philosophic framework, certain principled tenants. In turning to these, we, of course, take the statement at its face value when it declares: "These views should not be equated with outside influence or outside agitation but should be viewed as the natural process of growth and development within a movement; so that the move by the black militants and SNCC in this direction should be viewed as a turn toward self-determination." (New York Times 8/5/66).

At the same time, however, we know that ideas have a history of their own, and a logic of their own, and we must follow each to its logical, bitter end, including all its historic ramifications, not the least of which, both for past and present, is the inter-relationship between class and race.

RACE AND CLASS

There is no such supra-historical abstraction as racism. In each historical period it was something different. It was one thing during slavery, another during Reconstruction, and quite something else today.

To maintain, as the new SNCC statement and its new chairman, Stokely Carmichael, do, that there is something called a "white psyche" and that this "white psyche" is but the reverse side of the same coin which standard bourgeois white textbooks maintain: that it is not the exploitative class that is keeping the Negro down, but that it is due to some sort of "stigma of slavery." That, naturally, was not the intent of the SNCC statement, but ideas have a logic of their own.

To further insist that "whatever their political persuasion," "all whites" are "part of the collective white America," so that the U.S. has "180 million racists" is to blur the class line which cuts across the race divisions as well as to muffle the philosophy of total freedom which has created a second America. In this, the Negro has played a vanguard role and it is this role we must save from the SNCC statement which means to separate "all blacks" from "all whites"—and thus ends up by flying in the face of how the Negro shaped the course of the second America.

The truth is this. Despite the ruling Bourbon South's economic power with its Simon Legrees, despite its political power in the halls of Congress ruling the North, despite their "fear complex" (I know nothing of any "guilt complex"; none of them had sufficient of that to do anything about it—but regarding their fear of Negro revolt they did plenty in the South, in the North, in Congress, and in the Supreme Court)—despite ALL these powers, the Bourbon South not only failed to brainwash all the people, but a very important section was inspired by the slave revolts, just those slave revolts which SNCC thinks all feared, to organize the most remarkable organization this country had ever seen. I am referring, of course, to the Abolitionists.

NEGRO AND WHITE UNITY—1830-65

It was no coincidence that in 1831, the year of the greatest slave revolt, Nat Turner's, a white New England Abolitionist, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, founded the Liberator.

It was no accident that the Negro runaway slaves, the white Abolitionists and Negro freedmen gathered together, determined to resolve the problem of slavery, not by founding a colony abroad, but right here at home.

And it was neither accidental nor a mean achievement that these males had a different view of voteless women than that which was then prevalent, and the suffragette movement also arose out of this most remarkable organization of uncompromising freedom fighters that predated the origin of Bolshevism by 80 years.

Nor was it "an overnight affair." It lasted for three long decades, until they impelled the Civil War, and during all those 30 years, in slave-ridden America, these remarkable individuals practiced these human relations that they espoused for the country as a whole. So that when, finally, the paths of the Abolitionists and Karl Marx crossed, the affinity of his ideas and theirs should have revealed how indigenous, how deep were the American roots of Marxism.

It is peculiar, indeed, that this page of history, so carefully hidden from all standard white textbooks which, at best, treat the Abolitionists as a tiny group of "fanatics" with no influence on the course of American history, should also have been skipped over by Carmichael because it doesn't fit into his conception that all whites have the same "psyche." This does no harm to history because it has been lived.

It does a great deal of harm, however, to the SNCC philosophy which has thereby deprived itself of the awareness of the duality of historic development, of the dialectic methodology which is born out of these contradictions, and which had led Marx to see men's development as the development of various stages of freedom. This is the methodology which enabled Marx to make pivotal to his philosophy the vision that, just as man develops through contradiction, so his "quest for universality" is most intense when people are most degraded.

Either SNCC has not the slightest conception of this world view of history. Or they deliberately disregarded it, to continue with the logic of their first false premise, that "all whites" have one "psyche" and "all blacks" another, and if ever the twain meet, it is always to the end that the whites interfere with or pervert the Negro's self-organization.

PERVERTED PHILOSOPHY PERVERTS MOVEMENT

It is to that end that Stokely Carmichael, instead, singled out the organization of the Niagara movement, which he says was all black and great, until it was "perverted" by whites and merged into the then new NAACP. Whatever the white liberal did in changing the direction of the Niagara movement as it became the NAACP, this was not grounded in either their whiteness or their liberalism.

Rather, it had its origin in the thesis of Du Bois himself; in his concept that each nation, each race has its own "talented tenth," and that this elite "brings" freedom to the mass. With such an underlying philosophy, the Niagara movement couldn't possibly get a mass following, no matter how militant it was in its demands for full equality as against Booker T. Washington's philosophy of "Cast down your bucket wherever you are."

It is true that by then (the turn of the century) racism had become rampant, North and South, for, with America's plunge into imperialism in 1898, the other great pages in American history of black and white solidarity, including the greatest page within the South's development—Populism—were fully expunged. It is true, also, that the only rational voice came from the Negro. It isn't true, however, that the failure of these movements to become mass movements was due to the whites "taking over" the NAACP.

As against Carmichael's rewrite, here is how one of the leaders of the Niagara movement summed up this failure: "... their cause was just, their motives pure, their goals noble and practical; but they were perhaps too far removed from the masses to inspire them to action—too conscious of their own privileged position as a black elite..." (Henry Lee Moon, Balance of Power, p. 848)

Now, despite the fact that the word, black, and not the word, white, precedes the word, elite, this is a class concept, a thoroughly bourgeois class concept, and it led to the isolation, self-imposed isolation of the black intellectual, from the Negro masses, and therefore from their self-organization.

HOW CLASS SHOWS THROUGH

The only time this wasn't true, and Negroes by the millions organized themselves and put an end to the myth that the Negro couldn't be organized (and this was 1920, not 1966) to fight for his freedom in an all-black organization, was the Garvey movement. The interference it ran into was from the black "talented tenth." The most prominent of these, and the one who appealed to the white power structure, particularly the Justice Department, to deport Garvey was—Du Bois!

Now Du Bois was a great historian, one of the greatest this country has ever had, white or Negro, and the only one who has made a great contribution to the true history of Black Reconstruction. Unfortunately, however, his class (petty-bourgeois) character always showed.

This was so when he organized an all-black movement, and retreated. It was so when the West Indian, Marcus Garvey, organized an all-black mass movement, and Du Bois attacked him. It was so when Du Bois fought against the Marxists. And it remained true when, in his old age, he joined the Communist Party and followed their African line.

The point here is that, just as Du Bois showed his class character in this country, so did he show it on the world scene, especially in Africa. For while he appealed to still another white power structure—the United Nations—to give Africa limited freedom, the African masses arose spontaneously and changed the whole map of the world in less than a decade.

The point is that Du Bois moved to Ghana after it became independent, that is to say, only when state power was won. The point is that, as with all intelligentsia, so with the Negro, there has always been a separation between the elite and the mass.

NEGRO AND WHITE UNITY—1930s AND NOW

This was so not only as they organized themselves in nationalist movements, but when they organized themselves, with white labor, to reorganize the whole industrial face of the nation through the CIO. Considering George S. Schuyler's present reactionary stance, it is important to see how differently he spoke under the impact of the CIO, as he lashed out against the established Negro leaders in 1937: "Nowhere were the 'educated' classes cooperating with the unions to aid the work of organization, save in a few notable instances and there only by one or two individuals . . . Their desertion of the struggling Negro workers in this crisis constitutes one of the most shameful chapters in our recent history. The new position Negro labor has won in the past year has been gained in spite of the old leadership. It has been won with new leadership; militant young men and women from the ranks of labor and grizzled black veterans of the pick and shovel and the blast furnace." (Crisis, Nov. 1937)

You cannot reverse history. This integration into labor having been achieved, the ones who will save the CIO from its degeneration, as we can see by the new formation of Negro caucuses for upgrading, for the end of lily-white departments, against the bureaucracy in general, are the workers. It will not be achieved by those who disregard the integration, and themselves use college-type vocabulary, completely devoid of any sense of class struggle. The great German philosopher, G. W. F. Hegel, had a phrase for this type of thinking. He called it "self-determination applied externally." That is, from above, not as it emerged from internal self-development.

The Negro Revolution of the 1960's that emerged from below was for integration, not because of interference by the whites, but because it arose spontaneously from black youth who wanted it. The Muslims were completely external to this movement, outside of it. Indeed, to get back into the mainstream of the black revolution, Malcolm X found he had to break from Elijah Muhammad.

The development of SNCC to greater militancy, of necessity, had to involve a break from white liberals—a break both from their money and their policies, it is true. But the emphasis, if this is what SNCC meant to do, should have been on the "liberalism" they opposed. Instead the emphasis was put on "all whites," as a generalization, including even those who had given their very lives for the movement.

And the trouble with generalizations is that they very often sow only confusion, because each one reads into it his specific interpretation, which may not be what you intended at all. There is no way to avoid confusion except by being specific instead of general.

EDITORIAL**Resurgence of Nazism?**

The recent West German elections, which produced a 7.4 per cent vote for the neo-Nazi National Democratic Party, in two states, has brought fear of the possible resurgence of Nazism. There were strikes and youth demonstrations in West Germany against this showing, but it is not this that the Western press played up half as much as they tried playing down the significance of the neo-Nazi vote by stressing that, "after all", the NDP got only eight deputies out of 96 into the state parliament in Hesse, and 15 out of 204 seats in the state parliament in Bavaria.

As if there were much difference in outlook between these NDP deputies in Bavaria and the Christian Democrat Franz Joseph Straus, who played a key role in the Christian Democrats electing the former Nazi, Kurt Kiesinger, as Chancellor!

Here, too, the whitewash machines were put to work, referring to Kiesinger's Nazi past as an "unfortunate decision" back in the 1930's to join the Nazi Party, which he supposedly left at the very height of World War II.

The worst development of all however, was the decision of the power-hungry Social Democrats to form a coalition with the Christian Democrats at this critical moment of the latter's disintegration.

It is true that the Social Democrats have long since rejected any relationship to Marxism. Nevertheless, some of the youth had nowhere else to go to show their opposition to the ruling party. The same was true of the new intelligentsia, some of whom are now resigning from the Social Democrats. For the former anti-Nazi fighter, Willy Brandt, to become vice-Chancellor to the former Nazi, Chancellor Kiesinger, is an unholy alliance which can only help the reaction, in and out of Germany.

Where the totalitarian regime of East Germany needed to erect a wall to keep its workers from escaping, so the government, born out of the massive retaliatory policy of the Dulles-Adenauer era, needs this coalition to keep a genuine left opposition among the workers and youth in West Germany from developing sufficient force for its overthrow.

THE U.S. ROLE

The irony in the fall of the Erhard regime and the rise of Kiesinger, who seeks to revive the Franco-German axis, is that its immediate cause was U.S. insistence on the continued buying by West Germany of U.S. armaments. Supposedly, this was to pay for the maintenance of U.S. troops in Germany.

Since this money goes, not to the U.S. government, but to private munition manufacturers, this, at best, is a very, very indirect way of doing this. What is more important is that it is thus aiding in the rearmament of West Germany — which even West Germany thinks is excessive. As one German official in Washington put it: "We have bought so much U.S. military equipment that we now have a machine gun on every desk."

Unfortunately, this doesn't mean that they wouldn't like to get their hands on the nuclear trigger; but at the moment even the staunchest, capitalist allies of U.S. imperialism in the West fear that U.S. imperialist involvement in Vietnam means that, in U.S. eyes, the key to the world situation has shifted from Europe to the Orient.

WORLD CAPITALISM, WEST AND EAST

The rise of the neo-Nazi party this year is symptomatic of more than a possible resurgence of Nazism in Germany. It is the reminder of the degeneracy of world capitalism, which has solved not a single fundamental problem since the World Depression first gave birth to Nazism. Its possible resurgence at a time of affluence shows that the disorging of Nazism was not only an economic fact of life. Just as the world economic crisis did not "end" till World War II was in full swing, so the political crisis did not end with the coming of peace. Peace came only because all contestants were exhausted. So they put markers for their next engagement: two Germanies, two Koreas, and in the 1950's, two Vietnams.

DeGaulle France, loudly protests U.S. imperialism's role in Vietnam, but considers its own colonial war there, which brought about this division of Vietnam, as "just." In the same way it tries to replace U.S. imperialism's role in Europe in general and in Germany in particular. Hence, the Franco-German axis, which, thus far, has been a stillbirth. And now that it has developed its own nuclear bomb, DeGaulle France thinks there is still room for a "third power" that is not proletarian but French chauvinist.

By no accident DeGaulle France is likewise experiencing a new anti-Semitic trend. Latest polls show that 20 per cent of the French population is anti-Semitic. How can one look to this type of anti-Americanism as a way out of the world crisis?

Just as the biggest blow to the development of a West German working class opposition to the ruling Christian Democrats was achieved by the Social Democrats joining them in coalition, so the biggest blow to the new emergent anti-capitalist forces throughout the world would be dealt by any who would choose sides with one imperialism against the other as the "lesser evil," be that DeGaulle France or Brezhnev's Russia.

The idea that, since unification of Germany was not achieved by being "on the side of" the United States, perhaps it can be achieved through flirtations with Russia, is the biggest illusion of all. Unification of Germany will never be achieved so long as capitalism, private or state, exists and gains from this division.

A NEW BEGINNING

A new beginning in West Germany must start with the workers fighting against capitalistic conditions of labor; with the youth demonstrating against Nazism, fighting against the status quo on all fronts from education to war, and beginning to revolt in the Free University of West Berlin. The intellectuals who have broken with the Social Democrats must join with the workers and the youth and work for the establishment of new forms of organization.

The model for any new Left in Germany is neither the East German single-party system or the "two party" system in the U.S. but the actual movement for freedom, whether that be the East German rising of 1953 or the Freedom Now Movement in the U.S. since 1960. Whether it be the Negro movement, the student revolts, or the anti-war demonstrations, these new forms of organization are tied closely to the actual movements for freedom, and in that alone lies also the hope that there will be no Nazi resurgence in West Germany.

The times when each opposition movement could work only in its own country are gone. Our one world demands a world movement for freedom, with a show of international solidarity being but the first step towards such a world development.

JANUARY, 1967

6784

Editorial Article

Is China Preparing for 'A Great Leap Forward' or for World War III?

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman National Editorial Board

Suddenly, Mao Tse-tung (heretofore famous for his declaration that "US imperialism is a paper tiger") has preoccupied himself with transforming a real paper tiger — "a handful" of anti-Maoists — into so overpowering a force that it has (1) caused "a state of civil war" in China, (2) influenced Army units "to disobey Mao's seize control committees" in a province no less crucial, and closest to the borders of Russia than Sinkiang, where China's nuclear testing ground is located, and (3) had Lin's Army paper proclaim

that, since the "pro-Mao forces may, temporarily, be in a minority", the Army itself must answer these "reactionary power holders with the gun."

REVOLUTION OR COUNTER-REVOLUTION?

What are we to make out of this welter of fantastic reports, issued, moreover, not by the alleged opponents of Mao, but the Mao faction itself which, though "temporarily in a minority", nevertheless controls all mass media — newspapers, radios, telegraphs, magazines, posters — and speech itself?

Can such a history-transforming act as a civil war be without voice? It would be easy to dismiss stories of victories against "enemies" we didn't even know Mao had, of reconquest of regions we didn't know he had lost, by declaring them to be sheer madness or sheer pretense. But if civil war exists only in Mao's fertile imagination, what is its purpose? If it exists in fact, where are the real forces of social revolution — the proletariat, the peasantry, the youth who have not been anointed as "Red Guards"? Who, then, except Mao himself, has "taken the road back to capitalism"?

To transform the "great cultural socialist revolution" into a felfish, a secret signal for world revolution, as some radicals are attempting to do, is but the other side of the unctuous attitude of bourgeois journalists who are trying to reduce epoch-making events to a question of "Mao's paranoia."

The developments in China have a logic of their own and it is this we must try to discern. To counter the weight of one-sided news, let's begin with verifiable events — places, dates, human forces that can be tested against objective world developments. Such a date, obviously, is the period — from November 1965 to May 1966 — when Mao was out of public sight. Far from having been totally ill, as the bourgeois press then reported, it now turns out that he was then preparing the "cultural revolution" to which the country is now being subjected. The year, 1965, interests

us especially since it helps illuminate not only Mao's disappearance but also three world developments.

RUSSIA, THE VIETNAM WAR AND THE INDONESIAN COUP

The first of these developments was Russia's attempt, following Khrushchev's fall in October 1964, to work out a new modus vivendi with China. The second is the new escalation by U.S. imperialism of the Vietnam war by wantonly bombing North Vietnam. Since this coincided with Kosygin's presence in Hanoi, after which he left for a meeting in Peking, it was expected that joint aid to North Vietnam would be worked out by the two Communist giants.

Instead, we were witness to just how far China had moved from the ideological conflict that had reached its climax in the 1963 challenge to Russia for leadership of the Communist world. By 1965 it wasn't only the Communist world Mao wished to head; he was busy plotting with Sukarno a new power axis with global aims. During all this time the "helmsman" was at the ship of state. The direction didn't change even when in October, 1965, the Djakarta-Peking axis collapsed under the impact of a grisly military coup in Indonesia.

And yet the sequence of events does more than place the Mao-Liu conflict in its proper world context. By eliminating the world-shaking events as cause for internal conflict, we can now pinpoint what did become the internal point of division. It is "the great proletarian cultural revolution," which then lacked the adjective, proletarian.

POINT OF DIVISION

The Peking Review claims that the "cultural revolution" had originated in September, 1965. It is obvious, however, that this is not what is going on now. Then, it was limited to a mild purge in the opera, theatre and literary and art fields, and was played in so low a key that the outside world barely heard of it. The point is that in October (November?) this is what Mao proposed to change.

Despite the new anti-Russian stance which meant that the fight against "revisionism" was placed parallel to the fight against U.S. imperialism at the very time when the Vietnam war called for united action, and despite the Indonesian coup, Mao was proposing an extension of the so-called cultural revolution into all walks of life. The Politburo (or whatever section of the Maoist bureaucracy makes all the decisions) balked at the proposal for Maoisation of the whole national life in circumstances when they thought it imperative to build up the economy and were preparing, finally, to initiate the third Five-Year Plan. A peaceful co-existence with its own masses, if possible, was preferred to new purges.

Liu Shao-chi, since 1959 Chairman of the People's Republic of China, who is now played up as "the person in authority taking the capitalist road" could not have been able to block the on-stage movement of Mao's "revolution" that has already begun. Judging by the fact that Liu En-lai is still trying to keep the so-called Revolution away from production, he has not yet resisted Mao's "revolution" to the deepening world crisis. And judging by the conflicting powers on his status, Chou may very well be next singled out for purge after he has served as the buffer between. But the power struggle within the Communist Party hierarchy is not what is important if it is only a power struggle.

What is important is the objective point of division: the attitude toward labor and production. There is no point of division between the Communist bureaucrats on the fact that labor must work "and work harder." The new in Mao's brand of counter-revolution is that he is trying to fashion an instrument, other than the Communist Party, to drive the masses as they had been driven during the primitive accumulation of capital. He knows moreover, that he has not the advantage of Stalin who still could transform the world's Communist Parties into mere outposts for defense of "socialism in one country." The im-

(cont'd)

pulse to Mao's "madness" is that he has lost all confidence in the world proletariat.

THE NEW IN MAO'S STATE-CAPITALISM:

1) The Institutionalization of the Red Guards

Contrary to the bourgeois press, it isn't nostalgia of an aging revolutionary for "pure" revolution. Like every other fundamental mental attitude, Mao's voluntarism has an objective base, or, perhaps, we should say is produced by lack of a material base that is human. That is to say, the masses are not with Mao, not because he is out for "pure" revolution, but because he is under the delusion that, once "armed with Mao's Thought," the masses will accept regimentation and militarisation as "socialism." Therefore Mao must create shock troops under the further delusion that thereby "20 years equal 1 day" and China becomes the dominant world power.

Contrary to the Mao apologists, revolutions cannot be made from above. They either well up from below in spontaneous outburst, or they are the palace kind that affect no one but "power holders." Hence, the workers didn't rush to join the "Red Guards" and give that bastard creation proletarian legitimacy. Hence, the peasants didn't take the shock troops into their midst and thus create a genuine mass base for state-capitalist purposes.

Nothing, however, stops Mao from reaching for "the Absolute like a shot out of a pistol," to use a Hegelian phrase. Or, to translate it into pure Maoism, basing himself totally on the concept, "Power comes out of the barrel of a gun." Hence, he disbanded the National Trade Unions, though they had little enough independence in the "old" state-capitalist regime of the Communist Party. Hence, the discontinuance of the Young Communist League, or any youth not anointed by him. Hence, the move to institutionalize the "Red Guards" who are totally rootless, know no world beyond China, and owe loyalty to none but Mao.

Mao thinks that thereby he assures their culture to be neither Confucian nor Communist, but "purely"—without any mediation—and totally Maoist. No more Chou Yangs who, though he was Mao's chief propagandist for 20 years, nevertheless knew Russian literature and had even translated Tolstoy, which, no doubt, led him to use only 70 tons of paper for Mao's works while 7,500 tons were used to reprint ancient Chinese classics. With 30 million copies of "Mao's Thought" being brandished by "Red Guards," Mao bargains, not merely to "assure" himself "immortality," but to lay the new foundations for a society in which people are born, live and die by "Mao's Thought," fearing no nuclear holocaust.

The August rhetoric of the Plenum statement — "to dare to break paths unexplored by people before, and scale unclimbed heights" — is being dismantled by the stark winter acts of institutionalizing the shock treatment of the "Red Guards," "Red Rebels" will replace trade unions. All other organizations—from the youth to women and from the peasantry to the arts—will undergo the same "reorganization," perhaps ending in some sort of national congress either to replace the Communist Party itself, or as parallel to it. Through such shock treatment the Chinese masses are supposed "to learn how to make revolution by making it," not, however, without the Army standing by and ready to complete the job of stifling all opposition. And instead of calling this by its rightful name of counter-revolution, they dare call this "pure revolution"!

2) War — With Whom?

Presently, it is claimed (in a New Year's editorial published simultaneously in the People's Daily, and the Red Flag) that not only had "persons in authority" opposed the creation of the Red Guards but had "clamped down on different views . . . practiced white terror." Moreover, according to the "red" terror posters, this didn't start in 1966, but dates back to 1959 when Mao was "forced" to step down from the presidency of the republic.

That, again, is a verifiable date that not only marks the period when Liu Shao-chi became Chairman of the People's Republic of China, but, what is far more important, marks the official retreat from the disastrous "Great Leap Forward" which Mao had initiated in 1958. And it is also the beginning of the break with Russia as well as the first reorganization of the People's Liberation Army. This ended in the removal of its head, P'eng Te-huai, who was supposed to have leaned toward Russia. Lin Piao took his place and has so reorganized the army that now every one else is supposed to learn from his great achievements in infusing it with "Mao's Thought." The slogan now is: "Everyman a soldier." In a word, labor and production bend to militarisation. Obviously, Mao has never considered his "Great Leap Forward" a mistake and is ready to embark on another one.

Or is Mao readying the country for war? And if so, with whom?

There is no doubt whatever that fighting a war is Mao's outstanding achievement. Not only does he know the problem a great deal more thoroughly, theoretically and practically, than ever he knew Marxism. But on guerilla warfare he is a true "original", a genius. The trouble is that the problem he has set for himself presently is not that of a guerilla war against

an obvious enemy—a corrupt ruling class, an imperialist occupying power—but China's Communist counterpart, Soviet Russia.

Toward that end it is not beneath him to engage in little provocations to try to cause a break on an even purely diplomatic level, with Russia. For weeks now, a marathon demonstration around the Soviet Embassy in Peking has been in progress over an alleged scuffle in Moscow between Chinese students who wanted to lay a wreath at Lenin's tomb and the Russian police.

"Shoot Brezhnev! Burn Kosygin!" read the posters of some million Red Guards, backed up by the Army. It is all part of the process of "hardening" the Chinese people's attitude toward Russia. Mao doesn't think the price of some self-created havoc in China itself is too high as part of the preparation for a possible confrontation between these two Communist giants.

Where, in everyone else's mind, the real war is the one that is actually taking place in Vietnam, to Mao "the real enemy is Russian revisionism." Or, more truthfully put, the real enemy is Russian geography, its being there so close to China, with great chunks of it having once been part of Imperial China!

Where everyone, including the Communist Parties who lined up with him in the Sino-Soviet conflict when it was "ideological," is demanding unified action for the country under attack by U.S. imperialism, Mao not only makes "fighting Russian revisionism" a prerequisite to fighting United States imperialism, he considers the Vietnamese people themselves expendable. Far from concerning himself with the Vietnam war and how to help end American occupation of Vietnam, he is preoccupied with Russia.

A "PREVENTIVE" CIVIL WAR?

As we see, Mao's impatience with State Plans, his voluntarism, is neither paranoid, nor of merely passing interest. It is rooted in the non-viability of state-capitalism he calls communism.

No ruling class has ever voluntarily given up power just because it outlived its usefulness. Mao attempts to prolong his rule, first, by expanding beyond his borders, and then creating a new, an anti-Soviet international, to do for him what Stalin had the Comintern do for Russia — transform the world's Communist Parties into outposts for his foreign policy.

The theoretic substitute for the bankrupt policy of "socialism in one country" was the declaration that the new, third world had become "the real storm centers of world revolution", and

6786

(cont'd)

6 7 8 7

that, therefore, all must be ready to sacrifice everything to realize this "new era of world revolution." The policy may have worked if Mao hadn't so early been called to practice what it preached.

Once U.S. imperialism chose to make its stand in Vietnam, Vietnam, rather than China, at once became the testing ground of all revolutionaries. Under those circumstances to refuse united action with Russia for Vietnam at once exposed China's national interests as the predominant ones.

Mao grew impatient also with the Chinese leaders for failing to recognize that the first necessity to prepare for a war outside was to cow the nation inside. In turn, he failed to recognize that their resistance to purges did, in fact, reflect the feeling of the Chinese people, rather than just themselves as "those in power taking the road to capitalism."

When the Sino-Soviet conflict was still conducted on an ideological plane, we already raised the question: "Can there be war between Russia and China, two states calling themselves Communist?"* What sounded "wild"

in 1963 is being handled in 1967 as if it were already a fact. These commentators show they understand as little today as they did four years back when they disregarded our analysis. For Mao is not about to give up the pretense of proletarian revolution which brought him into power. As is clear from his latest (Feb. 2) accusations against the anti-Maoists — that behind them stands the "combined power of Russian-United States-Japanese imperialism" — Mao means to play the role of self-appointed "leader of the world revolution."

In the West, too, there are self-styled "revolutionaries" who are ready to forgive Mao every crime in the book (and leave a few blank pages for those he might invent) on the ground that, since U.S. imperialism is the chief enemy of world revolution, "therefore" Mao must be supported at all costs; supposedly he alone will fight the main enemy "all the way." Their ignorance of the fundamental class divisions within each country, China included, is here matched by the violence in a logic which attempts to identify those opposites, war and revolution.

*See "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung" in MARXISM AND FREEDOM, p. 316.

Even at this late stage in the disclosure of Mao's ideological nakedness, it naturally cannot be excluded that these Mao apologists will continue to genuflect before "Mao's Thought." Thereby they only reveal how very much a part of their own organism is the state-capitalist mentality that is constantly looking for solutions to capitalist crises everywhere except where alone they can be resolved, by proletarian revolution.

The concept of the backwardness of the proletariat is so deeply ingrained in them that they cannot conceive of the workers doing without a "Great Helmsman" like Mao, who is the very one who is pressing down upon the Chinese masses with all the power of the state, the military, and the suffocating deification of himself. Instead, they are ready to accept anything, anything at all, including what can only be called "preventive" civil war.

BEGINNING OF THE END

In trying to stop the civil war before it ever started, Mao has, in fact, sealed his own fate. This has nothing whatever to do with whether he comes out loser or winner in the current struggle he himself unleashed. Once having done so, he has laid bare the divisions within the ruling state-capitalist bureaucracy and thereby created an opening toward genuine proletarian revolution.

It is but a faint glimmer, the mass resistance to Mao's "leaps" and war schemes, but it is there. The end of the opening is nowhere in sight. But it is the beginning of the end of Chinese state-capitalism. The Chinese masses, and they alone, can end the present tragic conditions in China, and open a road, not to war, but to revolution.

Naturally, the American press is delighted at the disastrous turn of events in China. Suddenly it has likewise become the source of a steady stream of rumours about possible peace in Vietnam. Like Mao and Chen Po-ta who heads his cultural revolution, so Rusk and McNamara who head "defense" think that they can now bear down even heavier on the Vietnamese people. It is now that these rulers must be watched like hawks and not permitted to occupy Vietnam, nor to saddle it with a native military junta. American presence is not needed. And neither is Chinese.

6 7 8 8
FEBRUARY, 1967

Youth, Philosophy and Revolution

Ed. Note: This review was written for and appeared in the Fall 1966 issue of *The Activist*, student journal published at Oberlin College.

The Revolutionary Internationals, 1864-1913, Edited by Milroad M. Drachkovitch, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford, Calif. \$6.95.

The sin of sins, in the eyes of the editor of the volume under review, is to be young. It seems that to be young—whether you are a socialist or not, but “especially Socialist youth”—is almost a sure guarantee that you will take the primrose path leading straight to Bolshevism.

All this, and more, the reader will learn from Professor Milroad M. Drachkovitch, who, this time as author, (in collaboration with Branco Lazitch) assures him that the world enthusiasm generated by the birth of the Communist International in 1919 was all “a historical misunderstanding,” based on “emotional rather than ideological grounds.” (p.161) These emotions made non-Communists “oblivious of the fact that . . . civil war and revolutionary warfare were integral parts of Bolshevik strategy.” (p.162) Which is, no doubt, why they were “drawn to Bolshevism by the prestige of the only successful revolution.” (p.161)

(Dear readers, disregard any contradictions; better is yet to come.) We are informed that, where these non-Communists—from pacifists to anarchists and from syndicalists to socialists as well as some real innocents—weren't “ignorant,” or didn't come either from “backward countries” or “the most backward parts” or “politically underdeveloped regions” of a country, yet nevertheless showed their “political immaturity” (p.163) by succumbing to “the fascination of revolutionary power.” (p.160) To emphasize just how “attractive” had been “the Bolsheviks' activism” (“especially true of Socialist youth” p.162), the authors conclude ponderously and, though with hindsight, use the tone of prophecy: “It was no accident that the overwhelming majority of Communist leaders in the period between 1919 and 1921 were under thirty years of age, and many of them under twenty-five.”

LEST ANY readers despair that, being younger than even 25, they are beyond redemption, let me hasten to inform them that the venerable Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, is all too eager to save “both the layman and the professional historian.” In the Preface, the editor assured us that the aim in presenting these papers from a conference on the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the First International was to introduce one and all “to new facets of an extremely complex phenomenon.” So there is nothing to fear. Just how comparative these “comparative historic studies” are can be gleaned from the insensitive dragging in of a tragedy of historic proportion just to get a whack at Lenin: “With respect to the German Communists whose leaders opposed the creation of the Third International as premature, Lenin enjoyed a great stroke of political good luck (!) in the assassination by a ‘class enemy’ (1) in 1919 of Rosa Luxemburg and Leo Jogiches.” (p.161)

Having taken up five and one-half pages for this type of mood setting, the reader has a right to expect that Professors Drachkovitch and Lazitch should be ready to get down to the facts of the case. It turns out, however, that the section, “The Shaping of the Comintern,” begins, not with a discussion either of the first Congress of the Comintern, or the Russian Revolution which created its foundation, but by a return back to 1902: “The events of October 1917 in Russia,” they write as if they had just finished interviewing Lenin, “confirmed Lenin in the correctness of his 1902 view, set forth in *What Is To Be Done?*, that spontaneity was the main enemy of the working-class movement . . .” (p.164)

IT WOULD be hard to find anywhere more errors compressed into one-half of one sentence. (2) First of all, Lenin had never said, written, or thought that “spontaneity was the main enemy of the working-class movement”—not in 1902, not in 1905, not in 1917, not in 1919, and not when he died in January, 1924. The spontaneity, or rather lack of it, that Lenin deplored in 1902, was the alleged fact that the workers couldn't “spontaneously” come to Marxism; that “professional revolutionaries” had “to bring” socialism to them. The 1905 Revolution, however, led Lenin to

enthus: “The working-class is instinctively, spontaneously, Social-Democratic.” Far from 1917 having confirmed Lenin's alleged position that “spontaneity was the main enemy of the working-class movement,” Lenin was so thoroughly disgusted with the leadership of his “vanguard party” that was supposed to bring socialism to the masses—and precisely for not understanding the directions of the spontaneous actions of the workers—that he wrote it: “I am compelled to tender my resignation to the Central Committee . . .” and threatened, instead, to go directly “to the sailors.” (3)

Now then—and for the purpose of the subject at hand, the second point is more important than the first—why did Professors Drachkovitch and Lazitch drag 1902 into a discussion of 1919? The reader is compelled to plod through 30 more pages of this type of rewriting of history before there is another reference to *What Is To Be Done*. He is told that what really dominated Lenin's revolutionary thought from 1902 until the founding of the Third International was “obsession with power.” (p.194) Moreover, he developed all these ideas which brought about “the isolation of Russia in order to (sic!) prevent its contamination by infidels—these were Lenin's legacy to the Comintern. Stalin simply exploited the full potential for evil of practices that were well-established in Lenin's lifetime.” (p.194; emphasis added)

STALINIST totalitarian practices thus emerge “naturally” out of Lenin's theoretical preoccupation, nay, veritable obsession with power. Note also that: (1) Once you have claimed that Stalinism is the outgrowth of Leninism, you need not reveal that Lenin left a Will which called Stalin “rude and disloyal” and asked the Party “to remove him.” (2) Thus, it is as nothing to fail to deal with the period from Lenin's death in January, 1924, to Trotsky's expulsion in November, 1927, as a Great Divide between the early years of the Comintern that inspired revolutionary world response, and the Stalinism which was soon to generate a counter-revolution. Instead, you can call the period, simply, “Interregnum,” and statistically reel off those years as if no fundamental changes occurred within the International as a result of objective developments outside it. (3) Above all you need pay no attention to the overriding economic and political changes which transformed the early worker's state into its opposite, a state-capitalist society and therefore transformed the Comintern into nothing but an outpost of state-capitalism, dubbed “socialism in one country.” It is so much easier to state that “personal (sic!) differences” between Lenin and Stalin notwithstanding, Stalin carried out Lenin's line, making the CI into the tool of one man.

With all those burdens out of the way, you have but one question left to answer: was the Third International “the only legitimate heir of the First, and the redeemer of the sins of the Second?” (p.198) Here our authors at first begin modestly: “The problem is of course complex, but it can be reduced to a relatively simple proposition.” Then our specialists in reducing complex questions to non-existent ones continue: “Inasmuch as Marxism in theory and practice was both deterministic and voluntarist, revolutionary and reformist . . . (and) Marx himself was . . . a Blanquist and an anti-Blanquist, a supporter of the bourgeois republic in France and the inflamed avenger of the Paris Commune . . .” (p.199)

ALL THAT is needed is a label: Marx's “dual nature” (p.200). “Dual Nature” speaks for itself, and it takes in Marx, Lenin and Stalin. Now this is indeed a magical feat that far surpasses the story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde who were such absolute opposites that, though they were one person, the author still had some explanations to make.

(Concluded next month)

(1) That a historian, in 1966, should use quotation marks around the words, class enemy, in a reference to the murderers of Rosa Luxemburg and Leo Jogiches is, in itself, a condemnation of the study under review. For the most objective study of that year, 1919, in Germany, see Rosa Luxemburg by J. P. Neuille (Oxford University Press).

(2) The second half of that sentence reads “and that the victory of the revolution could be secured only by ‘the centralization of the most secret functions in an organization of professional revolutionaries.’” It is characteristic of the sloppiness of the work of these authors that all their references fail to specify which edition of the works of Lenin they are citing—and, for their information, there are many editions. In any case, it is in none of the editions, either English or Russian or French of the *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, pp.338-9. Indeed, that volume does not contain *What Is To Be Done?* Very obviously, “the centralization of the most secret functions in an organization of professional revolutionaries”—whatever it meant for 1902—fell through in 1917 as Zinoviev and Kamenev published the date of insurrection. However, Kerensky, even as the Tsar, could not possibly stop “secret functions” when they were being executed by the spontaneity of the masses.

(3) Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol VI, p. 332, Am. ed. 1943. (International Publishers)

MARCH, 1967

Youth, Philosophy and Revolution

(Ed. Note: The following installment concludes the "Two Worlds" article begun in the last issue of NEWS & LETTERS, a review of "The Revolutionary Internationals," edited by Milroud M. Drachkovitch.)

Magical indeed is the rewriting of history. It is time to journey back to the beginning. Since 100 years stand between the 1860's and the 1860's, any analysis of the First International is bound to be more objective. Part I of the Revolutionary Internationals is more or less objectively written and has the further advantage of giving the reader a more rounded view of the historic period by including one essay of a hitherto unexplored aspect—"Secret Societies and the First International" by Boris L. Nicolaesky—as well as the most lively piece of writing in the volume—"The Anarchist Tradition" by Max Nomad. Unfortunately, the main burden of the section, of necessity, falls to the subject at issue, "Rise and Fall of the First International" by Jacques Freymond and Miklos Molnar. Despite the greater objectivity of approach and marshaling of facts, (as compared to the analyses of the Third International), the essay is hampered by its underlying philosophy—if so bland an attitude as theirs can be called a philosophy.

ONE WOULD never know, from reading this article, that the authors are dealing with that exciting decade, the 1860's, which, according to Marx, opened a new world epoch of struggles for freedom the moment John Brown made his attack on Harper's Ferry, comprised the Civil War in the United States which "sounded as the tocsin for the European working class" (4) and culminated in 1871 in the Paris Commune, the first workers' state in history. Where Karl Marx held these views, Messrs. Freymond and Molnar not only never mention John Brown, but hardly deign to speak of the Civil War, much less give credit to the IWA for having influenced its course toward the abolition of slavery. Instead, here is how they introduce the one phrase from Marx on the subject: "Marx went so far as to claim that the founding of the IWA was what decided Palmerston to avoid war with the United States." (p.26). It is not unusual for Europeans to discount the American roots of Marxism (5), but these writers stoop to psychology: "Marx hoped in 'compensation' for the ideological concessions to reap the benefit of the new 'power' (Macht) that the IWA was beginning to be on the international scene." (p.26)

Despite the fact that these authors show that "throughout Europe and the United States, and during the large strikes of 1868 and 1870 and the Paris Commune of 1871, several hundred thousand workers proclaimed their allegiance to the IWA" (p.21), Professors Freymond and Molnar not only conclude that the IWA wasn't all that effective, but proceed to downgrade significance of the Commune, which, they tell us, "was not so much an insurrection provoked by general social unrest as an outgrowth of the frenzied state of a beleaguered and starving Paris." (p.31)

SO HERE we are, back at the old dogmatism—the backwardness of the proletariat—from which intellectuals find it very nearly impossible to break loose. What is paramount in the minds of the essayists is their opposition to the International's Resolution that the building of a proletarian political party would henceforth be considered "indispensable for assuring the triumph of the social revolution aiming ultimately at the abolition of all classes."

Whatever the reason they took such a roundabout way of stating their opposition, here is what the dialectic means to Professors Freymond and Molnar: First, they quote Engels' evaluation of the IWA: "The Commune was beyond doubt the intellectual child of the International . . . For ten years the International channeled European history in one direction—the direction of the future . . . I believe the next International . . . will re-establish our very principles, a truly common theoretical program." (Letter to Sorge, Sept. 12-17, 1874). They seem almost to agree with "the lucidness of this clear (sic!) application of historical materialism, calling it "the rough outline of a thesis." (p.23) Whereupon they are off in search of an "antithesis." (p.23) Naturally, it must be an objective, verifiable fact, reality itself. Although this turns out to be their subjective evaluation of the Paris Commune, they nevertheless accept it as objective. Not only that, the "antithesis" becomes, simultaneously, the "synthesis," not to mention that it was an a priori judgment in the first place: "his (Marx's) real adversary was not Bakunin or any other leader, but the nearly physical resistance of the environment." (p.30)

YET I DARE say that even Professors Freymond and Molnar were surprised to find to what uses Professors Possony and Niemeyer put the "dialectic" (6) in evaluating the Third and Second International, respectively.

Professor Gerhart Niemeyer, author of "The Second International: 1889-1914," builds up a straw man he calls the "Second Reality": "German Social Democracy—the very term indicates its character as a little world unto itself—formed 'a state within a state.'" (p.104) Having aroused the apparition of "a state within a state," and thrown in, for good measure, that, although with the expulsion of the Anarchists, the Second International thought they had exorcised "the ghost of revolutionary radicalism" but didn't, the lofty professor is ready for the broad jump that does violence to history, theory, and reality: "Without the International, European labor might have become an integrated part of the existing society . . . The revolutionary and utopian ideology, however, stood in the way of this development. It created fears and counter-fears, and these helped to nourish the fascist and Nazi movements as much as they nourished the Communist movement." (p.128)

McCarthy couldn't have done better, and he wasn't even a professor. Professor Possony, however, does him one better in the climactic final article of the whole volume, entitled "The Comintern as an Instrument of Soviet Strategy." There he not only reiterates the same thematic slander—upon the authority of a Nazi—that "the Communist movement provided a model for the National Socialist struggle" (p.212), but he rolls this history back from the Stalin to the Lenin period: "The cooperation between Communists and German nationalists had a long history dating from Imperial Germany's aid to Lenin during World War I." (p.211) Nor does the Director of the International Political Studies program of the Hoover Institution stop there. He returns to the period prior to the Nazi victory: "Naturally the Communists did not help the Nazis merely because they wanted Hitler to win." (p.215)

PARDON ME, dear reader, if I stop here. Not being as adept as the professors in this symposium at seeing Machiavellian schemes everywhere, this type of tailoring of history to suit one's prejudices makes me gag. For those of us who fought Stalinism from its birth, and broke also from Trotsky when he called for the defense of Russia, the totalitarian pattern of the rewriting of history and amalgam-building is all too familiar. Frankly, the hatchet job under review merits no review, I did it for only one reason—the complete confidence I have in the New Left youth not to submit to brainwashing, either via the tomes issued by the multiversities or to the courses these institutions of "higher learning" offer on "Marxism-Leninism." Instead, if I may, I should like to direct their attention to an international symposium by writers from both the East and the West on Socialist Humanism, edited by Erich Fromm. In my contribution to that symposium I dealt with precisely the type of writing Professor Drachkovitch wrote and edited: "Let us not debase freedom of thought to the point where it is no more than the other side of the coin of thought control. One look at our institutionalized studies of 'Marxism-Leninism' as the 'know your enemy' type of course will show that, in methodology, they are not different from what is being taught under established Communism . . . (7) The espousal of partyism (party principle) as a philosophic principle is another manifestation of the dogma of 'the backwardness of the masses.' . . . This is not an academic question for either the East or the West. Marxism is either a theory of liberation or it is nothing. In thought, as in life, it lays the basis for achieving a new human dimension, without which no society is truly viable."

Because it is the new human dimension today's youth are striving for, and because they are creative in bucking the multiversity's attempted stranglehold on them, I do not doubt that they will yet reverse the tendency of academia to assist the bourgeoisie in its descent into the total bankruptcy of thought.

FOOTNOTES

(4) Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 14. (Charles H. Kerr, Chicago, 1933)
(5) For the American roots of Marxism, both historically, and theoretically, see Chapter 6, Marxism and Freedom, (Twayne Publishers, N.Y., 1963) For the American roots in the Second International and the European attitude, see Chapter 1, Vol. III, Part I, The Second International by G. D. H. Cole (London, 1929).

(6) Professor Possony's venom against Bolshevism, for example, is of such a fantastic nature that it even includes Hegel whose alleged "law of dialectics" Communism used. Thus: "But even the highly disciplined 'Bolshevized' Communist movement could not be switched to the laws of dialectics demands. It (Communist power) was all in line with the insight which Lenin drew from Hegel's philosophy of history. Dialectics caused the destroying of oneself." (pp. 221-222) Which ignorance of the dialectic ought to make poor Hegel turn in his grave 133 years after his burial.

(7) See especially Princeton University's Graduate Program (Spring Term, 1962-63) for "Marxism and Communist Ideology" where the only biographer of Marx is the slenderous C. Sprague; the only book by Trotsky is "Terrorism and Communism." The "standard" work seems to be that erudite work by the professor who teaches the course and who has authored a work that considers the class struggle a "myth" which Marx propagated so he could glorify the proletariat but that in fact it was only "the end product of his philosophy of alienation." (Philosophy and Marx, by Robert Tucker, Cambridge University Press, 1961). Nor does the European Marxist George Lichtheim, though he too is an anti-Bolshevik, consider such American analysis "a sort of intellectual counterpart to the late Mr. Dulles' weekly sermon on the evils of Communism." (Survey, No. 50, January, 1964).

6789

Schurmann on Mao's China: A Fantasy

(Ed. Note: THE NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS published a special supplement on China, authored by University of California, Berkeley, Prof. Franz Schurmann. The following critique of that supplement was sent to editors of the REVIEW, who have not as yet printed it.)

In contrast to the informative special supplements on America's barbaric war in Vietnam, The Review's special on China (10/20) takes us on a fairytale journey not only on the question of "the greatly improved chances for peace in Vietnam" (allegedly created by the so-called cultural revolution in China), but also in the matter of rewriting the history of Stalin's Russia during the 1930's.

This period, according to Professor Franz Schurmann who authored "What is Happening in China?", is supposed to have "brought the sons of workers into cadre positions at all levels of the organizational system." So that is what Russia's establishment of forced labor camps was all about as the decade of the 1930's reached its climax, internally, in the infamous Moscow Frame-Up Trials that eliminated the general staff of the Revolution, and, externally, in the Hitler-Stalin Pact!

Perhaps I should have been prepared for Prof. Schurmann's nightmarish presentation of counter-revolution as revolution by his fantastic statement that "A close analogy to what has happened in China may be found in the Jacobin appeal to the people of Paris." I admit I was not. It is true that the whitewashing of Mao's (and/or Lin's) self-created turmoil in China is not as typical of Professor Schurmann's writings that are a strange admixture of erudition and Maoist apologetics, but I did not think he would write that unabashedly about Russian history, singling out the very period in which the workers' state had

been transformed into its opposite, a state-capitalist society.

SCHURMANN'S DOUBLE VISION ON CHINA

Evidently, nothing, including his own writings, stops Prof. Schurmann from his unfounded assumptions and overconfident conclusions regarding either Russia or China. Thus, he modestly introduces his major work, *Ideology and Organization in Communist China*, with these words: "The writing of this book has been, like the Chinese Revolution, a long process climaxed by an act." This, despite the fact that a few pages later, he will have to confess that, seven years of research (1957-65) in Chinese, Japanese and Malayan languages notwithstanding, it was only "After I had completed this book, I realized that I had omitted an important area of organization: the army." (p. 12)

This did not however stop him, the following year, from beginning his article on "China's Power Structure" (*The Diplomat*, Sept. 1966) with what should have been just as self-evident in 1965: "China is today ruled by a trinity of organized power party, government and army." The only trouble is that by then a new, extra-legal force appeared, seemingly out of nowhere, and yet fully organized as well as "armed with Mao's Thought," imprinted on millions of leaflets, pamphlets, posters and photographs: the so-called Red Guards.

Far from being dismayed by this unprecedented phenomenon, Professor Schurmann, who could conclude nearly 600 pages of text on Chinese Communist organization by leaving the Army out of consideration, appeared all too ready (NYR, 10/20) to testify to the spontaneity of the new "mass movement," ("thousands of young students swarmed into the streets and formed the red defense guards." — my emphasis) that arose just in time so that "When Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao felt that they had not completely carried the day at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee, they were called on to spearhead the campaign against Party oppositionists . . . The use of these teen-

age red defense (sic!) guards, with the army in the background, thus avoids the appearance of military power emerging as the leading organizing force of the country."

... AND ON VIETNAM

Now, whether, in the turmoil in China, we are allegedly participating in a "school of revolution," or are witnessing a new form of Bonapartism, the point is that what is immediately at stake are the lives of the Vietnamese people.

Since Prof. Schurmann is also moved by this crucial factor in Chinese foreign policy, we should be able to find an area of agreement. Unfortunately, he is by now spinning new fairy tales that, "just as in Russia," in the 1930's, "so now in China, opponents to the 'left' and 'right' were eliminated . . . sons and daughters of the poor are coming into leadership positions in China."

No one need, however, hold his breath too long; it turns out that the one who is really the golden mean is none other than Mao himself. We are told to act at once lest any further escalation of the Vietnam war "will arouse the voices of preventive action in China." The proof of Mao's opposition to "left adventurism?" "We might note," states Prof. Schurmann, "Lin Piao's strong advocacy of united front tactics in his article on people's war."

What Prof. Schurmann doesn't tell us is the reason why he must quote a statement by Lin instead of the official communique of the recently-concluded plenum of the CCP. Yet the reason is simple enough; the communique states the exact opposite in most unequivocal terms: "It is impossible to have 'united action' with them." (Russian Communists).

Moreover, as Prof. Schurmann knows very well even if he is silent on the question, this rejection of united action to aid Vietnam which is under U.S. imperialist bombardment is not only rejection of united action with "revisionists," but with any who do not unquestioningly follow the Chinese Communist line. As Fidel Castro put it when Cuba had to break relations with China: "Our

country had liberated itself from the imperialism 80 miles from our shores and it was not willing to permit another powerful state to come 20,000 kilometers to impose similar practices on us."

For a whole generation now the Vietnamese people have known nothing but war. And, because of their country's geographic position in the light between military giants out for world domination, their lives are still being put to the stake. Under these circumstances, is it too much to ask that we stop apologetics for Mao's China long enough to work out anti-war action in favor of self-determination for the Vietnamese that would, while fighting U.S. imperialism, be independent of Communist Chinese interpretation of Vietnam, Chinese and world events?

Raya Dunayevskaya
Oct. 23, 1966

MARCH, 1967

6790

EDITORIAL

The White Congressional Line Shows Up As Cowardly Yellow

The righteous indignation of the U.S. Congress against Rep. Adam Clayton Powell might have sat better with the public if the cowardice of the Northern Congressmen hadn't shown itself quite so quickly in their total capitulation to Southern racist demands for the Negro Congressman's scalp. After but one see-saw vote to approve a motion of their own bi-partisan committee, headed by Rep. Celler of New York, these Northern Congressmen rushed to expel the duly-elected Congressman from Harlem.

This lynching, Northern style, was led by that infamous Southern racist, Rep. Albert W. Watson, Republican, of South Carolina. In answer to the plea of one Congressman that, to vote to strip Powell of 22 years seniority and impose a \$40,000 fine as well as censure, was humiliation enough, the self-styled moralist from the blighted South exclaimed: "So far as I know, he's down in Bimini with a glass in one hand and a woman in the other."

WHY NO CONCERN FOR THE ALCOHOLIC, RIVERS?

What Rep. Watson failed to explain was why he has no such moral concern for the alcoholic state of his Democratic colleague, Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, who heads nothing less "security conscious," as the saying goes, than the House Armed Services Committee, and is thus automatically privy to every defense secret.

Whether or not, along with the glass of Bourbon, Rep. Rivers can also hold a woman in his hand, is not known. What, however, is beyond the peradventure of a doubt is that when he is drunk, which is his usual state, he babbles on and on, remembering not a word of what he said or to whom he said it. Yet when Columnist Drew Pearson revealed these sterling facts, this same Rep. Watson led a standing ovation for Rep. Rivers for his "dedication to duty."

It doesn't matter whether a standing ovation is held for an alcoholic colleague, or a tepid investigation is conducted for another like Senator Dodd who has, like Powell, used Congressional funds for his personal needs; the point is that it was so easy to unleash what Rep. Celler called "the blinding forces of hysteria" because the white backlash in white U.S.A. is in its Congress.

HANG THE CONSTITUTION, TOO

Rep. Celler was unable to stem that tide even when he reminded his colleagues that there had been only three expulsions from Congress, all for outright treason, all during the Civil War. So, if even the Constitution must be hung along with the Negro Congressman, so be it—as Congress, 248 to 176, sees it.

Only one more fact needs to be added. The "moderate forces" could say that none but for treason had ever been expelled from Congress, by a sheer technicality. Congressman Berger could not be "expelled" because he had never been admitted. But he too, if you turn your history pages back to World War I and the war hysteria against socialists who opposed the war, was refused a seat, although duly elected to serve in Congress. For white America outdoes itself when its imperialistic-capitalistic class consciousness is involved.

This is what is called "free enterprise democracy!"

MARCH, 1967

6791

6 7 9 2

APRIL, 1967

A. J. Muste: Labor and Marxist Page

The death of Rev. A. J. Muste on Feb. 11 has been the occasion of many eulogies about his principled and courageous pacifism, dating back to World War I and continuing to the day of his death. Unfortunately, and not accidentally, his labor record was either neglected outright or mentioned only in order to be neglected. And yet it is this neglected labor page, and not his non-violent anti-war activities, that helped change the course of history. His labor record, especially during the 1930's when he had become a Marxist, helped transform the industrial face of the nation and re-establish the American roots of Marxism.

It is true that his anti-war activities have been the most consistent and that there has been no diminution of these activities, although at the time of his death this fighter was 82 years old. It is not true, however, that either the underlying philosophy of these activities, or their relationship to the objective world in general and the labor movement in particular, had always been the same. Just as it was the objective world situation at a time when great masses of men were in motion against the status quo in the early 1930's which led Muste to the study of Marxist theory and a striving to unite theory with practice, so it was the war clouds and the feeling of doom in the late 1930's which led to his return to the church and pacifism.

Today's New Left has much to learn from this because the life of this one man, and not any abstract theory, illuminates the difference between individual and small group action, on the one hand, and those of a mass force, on the other. The same man, with the same moral integrity and strength of character, the same devotion and the same pragmatic attitude toward ideas, is helpless in trying to influence the course of events in one case, but, in the other, becomes both an integral part, and a vanguard, of a mass movement actually transforming reality. It becomes necessary to turn to that neglected but history-making labor page.

THE UNEMPLOYED AND UNSKILLED

The Depression shook capitalism to its foundations not merely "economically" but because the masses, beginning with those thrown into unemployment, were in open revolt by the hundreds of thousands in all big cities. These mass demonstrations culminated in two national hunger marches which converged in the capital only to be shot at and "dispersed" by General MacArthur. At the same time a new employed force—the unskilled—who had been kept out of the craft unions were beginning to fight for a new type of union.

The heartbreaking 1930's which revealed the spontaneous actions of the employed and unemployed attracted many intellectuals to labor. None had more roots in labor than the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, organized by A. J. Muste, who had first been thrust into the labor movement back in 1919 during the bitter strike of textile workers in Lawrence, Mass., and had moved from union organizing to the establishment of the Brookwood Labor College in 1921, and by 1929 had decided upon more active, indeed total, participation in the labor movement through the organization of the CPLA. Under its leadership, Unemployed Leagues began to spring up in the midwest. These were both the most militant and had far more native roots than either the Workers Alliance organized by the Socialist Party or the Unemployed Councils organized by the Communist Party.

The Unemployed Leagues, moreover, related their work directly to those who were employed and were fighting for industrial unionization. From this unity of the employed and unemployed arose, first, the great strikes of 1934; then the new method of fighting: THE SIT-DOWN in 1936; and finally the CIO, which truly transformed the industrial face of the nation.

The preparatory ground was forged in 1934 when no less than 1,353,608 strikes broke out throughout the United States and embraced all basic industries—from coal and steel to auto and textiles, from rubber and shipbuilding to the needle trades. Workers in the copper industry, the longshoremen, and even toy workers, were all in motion against the status quo. (1)

The three most famous (because precedent shattering in the creation of new methods of battle) were the Toledo Auto-Lite strike led by Musteites, the teamsters strike in Minneapolis led by the Trotskyists, and the longshoremen's strike in San Francisco where "Bloody Thursday" led to a general strike. It was the Toledo strike which opened this new page of labor history in the United States by daring to fight the court injunction which limited picketing to 25. Some 1,000 workers appeared at the plant gates the first day. The numbers grew to 4,000 the second day, and to 6,000 on the third day. The National Guard was called out, but by then no force could stop the workers or keep them from their victory.

THEORY AND THE INTELLECTUALS

What victories the workers won were won, not at any "bargaining table," but in the plants and in the streets in battles with management, with the police, with the National Guards. Precisely because the spontaneity of the mass actions had brought the workers face to face with this brute force of government, ever larger groups began to feel the need not only for intensification of their struggles for industrial unionism, but also for extension of these struggles from the point of production both to the political field and to that of theory. These impulses, rather than any preconceived ideas about the need for theory, led Muste, first to organize the American Workers Party which absorbed the CPLA, and then to the study of Marx and Lenin.

This native American radical party was internationalist from the start, standing, as its program put it, "for a workers' republic to be united in bonds of comradeship with workers republics throughout the world." Naturally, all existing old radical groups—the Socialist Party, the Communist Party and the Trotskyist Communist League—immediately pounced on this new party on the horizon, the first since then's day with any genuine native roots both in its ranks and in its leadership. The Trotskyists won and the two organizations merged as the Workers Party of the United States.

At each period in the development of A. J. Muste—from minister and pacifist to labor organizer and dean of a labor college, to revolutionary Marxism—a different type of intellectual was attracted to the movement he led. In the first period he attracted such intellectuals as the economist David Saposs and the Jewish socialist and labor journalist, J. B. S. Hardman; in the second period young philosophers like Sidney Hook and James Burnham, all of whom have long since left any "Movement," the latter two going to near Right and far Right.

DISILLUSIONED REBEL

A. J. Muste, himself, however, remained a rebel. Both his followers (2) and his detractors (3) are trying to say that this proves his integrity as against the "dirty politics" in radical parties such as the Trotskyists. There is no doubt that he was, and not without good cause, greatly disillusioned with the Trotskyists. It is entirely erroneous, however, to attribute his leaving the labor movement and returning to the church and pacifism to that factor.

The truth is that his trip to Europe in mid-1936, where both Nazism's strength and the feeling of coming war were much more in the air than in the U.S. had put Muste into such a mood of despair (4) that Muste isolated himself from the labor movement and not just from Trotskyism. In place of a laborist view he assumed that of a churchman concerned with "human behavior."

From this followed his attributing to the church (5) the role he formerly had reserved for labor, i.e., the motive force for removing militarism and transforming capitalism into "a new society."

FAITH IN WORKERS LOST

In a word, it wasn't the Trotskyists, either as alleged theory-spouters or as organizational maneuverers, that brought about the return to the church. It was the loss of confidence in the proletariat. And precisely for this reason Muste took no one with him. For the first time since 1919 Muste had no organized movement, either of labor, or of intellectuals. When action and theory were united, he had a following among both strata. But this was neither a choice of action vs. theory nor vice versa. Without class roots, theory becomes little more than individual caprice, no matter how idealistically motivated.

6792

(cont'd)

6 7 9 3

All through the 1940's, A. J. Muste worked with religious groups. It was only in the 1950's that his pacifism not only extended from religious groups to other peace groups, but also to revolutionary anti-war groups. Having removed, however, the class roots of theory, Muste also looked down upon the Negro movement, preferring to work with intellectuals, including the radicals. As he expressed it in *Liberation*, it wasn't only organized labor he opposed: "Most Negroes, we may observe in passing, want to become a part of the American affluent society, not to revolutionize it." (6)

Contrast this misreading of history with the attitude during the period when he did consider himself a revolutionary Marxist and therefore did not divide theory from practice. He was then full of confidence in the mass movement which alone could transform society. He won the intellectuals to his side because they could see, in practice, that the workers, in both their spontaneous and organized actions, accepted direction from a Muste in trade union work, in politics, in theory.

The saddest feature of intellectuals in general, rebels like Muste included, is that the minute they leave the labor movement, they fail to understand what theory is. It is only when isolated from the mass movement that the charge of dogmatism becomes popular. Far from being a "dogmatism," genuine theory does not ossify because it is always in motion along with the historic development of the very source and subject of theory: the proletariat.

At this very moment when the Negro Revolution is actively relating itself to the anti-war movement and labor too is beginning to awaken to its anti-war tasks, the best way to honor A. J. Muste as rebel is to remember the labor and Marxist page and in that way develop the anti-war movement into a truly revolutionary force for the creation of a new society.

(1) One of the best descriptions of this period is in *Left, Right and Center* by Sidney Lens, even though he too tries to reduce the reasons for Muste's leaving the movement to disillusionment with Trotskyism.

(2) *Liberation* and *WIN* magazines. Also see the biography by Nat Hentoff as well as *The Essays of A. J. Muste*, edited by the same author.

(3) Daniel Bell's "The Background and Development of Marxian Socialism in the United States" in *Socialism and American Life*, Volume I, tries to hide its scurrilous nature behind a lot of "scholarly" sounding footnotes.

(4) Trotsky told me that when Muste visited him to inform him of his intended break from Trotskyism he was so overwhelmed by the feeling of doom that he enthusiastically reported the existence of a group of English churchmen who considered removing themselves to an island, away from the war holocaust that was sure to come.

(5) "The Way of the Cross" by A. J. Muste, *Christian Century*, Dec. 14, 1938.

(6) Quoted by Nat Hentoff, *Peace Agitator*, p. 230.

6793

April 1967

The Role of the Intellectual

A Look Back Illuminates Today

(EDITOR'S NOTE: In these days when we are witnessing one more retrogressive step to military dictatorship—this time in Greece—we feel it illuminating to reprint the following article by Raya Dunayevskaya, which was written in July, 1958, at the time that De Gaulle came to power in France.)

History, wrote Marx in his analysis of the coup of Napoleon III a century ago, repeats itself: once as tragedy, the next time as farce. Today, two weeks after the coup of De Gaulle, this applies both to General de Gaulle and to the French Communist Party. The General deludes himself that he can become the heroic Maid of Orleans merely by substituting the "I, De Gaulle" for Pétain's capitulation to Nazi Germany. The French Communist Party thinks it can delude the workers because it is saying all the correct things against De Gaulle, although it did nothing to stop him.

There is no greater obstacle in the path of the workers striving for a totally new way of life than that the Communists should gain control of their movement and once again thwart their aspirations, as they have done ever since the end of World War II when they used their prestige as Resistance fighters to establish bourgeois parliamentarism that brought De Gaulle to power in 1945, and again in 1958.

THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communists had been officers in the French Resistance under De Gaulle. At the end of the war they outdid him in their chauvinistic attitude to Germany. In both cases it was because they followed the Moscow line. So long as they thought they could keep him from attaching himself to the other pole of world capital—America—they didn't find much to criticize in the General.

Meanwhile, a million Frenchmen had joined the Communist Party. Other millions—workers in trade unions—let the Communists gain control of their union. These workers, however, were not playing parliamentary politics. They had hoped thus to have "the form of organization" with which to establish an entirely new society free from capitalist exploitation.

The Communist Party, however, had no intention of reaching for power—not when there was no Russian Army at hand to control the workers. Instead, it began to expand its "cultural" activities while engaging in politicking at its worst. For example it voted emergency powers to Pflimlin that forbade workers' demonstrations and was part of the parliamentary farce which completed the downfall of the Fourth French Republic. There is no doubt that the social

MAY, 1967

composition of the Communist Party in France has changed radically during this decade as it moved away from proletarian action. The only successful Communist call for strike action in 1958 was from the Teachers Federation. Nevertheless the Communists hope now to regain the working class support that the socialists have had.

EXISTENTIALIST INTELLECTUALS HELP

TIGHTEN THE COMMUNIST STRANGLEHOLD

A key role in this will be played by the French intellectuals. The most infamous of these are the Existentialists who have been willing victims of the Communists who leave them free "to engage" or "disengage" from any activity in the mass movement by taking over all "responsibilities of leadership."

1948 witnessed the first breakaway of a part of the French proletariat from the stranglehold of the Communist Party. Existentialists offered to lead it—and led it right back to Communism. The most prominent Existentialist apologist for Communism, Jean-Paul Sartre, did break away during the brutal Communist suppression of the Hungarian Revolution, but he is now back in some "popular front against fascism."

Why?

It is not out of any confusion between Marxism and Communism. Nor is it necessarily for lack of bravery. No. The brainwashing these intellectuals have undergone is due to the simple fact that intellectuals, far removed from the discipline of the factory and the class struggle, are afflicted with an incurable malady: the concept that workers are "backward," must be "taught," must be "led." They are totally blind to the fact that the greatest obstacle in the way of the workers' establishing a totally new society, new human relations, is precisely the established self-styled Marxist parties like the Communists, Socialists and Labor Party.

TASK OF THE INTELLECTUAL

Where Marx removed theory from a dispute among intellectuals and made it into a weapon in the class struggle, the modern intellectual reduces theory to a word game reserved for intellectuals. Where the Existentialist Intellectual thwarted the proletarian attempt to break away from Communism, the Marxist Intellectual let it suffocate for lack of any comprehensive revolutionary theory with which to combat Communism. Where they did not threaten to lead, to sit in the seat of the capitalists and plan "for" the workers, they nevertheless did nothing to face their intellectual responsibility, to put an end to the intellectual sloth that has accumulated in the Marxist movement. Despite all protestations to the contrary, small theoretical groupings who did see Communism for the state capitalist tyranny it is, did nothing to re-establish Marxism in its original form of a new Humanism. It is high time for a serious reappraisal.

6794

Editorial

'Law and Order' from Barrel of Gun

"Abolish the slums!" was so clearly and loudly the demand of the Negro Revolt in every single part of the country—North, South, East, West—that even LBJ couldn't pretend not to have heard it. In words, the President even claimed that that was part of his "war on poverty." Hadn't he asked for rat control, and hadn't Congress denied him even that piddling sum?

The trouble with that fairy tale is this: where, as President, he must plead with the people and thus is double-tongued, as Commander-in-Chief, he need not plead. He orders, and his orders were clear and unequivocal:

1) Shoot first; the questions can wait for later. It is true that by then some people will have become corpses, but "law and order" will have been restored.

2) Shoot at anything that moves; if that turns out to be only a cigarette light, and the innocent victims are men, women, and children, still "law and order" has been restored.

3) Shoot up a whole building if a sniper is suspected anywhere. It is true that by then not only will fear have been thrown into the beleaguered ghettos, but it will also have encouraged self-styled "patriots" to take the law into their own lawless hands. But thus will terror rule, and "law and order" prevail.

The crackle of a federal tank, under orders; the barrel of a racist cop's revolver, not under orders and lacking a search warrant; the barrel of a National Guardsman's machine gun, under orders, but gone wild—all these combined to "restore law and order" in Detroit this July 28th.

"Law and order" meant 43 lay dead; some 1,500 were wounded; 4,000 were jailed with such impossible sums of bail demanded (up to \$100,000!) that constitutional rights were nullified.

Though no "foreign invaders" had landed anywhere in the United States; though no insurrection against the state—"constituted authority"—was in progress; though only one side was thrice armed, the city was, to all intents and purposes, under occupation. "Emergency measures" turned out to be a pseudonym for martial law.

THE HUMAN SIDE

What did happen was the burning down of the black slums. What Detroit Negroes attacked was white property, not "whitey," as such. On that score, both appropriations and sniping were bi-racial. As distinguished from other revolts—and that was the new stage of black revolt—what happened in the shops was solidarity of white and black labor, with the have-nots, and against the have-it-alls.

To try to deny this, to make the revolt appear purely racist, the power structure—from Democratic Vice-President Humphrey to Republican Governor Romney, plus the liberal Establishment—have had to quote Stokely Carmichael. He, however, was in Havana; the action was in Detroit. He was talking, not acting. Those who were the actual participants in the revolt made their actions stark and clear: Down with the black slums. Let's not have two nations, one filthy rich and the other miserably poor. Let's have one nation with totally different, truly human relationships.

To the extent to which, as against the Negro masses, the elitist black nationalists did operate in the ghettos, whether that was in Cambridge (Md.) or in Detroit, in Wichita or Elgin (Ill.), in Newark or Milwaukee, they were just trying to get credit for that which the masses themselves did, did spontaneously. They revolted against the class system wearing a white face rather than against "whitey" where he was not part of the exploitative system.

The simple truth is that it is the Government—national, state, city and farm; the police, the prisons, and the courts—and not the "outside agitators"—which breed racism and evoke the wrath of the people. Outside of this reality, and the unvarying tale of police brutality, the greatest breeder of racism is Congress, rushing headlong into multiple investigations, not of the criminal system which produces racism, but of its victims.

THE CRIME OF THE CONGRESS, WITH AN ASSIST FROM THE PRESIDENT

Even before the outbursts from the black urban ghettos reached their climax in Detroit, the Senate tried to rush through the anti-riot bill, already approved by the House. It may still do so, and write final to the most elementary democratic right of travel by making it illegal to cross state lines (state lines within these allegedly "united 50 states") "to incite to riot." The people who "rioted," however, were not brought in across state lines. The rebellions were not only indigenous to the state, the city, but to the very limited slum area to which they had been restricted all their lives. This is precisely what they rebelled against, the ghettoization.

So far removed are the members of Congress not only from the ghettos, but from the lives of the overwhelming majority, from life itself outside of the Congressional corridors, their own plush homes and those of their "business friends," that the competition was on in Congress for discovering "conspiracies," "un-American" ones; rackets, "crimes" and guns, American ones, and, of course "outside agitators."

Allegedly it was to stop this asinine and vindictive search and turn attention to the real "socio-economic reasons" of revolt in the cities, that the President established his own special "Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders." The lie was given to that one when the first "witness" was none other than J. Edgar Hoover, he who got his lawless spurs in the infamous Palmer raids back in the 1920s in the first post-world war hysteria; he who has long since become a law unto himself as FBI chief, he who, this very year, found "conspiracies" and "subversives" even in staid civil rights organizations and in the "New Left."

In any case, it didn't stop the hearings by the Judiciary Committee headed by the arch-reactionary racist, Senator Eastland of Mississippi, and the creation of a sub-committee to be headed by that "rackets-buster" racist Senator McClellan of Arkansas. Or the red-baiting House Un-American Activities Committee Sub-committee headed by that other racist, Willis of Louisiana. Even that paragon of virtue who misappropriated all those political contributions for private use, Senator Dodd of Connecticut, who has a drive of sorts on for a gun control bill, got in on the act.

And all that is but the beginning. Wait till all the "reports" are in, new reactionary legislation passed, further "training in riot control" "practiced"—then watch how bourgeois democracy has gone the totalitarian way and prepared for World War III simultaneously with putting down "civil disorders." "Law and order" from the barrel of a gun, and from the legislative hopper, will coalesce to give reality to the nightmarish mirage of fascist totalitarianism.

What can stop this horror from realizing itself?

WHO WILL DO IT?

Today the vitality of the Negro people, full of purpose, has attacked only the symptoms of oppression—the white landlord in the slums, the white merchant, the white middleman.

This is not because they do not know who Mr. Big is. Rather it is because they do not see white labor ready to join them in their determination to undermine the whole system. They know better than the elitist leaders that, without white labor, the system cannot be torn up by its roots.

The urgency of the times demands that white labor, not as a sometime thing, not as the exception, solidarize itself with black labor. In that way, and in that way alone can blind revolt become social revolution.

The black masses have already laid the groundwork for this, and shown themselves in the vanguard in these crucial ways.

In 1955, with the Montgomery Bus Boycott; their self-organization showed itself in every phase of their activities—from the daily mass meetings to the organization of their own transportation.

By 1960, when the sit-downs at lunch counters initiated the Negro Revolution in a way recognized by white youth as well, a new force was born: a whole new generation of revolutionaries, white as well as black.

The following year, with the Freedom Rides, we witnessed a third force for revolution, "Womanpower, Unlimited."

These three forces—workers, youth, women—coalesced in the urban revolts which reached their climax in Detroit because here, for the first time in years, outside and inside the shop, there was the first appearance of white and black solidarity. It is but the faintest of beginnings. But it did appear.

The dialectics of liberation will assure, with no matter what false relapses and deflection by racism, its forward movement toward ending black slums and brilliantly white imperialism, black poverty and white profiteering, exploitation of black and white. Only then will the social revolution unfold itself and not just against the middleman, but against the system itself, and its moral decay. R.D.

Victor Serge, Revolution's Author

BIRTH OF OUR POWER by Victor Serge (Doubleday, N.Y. 1967—\$5.95)
Translated from the French by Richard Greeman.

The appearance of an English translation of *Birth of our Power* by Victor Serge is as timely as today's headlines. This documentary novel of the cities of Barcelona, during workers' abortive uprising, and Petrograd, in the aftermath of the great Russian Revolution, comes like a breath of fresh air. Pressed down by the mustiness of the old generation which has lost all recollection of social revolution, unfelt by the young generation that lacks the experience, the breadth, the suffering and the triumph of a successful proletarian revolution, and covered over by the current popularity of "short-cuts" to revolution, the epic-making events of 1917 have very nearly receded from memory.

All the more welcome therefore is this excellent translation from the French by Richard Greeman. At no time is the reader conscious of reading this exciting documentary novel in anything but the original language. Both the power and the fast pace of the novel carries the reader forward so that he seems to be present at all events as they occur, in the cities where they take place, and in dialogues of rare intimacy with people one has met, be he the Spanish hero, Dario, or the conglomeration of people in a concentration camp in France — three Wobblies from America, two Zionists from Poland, "with the oriental ugliness of pyramid builders, and high, red, sugar-loaf skulls shaved like those of fellahs," along with a great number of Russians, "Bolshevik suspects" — or the Red Guards in Petrograd under seige.

It is history-in-the-making, not "historicity." The masses are seen individually as they busy themselves uprooting, liberating — and dying. It is this which invests the novel with an excitement that refuses to lose any of its force simply because it is "documentary." Having been a participant in these revolutions, the narrator, as the author himself, Victor Serge, a writer of great talent, knows how to "fictionalize" history, although the molds of the traditional novel have here been broken down. From the very first paragraph, the very first chapter, "This City and Us," Serge unites not only people and history, but brick and mortar, past and present—with a little glimpse of things to come:

"A craggy mass of sheer rock—shattering the most beautiful of horizons—lowers over this city . . . Hard, powerful upheaval arrested in stone, affirmed since the beginning of time . . . We would have loved this rock—which seems at times to protect the city, rising up in the evening, a promontory over the sea (like an outpost of Europe stretching toward tropical lands bathed in oceans one imagines as implacably blue)—this rock from which one can see to infinity . . . We would have loved it had it not been for those hidden ramparts. . . ."

Those hidden ramparts held the names of freedom fighters who had lost their lives. Yet neither tragedy nor symbolism appear there as mere mourners: "Some of tomorrow's corpses were laughing raucously . . . our heads held high filled with the music of ideas."

Death stalked the battlefields — Frenchmen, Canadians, Australians, Serbs, Belgians, Russians, New Zealanders, Hindus, Senegalese — "in the war blood of all men is brewed together in the trenches." Yet this city which was not at war on any battlefield was filled with class struggles and dreams of world revolution.

Suddenly, there is news of the February revolution in Russia; it gives new impulse to the planned revolt in Barcelona. Dario "made us explain the Russian events to him while he wrinkled his brows like a schoolboy having trouble following the lesson. Then, suddenly erect, joyful: 'I've got a feeling we're going to catch up with the Russians! That would be beautiful, Europe burning at both ends!'"

The recognition of each other "by the way . . . we had of tossing ringing coins into any conversation" becomes prelude to action as recognition of what workers' power is:

Someone wants the incredible truth repeated: that it has really happened. Someone demands, his hand outstretched: "Well, and the Czar. . . ."

"No more czars."

Like a breeze—the final eddy of a hurricane uprooting oaks on the other side of the ocean—that makes the leaves tremble gently in a wood, the same breath of inspiration makes these men tremble with excitement. And we carry on this dialogue of shadows:

"The army?"

"With the people."

"The police?"

"No more police."

"The prisons?"

"Burned."

"The power?"

"Us."

Yet there is no romanticizing of the events that followed, not only of the brutality with which the revolt is put down but even of the revenge by the proletariat who murdered the police after the police had murdered Dario. Nor does Serge attempt to "skip over" the abortive uprising by the feeling that "nothing is ever lost." This despite the fact that "nothing is ever lost" reappears as an actuality in the Russian revolution. But those who did not die in Barcelona and the narrator who escaped to France escaped, not to freedom, but to a concentration camp.

There, too, even when an epidemic breaks out to decimate their number, and each day when they awake, the question is of who died the night before — the infirmary simply being referred to as the "morgue" — the dream is of revolution:

"When there are six of us around a table, we have the experience of all the continents, all the oceans, all the pain and the revolt of men: The labor parties of New South Wales, the vain apostleship of Theodor Herzl, the Mooney trial, the struggle of the Magon brothers in California, Pancho Villa, Zapata, syndicalism, anarchism, Malatesta's exemplary life, the individualism and the death of those bandits who wanted to be 'new men,' Herveism, social democracy, the work of Lenin—as yet unknown to the world—all the prisons."

Ideas are the steel armor which protects them from utter destruction and, finally, does bring them freedom when the armistice is signed and they are repatriated to Russia in exchange for the French hostages. Even here, even in the moment of triumph upon the arrival in Petrograd, it is not the myth of revolution, but its reality that we face:

"We found not the passionate mobs going forward under new flags to struggles begun anew each day in tragic and fruitful confusions, but a sort of vast administration, an army, a machine in which the most burning energies and the clearest intelligences were coldly integrated and which performed its task inexorably. And that task was to strain ceaselessly, for commonplace, often invisible achievements, with forces which, each day, seemed to be the last; to live and to persevere day after day; it was also to make an exhausted country, on the point of falling back into inertia, rise above itself; it was, finally to resist and to conquer everywhere, at every moment, transcending all logic."

The daily labors, the simple routines that become challenges to survival have their humor as well. Here they sit one day, the survivors of lost and won revolutions, huddling together in an old castle that they cannot heat and suddenly:

"Old Levine's footsteps echoed on the floor of the grand salon, plunged in darkness. He entered; his arms loaded with heavy greencovered books which he dropped softly next to the stove. Silent laughter illuminated his ruddy face. 'The laws are burning!' he said."

The friendly warmth in front of which the young woman was stretching out her hands came from the flames devouring Tome XXVII of the Collection of the laws of the Empire. For fun, I pulled out a halfburned page, edged with incandescent lace. The flames revealed these words forming a chapter heading: Concerning Landed Property . . . and further down: . . . the rights of collateral heirs . . .

"It was only then, after thirty harassing hours, that I remembered the letter I had received the previous day. I had carried it through this unknown city, hereafter ours . . . All at once it seemed to me that Dario was about to walk in, to shrug his invisible burden off his shoulders . . . then to turn toward me, his palms open, his eyes full of mischief, 'Well, old man, what was I telling you. You see that we can take cities! and it's not over yet, and we will take the world!'"

This dramatic moment does not, however, end the work, instead: "I skimmed over those four pages of writing once more, at a glance, and I stumbled upon one line, no different from all the others in the forest of symbols, which said: . . . ever since they killed our Dario . . ."

The chronicler of revolutions, the artist who has broken the mold of the novel, even some of the prose that haste fragmented — all of these combined to transform the reader into a participant. That is the great achievement of *Birth of Our Power*. No one, old or young, worker or intellectual, American, European, Arab or African, Jew or Chinese, should miss this singular opportunity of living or reliving that revolutionary era, which is neither lament nor prophecy but just is.

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

Detroit, Michigan—June 22, 1967

AUG. SEPT., 1967

6796

Instant Vulgar Materialism vs. Marxist Humanism

Editor's Note: The following letter by Raya Dunayevskaya was sent to the philosophic journal, Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, as a critique of an article by Professor Donald Clark Hodges on "The Young Marx—A Reappraisal". While the journal chose not to print the letter, we feel it important to publish it for our readers.

Fortunately, Marx's world outlook, which he originally called "thoroughgoing Naturalism or Humanism" and elaborated in a series of manuscripts now entitled Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, 1844, is now available in several English translations. These speak eloquently enough against Professor Donald Clark Hodges' reductionism: "In the manuscripts of 1844, alienation involves a specific economic transaction between an alienor and alienee." ("The Young Marx—A Reappraisal" in the Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, Vol. XXVII, Dec., 1966, pp. 216-229.)

Unfortunately, Prof. Hodges didn't limit himself to what we might call instant vulgar materialistic interpretation of Marx and those who dare to defend the young Marx in the revival of Marx studies, but stooped also to ideological McCarthyism. This must not go unchallenged. Here is what he writes: "It has been a matter of principle for each of the major revivals of Marx studies in this country to claim intellectual independence of the U. S. S. R. In fact, however, each has been closely allied to corresponding economic and political developments within the Soviet Union." (p.219) And further down on the same page: "As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union seems to have led the way of awakening interest in the young Marx. The first English translation of the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts was published in Moscow in 1956, presumably for foreign consumption. A new Russian edition was published during the same year, testifying to the increasing domestic interest in the work."

FIRST ENGLISH PUBLICATION IN "MARXISM & FREEDOM"

Accidentally or otherwise, 1956, which is given as the date of the allegedly first English publication, in Moscow, would indeed make it the first published version in English. The only trouble with the 1956 date is that it isn't true. While in mimeographed form, these Manuscripts were translated in the United States in 1947, I was unable to get a publisher until 1958 when I appended Karl Marx's Private Property and Communism, and Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic to my work, Marxism and Freedom. When later I lectured at the University of Leeds on "Marx's Debt to Hegel", Mr. Martin Milligan, the translator of the Moscow edition, told me that he too had these manuscripts translated but had been unable to convince the publisher to print them, and was most pleasantly surprised when they finally did appear in 1959. A new Russian edition of the Early Writings of Marx did appear in 1956, but, contrary to Mr. Hodges' contention, that this is proof that Russian Communism "led the way of awakening interest in the young Marx", here is the sequence of events leading up to, and following the Russian edition:

In 1955 the major Russian philosophical journal suddenly launched an attack on the Humanist essays of Marx. As if Marx had jettisoned his Humanism, V. A. Karpushin, the author of "Marx's Working Out of the Materialist Dialectic in the Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts of the Year, 1844" (No. 3—1955, Voprosy Filosofii) argued that it was necessary to separate the "materialism of the mature Marx" from the "mysticism" of Hegel which allegedly still clung to "the young Marx", pounding away against "Hegelian terminology" like "negation of the negation." Due to a "cultural lag" (p.219) not so much, as Mr. Hodges thinks, in the ranks of "open Marxism" (whatever that means), but rather among Western intellectuals, I was then unable to convince anybody in academia that the Russian declaration of an open season on criticism of the young Marx was anything but "hair splitting."

REVOLUTION "IN THE AIR"

My contention was that a great power like Russia would hardly unloose such a barrage of criticism against the Hegelian phrase, "negation of the negation," unless revolution was still "in the air" despite the two years that passed since the crushing of the East German revolt of 1953; to Marxists, after all, that is what "negation of the negation" meant: revolution. Reasons far different than that

of "comparative affluence" (p.219) were taking the Humanist essays out of the academic halls and onto the historic scene, as was clear also from the intellectual ferment in East Europe, whether one begins with the writings of Ernst Bloch and Wolfgang Harich in East Germany, Leszek Kolakowski and almost any issue of *Po Prostu* in Poland, and, later, the Petofi circle in Hungary. In any case, it was only after the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 and after Imre Nagy was executed that "the West" learned that Imre Nagy, in his letter of appeal against Rakosi, had raised the question of Humanism as true Communism. (Imre Nagy on Communism) And it was long after that—on February 6, 1959, to be exact, that Pravda reported that M. B. Mitin had declared Khrushchev's report to the 21st Congress of the Russian Communist Party to be nothing short of "the magnificent and noble conception of Marxist-Leninist socialist humanism."

In a word, far from having "led the way in awakening interest in the young Marx" and laid out a path for American scholars to follow, the Soviet Union, during the Stalin regime and into the Khrushchev era in 1955, so totally ignored these essays as not even to have included them in Marx's Collected Works; between 1955, and up to the Hungarian Revolution in 1956, the Russian Communist theoreticians began cautiously to talk of the Humanist essays, hoping to put their imprint on them, i.e., that they were not by the "real" Marx; only after the failure of the ideological campaign to brand the underlying philosophy of the real revolutionaries in East Germany, in Poland, in Hungary as "revisionism" did Russian Communism begin to sing a somewhat different tune;—and even then only because the Humanist philosophy had by then been raised by the revolutions against Western imperialism from Latin America to Africa.

The 1960's, which witnessed both the creation of a new third world and great mass movements, in technologically advanced countries from the Negro Revolution here to the anti-American demonstration in Japan, finally propelled the revival of Marx studies in the United States as well. In the world of established Communism, one voice held out against any "softening" on the question of Marxist Humanism. It was that from China and here is what its Academy of Sciences held forth: "The modern revisionists and some bourgeois scholars try to describe Marxism as humanism and call Marx a humanist. In particular they make use of certain views on 'alienation' expressed by Marx in his early Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts, 1844 . . . In the early stage of development of their thought, Marx and Engels were indeed influenced by humanist ideas . . . But when they formulated the materialist conception of history and discovered the class struggle is the motive force of social development, they immediately got rid of this influence." (The Fighting Task Confronting Workers in Philosophy and the Social Sciences, Peking.)

Now it is easy enough to show a similarity between the Chinese views just cited and those by Professor Hodges about how Marx "outgrew" his "alleged (sic!) humanism" (p.217), how U.S. scholars who say differently are only engaged in "a salvage operation . . . from Marx's own wastebasket" (p.216), ending with an appeal not to create "a humanistic image . . . congenial to the academic community" (p.216) but rather to leave the manuscripts "to the gnawing criticism of the mice" (p.229). But how could any one possibly jump from those "facts" to the conclusion that the scholar isn't as "intellectually independent" as he claims, but is "closely allied" (p.219), etc. etc.? At the risk of being considered "soft" on the philosophical community, I dare conclude that it would have been far better for freedom of thought, for academia and all others, if Professor Hodges hadn't become so "increasingly irritated" (p.217) at all interpretations of Marx other than his own as to be ready to create instant amalgams!

January 22, 1967
Detroit, Michigan

Raya Dunayevskaya

OCT., 1967

6797

Editorial

Che Guevara, Revolutionary

Che Guevara has joined the ranks of immortal martyrs. What makes his martyrdom unique is that he chose not to remain part of the new state power, although he had been a leader of the successful revolution in Cuba. He gave up his post as head of the economic ministry and embarked anew on the hardships of guerrilla fighting in still another country, Bolivia.

Che's death in Bolivia at the hands of U.S.-trained-and-led Bolivian Rangers was a case of outright murder. He had been wounded and surrounded by a force of 180, armed with automatic rifles. He was alive. From Quebrada del Yuro, where he had been overwhelmed, he was carried five miles on a stretcher to the town of Higuera. There the Bolivian army junta was asked what to do with him. Assured of American support, they ordered him shot.

Although Bolivia has no official death penalty, Che was executed within two hours of arrival in Higuera. Seven bullet holes were clearly visible, including one through the heart, administered AFTER he became a prisoner. His fingers were then cut off to identify his fingerprints, obligingly sent the Bolivian military by the Argentinian junta. His body, strapped to a helicopter, was then flown to Valle Grande and taken to a Catholic hospital where the body was put on public exhibition.

So afraid was the Bolivian military of even the dead Guevara that, though it is against all custom in Catholic Bolivia, his body was nevertheless cremated. Even that didn't end the macabre ritual. As if that would stop Che from becoming a beacon for all Latin Americans struggling for freedom from their own oligarchy and U.S. imperialism, they then scattered his ashes to the wind.

WHEN THE TIME IS RIPE

In vain are all these frantic efforts to erase the memory of the revolutionary martyr. Pure delusion is the thought that, with his death, the revolt against the exploitative regime has ended. Bolivia has more than doubled its military budget during the Barrientos tyranny. In view of the fact that Bolivia is at war with no one—that is, no outside enemy, large or small—it is clear that the 17 per cent of the national budget spent on "defense" is spent on arms to fight its own masses. When the time is ripe, the cold-blooded murder of Che will be avenged by the Bolivian masses who will put an end to this oligarchical regime.

The Bolivian masses had once before succeeded in ridding themselves of a military junta soon after the end of the world war. But they found that it is insufficient to succeed "at home" unless they also overthrow U.S. imperialism's iron grip on the country's economy. It is this which Che's fight has highlighted.

To prepare themselves for the uphill struggle on two fronts it becomes necessary to also have a clear head, that is to say, a revolutionary theory, fully integrated with the self-activity of the masses. It is for this reason that we must not blind ourselves to the double tragedy of Guevara's death. Bravely he lived and bravely he died, but he did not do in Bolivia what he had done in Cuba: relate himself to the masses.

SOCIAL REVOLUTION AND GUERRILLA WAR

Guevara's isolation from the mass movement arose from a certain concept of guerrilla warfare as a substitute for social revolution. The impatience with the masses who do not rise at the call of the guerrilla leaders, the disdain for the city, which Castro had called "a cemetery of revolutionaries and resources," the scorn for theory—all added up to isolating Guevara from the Bolivian masses at the moment he decided the time was ripe. His tragic death makes it imperative that these facts become widespread because there is no other way to uproot oppression once and for all.

Che himself had admitted, in tracing the development of the Cuban revolution, that "The men who arrived in Havana after two years of arduous struggle in the mountains and plains . . . are not the same men, ideologically, that landed on the beaches of Las Coloradas . . . Their distrust of the campesino has been converted into affection and respect for his virtues; their total ignorance of life in the country has been converted into a knowledge of the needs of our guerrillas; their flirtations with statistics and with theory have been fixed by the cement which is practice."

However, the theory and practice of guerrilla warfare as if that were the only road to revolution led Guevara to disdain other forms of class struggles—from a minor strike to a general strike, from political struggles to theoretical development, including the separation of true Marxism from Communist perversions.

Because Guevara could not separate the one from the other, he became impatient and looked for shortcuts to revolution. Yet he himself did, at certain critical periods, understand that only when the working class and the peasants are united, "the first step toward definite liberation is taken".

SPONTANEITY AND THEORY

This is what the guerrilla fighter forgets when he becomes impatient and wishes to substitute himself for the masses. At those moments, Guevara argued against the statement of Lenin: "Without a revolutionary theory, there is no revolutionary movement". Instead he held that "even if theory is not known, the revolution can succeed if historic reality is interpreted correctly and if the forces involved in it are utilized correctly."

But it is not a question of "utilizing" the forces. A revolutionary who appreciates the elemental surge of the masses learns from them because he then sees them as reason, not only as mass force and energy. The fatal flaw in the concept of guerrilla war, whether that be the concept of Guevara or Mao or Giap, is that it is taken to be the equivalent of social revolution.

It is impossible, however, to create revolutions from above. They arise from the spontaneous, creative self-activity of the masses. The theoretician who learns this prepares himself for the revolution.

To work out a new relationship of guerrilla fighting to social revolution, of theory to practice, of the class struggles of the factory workers and those of agricultural labors remains the task. In this way alone can the death of Che Guevara become a movement toward so total a revolution that it will abolish decadent capitalism and create a totally new, humanist foundation for life and labor and thought—a new society.

NOV., 1967

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya,
Author of Marxism and Freedom

Black Mass Revolt: Where to Now?

Because of the importance of BLACK MASS REVOLT, which has just been published by News & Letters Committees, I am turning over my column-space this issue to reprint excerpts from the last chapter, "Where to Now?"—Raya Dunayevskaya.

The whole point against whiteness is to get rid of the power structure, that is to say, the capitalist class system. Without tearing that out by its roots, no freedom is possible. Tokenism will not do. That must go. Far from creating jobs for the masses, or ridding the slums of rats, much less ridding them of the tenements themselves, or sending the poor black man's children to the universities from which one may reach Congress, the Senate and now even the Supreme Court, tokenism props up the status quo, "the system".

Too many of the leaders who talk about black power mean only electoral power as if that would change the system. They talk about being the majority, or promise they "soon will be", in the cities. But the masses down South, where they are the majority, know that voting doesn't change anything very much. It isn't only that whiteness cheats them out of their majority—that they do expertly even when the blacks do come and vote. But the greater truth still is this: so long as the "boss and black" relationship remains, no vote can change their conditions of life.

SO OVERPOWERING is that relationship of "boss to black" that when the New Deal first came South, even the federal power had to bow to it. And it is even more true now that "neutral" mechanization—Automation—has taken over. Just consider the single fact that even in the state of Mississippi in the 17 counties where most of the cotton is grown, no less than 75 per cent of all cotton picking is done, not by human labor, but by machine. It is in the heart of the South, in the places where the Negro is still the majority, where there is actual starvation, actual infant mortality that compares with what it is in the most technologically underdeveloped countries like India—where the actual health conditions of the adult population in any village are comparable to those in Lowndes County, Alabama, or the Mississippi Delta.

It drives the masses from the farms to the cities, in the South as well as the North. But, though there is 65 per cent urbanization among Negroes, this too solves no problems as unemployment follows the Negro wherever he goes. Of course, they have certain power, as the revolts in the cities have shown. But, unless one is strategically placed in industry, one cannot stop its wheels from turning and thus stop capitalism in its tracks.

TO GIVE ANY other impression by claiming that the organization of the ghettos is equivalent to the organization in the factories is only to sow disastrous illusions. The masses are right to reject these illusions, and, instead, try to find some solidarity with white labor—the white rank and file workers who do oppose management. Not only are they involved throughout the country in big strikes together, but the black workers are right to use this as the reason for not isolating themselves from the white workers by lumping them in the same category as the whiteness who is boss . . .

Nor are they about to accept a Sunday sermon as a "philosophy of history". Just as black nationalism didn't change its class nature by moving from Elijah Muhammad's "Nation of Islam" to the Christianity of a Black Jesus and a Black Madonna, so black power, exhilarating as that naturally is, will not mean tearing the system up by its roots unless it means mass power, working class power. This is what a black worker meant when he said, "I like to listen to Ray Brown and Stokely Carmichael. I like to hear them lay it on the line to whiteness. They talk it up good. But that doesn't mean I'll follow them. I have to see things change right here, first", and he pointed to the production line . . .

IT WILL NOT do to speak of a "philosophy of history" as if that, to use an expression of Marx's, is nothing more than "the evacuating motion" of the intellectual's own head. Unless the philosophy arises out of a historic movement of masses struggling for total freedom, and the whole world is its stage, it can neither answer the urgency of our life and times, nor bear the seeds of the future forward movement of humanity. Because the Carmichaels understand this (but only in part), they are trying to associate "black power" with the struggles of the "third world". The advantage there is that this means the mellowing of the blackness, since there are many oppressed whites, yellows, and whatever other color the human is.

The trouble is that this "third world" that is being associated with "black power" seems to be only that part of it which follows the "Communist line"—and that only at the moment when it is not revolutionary, but more racist than either nationalist or internationalist. At the same time, Carmichael is so preoccupied with "shortcuts to revolution" (guerrilla warfare) that he doesn't even realize that, instead of a shortcut, he is holding on to a short circuit. But the revolution in America is not about to short circuit itself before it has ever gained sufficient momentum to achieve the goal of total freedom.

THE ADVANTAGE of all the talk of black power is its own dynamism, the fact that it is altogether too late now to turn it back to a talk among "leaders". What some call the civil rights coldrum, and others call the fatal division within the black nationalist movement, we, of News & Letters Committees, see as the organization of mass thought by the masses themselves. There is no substitute for this self-organization of thought, any more than there is a substitute for the self-emancipation of the masses. The task is too large, too vital, to be left to intellectuals, or even to a "cadre organization". It has to be a mass activity . . .

But no Great Walls separate spontaneity from organization. They, too, are related—as is thought to action. Any separation of one from the other would be fatal. The unifying cement for the two is the type of organization which includes the organization of one's thought. That task, too, cannot be achieved without you. We invite you to join with us on the hard road to total freedom.

—News & Letters Committees

NOV. 1967

6799

DEC., 1967

EDITORIAL

THE MOUSE THAT ROARED

On Nov. 27, at his 16th semi-annual press conference since he returned to power in 1958 and mutilated the French Republic to his authoritarian demands, de Gaulle, the head of a technologically advanced land, rich in history and culture, strategically situated at the very heart of Western Europe, began his well-rehearsed eloquent discourse against "the outside element, artificial and unilateral, weighing on our patrimony." From his self-styled Olympian heights, de Gaulle aimed to dethrone the American dollar and enthrone the king of metals, "the immutability, the impartiality and the universality that are characteristic of gold" and refused "even to negotiate" England's entry into the Common Market.

Above the din of de Gaulle's exhortations to turn back both the American "invasion" of the West European economy, and the British "degradation" that would "toll the knell for the community," could be heard the moan that "the voice of France went unheard" in Israel. He failed to take note, however, of the fact that on this question "the voice went unheard," not only in Israel, but everywhere, including, above all, among the French people themselves. Just as they opposed the General's following the Russian Resolution reiterating the Arab line on the Arab-Israeli war in June, so now they detected an underlying anti-Semitism in his description of the Jewish people as an "elite people . . . sure of itself, domineering."

But the full descent from the sublimity of challenging "American hegemony" in world affairs to the bellicose but farcical attempt to detach Quebec from Canada became manifest as the clarion call for "independence" began to sound imperialistically paternal. He promised "the submerged peasants" (at Expo '67?) that France would never again "abandon her children."

No wonder people refused to take the mouse that roared for a lion!

GOLD AND THE STATE PLAN

De Gaulle should, however, be believed when he says it was not France that caused the pressures on the gold market. First, France doesn't have the gold with which to challenge the American \$13 billion gold bullion in Fort Knox. France couldn't even seriously upset the British pound as it contributed only nine percent of the gold pool—some \$63 million as against the \$700 million the pool was to have lent Britain to back up the failing British pound. Secondly, the "gold lobby," the speculators who have the ready bullion to shake the world exchange, are the

Middle East potentates and the extremely wealthy from India and "the West," not excluding the greedy American "free enterprisers" who hoped to make a killing if they could compel the American government to devalue the dollar.

There is much truth also in what de Gaulle says about U.S. imperialism. The American balance of payments internationally is inflationary and lopsided. The American investments in Europe are due more to "big capital eating little capital" (to use Marx's expression) than to technological superiority.

Above all, the American private investors are totally irresponsible both in their disregard of the national state plans and the state of employment and unemployment.

It isn't that de Gaulle's heart bleeds for the workers, employed or unemployed. His success in bringing "order" into the French economy when he returned to power was done by a drastic devaluation of the franc plus a substantial reduction in real wages. But European capital has learned what the more affluent American capital keeps forgetting. The State Plan—in France it is called "indicative planning"—can keep depression recession size, the unemployed army "manageable," and the "international cartels" forced to show some responsibility to the "nation" rather than indiscriminately following the road of highest profits globally.

THE AMERICAN BEHEMOTH

From 1959 to 1963 de Gaulle tried to restrict American investment. In 1965 he rediscovered gold. He then found that if France converts its dollar holdings into gold, he can exert a pressure upon American gold reserves and hence the whole economy. His attack on American capitalists helped LBJ do what he was unable to

do previously—get them to voluntarily restrain their flight of dollars abroad in search of higher profits and cheaper labor—while de Gaulle's "partners" in the Common Market leaped at the chance to invite the limited American investments to their countries instead of to France. And since it is America, not France, that has the bulk gold, the Behemoth, American capitalism, didn't move over either for the State Plan or for the world market.

Because de Gaulle's France had automated its industries, centralized its capital, satisfied its plan and, through the Common Market, at least kept England out of its monopoly, de Gaulle is under the delusion that he can change the hard facts of the post-war world: that in place of the several big powers that divided the world between themselves, two, and only two super-powers—U.S. and Russia—remained standing. Just as Mao tries his best to undermine Russia's predominance in the Communist world, so de Gaulle tries to undermine America's predominance in the NATO world.

Because the American economy in the late 1950s was stagnant while the European economy was booming, de Gaulle thought that he could "prove" to European powers their "superiority" over the American Goliath—particularly if they followed him. Toward that end he first tried creating a new world axis—Paris-Bonn—and then went after the American dollar.

Thus, he finds "quite remarkable" that the total of the American balance of payments deficit, over a period of eight years, equals the total American investments in Europe over that period. U.S. capital does get away scot free, freed also of the "risks" involved in investing in industrializing the underindustrialized world. But, far from this proving that Europe could "balance the enormous U.S. power," it only proves that Europe pays for American investments in Europe!

But between 1965 and 1967 LBJ escalated the Vietnam war and with it came fat war contracts, swollen profits attractive enough even for greedy American "free enterprisers" to expand plant equipment in America, and the American economy was again booming. So de Gaulle now imagines himself as the "Third Force." He lets his imagination go wild as he blames the Middle East war on the U.S. war in Vietnam. He thereby only shows that what preoccupies him is neither the Middle East nor Asia nor Africa, for that matter. His one obsession is the U.S.

The Behemoth, American capitalism, will not move so long as the militarization of the American economy means spending \$30 billion annually on the Vietnam war (as against the mere pittance of \$200 million as America's "contribution" to "Asian development"). It is upon this, and not upon West European capital, that American capitalism gorges itself. This plus the dead, the maimed, the spoliation of the land, the savagery and barbarism of modern warfare.

THE MILITARIZATION OF THE ECONOMY

It is not de Gaulle, who is himself a participant in the militarization of the world economy, who can reverse the trend. There is no country in the world, be it France or China, the Middle East or Russia, not to mention America, that doesn't spend impossible sums on the militarization of the economy, including "The Bomb," be it of minor proportions like China or capable of being dropped from outer space like Russia.

Concretely, the world is spending over \$130 billion annually toward these destructive purposes. Of this the U.S. alone is spending \$70 billion. In the two decades since the end of World War II, U.S. capitalism has spent no less than \$850 billion for what it dares call "defense." And this is the time when there were no "major" wars and we avoided the nuclear holocaust!

De Gaulle has discovered the Achilles heel of the super powers—that all the contradictions are thereby so intensified that the super power becomes the most hated throughout the world. But though De Gaulle thinks he has discovered the Achilles heel of America, in truth he himself has become vulnerable, if not in the heel then in the head. His intellectual chauvinism, France's strategic position, has led him to play for the highest stakes, and he thinks he can make the United States play power politics according to his tune. It does not, and will not work.

Because the crisis is rooted in relations at the point of production, and these human relations with exploitative capital extend over those left out of production over whom Behemoth rules, the working people alone can destroy it at its root. No one else will, not only because they themselves have vested interests but also because no energy source on earth, including atomic, can substitute for the energizing force of the enthusiasm of people bent for freedom. Just as in the first part of this decade, the newly-created third world performed miracles in wresting political freedom from imperialism, so now they will, with the workers and youth in the technologically advanced countries, move to total freedom.

—Raya Dunayevskaya

JAN. 1968

Nigeria: A Retreat, Not A Victory

The following is a letter, unpublished as we go to press, sent to the editors of the New York Review of Books by Raya Dunayevskaya in response to a recent article.

Conor Cruise O'Brien's brilliant article (NYR, 12/21) does much both to correct the one-sided press coverage of the tragedy of Biafra and to undermine the spurious reasoning by analogies. Mr. O'Brien has turned away the blanket of abstractions about "Federation" vs. "Balkanization", "nationalism" vs. "tribalism", and laid bare the ugly reality of Northern emir-dominated, neo-colonialist Nigeria where some 30,000 Ibos were massacred last July and two million more driven back to the Eastern Region only to be invaded by genocidal-minded "Federal" troops soon after the Region declared its independence under the name of the Republic of Biafra.

Just before the fall of Enugu I received a letter from a friend there who fully confirms Mr. O'Brien's statement that, for the Ibos, the choice concerned, not ideological abstractions, but a matter of survival or extermination. The writer of that letter had always called himself a Marxist-Humanist. At the time of the July 1966 massacre he had been a trade union organizer in the Middle Belt, and barely escaped with his life. This young man in his later twenties, though an Ibo, had not previously lived in the East Region. Yet he now wrote: "I shall never move outside the Eastern Region so long as I live." This letter is representative of what had been Nigerian nationalism.

WHY, however, must Mr. O'Brien turn the tragic situation into a virtuous one by transforming the forced compulsion to secede into still another abstraction — "Now that they (the Ibos) have in very truth formed a nation on their own soil under the pressures of history" — and pit the Ibo "nation" against the "mystique of 'Nigeria'" as if Nigerian nationalism was only something the Ibos "invented" in the 1950's? "The irony," writes Mr. O'Brien, "is that the mystique of 'Nigeria', under which they are now being crushed, was in large part their own creation. The Ibos were once proud to call themselves Nigerian nationalists although there was no Nigerian nation and although at that time — some years before independence — no one else thought in such terms."

Now, it is true that the Ibos were in the forefront of the struggle for the freedom of Nigeria from British imperialism. They began that struggle for the freedom in the 1930's, not in the 1950's. In the full tradition of African nationalism which had always been universalist, Nnamdi Azikiwe (Zik), who can rightly be called the father of Nigerian nationalism, at first condemned territorial nationalism.

WHETHER he propagated for Nigerian independence from his self-exile in Accra in 1935, or from Lagos (1937 and thereafter), the spirit that animated both his activity and the papers he founded was that which he first comprehensively expressed in his book, *Renascent Africa* — the freedom of the continent of Africa from European colonialism.

The uniqueness of African nationalism was not lost when the realities and complexities of the freedom struggle made it necessary to conduct the actual struggles within the "national" boundaries erected by Western imperialism. And it did not change its character when, from an idea propagated by small groups of intellectuals, African nationalism became a mass movement. This is especially true of Nigeria where Zik, from the start, concentrated his attention on the multi-tribal militant youth, the new generation that, under the impact of World War II, wanted "freedom now."

BY 1945 a new force — organized labor — swept onto the historic stage with a general strike. Of all the leaders of Nigerian nationalism, including the Yorubas who preferred "cultural nationalism" and regionalism, Zik alone came out in support of the general strike, thereby imparting a new, a proletarian quality to his Nigerian nationalism.

He at once became a national hero. Needless to say, it was not because he alone or the Ibos as a whole "invented" Nigerian nationalism. The truth is both less magical and more powerful. The alignment with labor disclosed a new unifying force in Nigerian nationalism present within the colonial entity called Nigeria.

ALTHOUGH only a few Northerners had participated in the general strike, it was the beginning of a Nigerian nationalist movement in the North, one not led by the conservatives only in order to oppose militant "Southern" nationalism, but one led by Northern militants. It was aided in its work by the fact that one page of Zik's paper was written in Hausa. It was, naturally, not a question only of language, but of the nationalism propagated in that language — a nationalism that opposed both British imperialism and their own ruling class.

It is true that Nigerian nationalism in the North never had the mass support it had in the South and especially the East. It is true that when the North "as a whole" embraced "nationalism" it was only because it was sure that it was favored by British imperialism to be the rulers of an "independent" Nigeria, and that, once in power, Zik worked hand in glove with Balewa to deny democracy to the Midwest, to the Yorubas.

IT IS not true that that is all there was to Nigerian nationalism. One event of my 1962 trip to Nigeria stands out especially in my mind — a mass rally called by the National Trades Union Congress, the Nigerian Youth Congress and the Lagos Tenants' Council to protest the government's austerity budget. The speaker who got the biggest applause was a Hausa youth who described the conditions of life and labor of the talakawa (peasant masses) in the North where conditions were "no different than when we were a colony" because now, "with Zik's help" the stranglehold of "our emirs" over the talakawa is anointed as "nationalism." "What we need," he concluded, "is a real revolution. We need to get rid of the scoundrels in Parliament."

It is true that, along with the "new" military junta in Lagos (who now get aid also from Russia) British imperialism wants Nigeria intact for what Marx in his day called "order mongering" purposes. It is not true that neo-colonialism emerged out of Nigerian nationalism. The truth is that by the 1950's the Cold War had reached the shores of Africa and the global conflict between the two nuclear titans affected drastically the character not only of Nigerian nationalism but the whole of African nationalism.

UP TO the fifties, even when a founder like Zik moved away from the high point reached in 1945-48 and began to play the game of nationalism according to the rules set by British imperialism, this did not affect the Zikist youth movement which continued to function without him. Indeed the revolutionary activity at first intensified so that when the Zikist movement was banned by British imperialism, it simply renamed itself the Freedom Movement and continued its struggle against "all forms of imperialism and for the establishment of a free socialist Republic of Nigeria, fighting in and out of parliament, employing non-violent revolutionary tactics."

By the end of the 1950's, on the other hand, the pull of the objective forces (both of the vortex of the world market and the the new stage of imperialist struggle for world mastery politically) became irresistible to the nationalist leaders who moved away from dependence on the spontaneity, the self-activity of the masses that had made political independence a reality, and, instead, began "choosing sides" — "the East" or "the West" — as a substitute for the deepening of the African Revolution.

UNDER the circumstances, to date the movement for Nigerian independence to the Fifties is not only an historical inaccuracy, but, what is far worse, blinds us to the historical distinction between the independence movement "As Reason" and its regression into state power, and thereby makes it impossible to draw any lessons from history for today, which was, rightly, Mr. O'Brien's pre-occupation.

There has always been a dualism in "the pressures of history" and it will not do to cover up this dualism with phrases like "in very truth" and "on their own soil." In coming to the support of Biafra — and world opinion must be mobilized to stop the slaughter and the enwring of the Ibos in the name of a non-existent "Nigerian nation", in the name of "order mongering" — let's not, for heaven's sake, elevate the new nation of Biafra to where we forget that it is a retreat, a necessary, an imperative retreat, but a retreat nevertheless, and not a victory for African nationalism, for the African Revolution that remains unfinished.

Detroit, Mich.
December 19, 1967.

Raya Dunayevskaya

5901

EDITORIAL ARTICLE

US Bombs Devastate South Vietnam As Civil War Rages in the Cities

By Raya Dunayevskaya, National Chairman
News & Letter Committees

Civil war is raging in South Vietnam. From the inception of the recent military offensive struggle, it was clear that the Vietcong had the sympathy (and sometimes the full collaboration) of the people as a whole. It would otherwise have been impossible for the Vietcong simultaneously to "infiltrate" into the capital, Saigon, spread through the length and breadth of the country, and raise its flag over Hue, the cultural center of the country and home of the Buddhist and student opposition to the corrupt militarist regime of Generals Thieu and Ky who choose to wear the civilian clothes of President and Vice-president. Moreover, the Vietcong achieved these spectacular successes with minimal

help from North Vietnam. Its appeal was to its own "compatriots."

At the same time the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong, extended its appeal to "the American people . . . to side with the South Vietnam revolution."

LAWLESS GOVERNMENTS

Secretary of State Rusk's claim that the appeal for the overthrow of the "duly constituted Government" was a "complete failure" since no instant full-scale uprising took place cannot hide the truth either of the widespread sympathy and support for the Vietcong, or the people's passion for freedom from the stranglehold of their own authoritarian Government and its U.S. protector. Nothing so clearly reveals the utter impotence of Thieu-Ky as the fact that the only thing they could think of doing to counteract the appeal to revolution was to order the bombing of their own country!

On the fifth day of the battle, Nhona, a largely Catholic suburb of Saigon, looked like "Stalingrad with palm trees." (NY Times, 2/4). Palm trees or otherwise, Nhona, like Stalingrad when it turned back the Nazi tide during World War II, was so devastated that tanks could not "sweep" through the rubble. Still the guerrillas were not "flushed out." What was flushed out, once and for all, was the pretense that the Saigon Government enjoyed the right of legitimacy in the eyes of the people of South Vietnam.

What the flares of battle illuminated, and the world's photographers recorded, was the shameless lawlessness of the corrupt Thieu-Ky puppet regime. But, though previously invisible to the world, labor had known, and suffered, from this state of lawlessness all along.

Thus, on Jan. 13, or 18 days before martial law was decreed and the Constitution suspended, the fascist police invaded the headquarters of the General Federation of Trade Unions, seized the electrical workers who had engaged in a sitdown, and arrested the leaders who had scheduled a general strike in support of the electrical workers.

Today every one is familiar with the barbaric acts of the national police chief, Brig. Gen. Nguyen Ngoc Loan, who personally executed an alleged Vietcong officer, because the world's press recorded the street scene where this prisoner of war, his hands tied behind his back, was shot by this terrorist in uniform. But the savagery of Jan. 13, when Saigon police chief Lieutenant

Col. Nguyen Van Luan, rounded up the striking workers, at gun point, forcing them to return to work or go to jail, was not photographed by the world's press.

Today the world has been made witness to the consequences of the order for indiscriminate destruction of everything that stands in the way of the Thieu clique, from the headquarters of the militant Buddhists—the An Quang Pagoda—because it allegedly harbored the Vietcong, to the humblest hut of a non-political peasant.

Today one watches the totalitarianism and oppressive presence of the South Vietnamese Government and U.S. military might that is destroying the country, killing the people, ravaging the land, creating tens of thousands of new refugees.

And then one comes face-to-face with a three-fold increase in the price of bread which makes it necessary for these bombed-out people to roam the streets hungry while those who can afford the price eat all they want. The unavoidable question is: why should a government that can unleash such destructive

power be powerless to stop black marketeering, decree rationing so that all are at least assured the bare necessities of life? And the answer is just as inescapable. This governmental clique represents nobody but itself.

GROSS CORRUPTION

The rampant corruption didn't suddenly break out on the day of battle. For years now the Thieu-Ky regime has lined its pockets with as much as 75 per cent of the \$30 million the U.S. sent South Vietnam for "refugee programs," has dispensed jobs of power for a price, has sold military deferments, had its wrath aroused only when the workers demanded a 12 per cent increase in wages to counteract chronic inflation.

It is the action of these sawdust Caesars that explains why, whatever terrorist acts the Vietcong may have committed, it is Government, not Vietcong, barbarism which precludes any "victory" for either the Thieu-Ky clique or its U.S. protectors.

McNAMARA'S BIG LIE

Three days after the Vietcong started its many-pronged assault, the departing Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, made his annual and final report to the Congress. Although mainly concerned with Big Power politics—how destructive and numerous are the stockpiles of H-bombs and missiles of U.S. vs. Russia—McNamara did take time out to apprise us about the situation in South Vietnam.

So overwhelmed by the holiness of computers is this former "Whiz Boy" that, even as the headlines brought news of the wide acceptance of the Vietcong by the people, McNamara continued to repeat the Big Lie of the success of the so-called pacification program.

It appears that the computerized heads of the Administration had a new, "more valid standard of measurement" by which to judge the success of the "pacifi-

cation program." It is called "the hamlet evaluation system;" went into effect early in 1967; and indicates that about 67 per cent of the people of South Vietnam live under allied military protection."

No blue pencil was used to modify, much less eliminate, the lying claim, yet by the time the report was delivered, it should have been clear to the most obtuse worshipper of computerized data that this "allied military protection" doesn't amount to a

hill of beans, or, what is more to the point, to a few grains of rice which would still the hunger pains of at least some of the "67 per cent of the people of South Vietnam" so protected.

On the contrary, the Big Lie is further extended to slander the whole people: "No matter how great the resources we commit to the struggle we cannot provide the South Vietnamese with the will to survive . . ."

It doesn't seem to dawn on McNamara that the sense of nationhood and the will to survive includes independence from both the "protection" and the destruction of the U.S. military occupiers. In his total disregard of the peace this nation yearns for, this civilian head of the armed forces is as one with the military brass.

CIVIL WAR VS. MILITARY MYOPIA

Until they are finally swept away, generals have a way of describing every humiliating defeat as a brilliant victory. Thus, despite the fact that even the U.S. Embassy was unprepared for the surprise Vietcong attack, General Westmoreland blandly maintained that he had known "all along" that the attack was coming. Thus, during the continuing spectacular successes of the Vietcong on the first, second, third days of battle, he kept repeating that "the enemy" had "run out of steam."

And thus, despite the far-flung battles that covered the length and breadth of South Vietnam, the U.S. military commander in South Vietnam insisted that all these battles from Saigon to Danang, from Hue to Kontum, from Nahtrang and Pleiku to Dalat and Bienhoa—in a word in very nearly every well-populated region as well as at air bases—that all these battles were just "diversionary" and the "principal" battle would take place at Khe Sanh.

The discussion about what is "diversionary" and what is "principal" is pointless. Where a civil war is the issue, the whole point is this—and it holds true where it is only a guerrilla war or is already a full social revolution—no stand is diversionary. Or, to put it differently, all stands on

the road to freedom are diversionary, and therefore none are.

Because civil war is not mainly a military operation and involves the whole population, it can and must and does take place simultaneously in many places. Because the aim is freedom, there are no "diversionary" battles; all are principled. Dienbienphu wasn't lost because France was weaker militarily than the U.S. although it was that too. It was lost because its generals then, like the Americans now, were involved in a military engagement while the Vietnamese were fighting a liberation struggle.

In a word, the question isn't whether Khe Sanh is the real diversion, or turns out, after all, to be the "principal" (though not the principled) military confrontation.

Whether or not there will be a military confrontation at the spot where both North Vietnam and the U.S. have amassed regular troops and impressive weaponry; whether or not LBJ got a signed assurance from the Joint Chiefs of Staff that Khe Sanh will be held! And even irrespective of whether or not it will be "another Dienbienphu," the point is that the Vietnam war has already been lost in the cities of South Vietnam.

Which doesn't mean either that the U.S. has been defeated militarily or is only a paper tiger. Its nuclear arsenal is awesome enough. The question to be posed, therefore, is: will the Vietnam war never end but only stretch into World War III?

GLOBAL WAR?

The "domino theory" has come true in reverse. There are no longer any fast boundary lines in Southeast Asia. Whether Khe Sanh is held or not, both the U.S. and North Vietnam have crossed and recrossed the 17th parallel, have violated the territories of Laos and Cambodia, have pressured Thailand. The very fact that what happened in Saigon and Hue this week happened has strengthened Cambodian neutrality and weakened Thailand's commitment to U.S. imperialism.

"We're not going to shoot from the hip," LBJ is supposed to have told his super-patriots when North Korea captured the American spy ship Pueblo. (See Our Life and Times, p. 8). It isn't that President Johnson has, as a principle, any aversions to shooting from the hip. But in this case he was telling his hawks that they better weigh the consequences carefully lest it be a plot not only to divert the U.S. from the Vietnam war but to get it sucked into a two-front land war—both in Asia.

Possibly, instead of being coordinated with Hanoi and Mos-

cow or Peking, North Korea was playing a separate hand and probing for its own purposes. It was necessary, above all, to investigate Russia's role in this. For when all is said and done, it is the two nuclear titans who will decide whether there will be a new world war. A dispatch was thereupon sent to Russia.

That Russia's global aims were not too far from the surface was seen also in the interview Kosygin granted the editors of Life magazine. Premier Kosygin expanded himself not only on the Vietnam war where it was easy to appear in the right, but also in the Middle East where his stance has been both anti-Semitic and pro-Arab oil and strategically astride three continents.

It is to be doubted that LBJ will be allowed to get off the book easily, especially since this is Russia's chance also to show China that, for all her big talk, it is Russia, not China, that is the big supplier of firepower to Hanoi and the Vietcong.

THE SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT

The internal dialectic of guerrilla war clashes violently with the Big Power struggle for world domination. When, however, the guerrilla war is Communist directed, its self-development is blunted.

At the moment, for example, it is impossible to tell whether the present Vietcong attacks in the cities and the possible military confrontation of North Vietnamese troops with the U.S. Army at Khe Sanh, are aimed at overthrowing the Thieu-Ky regime and driving the U.S. into the sea, or are subordinated to Russian and/or Chinese aims—and "victory" will thus be used only to try to achieve a "coalition government."

It would be the first time that the Vietnamese Revolution, North and South, was betrayed. Ho Chi Minh's class collaborationism began during World War II and was aimed at getting the French "to accept" the Vietminh. When French imperialism, instead, began the counter-revolution, the dialectic of revolution did lead to full victory only to have both Russia and China at Geneva pressure Ho Chi Minh in 1954 to accept the division of Vietnam at the 17th parallel.

This, then, is the third round of a civil war that has been on and off for no less than a quarter of a century! The fact that the Sino-Soviet orbit is now split is no help, for they are so interested in fighting each other for leadership of the Communist world (if not for each other's territories!) that they could not even achieve a united front on so elementary an issue as to aid a Communist ally in a struggle with U.S. imperialism.

Last week, when Kosygin visited India, the Chinese Communists said that the "real reason" for the visit was to line up India behind Russia's "collusion with U.S. imperialism to betray Vietnam." The weeks before this wild charge by the Chinese, Russia accused China of wanting "to prolong the Vietnam war."

WHERE TO, NOW?

Nearly two years ago, when the Buddhists were in the forefront of the struggle against the ruling military junta, and the Vietcong were mere bystanders, we stressed that, though power lay in the streets, neither the Buddhists nor the Communists were reaching for it.

The Buddhists shied away because they feared both the Communists and any social revolution; the Communists because they feared any truly spontaneous outburst by people they did not control.

This being so, the only victor was U.S. imperialism. Since then the crisis has become so total that even those opposed to the Communists are presently helping them. As we wrote then: "U.S. imperialism is the biggest breeder of Communism."

The simultaneous fascization of the world, with U.S. capitalism in the lead, and the nuclear arsenals no longer the monopoly of either the United States or Russia, but challenged by China and De Gaulle France, the world crisis has become so total as to make it appear that there is no exit anywhere for mankind.

Yet the very fact that so little a country as Vietnam can keep the biggest world power at bay shows that there is no substitute for freedom's power, the power of ideas that cannot be destroyed by military means. Therefore, what is of the essence, what is quintessential for realizing the idea of freedom, that is to say, for practicing liberation, is to make sure not to stop midway now, but at the very moment of driving out American military occupation, to disclose that they are not choosing any other big power, but are fighting for self-determination for themselves.

For that self-liberating goal they have and will continue to have the support both of the world proletariat and peasantry, the black mass revolt, and the youth, including those in the U.S.

This is the time for black and white to unite. Just as the black revolution must not remain isolated, so the anti-war movement must not remain silent or equivocal in its opposition to all poles of world capital. Self-determination for the South Vietnamese can be achieved only if both international solidarity and the idea of liberation are free from connection with any state power.

Oppose U.S. occupation of South Vietnam! Demand return of all U.S. armed forces and its "Pacification Hordes" as well! All big powers must keep hands off South Vietnam! Support self-determination for South Vietnamese people!

—Feb. 7, 1968

Moreover, the "new dialectic of Mao" demands that physical culture should also be a part of the "cultural revolution" and that the army should be not only a political force but also a "cultural force" when it "facilitates the organization of people's groups of labor, the implementation of revolutionary laws, and so on."

Shortcut To Revolution Or Long Road?

Revolution In The
By Regis Debra

John Paul
that when the
travels from
the party's
neutral
beating
club
The
d.

THE POLITICAL

A general
the political
"terrain" of the
tion that, in effect,
only as "superstition."
As if a phony like
latest cigarette commercial
just never again. Every consumer,
especially military details. Everything
Fidel under the guise of this military, the
theoretic developments are summed which indeed change the course
not of details, but of theory and that history and "a new dialectic
of Mao." Dominating this new dialectic is the need to set up
"military clubs, not political clubs." Four dialectics, what comes
have not been mentioned in the news.

"We've suggested, further, to extend the politics of the military
over the political party to the point where it substitutes also for
theory, based in its corporate class in contemporary and based
from such things as "the party" on Mao's theory of social revolution
as an essential element. It surely frees one of "bourgeois orthodoxy"
and to mention "dialectical methodology" which might result that
the first act in the dialectics of education rather a second operation,
or total reorganization of both reality and theory. According to
Debra, even in the dialectical field of guerrilla war, "theory does as
well as good."

"The way well remains in a circle of good and bad and that that had
not read the military writings of Mao Tse Tung before demanding
on the coast of Debra, he must then meant, for the good and out of
his own experience, principles of a military doctrine to consistency
with the terrain."

AND THE LEADER MASSIVE

the party's
of Mao's
he stressed
some points
The word
within the
operator he
to only one
the book
"dialectical"
As for the
things which
dialectical
the party of
and Che Yeh.
and Trotsky
and political
Center." Thus,
they teach

political workers,
City of London
for that he pro
and international
"the party"
of Mao's theory is
and Trotsky in the
the set of guerrilla
is to reach followers
of revolutionary events
the highest order of
though Debra mentions it
dialectical work and that the
newly set up in the
international level the country
the leaders of the Cuban branch

dialectical of Lenin and Trotsky is undoubtedly correct,
to see the dialectic turned straight in a country linked
dialectic but more to give the proper sense of "dialectical" as
the dialectic turned into a dialectical method. "Let us by the
moment to see the Trotskyist methodology, and not
in the past and create something that is in nature. We have
been told that Trotskyists are often misled, wishing to further from
the book Trotskyism and Internationalism that is undoubtedly correct
workers in the struggle for socialism." Although "the art of
revolution" has been Trotsky's strongest point both as revolutionary
and revolutionary, the Trotskyist emphasis did not end with the
creation of Trotskyism and in their high praise of Debra's book, they
can mention that it contains some chapters, "The Trotskyist
The revolutionary principles of those who have the power to
apply them to the present of guerrilla warfare, and the
dialectical method as a dialectical method in both the case."

Shortcut To Revolution Or Long Road To Tragedy?

Revolution In The Revolution?
by Regis Debray, Grove Press, N.Y., 95c

Jean-Paul Sartre was so impressed with Regis Debray's booklet that when the author was arrested in Bolivia, Sartre held that the reason behind the arrest was not any alleged guerrilla activity, but the authorship of a book which "removes all the brakes from guerrilla activities." Long before Debray's arrest, followed by the brutal murder of Che Guevara by the Bolivian military junta, the Cuban government had no less than 200,000 copies of *Revolution In The Revolution?* printed of the original Spanish edition. Since then it has undergone many translations and has become a must for all would-be Cuban type guerrilla fighters. The young French philosopher is, indeed, Fidel's alter ego, and, very obviously, Castro considers this booklet an accurate presentation of his views.

INSURRECTION OR REVOLUTION

Nevertheless, the very title of the book is quite deceptive. This is not a book about revolution either "as such" or "within." The Russian Revolution of 1917 is, for example, never once referred to as a revolution, but is called "the insurrection." Nor can the reader find a single word in the work that would inform him that that "insurrection" was the last, not the first, act of revolution, whose spontaneity as well as organization, dialectic of objective events as well as of theory, self-development of millions of people tearing the old society up by its roots in general strikes and battle of ideas, in anti-war struggles and in two revolutions, all led to the success of the insurrection.

Instead, spontaneity as well as organization—be it the mass type like Soviets or "the Party"—objectivity as well as theory seem to be dirty words. In their place we get the glorification of one, and only one, activity, guerrilla war.

But here, too, there is deception. Glorification of guerrilla warfare encompasses only Latin America (actually only Cuba). Upon it alone "the irony of history has willed... this vanguard role:" it alone has evolved a "new style of leadership." The leaders of all other guerrilla wars, including the Vietnamese, are consigned to "the past." The booklet burns with missionary zeal "to free the present from the past."

THE POOR DIALECTIC!

A greater deception than either that contained in the title of this pretentious little booklet, or in the alleged narrowing of the "terrain" of guerrilla war to Latin America, underlies the contention that, as against the abstractions of theory, this essay is based solely on "experience," facts, "the concrete."

As if a phrase like "the irony of history" was no more than the latest cigarette commercial — "Beats me, I don't know why. Taste just never quits." — Debray continues to sing the praises of details, especially military details. "Everything is a matter of detail," said Fidel. Under the guise of this untheory, the most pretentious theoretic declamations are asserted which indeed change the course, not of details, but of theory and fact, history and "a new dialectic of tasks." Dominating this "new dialectic" is the need to set up "military focus, not political 'focus.'" Poor dialectics, what crimes have not been committed in thy name!

"We're supposed, further, to believe the priority of the military over the political party to the point where it substitutes also for theory, indeed is its superior since it is contemporary and freed from such things of "the past" as Marx's theory of social revolution as an elemental outburst. It surely frees one of "theoretical orthodoxy," not to mention "historical orthodoxy" which might recall that the first act in the dialectic of liberation evokes a second negation, or total reorganization of both reality and theory. According to Debray, even in the glorified field of guerrilla war, "theory does as much harm as good":

"One may well consider it a stroke of good luck that Fidel had not read the military writings of Mao Tse-tung before disembarking on the coast of Oriente, he could thus invent, on the spot and out of his own experience, principles of a military doctrine in conformity with the terrain."

Moreover, the "new dialectic of tasks" demands that physical fitness tower above "a perfect (sic!) Marxist education," clandestine work above open propaganda, now dubbed "armed put off, perhaps," which is not only subordinated to the military, but put off, perhaps till even after power when it "facilitates the organization of production, the collection of taxes, the interpretation of revolutionary laws, the maintenance of discipline" . . .

THE "POOR PEASANT" AND THE LEADER MAXIMUM

Debray is as completely unconscious as to the capitalistic character of the concept he had just uttered as he was of the intellectualistic petty-bourgeois concept of the "backwardness" of the masses that he gave vent to when he stressed the need of being secretive around the peasantry: "The poor peasant believes, first of all, in anyone who has a certain power . . . The army, the guardia rural, the latifundista's private police, or nowadays the 'Green Berets' and Rangers, enjoy a prestige all the greater for being sub-conscious."

It seems the poor peasant can be saved in only one way by guerrilla warfare carried out by small guerrilla bands irrespective of the ripeness either of the objective or the subjective situations. Instead of these dead-end streets, there is a "shortcut": it is the duty of revolutionaries "to make revolutions." As for the poor peasant, well, "Guerrilla warfare is to peasants what Marx is to Sorel." Nothing less!

As against the trusting peasant, the French philosopher shows his independence of authority by pontificating about the duality of politics and the military symbolized by Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh, Ho Chi Minh and Giap. "Perhaps we could add Lenin and Trotsky" (1) but, glory be, "In Cuba, military (operational) and political leadership have been combined in one man: Fidel Castro." Then, with the help of a purported statement by Che, Debray reaches for the Leader Maximum:

"The guerrilla force, if it genuinely seeks total political warfare, cannot in the long run tolerate any fundamental duality of functions or power. Che Guevara carries the idea of unity so far that he proposes that the military and political leaders who lead insurrectional struggles in America can be united, if possible in one person" . . .

Marx should never have praised so highly the peasant wars in medieval Germany, much less dared criticize his closest collaborator, Engels, for "paying too much attention to military affairs" in the Civil War in the U.S. If only he had lived to learn the art of guerrilla warfare he would have seen how much easier it is to teach followers to concoct a Molotov cocktail than the theory of proletarian revolution, especially if one does not himself have the foggiest notion of the Marxist philosophy of liberation.

So dominated by the concept of the single leader maximum is Debray that he projects it on an international scale and into the future: "When Comrade Che Guevara once again took up insurrectional work, he accepted on an international level the consequences of the action of which Fidel Castro, the leader of the Cuban Revolution, is the incarnation."

"When Che Guevara reappears, it is hardly risky to assert that it will be as head of a guerrilla movement, as its unquestioned political and military leader."

(To be concluded in the next issue)

(1) This linking of Lenin and Trotsky is, unfortunately, asserted, not in order to set the historic record straight in a country linked with Russia, but merely to give the proper show of "objectivity" as the author launches into a typical Stalinist diatribe: "Let us for the moment decide to take the Trotskyist conception seriously, and not as the pure and simple provocation that it is in practice . . . we have been told that Trotskyists are ultra-leftists. Nothing is further from the truth. Trotskyism and Reformism join in condemning guerrilla warfare, in hampering or sabotaging it." Although "the art of insurrection" had been Trotsky's strongest point both as practitioner and theoretician, the Trotskyist epigones not only did not rise to the defense of Trotsky, but in their high praise of Debray's book, never once mentioned that it contained these slanders. (See *The Militant*) The administrative mentality of those who thirst for power leads naturally to the preference of strange political bedfellows to an open clash of ideas. In both cases—Debray as a Castroite and *The Militant* reviewer as a Trotskyist—the style is truly the man.

MARCH, 1968

MAY, 1968

10c A Copy
6d in Great Britain

Editorial Article

These Uncivilized United States: Murder of Rev. King, Vietnam War

by Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman News & Letters Committees

The long hot summer began in spring this year with so fast-moving a scenario that neither the startling abdication of LBJ nor his loaded "peace feelers," had time to sink in before the shot that killed Dr. King reverberated around the world. LBJ's popularity which had risen late Sunday night with his announcement of de-escalation of the Vietnam war plummeted down with the news of King's assassination on Thursday, April 4.

No serious commentator abroad thought this was an act of a single individual, insane or just filled with hatred. Every one took a second look at this racist land where acts of conspiracy to commit murder "and get away with it" are spawned out of an atmosphere emanating from a White House conducting a barbaric war abroad, and a Congress which allows its "illustrious members" to sound like rednecks bent on murder.

when the "Negro Question" is the issue. Just the week before the assassination those legislative halls were resounding to demands "to stop King" from leading a Poor People's March into Washington.

THE AMERICAN REALITY

Even so dear a friend of the savage U.S. war in Vietnam as Thailand gave vent to criticism as its prime minister announced that he might have to postpone his visit to Washington "should peace and order not be restored."

Life magazine's dismissal of this "orgy of doomsaying" notwithstanding, the American reality that was photographed for posterity showed a National Guardsman armed to the teeth standing at the ready on the steps of the White House as shots were being exchanged less than three blocks away.

The President was compelled to call off the meeting he had scheduled with his Pacific satellites. Though he ordered the flag flown at half mast and shed many a crocodile tear, one thing was clear: no overflow of staged tears by the Administration could possibly whitewash the Presidency and these uncivilized United States of America. The murder of Rev. King pushed even the Vietnam war off the front pages of the papers as black revolts struck out in no less than 125 cities, most of them untouched in the previous hot summers.

The very fabric of American civilization was unravelling so that its racism stood stark naked for all the world to see. When "law and order" was restored, nothing was in the same place, nor will it ever be.

Although LBJ finally flew off to Hawaii to meet his reactionary South Korean co-partner in war, no one cared any longer to listen.

The latest act of hypocrisy had already been revealed by Hanoi's exposure of LBJ's retreat from the promise "to go anywhere anytime to talk peace." The wanton act of murder had already inspired a neo-Nazi to attempt duplicating the act by shooting a socialist student leader in West Germany. (See article, col. 3.)

POVERTY VS. AFFLUENCE

Though all the "dignitaries" were duly represented at King's funeral, the difference between the pomp and pageantry of the funeral of the assassinated president five years ago and the present mule-drawn carriage bearing the body of Dr. King was stark.

This was due not only to the difference between a president and a "civilian." Nor was it just the difference between a rich man and a poor one; Rev. King wasn't all that poor. He had chosen the mule-drawn carriage as symbol for his Poor People's March on Washington not only to underline the difference between affluence and poverty in this richest of all lands, but mainly to stress the difference between the backwardness of the conditions of the black farmer in this most technologically advanced land.

The Negro has always been the touchstone of American civilization, exposing the hollowness of its democracy, the racism not only at home but also in its imperialist adventures. And the latest of a long list of martyrs in the battle for freedom was too much flesh of the flesh of the whole of American "civilization" to be capable of cover-up by all the flags flown at half mast. After the black man had had his funeral, what then?

The true measure of both the grief and determination to go on

with the civil war for freedom was seen, in one form, in the mass outpouring of 150,000 who were in Atlanta, and, in another form, in the black revolts in the cities.

SELF-STYLED "REVOLUTIONARIES"

Enter the self-styled "revolutionaries" with their depreciation of the role of Dr. King in the Movement. It is the obverse side of the hypocritical mourning by the Administration. Parroting the talk of the white power structure, they equate King's life with his stand on non-violence. That isn't why Rev. King was subjected to 30 jailings. It isn't why he earned the most unbridled attack from Congress. And it isn't why he was marked for assassination.

On April 8th, when Rev. King's body was still lying in state, one such self-styled "revolutionary"—William Epton—rose to speak to a campus meeting of some 200, mostly white CCNY students. Just because he was a black man, he had the gall to speak as if he represented the black community as he yelled "We don't mourn King . . . We saw King as an obstacle to the black liberation movement."

Outside of the inhumanity of such a statement about one man who was struck down at the age of 39, having given his whole adult life to the Movement, the misreading of the history of the black liberation struggle is self-evident when one considers that Rev. King was murdered because he came down to Memphis to assist black workers locked in class struggle with the white power structure.

But this isn't a question only of the past, either that of one man or of the Movement. Rather, it is a question of perspective of future development, and is not

6805

unrepresentative of some black nationalists and their white followers in the so-called New Left. It becomes necessary therefore

not only to set the record straight, but what is even more important, to see that the objective movement of history isn't replaced by petty-bourgeois subjectivism—he expressed in the open air crudely by a William Epton, or more subtly in a vanguardist church by Rev. Cleage. Any voluntarist approach cannot but have tragic consequences for the American revolution that is yet to develop.

VOICES FROM BELOW: 1956-66

In retrospect, the coincidence of Rev. King's beginnings as a leader of the Montgomery Bus Boycott with the totally new stage of Negro revolt appears, not as accidental, but the right person at the right place at the right time. That is to say, it speaks the objective significance of Rev. King's role in that struggle, sparked by the refusal of a Negro seamstress, Rosa Parks, to give up her seat in the bus to a white male.

We didn't need the lapse of a decade before we sensed the historic significance of "the forceful voice of the Alabama Negroes who have taken matters of freedom into their own hands." At the very moment of its happening we compared the significance of these actions against the white power structure in Alabama to the Hungarian Revolution against Russian Communism, stressing that "the greatest thing of all in the Montgomery, Alabama, spontaneous organization was its own working existence."

But let us add here that it wasn't only that Rev. King was there. It is that he knew how to listen to the voices from below and, therefore, to represent them in a boycott that lasted 382 long days during which it was in mass assembly some three times a week, daily organized its own transport, moving from a struggle against segregated buses to a demand for hiring Negro bus drivers—and won on both counts.

If there were those who hadn't recognized this totally new stage of Negro Revolt in 1956, none failed to see, on the one hand, the barbarism of Bull Connor's police dogs, water hoses, electric cattle prods, and, on the other hand, the bravery, daring, and massive persistence of the Negroes in Birmingham in 1963.

Again King was there. This time he tried also to give philosophical expression to the struggle against segregation. In his famous letter from a Birmingham jail to the white clergymen who objected to "illegal acts," Rev.

King wrote: "We can never forget that everything that Hitler did in Germany was 'legal' and everything the Hungarian Freedom Fighters did in Hungary was 'illegal' . . . To use the words of Martin Buber, the great Jewish philosopher, segregation substitutes an 'I-it' relationship for the 'I-thou' relationship and ends up relegating persons to the status of things."

Both nationally and internationally, both in relationship to the non-violent tactics here and the more violent phases of the African revolutions, Dr. King had developed to the point where he let nothing stand in the way of the struggle for freedom.

Though the humanist philosophy he then unfolded was quoted from Buber, and not Marx, he was not unaware that the African Revolutions based themselves on the Humanism of Marx.

ISOLATION

It is true that, by 1965, Rev. King faltered seriously as he was completely baffled by the newer stage of Negro revolt in Harlem and Watts and all the other long, hot summers, marked by the shouts of "Burn, baby, burn!" But the isolation from the Negro masses at that moment was not due solely to his belief in non-violence.

Those leaders who made a principle of the need for violence for self-protection were just as far removed from the actual black revolt in the Northern cities as were those like King who persisted in preaching non-violence.

For something a great deal more significant than violence vs. non-violence was involved in the



ARREST OF DR. KING IN MONTGOMERY, 1958

new black mass revolt. New per-

spectives were needed. A new comprehensive view; new allies among rank and file labor and other white militants to help in the arduous task of tearing the whole exploitative society up by its roots.

New leaders did arise, but they travelled everywhere from Cuba to Algiers. They were not where mass power lay—on the streets. They were not working out a new relationship of theory to practice on the basis of it and hence could not give expression to the new in the masses.

1967-68: THE VIETNAM WAR AND DEATH AT HOME

The sickness unto death with the Vietnam war on the part of the youth, both white and black, at first got but little response from Rev. King. However, there was no doubt that the dream he had of achieving equality for Negroes had turned into a nightmare as he moved North and came up against the mightier white power structure there in the person of Chicago city boss, Mayor Daley.

At the same time, the white youth that had gone South to help in the civil rights struggles had clearly, since 1965, shifted to creating an anti-war movement to oppose the barbaric imperialist war.

Many a tactic of the earlier fight — sit-ins as well as teach-ins, marches as well as days of protest on an international scale — had been applied by them to the present struggle which they

saw as critical both to their lives and to any movement "to end poverty." With \$20 billion being poured in annually into the Vietnam war, the Administration's "Great Society" was the forgotten black walf left both homeless and starving in the backwaters of the South as well as the ghettos of the North.

Clearly, without a new unifying philosophy of liberation, that would relate itself to the new reality, it was impossible to move forward. The new voices of revolt in the North as well as Virginia and Mississippi that had not been heard in 1965 were finally heard to say "Hell no, we won't go!" in 1967.

UNITING MOVEMENTS

Dr. King came out against the war and tried uniting the two movements fighting the Administration. At once, he became the target of the most slanderous campaign which showed also its arrogance in telling him to keep hands off other than "Negro problems." In this, the Administration was joined by the leaders of the NAACP and Urban League. Gone was any pretense to black unity. Gone was "approval" of King as a man of non-

6806

May 1968

6 8 7
violence. The deep-freeze against "the war on poverty" was no longer restricted to Southern bourbons but was the dominating line of the Presidency.

It is this atmosphere of capitalistic monolithism that Rev. King confronted as he planned what became his last and greatest battle: to combine the poor — black and white, Indian and Mexican-American — in a massive march on Washington that would not only coincide with the days of protest against the Vietnam war, but also promised to continue till the whole white power structure was disrupted; civil disobedience that would peacefully revolutionize society by masses in motion. Thereby Dr. King courted death.

It was not King who was the "obstacle" to black liberation. It was the capitalistic system. The "guerrillas" had far less a revolutionary perspective with their smaller goals and elitist concepts. Whether the march would have developed to keep things moving, to bring "orderly" government to a halt, it is impossible now to say. What is clear is that the threat of the march kept the Administration on tenterhooks. All sorts of "new politics," too, was brought in to bring pressure upon King to direct the movement into electoral channels — and he seemed to begin to think in these terms himself.

BLACK AND WHITE

But all was still in flux, masses were in motion if not in the Movement; white labor was forced to help black labor at least on specific issues, and not only with finances but a promise to bring "thousands" to Memphis! The atmosphere was charged further as it became clear that President Johnson, while declaring for de-escalation, had in fact embarked on the greatest escalation, although within a more "restricted" area.

The civilians who died were not all in Vietnam. One was gunned down in Memphis and 46 more were killed, 2,600 injured and 21,270 arrested in the week of black revolt that followed King's assassination.

It is true that all that Dr. King had achieved through the years was but prologue. But it is prologue to a drama of liberation that is unfolding daily. His greatness lay in recognizing the objective movement of history and aligning himself with it. Precisely because it was both objective and had masses in motion, it is sure to continue on a high historic level till society is reconstructed from the bottom up.

6807

May 1968

June-July, 1968

Who Arrested the French Revolution?

De Gaulle's embrace of the OAS fascist generals as co-leaders in the counter-revolution against the darling of the French masses — workers, students, and the average man in the street who attempted to reconstruct French society — should have surprised no one. It most assuredly didn't surprise U.S. imperialism that so clearly understood its class nature that it rushed to the defense of the falling franc. Compared to the threat to the whole "Western system" that a successful French Revolution would have represented, de Gaulle's arrogance and persistent backbiting at the US was a minor enough irritant.

In face of the naked fascist slogan — "Cohn-Bendit to Dachau!" — all the ideologues of the ruling classes, including the Communists, came out against "leftist trouble makers," and stood ready to defend "law and order" — the Gaullist democratic (sic) order!

Why, then, didn't the class nature of Communism become as clearly visible to the Left, especially the Trotskyists? Why, although, from the start, the Communist attacks on the Trotskyists (who were among the most militant fighters in reaching for workers' power) was unbridled, did the Trotskyists continue to behave as if it were a mere question of "tactics"? Why, above all, do Trotskyists continue to distinguish between "the bourgeois order" and the "Communist"? These are not pedantic questions. The Trotskyists will be among the first to suffer from the reaction. Already they are listed among the organizations to be banned. Yet they are sure to continue to behave as they have for the past three decades and end up as the left face of Communism.

Knowing this, the Communists feared nothing from the exposure of the fact that Premier Pompidou had regular contact with the CP leaders throughout the revolutionary situation. Openly enough, through their control of the CGT, they did their best to contain the revolt, keep it from uniting with the students who had inspired it, and easily switched to both the electoral field and narrow trade unionism, not to mention their role as provocateurs for de Gaulle, a role, three decades back, they played for Franco as the Anarchists and the Trotskyists were still fighting the fascists and the Spanish Revolution was being destroyed.

History is about to repeat itself. Communists feel confident that there is nothing to fear from the Trotskyists. What they do stand in mortal fear of is power in the streets, spontaneous independent proletarian power which is independent of state-capitalism calling itself Communism. It is this, just this, Communism is out to destroy. It is this, just this, that de Gaulle appreciates in

Communism. For it is this, just this, which permits him his two faces: OAS and CP.

To all this Trotskyism remains deaf, dumb and blind, not because it does not know Communism's "history," but because it cannot comprehend its class nature. Because it is this which arrested the French Revolution, it is to this that we must turn.

STATE-CAPITALISM AND THE TROTSKYISTS

The first Trotskyist denial that Russia had become a state-capitalist society was based on the fact that, though "Cain-Stalin betrayed the Russian Revolution," its result — nationalized property — remained and, therefore, the workers' state, "though degenerate" enough to be tied to a Hitler-Stalin Pact, had to be "defended."

The second denial that Communism was no more than a euphemism for state-capitalism concerned East Europe where statified property had been instituted, not via a social revolution from below, but via a bureaucratic Party from above, propped into state power with the aid of a "Red Army." Again, though "born degenerate" and even though the Hungarian Revolution opened up an entirely new page in world revolution, and, in pools of blood, proved it wanted freedom from Communism (its Party as well as its secret police), wanted freedom to establish genuine workers' power through Workers' Councils, still the Trotskyists kept intoning that it was "impossible" to have a revolution unless there was a "vanguard Party to lead it."

Then the Third World was born without the aid of any of the shibboleths of Communism — statified property, or "the Party," Red Army, or the "International." So the Trotskyists came

up with still another excuse for tailending the Communists — these countries were technologically backward and US imperialism, as "enemy No. 1" would only perpetuate neo-colonialism and "therefore" one must be with the "Communist camp."

Now, what can possibly be the excuse for not unfolding a totally new philosophy of liberation free from all the shibboleths of what they call "betraying Stalinism"? France is neither isolated nor a backward country. It is far from having "workers' power" thrust upon it, pure, degenerate, or in-between; from below or above which somehow has to be defended from "imperialism no. 1" as an outside force or some inner "usurpers" (unless that be precisely Gaullism which must be overthrown and which Communism, instead, is propping up).

France is a technologically advanced land which is in the very heart of Europe. It is a world power, with a force frappe to boot. And the native Communists have betrayed it not once but twice. (Three times if you count the mid-1930s not only as it appeared in Spain, but also in France.)

When the Communists preferred sharing power with de Gaulle although they controlled the majority of the Resistance, and, again, even when the Marshall Plan came "to save" Europe for imperialist enemy no. 1, still the Trotskyists could not totally free themselves from the coat tails of the Communists. After all, the Trotskyists maintained, the Communists opposed the US purchase of Western Europe, they were the "mass party" and "the relationship of forces demanded," etc., etc., etc.

As in the mid-1940's, the Communists refused to fight for power if it meant facing an independent proletariat that came to power without the aid of the Communist Party or the Red Army, so in 1968 they "led" the proletariat only in order to betray it. How many betrayals are needed to kill the self-delusion of the Trotskyists about the class nature of present-day Communism even where it is not the state-power?

The answer is that the number of times is numberless for the good and substantial reason that the Trotskyists themselves believe in statified property, the State Plan, the elite party which binds them to the concept of the backwardness of the proletariat that is incapable of reaching socialism without being "led by the vanguard party." It is for this reason that the struggle against Stalinism, despite all the sacrifices, has amounted to nought, that is to say, has looked like just a family quarrel precisely because that is all it is.

It is for this reason that shouting "betrayal," "class collaboration," "new form of reformism," means nothing since they continue to tailend the Communists on the ground that "only in action" can they win over the masses in general and the rank and file Communists in particular. The elaborate subterfuge for the Trotskyist bizarre behavior has stood out nowhere more clearly than in the self-paralysis they brought upon themselves in France in 1968.

Although they have been in the forefront of the militants calling for workers' power and the revolution has only been arrested, not yet totally destroyed; although the fascist face of de Gaulle is aided by the Communists who are willing to settle for a few ministerial posts in an impotent Assembly, yet the Trotskyists do not draw a class division between themselves and the Communists. The reason for this can have but one explanation: they have no new, that is to say, genuinely Marxist philosophy of revolution, but only a variant of the Communist elitist one, for which, once again, they are ready to die.

No doubt it is brave to die for the revolution. The point, however, is to live for it. That is to say, to assure the revolution's success by a new unity of theory and practice which relies, not on some "vanguard party," but on the masses, the masses alone who would help forge out this totally new philosophy because they had a vision of a fully free society.

TO LIVE FOR THE REVOLUTION

To live for the revolution is not done only "in action," nor only by "bravery." It is impossible to prove "in action" what you have proved incapable of proving in theory—that you do indeed have a philosophy of liberation totally freed from Communist elitist concepts, and totally dependent on only one force beside a philosophy of liberation and that is the spontaneity of the masses who will themselves "to a man" reconstruct society on totally new, Humanist beginnings.

The general strike in France was not, after all, just an economic strike. And this was so, not because there were no economic demands, but because they clearly were not the dominant demands.

This was not just a political strike, again not because there were no political demands, but because these, too, did not predominate.

This general strike sharpened all class relations, and not only in the factory, but also the nature of education and "culture." In achieving this, the general strike went beyond economics, beyond politics, questioned the very way of life and its underlying philosophy.

No one, not even the bourgeoisie, failed to recognize that, both among the workers and the students, this was neither a dollar and cents nor a parliamentary struggle. The general strike of 10 million French workers brought the whole economy to a standstill, was not isolated from the student youth that inspired it, and, together, they nearly toppled de Gaulle.

Yet the revolutionary situation did not develop into a full revolution. And while the counter-revolution is mobilizing both visibly and clandestinely, the revolutionary forces are in disarray, not because they were defeated, but because they lacked the unifying cement of a philosophy of revolution. It is no accident that it was in East Europe, precisely because their struggle was directly against Communism in power, that this was expressed most clearly by Danilo Pejovic in *Socialist Humanism*, p. 199:

"Philosophy and Revolution is only another way of expressing Marx's well-known catch phrase about the 'realization of philosophy,' beginning as a revolution in philosophy in order to end as a revolutionary philosophy in the form of the philosophy of the revolution." This is the missing ingredient in France today.

For the 10 million workers and tens of thousands of students who have begun this new page in world freedom—the first such in the post-war world in a technologically advanced land—the world and France is still full of revolutionary possibilities. For the heroic Frenchmen who have already destroyed so many myths—the invincibility of de Gaulle to the myth that global glory-seeking is a substitute for social revolution within a country; from the myth that Communism represents "the Left" to the myth that revolutions can be made without the proletariat; for the world that has watched this drama of revolutionary change in the heart of Europe and saw France standing on the threshold of revolution, a new rebirth of revolutionary passion and revolutionary philosophy is sure finally to coalesce.

The one still remaining advantage the French masses possess is that their revolution has not been defeated. It has been arrested; it is threatened; the whip of counter-revolution is visible. But there is time yet for regroupment and rearming with a philosophy for our age, the concretization of the Humanism of Marxism.

6809

June - July 1968

Editorial Statement

**All Eyes On Czechoslovakia,
All Hands Off!**

A new page in the history of freedom is being written in Czechoslovakia. It is vividly described in the report, *At the Crossroads of Two Worlds*, (center supplement) by a participant in the dramatic events. We ask all our readers, here and in Europe, in Latin America and in the Middle East, in Asia as well as in Africa, to spread this analysis of events far and wide.

This is not just a report of what the Czechoslovak press calls "democratization," and the New Left here would describe as "participatory democracy." This is not only a description of the sudden birth of a genuine public opinion (expressed almost totally without censorship in the mass media) in a Communist land which is situated strategically at the crossroads of two worlds. Nor is it only an exciting drama of a people striving for national independence while the "fraternal Communist nations" of the Warsaw Pact are engaged in a game of Russian roulette as they conduct their military maneuvers all along the Czech frontier. This is also, and above all, the depiction of a flood of ideas emanating from a people who have "found their tongues."

Workers are openly questioning their conditions of labor and life. The student youth are expressing their solidarity with East European youth like the Polish, against whom the Communist rulers have struck out with slanders interlaced with a strong anti-Semitic flavor, with firings and outright arrests. And the youth are also expressing their solidarity with the rebels in West Germany and the revolutionaries in France. The intellectuals are demanding not only freedom of the press, but freedom to act, to create, to build opposition parties.

Should anyone in the United States be so obtuse as to imagine that this applies only to lands bound by a single party system, let him take a second look not only at the Tweedledum-Tweedledee character of the American two-party system, which is obvious enough, but at the not so obvious—and when it comes to the field of ideas, far more important—fenced-in pragmatism and arrogance that is summed up in the American intellectual concept of "the end of ideology."

Now compare this ideological barrenness with the concepts of the Czech historian, Milan Hubel, to whom a demand for a plurality of parties signifies a demand for "a plurality which grants freedom to a flow of ideas, competition of concepts, and an outline to get out of quagmire . . ."

We are in two different worlds. It is all the more necessary, therefore, to emphasize that, in expressing our solidarity with the Czechoslovak people, we are not doing something "for" them; we have a lot to learn from them.

In calling for all eyes to be on Czechoslovakia, and all hands off, Marxist-Humanists have in mind not only Russian state-capitalism calling itself Communism that had dominated Czechoslovakia for the past 20 years. We are also expressing our total distrust of and opposition to American capitalism which has seen fit to nurture the most notorious Czech Stalinist general who fled the country the moment of birth of democratization.

It is not, however, the escape of one general with secrets of the Warsaw Pact that throws fear into the heart of the Russian ruling class. On the whole, they know how to play those kinds of games better than "the West," as is evident from all the secrets they pried loose from NATO. What they fear most of all are masses in motion.

MASSES IN MOTION

The Russians, for example, have learned well enough how to get along with Rumania. Yet Rumania has officially questioned the whole concept of the Warsaw Pact, which Czechoslovakia has not. Rumania is also flirting with China, which again, is not the way of the Czechoslovak leaders. Rumania displayed its discipline

before Czechoslovakia embarked on her democratization experiment. Yet none of the threats against the latter have ever been pronounced against the Rumanians. Therein lies the true tale which illuminates the capitalist class nature of present-day Communism.

The Rumanian "deviations" have all been handed down from above. No freedom has been allowed the masses. The lid is kept firmly down on any free expression. Though the Rumanian nationalists, like the Russians themselves, no longer bow to the name of Stalin, as China does, Rumania remains completely totalitarian. Hence, the Russians and the Rumanians understand each other perfectly. They can horse trade in capitalistic fashion, practice class compromise and can turn the full state-military fury against intellectuals who would demand freedom of expression and workers who would demand control of production.

Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, though it is a long distance from allowing the exercise of workers' control of production, has released public opinion from censorship. The result has been that not only are intellectuals raising existential questions, and returning to their origin in the Humanism of Marxism, but masses also are in motion. The Russian and East European hard-liners' attacks on the Czechoslovak leadership have only solidified the nation, including those far to the left of the Dubcek leadership.

TWO DECADES. PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION

East Germany is vying with Russia as to who can be most Stalinist in its vitriolic attacks on Czechoslovakia. With its Berlin Wall and unchanged Stalinist leaders, it has reason to fear the fresh air of Czechoslovak democracy. By contrast, Yugoslavia, which was the first to break from Stalin's empire in East Europe, seems the model of "democracy" and that, indeed, is the most the present moderate Czechoslovak leadership plans to allow.

It is all the more essential to remember the true facts. One is that Yugoslavia remains a single party system that continues to jail Left opponents. The other relevant fact is that it was not the nationalist breakaway of Yugoslavia in 1948 which inspired serious rebellions against Stalin's Russia. Rather it was the proletarian revolt in East Germany in 1953, shortly after Stalin's death. The general strike on June 17, 1953, against speedup and low wages, and for "Bread and Freedom," put an end to the twin myths of the invincibility of Stalinist totalitarianism and the alleged incapacity of the working class to rise in revolution in a Communist land. At the same time it inspired the revolt in the Vorkuta forced labor camps in Russia itself.

It is against similar inspiration emanating from Czechoslovakia today that Russia and East Germany are trying to insulate the masses. All in vain. Already there is clandestinely circulating in Russia a 10,000 word essay by the Nobel prize-winning Russian physicist, Prof. Andrei D. Sakharov, which states: "We must, without doubt, support their (Czechoslovak) bold initiative, which is very important for the fate of socialism and the whole of mankind." Furthermore, Prof. Sakharov condemns the imprisonment of Russian writers who oppose the regime, Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniels, and others. The latest group of rebellious writers who were sentenced to labor camps include Yuri Galanskov, Alexander Ginzburg, Aleksei Dobrovolsky and Vera Lashkova.

No wonder the Russian ruling clique worries about the consequences, for Russia, of Czechoslovak democratization. No doubt Brezhnev and Kosygin remember that deStalinization did not begin in Russia from above, but in East Germany, from below. Moreover, Bertolt Brecht's winged phrase, "to think is to change" notwithstanding, the intellectuals did not lead, and at first were in no hurry to follow, the spontaneous revolt of the East German proletariat. For the most part, the intellectuals then stood on the sidelines.

It took another three years plus Khrushchev's open declaration for deStalinization before the intellectuals in Communist lands would rebel in such massive numbers as to bring about not only a revolution in philosophy, but a philosophy of revolution. But once the intellectuals and workers did finally unite in a struggle against repressive Communism, they did indeed initiate the beginning of the end of the Russian empire in East Europe. What the Polish intellectuals and youth pioneered in 1956 as they turned from purely economic to existential questions—and with it the humanist character of genuine Marxism—the Hungarian Freedom Fighters brought onto the historic stage in open revolution.

6 8 1 1

THE PARTY, THE PARTY

Without engaging in revolution, the Czechoslovak New Left did touch the raw nerve of Communism—in this case, Czechoslovakian as well as Russian Communism. They did this by questioning the concept of the vanguard, not to mention omniscient, role of the Communist Party. Here Dubcek refused to budge. On the contrary. He was not only adamant about the "leading role" of the Party. He not only claimed total credit for the new road of "democratization." And he not only opposed the creation of new opposition parties. He also staked out the claim that "the greatest majority of the best creative minds in the country is in the Party."

This, then, defines the next battleground of ideas. Hence, the importance of the fact that the philosopher, Ivan Svitak, and others, who raised the question of opposition parties, the role of the Communist Party, raised them as inseparable from their philosophic foundation, on the one hand, and the needed unity of worker and intellectual, on the other hand.

In raising the fundamental question of philosophy and revolution, the party and spontaneity, the unity of worker and intellectual, they have indeed laid the foundation of a new relationship of theory to practice. Thereby they have gone far beyond anything raised by the New Left in "the West."

The reporter from Prague whom we print in this special issue of News & Letters rightly stresses that the events he describes are but the first act of a live drama whose ending cannot possibly be known in advance. Show your solidarity with Czechoslovakia!

August 4, 1968

Raya Dunayevskaya

6811

Aug-Sept 1968

October, 1968

6812

Editor's Note: Ruzja Dumayevskaya has turned over her column this issue to Ivan Svítak, Marxist Humanist lecturer at Charles University in Prague, long one of the most active critics of totalitarian concepts of Communism. Born in 1925, Svítak spent his youth on a forced labor squad in an iron foundry during the Nazi occupation in World War II. He was a contributor to the international symposium on Socialist Humanism and wrote the following during the "democratization period" before the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia.

THE CURRENT CRISIS

By IVAN SVITAK

The three-months intermezzo between totalitarian dictatorship and socialist democracy ended with the adoption of the democratization programme by the communist party. Only now could the second stage of the democratization process start, a stage that is much more significant than the first one, a stage that will decide the character of the future political relations. The second stage will decisively be influenced by the central political question.

This question—formulated in different ways—is: Do six million non-party members, citizens of this country, have the same political rights as members of the communist party—or should they be given only a greater amount of freedom, not endangering the privileges of the party members? Are we going to have democratic, free and secret elections or are we going to play the old game with new people? Are we going to live in a sovereign European state with a polycentric political system or in a non-sovereign state formation, whose leading representatives fear most of all tank-divisions of their own allies?

PRAGUE SPRING

What happened in the first democratization stage that has been concluded in March? There were two types of changes: seemingly insignificant personnel changes, which are, however, structurally significant, and much more important structural changes carried out sometimes by people of the old political configuration. The first type of changes evoked mass excitement as they were accompanied by a well canalized demagoguery against the scapegoats that are to pay for the sins. The second type of changes brought about an unusual, unique, precisely carried out and improvised, but after all, an unwanted political turn.

The personnel, structurally insignificant changes were so far carried out in the supreme offices and represented the personnel exchange of the First Secretary of the Communist Party, the President, the Government, the Chairman of the National Assembly, the Presidium and Secretariat of the Communist Party and some representatives of mass organizations. The totalitarian dictatorship carried out an exchange of persons, publicly proclaimed its crisis and the desire for a new form of political life.

At the same time it left untouched all its mechanisms and did not rid one single representative of the old course of his mandate as deputy nor of his place as a member of the central committee of the communist party. The progressives and the conservatives made a temporary compromise which must soon fall apart, because it is impossible to continue in the demagogic search of the offenders in the person of the prosecutor Urválek and such like, who are linked by absurd bonds with their own victims.

The personnel exchange of communists in leading positions is finished. Non-party members could not have their say in this matter, although the government also wants to be their government. If you want to hear our voice, then extend the government by the representatives of six million adults—non-party members. We have just as good candidates as those nominated by the communist party and perhaps even better ones.

BESIDES personnel changes there were also a number of fundamental structural changes, which are much more significant guarantees of democracy than the new persons:

1. an actual, although not legal freedom of press and a limited application of other freedoms, mainly the freedom of assembly,
2. a spontaneous wave of political demands, dominant among which is the demand for rehabilitation of political victims,
3. the coming into existence of the first associations, discussion clubs or bodies of existing institutions, where ipso facto an alternative of the existing policy is being created.

The value of these structural changes is exceedingly high, but it must be expected that pressure will be directed against them in the sense of their gradual limitation and regulation. We

must, therefore, develop our civil rights, energetically and conscientiously, without demagoguery against the communists, but unyieldingly, quickly, in the masses of the non-party members, hic et nunc, here and now.

Besides these two types of changes one should also note those changes that did not take place. Besides people, nothing has so far been changed in the mechanism of totalitarian dictatorship and its heritage. Intelligent and able politicians, at the head of a monopoly apparatus of power are much more dangerous than simple duds, who are not even able to choose for this coup d'état, able generals.

The political structure did not change. The National Front is being artificially revived only for the old game to continue in it. If anybody today represents the nation then, it is not the old political parties, which represent only institutionalized collaboration. The ideas of the National Front expressing wider, above-party interest is not foreign to us, but we must openly admit that in their present form the non-communist parties and organizations represent all kinds of things, only not the nation, ideas or democracy.

THE MODEL of democratic competition for power is not ideal, but it is the best that exists today. In the history of political theory and in the constitutions of states, theoretically better mechanisms of the execution of power have been proposed many times. They were either not put into practice, or they collapsed into worse systems endangering human freedom much more than the imperfect, vulnerable, but functioning democracy. We welcome and want to have a better democracy than the Western kind but we do not want a worse democracy and on this we firmly stand.

The contemporary state of the political life in Czechoslovakia requires a healthy opposition to the communist programme. Not an anti-communist party, which would have its aim in the change of the economic relations and the total re-orientation of the state, but a political party or parties which would strive for the possibility to rule together and in partnership with the communists as the rightful representatives of the electorate.

If the communists are really for the freedom of assembly then they must admit that even within the limits of the present constitution every party, which is in agreement with the Declaration of Human Rights, has its right to existence. For us the question can therefore not arise whether it is permissible to found such a political organization, but only the question whether to found it, when to found it, and with whom and with what programme. We want to participate in the life of the political institutions of this country. We shall consider which is the best road, and whether the question of an opposition is expedient. Realistic political opposition can also exist without these organizational forms and can appear elementally as an extra-parliamentary opposition, as a students' movement or in any other form.

Regardless of temporary complications that will be quickly solved under the conditions of an open exchange of opinions and points of view, the movement of clubs of committed non-party members is arising as an exceedingly significant phenomenon. The clubs are already today a political platform and represent by their different points of view a realistic political force—an "opposition." The clubs of committed non-party members must be extended and linked so as to support by their polarization of opinions the natural tendency towards the origin of new political parties.

Regardless of the origin of other parties—to be more precise, regardless of the fact whether they will be permitted—the clubs have today already great possibilities. They can become a platform of political thinking and stimuli for public activity which in itself is more important than the elections themselves.

PERSPECTIVE OF THE CLUB

The main question of the second phase of the democratization process are the elections, which must be secret with independent candidates and separate lists of candidates if the democratization process is not to become a swindle in the very end. The nomination of independent candidates, proposed by non-political organizations, e.g. the clubs of non-party members, must be legalized in the election law.

The way, the elections will be held and the wording of the election law are the most important questions of this spring.

We can have a president and a government forced on us, but we will not have the election law, the rules of the democratic game forced on us. The clubs should openly state that they want to have a realistic influence in the nomination of candidates on the

course of the elections, that they want to put up independent deputies. We shall not vote for anyone who was a deputy in the present National Assembly. Not for anyone without any exception.

At present the clubs associate various political opinions of non-party members. They at the same time represent the basis for the activity of non-party members in special interest organizations, mainly the trade unions, and the youth movement. So far we can as yet not foresee the organizational form of the clubs and their future necessary politically more precise shape.

WE SHOULD soon submit to the broader public a certain political conception, with a kind of minimum programme of civil freedoms in Czechoslovakia. It is not necessary to put forward the most radical demands, but to pledge ourselves, the non-party member candidates and the future prospective representatives of state power to fulfill the principal demands on the basis of which we are willing to support certain deputies.

Clubs of non-party members should quickly arise in mass organizations, unions of artists, and should guarantee the basic programme of human rights. If democratization means the normalization of conditions leading towards democracy, then nothing can stand in the way of this activity. I openly state that we are not enemies of communism, that we will have nothing to do with the policy of anti-communism. We are fully responsible, adult, politically thinking citizens of a socialist country, who have outgrown the tutelage of the police-bureaucratic regime and want freedom and socialism.

We are striving for a parliamentary opposition as an alternative of the present execution of state power, because we fear that an extra-parliamentary opposition would be much more dangerous. If the political activity of the people will not be purposefully included in the creation of the socialist democracy, then it will necessarily take unto itself much more problematic forms, which it will be difficult to stop and which could endanger also the state and both its nations.

We know from an old fairy tale that the wolf had his voice changed to be able to get at the lambs. We know the voice of the wolves, the voice that was just as dangerous for communists as for non-party members. We shall not open the door, when he will try to convince us with a changed voice, because only fairy tales have a happy end. We do not, a priori, mistrust the communist, but in answer to any gentleman whose voice is breaking we clearly answer no.

The victory of little David over the giant Goliath is a myth. A reality on the other hand are the descendants of the people, whom Hitler's fascist dictatorship burned in millions in the gas chambers of the concentration camps, the young Israelis who tell us:

Never again like sheep! Never again like sheep!

—Ivan Svitak

Prague, April 18, 1968

6813

October 1968

CZECHOSLOVAKIA Revolution and Counter Revolution

In the stealth of the night, when most of Czechoslovakia slept, hundreds of thousands of Communist troops, in endless columns of Russian tanks, rolled into the country which had just completed the very first act of peaceful revolution—ousting the old Stalinist (Novotny) leadership and electing a new one, establishing a free press, radio, TV, and, above all, letting the people find their own tongue.

The ruling Russian bureaucracy had tried to justify their counter-revolutionary act by inventing a blatant two-fold lie, to the effect that "counter-revolutionary" forces were about to take over Czechoslovakia from within, and that the Russian Communist Party and state leaders had been "invited" by persons, unspecified, in Czechoslovakia. Instead, what the invading troops found were a people never before so united in opposition to the occupiers—not from West Germany, as charged, but from the "fraternal Communist countries."

The youth who were supposed to have been interested in nothing but "material things" were laying their lives down for the freedom of their country. "The little old ladies" who were supposed to have lived their lives, were taunting the troops as, by the thousands, and tens of thousands, the people streamed into the streets to sit defiantly in the squares. Brief but effective strikes were carried out. No Czechoslovak collaborators were found anywhere. **DUBCEK: ILLUSION OR COMPROMISE?**

Not only could the invaders not find a Quisling; they could not even find a Kadar. The defiance was total. When their leaders returned from Moscow, having there accepted the degrading conditions of the invading power, and showing they were becoming experts at speaking with two voices, the Resistance continued. So Dubcek is back in Moscow trying to see whether he can get the occupying forces out of his country. Is he subject to such vain illusion or only searching for a formula to make occupation acceptable?

"For three minutes on Red Square I felt free. I am glad to take your three years for that."

—Vadim Delone, 23 year old student, upon being sentenced to prison for protesting the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The shock of the invasion did not exhaust itself in the non-Communist world, but penetrated to the Communist parties. Thus, the two biggest Communist parties in Western Europe—the Italian and the French—opposed, as did the British Communist Party and those of the smaller countries.

What is far more important is that the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia has made it necessary for the anti-Vietnam war movement to fight on two fronts since it has, of necessity, centered attention of freedom fighters to the Russian, and not just American, danger. Surely, the Russian ruling bureaucracy visualized just such consequences. Why, then, did they embark on an action, the military success of which spelled out ideological failure?

There are some who think that it was Poland's Wladyslaw Gomułka, faced at home both from the Left and the extreme nationalist Right, who tipped the scales in favor of invasion. There are others who think the Russians have been led into the fatal decision by East Germany's Walter Ulbricht, who built an impregnable Berlin Wall to keep his workers from escaping to West Germany—only to find that the German workers could now make good their escape by a simple visit to a fraternal country, and from Czechoslovakia easily cross over into West Germany. There is, of course, no doubt that both of these situations were factors in the final decision. But anyone who believes in the fairy tale of the tail wagging the dog doesn't know the Russian bear.

"Would I go to jail for something I think is not right?"

—Vladimir Dremlyuga, unemployed worker sentenced to three years in a prison camp, upon being asked by the Russian court if he still considered that his protest was right.

No, to perceive the reasons for such a calamitous adventure one must look at Russia itself. Moreover, in looking at Russia, one cannot restrict himself to look only at repercussions in Russia of events abroad. Rather, one must keep eyes glued on what emanates from Russia.

As against the Sinyavsky and Daniel trial in 1966, the 1967 trial of Ginsburg and others (who are not part of the inner core of the highly structured Moscow literary establishment) had expanded their "platform" from literary freedom to civil rights, including that of public demonstrations in which they had participated. While it is true that these are all still literary men, and they have not succeeded in establishing a relation with workers as had the Czechoslovak intellectuals, there is also no doubt that unofficial groupings exist underground that publish "literary essays," including expressions of sympathy for Czechoslovakia, and demands for more freedom in Russia. The ruling bureaucracy knows well that where there is that much discontent in the privileged strata of the population, the restlessness among the masses is deep indeed. As one inmate of the Vorkuta forced labor camp, where there was a revolt back in 1953, expressed it then: "Russia is more than ever full of revolutionaries."

Thus, two altogether new features characterize the latest trial—that of Pavel Litvinov, Larisa Daniel, Konstantin Babitsky, Vadim Delone, and Vladimir Dremlyuga. First and foremost, this group appeared the day after the invasion of Czechoslovakia with placards demanding "Hands Off Czechoslovakia!" Secondly, this group of young intellectuals included an unemployed worker, Vladimir Dremlyuga.

The extreme military act of violating the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia was not to meet military threats, but to stop history's clock signalling the creation of Communism's gravediggers. As Ivan Sitak put it the day of the invasion: "Authentic Marxism is the main enemy of the Soviet power elite, not the Americans or Chinese."

What delusion to think that such an "enemy" can be stopped by tanks. Nothing can divert the masses from the road to freedom, much less the idea of freedom. New ideas are spreading throughout the world more powerful than the struggle for power between Russia and America, or Russia and China, much less East and West Germany. Czechoslovakia itself is proof of the emergence of a new world movement as a freedom movement, the very existence of which corroborates the Marxist-Humanist approach. **SPECTRE OF MARXIST HUMANISM HAUNTS COMMUNISM**

A spectre is haunting Communism as it has haunted private capitalism—the spectre of Marxist Humanism. It is this which has crossed over the boundaries between nationalities within a country and the borders between countries. It is this which transcended the boundaries that separate the generations and keeps workers and intellectuals apart; transcended, not as something super-human or supra-historical, but as the very stuff of which revolutions are made and remade. Its unifying vision of spontaneity and organization as a single force cannot be encapsulated in an elite party, but releases itself as a forward movement of the masses.

Czechoslovak Spring 1968 may not have reached the heights of Hungarian October 1956 with its Workers' Councils. But it has established new points of departure for unifying Marx's theory of liberation with its practice, and for this Czechoslovakia will forever remain enshrined in the hearts and minds of freedom fighters the world over. The Aug. 20 invasion by Russia and its satellites can no more erase the Czechoslovak experiment than it can stop history from dialectically developing to the end that something which is totally new: authentic Marxism, Marx's Humanism, which is no longer only what it was when Marx first proclaimed it in 1844, or even as recreated in 1956 in the Hungarian Revolution.

Czechoslovakia's greatest achievement is that it began anew the working out of a relationship between theory and practice, philosophy and revolution, freedom and reality. What it was prevented from completing remains our task. It begins with studying the Czechoslovak experience as told by its participants in the pages that follow. It does not end until, throughout the world, the philosophy of freedom has become reality.

October 4, 1968
Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman
News & Letters Committees,
Detroit

Harry McShane, Chairman
The Marxist-Humanist Group,
Glasgow

December, 1968

Kolakowski On Alienation

(Ed. Note: The following review was originally written for "The Activist," student journal of Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.)

THE ALIENATION OF REASON, A History of Positivist Thought, by Leszek Kolakowski. Translated by Norbert Guterman (Doubleday & Co., N.Y., 1968)

The name of Leszek Kolakowski, the most original and most controversial philosopher in Poland, first came to the attention of the American public in 1956, when the existential questions he had raised, as well as the Humanism of Marxism he tried to re-establish, came into head-on collision with official Communist doctrine. By the time the intellectual ferment in Poland reached its climax in the Hungarian Revolution, philosophy and revolution had indeed become inseparable. The Communist state labelled his views as "Revisionist" and Professor Kolakowski came under violent attack.

Today the philosophic ferment in Poland again coincided with youth unrest and economic crises preparatory to revolution, not only in Poland, but in Czechoslovakia as well. This time a strong dose of anti-Semitism was injected into the attack on Professor Kolakowski. He was expelled from the Communist Party, removed as head of the History of Modern Philosophy at the University of Warsaw, fired from any position at the University.

UNDER THE circumstances, it is only natural that the reader approaches a work by Kolakowski on several levels simultaneously. On one level runs a succinct narrative history of positive thought which differs quite sharply from academic texts on that subject in this country. There is nothing dogmatic about the views presented either from a Marxist or bourgeois vantage point. The deceptively simple style and the emphasis on the informational aspects of this history of a philosophic system so bent on "pure experience" and "demystification" of Reason, and seemingly so far removed from the concerns of Communism, do seem to add up to a subject with no inferences for Communism. By the time the reader reaches the last sentence of the work, however, he is startled by the reality, the timeliness, the oppressive presence of something unstated but implied.

"The philosophical work of our day," Kolakowski concludes, "has found itself caught—to a great extent under the influence of positivist criticism—between the philosophy of life and the lurid Manichaean vision." (p. 218)

It is then that the reader decides he better retrace his steps to the beginning. It is then he notes the title—*Alienation of Reason*—and begins to feel that the author's critique of Positivism is an implied critique also of totalitarianism. It seems to this reviewer that Kolakowski is also asking the reader to work out some of the implications of the criticism of positivism for "our day."

IT IS QUITE a challenge to confront the book on that level, especially when one is conscious that it is not as easy to decipher Aesopian language in philosophic and political tracts in "our day" as it was during Tsarist days. All Lenin had to tell the readers when, after the revolution, he reprinted an old text, was for him to keep in mind Tsarist censorship, and for the word, "Japan," to read "Russia," or for the expression, "scientific philosophy" to read "revolutionary Marxism." Moreover, even were we able to read correctly the inferences, that is not all Leszek Kolakowski is saying, for this is a serious and original study of Positivism "in itself"—that is to say, outside of any relationship it might have to our day in state capitalist countries calling themselves Communist.

"It is possible to begin the history of European positivist thought almost anywhere," the author informs us, "for many strands we regard as of primary importance in contemporary positivist doctrines had antecedents in antiquity." (p. 11)

Space forbids a reviewer from attempting to follow the author in covering the breadth and scope of the work. I shall, therefore, limit myself to the central points which, in the view of Kolakowski, entitled Positivism to be considered in its "diachronic unity," despite the many transformations in each historic period not only from antiquity to Hume, but especially from August Comte who coined the words, "positive philosophy," to our day when it still exists under the shortened term, Positivism.

"Positivism," writes Kolakowski at the very start of his analysis, "is a collection of prohibitions concerning human knowledge." (p.9) The chief of these prohibitions is any consideration of universal concepts like Reason. Its demotion as an autonomous sphere, if not outright rejection on the ground that it could not be reduced to an observable fact, meant the discarding of everything that was not verifiable fact at the moment, and the elevation of science to a worship. Along with the elevation of science to a worship, this "philosophic, or, if you wish, anti-philosophic revolution," Kolakowski writes, has signalled the "doing away with subjectivity." It is against this that Kolakowski's critique is directed.

NOTHING SO sustains his anger as a philosopher and as simply a human being: "The primary aim of this subjectivism without a subject was to formulate the idea of a 'pure' experience" (p. 104) as if thought is no more than a reflex "like a knee jerk" and, indeed, Positivism had made it its aim "to track down those elements in the current scientific image of the world that had been 'thought into' it." (p. 104). Positivism was determined to root this out, considering that metaphysics as a whole belongs in the dustbin of the pre-scientific, pseudo-hypothesis and pseudo-problems.

The trouble was, as Kolakowski beautifully demonstrates, that it wasn't only "metaphysics" that Positivists eliminated but all knowledge, including that which was more meaningful than science, but not empirically verifiable. Their abandonment of metaphysics, concludes Kolakowski, "applies not only to ontological and epistemological reflection but to the historical and humanistic disciplines, which the positivists lump together with metaphysics." (p. 198)

Thus, positivist theory gave up the potentialities of mankind for "facts" and anything that was not at the moment a fact had to be discarded, as was the case with Ernest Mach, a founder, at the turn of the century, of Empirio-Criticism, who though a scientist, said that the atom was but a "mental artifice." As against this type of mechanical materialism on the very eve of the nuclear revolution, Karl Marx, who lived when Newtonian mechanics dominated the age, declared: "To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie." We have been living under this lie ever since: the cultural crisis manifested in the philosophy of positivism cannot be seen outside of the historical circumstances that gave rise to it.

KOLAKOWSKI implies, but does not explicitly state, that, at its very birth, "positive philosophy" was a conscious reaction against Hegel's "negative philosophy," that is to say, the dialectics which does not affirm, but negate, reality, i.e., the status quo. Stahl, the German counterpart of Comte, openly proclaimed his intention to destroy Hegelian philosophy because inherent in it was "the principle of revolution." It is true that Positivism destroyed also the metaphysical illusions in natural science and thus freed the scientific temper of the age. Kolakowski holds on to this merit of Positivism, rejecting, however, its worship of scientism. Toward the end of the work this rejection rises to a crescendo of emotion:

"Suffering, death, ideological conflict, social clashes, anti-theoretical values of any kind — all are declared out of bounds, matter we can only be silent about, in obedience to the principle of verifiability. Positivism, so understood, is an act to escape from commitments, an escape masked as a definition of knowledge, invalidating all such matters as mere figments of the imagination stemming from intellectual laziness. Positivism in this sense is the escapist's design for living." (p. 210)

And again: "The language it imposes exempts us from the duty of speaking up in life's most important conflicts." (p. 210)

The reader must always bear in mind that when Kolakowski writes about speaking out on today's conflicts, "our day" is never only a point of time, but also a point on the map of Europe, specifically the Communist state of Poland. Moreover, he must say what he has to say in terms of his subject matter, Positivism. The Positivist attitude to "metaphysics" is, precisely, the Communist attitude, so that when Positivists ascribe the failure of their proclamation of the end of "metaphysics" "once and for all," not to their scientific doctrine, but to "human stupidity," Kolakowski's remarks have a double edge to them: "They are not seriously interested in finding out why the social results of their work are so insignificant, nor why people continue to ask questions that science cannot answer." (p. 198)

THIS REVIEWER considers the above chapter, "Logical Empiricism: A Scientific Defense of Threatened Civilization," the most important chapter of the book. Both in its attack on science, "technological efficiency," and "the pragmatic interpretation of truth" as well as in the way the author relates Positivism to the specific historical period between the two world wars, Kolakowski is crying out his opposition.

But, suddenly, Kolakowski sees merit in Positivism: "The sheer rigor of the positivist rules has awakened intellectuals to their own responsibilities, and in my opinion have been of practical aid in counteracting attempts to blur the boundaries between the position of the scientist and the obligation of the believer." (p. 206)

Anyone who is acquainted with Kolakowski's most famous work during the 1957 period, *History and Responsibility*, can have no doubt about whom he is castigating. Moreover, Kolakowski returns to his critique of Positivism where institutionalized Communism can certainly see its reflection.

THIS QUEST for Reason and refusal to lose the identity of "Subject" will continue to "create" the individual as "something" quite unique, irresponsible, "negative," i.e., revolutionary, and pushing history forward. And Kolakowski, in conclusion, therefore, repeats the question that has been running like a red thread throughout his work: "How can we account for the peculiar fact that over many centuries human thought has ascribed to 'Reason' the ability to discover 'necessary' features in the world, and for so long a time failed to see that these features are figments of the imagination? The vast amounts of energy squandered in these explorations and the extraordinary tenacity with which they were carried on are worth pondering, all the more because the explorers were perfectly aware of the technological inconsequence of their efforts." (pp. 215, 216)

The reviewer must end with apologies to the reader for not letting him in on Kolakowski's highly original views on the very topic that would no doubt most interest the American reader — the chapter on Pragmatism. He will need to read this for himself and, since it is a field with which he is familiar, have the special pleasure of comparing his views with those of Professor Kolakowski. He will, in any case, find this experience especially rewarding because the excellent translation by Norbert Guterman will make him forget that he is reading a translation.

6816

Dec. 1968

JANUARY, 1969

10c A Copy
6d in Great Britain**Of Arms, Men and Racism****NIXON, New, Old and Napoleonic**By Raya Dunayevskaya
Chairman National Editorial Board

On Jan. 3, in what he billed as his last public dinner speech before inauguration, Nixon proposed a toast to the President and the presidency. Far more precisely than the intellectual jibes that stress Nixon's nonentity—"When Nixon is alone in a room is anyone there?"—Nixon's own toast centered attention on the most fantastic imperial power the world has ever seen. It was clear that, in toasting President Johnson, he was toasting the presidency which he would wield for the next four crucial years.

The 12 grey-suited, nameless, faceless, mindless, rich WASPS that Nixon named to the Cabinet disclosed still another facet of the old Cold War warrior who had first sprung to fame during Joe McCarthy's witch-hunting heyday, that of little Napoleon dreaming to be a big one, "alone" setting foreign and domestic policies.

Designated for the number one job in the Cabinet, the Secretary of the State, William P. Rogers, had one thing to say in praise of himself: "I have never said or written a word about Vietnam. I am very happy about that." Allegedly, this proves how uncommitted the new administration is to old policies.

Instead, it discloses computer-oriented mindlessness of the new Cabinet regarding the barbaric Vietnam war that is tearing this nation apart, that brought down the Johnson Administration, and is sure to do the same for Nixon.

In any case, neither Nixon nor his Defense Secretary, Melvin Laird, from Joe McCarthy's home district, can lay claim to a record that is quite such a blank sheet of paper as that of William P. Rogers. On the contrary. Not even the white-heat desire to win the election and, therefore, the need to appear like a critic of the Vietnam war, could quite turn the hawkish Senator Laird into a dovish Secretary of Defense.

"Nuclear Supremacy"

Nixon himself was the one who delivered the most irresponsible speeches of the campaign. In its final lap, he suddenly discovered a "security gap," thereby expanding the Vietnam war to a possible nuclear confrontation with Russia!

Our new little Napoleon promised to close "the security gap," to restore "our nuclear superiority," build up "air supremacy" and give greater weight to the military as opposed to the top civilian administrators in the Department of Defense: "I intend to root out the whiz kid approach."

This speech, made on Oct. 25 over CBS, was followed the next week by the promise to revive the costliest, the most dangerous, in fact the greatest fiasco of that "whiz kid" former Defense Secretary, McNamara—the controversial and notorious TFX or F-111. Nixon chose Fort Worth, Texas, where General Dynamics (the largest weapons producer in the U.S.) built the F-111 to announce: "the F-111 in a Nixon Administration will be made into one of the foundations of our air supremacy."

As the close election results showed, this type of nuclear-powered sabre rattling very nearly lost the presidency to Nixon. He never did get a majority of the votes, and he got a plurality only because the bomb-away General Curtis LeMay made it look as if Wallace would, indeed, be the spoiler of this election.

A Repeat of the Eisenhower Days?

The facelessness of the Nixon Cabinet notwithstanding, each has shown a special talent for putting his foot in his mouth each time it is opened. It all began when the new Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy, set off a minor international monetary crisis with his very first press conference. Considering his arch-conservatism and concentration on internal, not external problems, that was quite a feat.

The irony was that Kennedy is of the old, old corporate capitalism school which thinks that, "to stabilize the dollar," lower wages and higher unemployment are needed at home; playing with the gold standard abroad would only divert from primary goal. The whole notorious "Chicago School of Economics" is famous for preferring a good deal of unemployment to a little bit of inflation.

Nixon is busy staffing the administration with successful businessmen in the Eisenhower tradition. The formula of the then Secretary of Defense Wilson was: "What is good for GM is good for the country." This business

philosophy brought about recessions enough in the 1950's. At the end of the 1960's, it can lead to nothing but utter catastrophe, especially since the added ingredient of Nixon's businessmen is racism—a total insensitivity to the Black Revolt.

Thus, even the "moderate" Robert Finch, the new Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, proposed, in his first conference, to "rationalize" the sprawling 435 separate domestic programs that are in operation now. Obviously unaware that at least some of them reach into the rural South, his computerized mind sounded as the efficiency expert bent on eliminating "boondoggling."

Immediately, Andrew Young of the SCLC stated that what is now going to the poor blacks in the South is the very barest minimum, is in local hands, and cannot be tampered with whatever. "We Blacks will tell it to Nixon like it is." White racists assassinated Reverend King. They showed disdain for the Poor Peoples March to Washington. They will not be allowed to practice "economy" at the expense of the already impoverished.

Stability—for Profiteers

Where Eisenhower attempted to have at least one plumber in his Big Business Administration, the mindless Nixon Administration appointed, as Secretary of Labor, George P. Schultz, the Dean of Chicago University's Graduate School of Business Administration.

Nixon is so concerned with the stability of the dollar for the profiteers that, along with attempting to slash the 435 domestic welfare programs, he intends to wield as big an ax in foreign aid. With the help of the Southern Democratic reactionaries in Congress, the Republican ax-wielders have already cut by a full third the miserly help the United

(cont'd)

6817

States gives to the third world, especially Africa.

The richest country in the world ranks seventh in this field. Gloating in the downfall of Sukarno, they think that NEFO (New Emerging Forces) is only an administrative figment of Sukarno's imagination. It is not hard to prove that that collapsed with Sukarno's downfall. What delusion, however, to think this means that the actually emerging new forces abroad, as well as the revolutionary forces at home, had been silenced. All such delusion proves is that Nixon's Achilles heel is in the head.

The South Rides Again in the North

Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew is not the only nameless one who, overnight, became a household word for racism. Nor was the racist character exhausted with the addition of a Cabinet member from the Deep South — Winton Blount of Montgomery, Ala., who, as Postmaster General, acts as dispenser of patronage jobs and political organizer for the Administration.

The illy-white Nixon Cabinet also contains one Walter Hickel as Secretary of the Interior. In his very first press conference, Hickel not only promised to give away most of Northern Alaska to the oil and natural gas interests; he also found it necessary to vent himself of this racist diatribe to explain why he did so: "Just to look it up and throw the key away would be unreasonable when there is only one white person for every million acres." Thus does the now Secretary of Interior talk of people and the huge federal wildlife reservation, about the last great unspoiled territory in America.

To round out the breed that must deal with labor unrest, racial strife, youth revolt—social unrest in general that parallels the Civil War days—we get John Mitchell as Attorney General. It was he, who wrote the winning jingle for the racist election — "Law and Order."

Judging by the manner in which the very first session of Congress saw the reactionary Southern Democrats and the Republicans gang up together against Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Nixon may feel he can depend on this unholy alliance to see him through the period ahead. What he doesn't know is that Congress is not where the decisions of the next period will be made, and that this first act of Congress is sure to do nothing but incense the black community more than ever.

Nixon may think that, since the blacks did not vote for him, he "owes" them nothing. But his good friend, Governor Reagan of California, could inform him how badly fares the policy of the big stick, the fastest gun on the

street, and the hayonet in the universities (see Editorial on Black Students Strike at San Francisco State College, p. 1).

"The Big Decisions"

Organization, organization, organization — it oozes out of all pores of Nixon's aides. For them, the presidency begins and ends with the organization and rationing of the activities of their Man. Toward that end, you first delegate authority to others; ideas can go hang. Nixon's energies must be conserved.

Like the "deliberate speed" of the 1954 Supreme Court decision which allowed the South to nullify, and the North to disregard, desegregation, so "the dignified pace" with which Nixon is inching into the White House allowed the underlings to sound off, thereby disclosing, in the raw, the racist character of private corporate capitalism, what "the dignified" would disclose only when dressed up in the proper democratic language.

A comparison of the two sets of policies would, however, show their deep kinship in both hawkism and racism. They are of the same flesh and blood, or, more precisely put, profit-making nature as conglomerate capitalism.

Thus, Nixon, his energies "left free for the really big decisions," announced as his first international assignment a special trip by Pennsylvania Governor Scranton to the Middle East. (Heavily financed by investment bankers and the oil interests, the Nixon campaign had early been told that oil was in the Arab Middle East, not in Israel.)

Upon his return from the Middle East, Governor Scranton announced that the policies of the Nixon Administration would be more "evenhanded." To what extent this led to the perpetually reheated situation there no one can tell, but one point is clear: "the really big decisions" were being dictated by the interests of conglomerate capitalism in general, not by little Napoleon in particular.

The World's Policeman

Thus, the latest, and more important appointment, was the naming of Henry Cabot Lodge to head the Vietnam "peace" negotiations in Paris. An admirer of that notorious admirer of Hitler, General Ky, this latest addition to the Nixon high command sets the stalled "peace negotiations" off on a course as far away from the reality as possible. Right after the announcement, the stock market went down.

It would be hard to conceive of anyone being able to harden the Johnson line, but little Napoleon managed it. The true continuity of Imperial America is seen in

the views of that modern Rudyard Kipling, W. W. Rostow, who speaks of the nuclear titans as "the trustees of the human race." When it comes down to brass tacks "trustees" becomes a single world policeman — United States of America:

"When we get the really big planes, we shall see in other parts of the world as well the positioning of forward equipment, with more of our forces maintained in the center but capable of quick movement." (The New York Times Interview, 1/5/69).

Power in the Streets

There are those who have rationalized the vote for Nixon to mean that he would more quickly "disengage" from the Vietnam war since it is not only the majority of the people who oppose the war, but there are even sections of the capitalist class that no longer find it "profitable."

Thereby these self-deluders not only forget the class momentum of the war, but they are putting blinders on themselves to shut out from sight the far more important objective compulsions of an imperialist world in crisis, an imperial nuclear world whose foundations are threatened by the social unrest tearing at the vitals of class society.

To protect themselves from any possibility of a social revolution, the sky would be the limit for social repression and continuing war.

If there is to be an end to the Vietnam war, it will be from a continuing and expanding anti-Vietnam war movement, not from a Nixon. If there is to be a stop to the fatal goal of "nuclear superiority," it will not come from the leaders of either nuclear titan — the U.S. or Russia.

They can be depended on only to push their own imperialist aims. The signs of revolt within Russia, on the other hand, reveal that the true opposition is within each country.

Crucial to the whole development in the immediate period ahead in this country is the black revolt which is the Achilles heel in the theme sounded by Nixon as soon as the election results were known — "bring us together." Nixon better forget the homilies and face reality. The key to the situation lies neither in the Executive Branch nor in the legislative halls of Congress, much less the Supreme Court decisions. It lies in the city streets.

Jan, 1969

6818

EDITORIAL ARTICLE

U.S. AND RUSSIA ENTER MIDDLE EAST COCKPIT

BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA
Chairman, National Editorial Board

The barbaric act of hanging 14 men from their necks in the public square in Baghdad has riveted attention, not so much on the alleged "Israeli spies," as on the degeneracy of the Iraq revolution. A decade ago it seemed to herald a new world. Today it has nothing to hang on to, except enmity to Israel. And even this "unifying force" failed to unify the Arab world.

IRAQ, EGYPT, AND NIXON TOO

The present Iraq government, the newest in a series of military coups and counter-coups, embarked upon the "discovery of Israeli spy rings" soon after it came to power "to clean up corruption." Obviously it was harder to achieve clean government than to unleash propaganda against the remaining 2,500 Jews in the country whom it promptly designated as "Fifth Columnists." Although other Arab countries, especially Egypt and Syria, suspected the virulent anti-Semitism was but a coverup to move against "Arab socialists," they at first could say little against the military junta headed by General Ahmad Hassan al-Bakr because they themselves held most adult Jewish males in prisons, and find anti-Israel propaganda almost the only unifying cement of their crisis-ridden countries.

After two months of "interrogations" and trials, however, one former high official of the Iraq Government, a left Ba'athist, was declared dead "while undergoing interrogation." Others, still held in jail, are feared to be among those marked for future hangings. Even foreign diplomats were not exempt from violent physical attacks. Indeed, on the very day of the hanging of "Israeli spies," a Syrian diplomat was wounded on a street in Baghdad.

The last straw, insofar as Egypt was concerned, was thrown by al-Bakr, a notorious anti-Nasserist, when he demanded that the Arab press laud his actions "for the Arab cause." The main Egyptian daily wrote that the gory spectacle was "not a heart-warming sight nor is it the occasion for organizing a festival and issuing invitations."

Consider, then, the sensitivity of the new Nixon Administration which announced that the President was looking for "new approaches" to the Middle East turmoil "insulated from decisions on the untidy rush of events in Iraq." All this is preparatory to plunging into a "Big Four" conference which will attempt to impose

"peace" on the Middle East without either Arab or Israeli having a say in the determination of their own fate. It is not hard to imagine the "objectivity" which will result from his Westernization of the Middle East crisis.

TWO OF A KIND: RUSSIA AND THE U.S.

Russia stood altogether mute during the savage executions. No doubt, part of the reason is the spontaneous affinity it feels for Iraqi anti-Semitism. But that is only part of the story. A more important reason for the lack of criticism, at a time when Egypt and Syria did attack the hangings, is the orientation of the Iraq military junta's questioning of the granting of concessions by the former administration to France to exploit 10,000 square kilometers of Iraq territory for oil development. Russia's interest in the same project overshadows the inclination to go along with De Gaulle's proposal for "Middle East peace," or to line up with "Arab socialists."

Outweighing both considerations is the possibility of the U.S.-Russia "detente," that is to say, U.S. recognition that Russia is in the Middle East to stay.

This doesn't mean that Nixon is walking into a "trap." On the contrary. Precisely because the U.S. does see further Russian expansion in that strategic area as signifying a shift in the world balance of power, it is anxious to re-establish its own role in the Arab Middle East before a confrontation with Russia. The U.S. sees as one with Russia — little powers must not be allowed to set the time for the nuclear titans, even if it is the lives of the little ones that are at stake. In a word, the see-allikes consider the Middle East an arena for a world power struggle, not for an Arab-Israeli confrontation "ahead of time."

Before the Arab-Israeli War in 1967, when both Russia and the U.S. thought they could control their "spheres of influence," the two super-powers could disregard the French proposal for a "Big Four" conference. They now know differently. Hence the present readiness to accept the junior partnerships of France and Britain and even the "world body, the UN", to delimitate "a settlement."

The stage is all set for the deal. The substitute actors are in their respective places. But what about the real actors, the peoples whose lives are at stake? What has happened to that new, third world that it can now be ignored?

THE ARAB REVOLUTIONS

There was a time when getting rid of Western imperialism and internal feudalism in the Arab Middle East took priority over an Arab-Israeli confrontation. It is true that the setting up of the independent state of Israel in what was formerly Palestine brought about the first Arab-Israeli war. But the very success of Palestine's freedom from British imperialism set in motion truly independent Arab national revolutions. A dimension other than oil, a new human dimension — freedom — entered the Middle East.

By 1958, when the Iraq revolution overthrew the Hashemite monarchy, the whole Dulles strategy of anti-national revolutions, for a new type of colonialism, and the creation of SEATO, a euphemism for American imperialism, fell apart. By knocking the kingpin out from under neo-colonialism in the Middle East, it became possible to start on an independent road.

Iraqi nationalism refused also to follow either Nasserism or the bastard socialism called the Ba'ath Party in Syria. As against the tendency to single party rule, Kassim, who headed the first republic of Iraq, allowed the activities of political parties, from moderate to Communist. (Now only in Israel is the Communist Party a legal party.) The unfinished state of the revolution, narrowness of mass base, however, made it impossible to fight the entrenched feudal landlords. The agricultural reforms were not implemented and when the Kurds demanded autonomy, the revolt was bloodily put down. A further political vacuum was created with Kassim outlawing all parties. The isolation from the masses was completed with the increase in unemployment and poverty. By 1963 Kassim rule was bloodily overthrown by a Ba'athist led military coup.

The most recent two-stage coup — on July 17 and again on July 30 — brought to power a right-wing Ba'athist retired army general. The young colonels who aided the coup were soon scuttled. The new junta moved against the "French faction" but did nothing to get the country out of the deep economic crisis into which it had been plunged by the disastrous Arab-Israeli war in 1967.

The country is in chaos, and yet it is, precisely, the total disarray of the ruling classes and the military, on the one hand, and, on the other hand the dissatisfaction of the great masses, (rural and urban), with their conditions of life as well as the armed resistance of the Kurds that has, in fact, created a pre-revolutionary situation in the country. It is fear of revolution that has compelled the al-Bakr clique to rely solely on the enmity to Israel and pure anti-Semitism to get it out of the ever-deepening crisis.

It is this which discloses yet another aspect of anti-Semitism — especially Russian anti-Semitism.

RUSSIAN ANTI-SEMITISM, ANTI-REVOLUTION

Had it not been for the hangings in Iraq and the Russian silence about them in face of the attacks on them by the Arab countries closest to Russia, one may not have felt compelled to take a second look at the existence of anti-Semitism in the Russian orbit, dating back to Stalin's reign. Because, in theory, Communism stands opposed to anti-Semitism, it was so shocking to find it in existence that it was all too easy to attribute it to Stalin's paranoia, rather than to the objective conditions which had produced the transformation of a workers' state into its opposite — a state-capitalist society. Inside Russia the opposition to Stalin's rule could be seen even as the people defeated Nazism.

For one thing, the heroic Russian masses refused to labor under the same exploitative conditions as they had done during the war. To get a sufficient labor force, all penalties for violations of Stalin's Draconian "labor laws," were cancelled.

Secondly, there were the returning veterans who had seen "the West" and failed to bow to the "superiority" of Russian "socialism." Thirdly, the youth and intellectual opposition grew.

It is because the revolutionary opponents grew, that Stalin un-

(Cont'd)

February 1969

(Cont'd)

loosed the anti-Semitic campaign that he euphemistically called the struggle against "rootless cosmopolitans." Anti-Semitism had nothing to do with the birth of Israel (which, at first, Stalin voted for, as none but the Jews had then successfully fought British imperialism). It had everything to do with internal conditions in Russia — the restlessness of the Russian masses with Stalinism.

Anti-Semitism had nothing to do with "rootless cosmopolitanism." It had everything to do with stifling the emergence of new revolutionary forces that were struggling to come to power and be independent of Russian domination, be that in Yugoslavia or France. The notorious "Doctors Plot" was not a struggle against "Zionism" in Israel but against revolutionary opponents in Russia and in the satellites. How quickly old radicals forget, once a new situation arises and a "new" enemy is discovered.

Of course, imperialism, whether Western or Zionist — or, for that matter, Communist of either the Russian or Chinese variety — has to be fought and destroyed. But how does that excuse the Left (from all the varieties of Trotskyism to the most "non-ideological" would-be revolutionary) for designating all the Arab lands, including even the feudal monarchies, as "representing the progressive forces"? What accounts for the designation of Israel, from its birth to its most persistent anti-Zionist manifestation, as representing "Western imperialism"?

Of course, internationalism must replace narrow nationalisms, but how does that get to equal "the annihilation of Israel?" Shouldn't self-determination guarantee Israel's right to exist even as it holds for all sovereign nations? Marxist-Humanists refuse not only "to take sides" in Big Power deals but categorically refuse to violate proletarian internationalism and the class struggle within each existing power on the dictates of the Stalinist-Maoist-Castroite "two camp" theory of the world. There has to be an independent way out. There is!

Of course, anti-Semitism is but one manifestation of capitalism. But when a "socialist" country like Poland in 1968 carries on so virulent an anti-Semitic campaign against its revolutionary opponents as to ape the Nazis in establishing a special "Jewish Department," it is high time both to recognize the class nature of present-day Communism, which is but a euphemism for state-capitalism, and to recognize that, in this epoch, it signifies anti-revolution as well.

To the extent that Israel is now an occupying force, resistance against it will, and is, emerging. It is this, and not commandos from without that serve as a beacon also for the Jews who are opposing

SOCIAL REVOLUTION


The danger now is to force a false "Arab unity" against Israel, or "Zionist unity" against Arabs, thereby not only giving the Big Powers an excuse for intervention, but actually stifling the new emergent revolutionary forces throughout the Middle East even as Stalin crushed every revolution in the path of the Red Army as well as every revolutionary movement that dared aspire to power outside of the Red Army orbit.

We have seen the same role reenacted in Paris last Spring. Are we now to have it reappear in the Middle East? That would be the greatest crime any revolutionary could commit. For, note this, the restlessness of the Iraq masses and the demand of the Kurds for autonomy there is directed, not at Israel, but Iraq. The opponents in the jails in Syria oppose Ba'ath rule; the very narrow mass base speaks loudly enough of the Ba'athist leaders' total isolation from the masses. And the student demonstrations in Egypt, as all over the world, are directed, not against a "foreign" enemy, but against the native rulers.

Nationalism is not the beacon it was a decade ago when it seemed to be the way to fight both imperialism and native class exploitation. New forces are emerging who are searching for a more comprehensive theory of liberation that would release these new revolutionary passions and transform the pre-revolutionary situations into social revolutions.

This is no longer a question of pointing to a theoretical void. The practical consequences of the void cry out loud for a philosophy of social revolution. If we only open our eyes, we will see new forces of liberation emerging. Do not stifle them.

*For an analysis of the Ba'ath Party, as well as of Mao's ventures into the Middle East, see "The Arab-Israeli Collision", A Political-Philosophic Letter, June, 1967, News & Letters.



Vladimir Hlavin

„Kdo je u tebe antisemita, ty kluku židovská!“
"Whom are you calling an antisemite, you Jew-bastard!"
—From Dikobraz (Prague), July 23, 1968.

Zionism. It was the threat of genocide that unified the nation. Commandos from without, led by exhorters of the "annihilation of Israel" cannot, however, be anointed as a "revolutionary force," not even when Mao* adds his blessing to those of the fascist Al-Shukary. In any case, the new mass dissatisfaction in Arab lands, disclosed in Iraq, is against their ruling classes, not against Israel. It is this the Left is in danger of strangling by tailending Communism.

February 1969

April, 1969

Hegel vs. Mao: From Culture to Philosophy to Revolution

In a muted form, Czechoslovakia has been showing all over again what the supreme elemental outburst of proletarian revolution in Hungary had revealed in 1956: that the struggle for freedom involves, among other things, a breakthrough in the field of ideas against the entrenched ideology—what Marx called the Fetishism of Commodities, or private property and "equality of exchange and Bentham." These fetishes of capitalistic culture, in its private form, had been replaced in state-capitalistic Communism by State Property and the Vanguard Party. It is these the Hungarian Revolution demolished and Czechoslovakia is again challenging. In their place the Hungarian Freedom Fighters had established Workers Councils, many parties and such a free flow of ideas that the Humanism of Marx saw its first direct historic re-establishment. It is this which has never stopped haunting Mao to this day.

Despite the opportunism and pure anti-Russian chauvinism which has led Mao presently to oppose the Russian invasion, Mao has not changed one iota from 1956 when he urged Khrushchev—that Khrushchev needed much urging—to lead a counter-revolution against the Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

It is true that in China itself, for a brief few weeks, Mao had opened a new road called "Let One Hundred Flowers Bloom, Let One Hundred Schools of Thought Contend." But the hypocrisy was clear from the start, in the insistence that, under all circumstances, one and only one Party remains the "leader." The moment the voices of revolt began contending vigorously against Mao, stating that what they had in China was not genuine Marxism, freedom, that freedom to speak: out was ended, and, instead, China embarked on the so-called Great Leap Forward. Mao was sent retracing the stages of alienation described in the Phenomenology as if he were being stage-directed by Hegel from his grave.

HEGEL'S PHENOMENOLOGY AND "THE DISCIPLINE OF CULTURE"

Marx considered Hegel's Phenomenology "the birthplace of the Hegelian dialectic," which contained "all the elements of criticism frequently worked out in a manner far beyond the Hegelian standpoint," that is to say, very nearly Marxist. Marx insisted that Hegel's abstractions were, in fact, criticisms of "whole spheres like religion, the state, bourgeois life, etc." The part that directly concerns us here was the one Hegel entitled "Spirit in Self-Estrangement, the discipline of culture."

Note, please, that self-estrangement, alienation, has not been overcome though we have now reached the part on Spirit which is the cornerstone of the Hegelian "system." Remember also that Hegel was himself a bourgeois, and wasn't out to destroy bourgeois society. Nevertheless, so devastating was his criticism of its beginnings in the Enlightenment that very nearly nothing has to be added by Marxists provided, of course, they understand that in Hegel, the critique is "standing on its head," that is to say, is dealt with only in its thought forms. What saved Hegel was his profound, comprehensive, objective historic sense. Thus he praises the Enlightenment's struggle against superstition. "The Enlightenment," he wrote, "upsets the household arrangements which spirit carries out in the house of faith by bringing in the goods and furnishings belonging to the world of the Here and Now . . ." (p. 512)

In our day, the positive feature of a new culture "upsetting the household arrangements"—in our case by the dominant prejudices which constitute white culture's "faith"—"by bringing in the goods and furnishings belonging to the world of the Here and Now," is seen in such slogans as "Black Is Beautiful." First, because it is true, and secondly because such separation from the dominant superstition is a step toward a new revolution, even as the Enlightenment was a step toward the French Revolution, and the Chinese did away with the comprador bestiality of Chiang Kai-Shek.

What happens the day after the positive features, which are but beginnings, is what Hegel was tracing and criticizing. First what Hegel called the spiritual life of "pure culture," which is always just on the surface, "is the absolute and universal inversion of reality and thought, their entire estrangement the one from the other . . . each is the opposite of itself." (p. 541) This is so because, to begin with, the here and the now was a "self-estranged reality." It must therefore be negated again, but the limitations of culture make this impossible for by now "the noble type of consciousness" finds itself "related to state power." (p. 526) The inexorable next

stage is that "in place of revolt appears arrogance," unless one sees it as but a "shrivelled skin" and is ready to slough it off.

MAO'S ALIENATION FROM THE MASSES

Once freedom is the goal, then nothing, culture included, will be allowed to stand in its way. Only then, to repeat the expression Hegel borrowed from Diderot, "will, one fine morning, it (spirit) give its comrade a shove in the elbow, when, bash! crash—and the idol is lying on the floor." But this "bash! crash!" can't just be destruction—which is what attracts all—it can come only when a new road to freedom is open before you. It got open in the Phenomenology because it was Mind, Spirit, the Dialectic of Theory and Practice which did the shoving, made Reason see that Culture was but "shrivelled skin" that must be sloughed off if the road to revolution (the French Revolution in Hegel's case) was to be open.

If religion is the opiate of the people, culture is the "rum and coca-cola" come on. In the case of Mao, once the alienation from the masses possessed him, he engaged in such a "giddy whirl of self-perpetuating disorder" called "Great Leap Forward" that it brought the country to near-famine. Having failed to create a revolution in production relations, Mao had no choice but to go in for the epiphenomenal.

At first he had tried to escape the relegation to the cultural sphere. What gave Mao a second chance was the rise of the Third World in the early 1960's. He then attempted to mask his opposition to proletarian revolution by declaring the new, third world of underdeveloped countries to be the "true storm centers of world revolution."

Thereby he hoped to win this new world and challenge Russia's leadership of the Communist world. It almost worked! U.S. imperialism's attack on South Vietnam in February 1965, however, made clear the need for united actions—and when Mao refused such a united front with Russia to aid Vietnam, it brought about a new opposition both within his own Central Committee and on the part of other Communist Parties who previously had taken the Chinese side in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

THE PULL ON YOUNG REVOLUTIONARIES

It was then, and only then, that Mao dropped the other shoe—revealing the true retrogressionist character of his thought. You could say that, though Mao didn't recognize philosophy, philosophy recognized him so long ago it predicted his coming. The fetishistic character of the so-called cultural revolution struck out, not against exploitative production, but the bland "four olds" (old ideas, old culture, old customs, and old habits). All sound and fury and no class content. Only he who has no future is so scared of the past! By any other name, including that of Red Guards, the elitist character of Party, Army, Red Guards and what now merged into the one and only "helmsman at the ship of state" is as unmistakable as was Louis XVI's "L'etat c'est moi."

It is not Mao that concerns us. The only reason we spent so much time on him is because in this year of transition, when genuine freedom movements are arising very nearly daily, we have to answer: what can possibly be the pull of Mao—or, for that matter, Castro—upon today's young revolutionaries, black and white, who are neither tied to state power, or elite party and/or guerrilla band, much less hunger for single world mastery?

The genius of Hegel, his relevance for today, is that he summed up what he called "the experiences of consciousness" in so comprehensive, so profound a manner over so long a stretch of man's development—from 500 B.C. and the Greek city-states to 1800 A.D. and the French Revolution—that the tendencies in the summation of the past give us a glimpse of the future; especially when materialistically understood in a Marxist-Humanist, not vulgar economist, manner.

Briefly, it is this. There is a dialectic of thought from consciousness through culture to philosophy. There is a dialectic of history from slavery through serfdom to free wage labor. There is a dialectic of the class struggle in general, and under capitalism in particular—and as it develops through certain specific stages from competition through monopoly to state. It in each case calls forth new forms of revolt and new aspects of the philosophy of revolution.

Only a Marx could work out the latter. What Hegel had shown were the dangers inherent in the French Revolution which did not end in the millenium but in Napoleon. In a word, the dialectic disclosed that the counter-revolution is within the revolution. It is the greatest challenge man ever had to face.

In our age of state-capitalism, totalitarianism, and transformation into opposite of the proletarian revolutionary party to the single State Party, philosophy is not only the abandoned orphan or whom no one cares, much less cares to develop and labor at and with, it is the missing link everyone seems determined will never be found. Time is so short, yes. But without such "labor, patience, seriousness and suffering of the negative" the danger is that you fall backward, just when you are on the threshold of high new adventure, into one of the existing world societies, rather than move forward to a new society.

Excerpts from a Lecture

HUMANISM AND MARXISM

Marx's theory of liberation was unique in a way which illustrates why this discoverer of what has been called the materialist conception of history insisted on calling his philosophy a new Humanism which, as he put it, is "distinguished both from idealism and materialism and at the same time constitutes their unifying truth."

On Religion, Alienation and Science

Take the question of religion. No doubt all of you know Marx's famous statement that religion is the opiate of the people. But how many know the context in which the expression appeared? It is one of the most beautiful passages in Marx's writings which discloses how human was his materialism, how majestic the historic sweep of his demand "to unmask human self-alienation in its secular form now that it has been unmasked in its sacred form." Here is the whole passage:

Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of men, is a demand for their real happiness.

Religion is only the illusory sun about which man revolves so long as he does not revolve about himself.

Man makes religion; religion does not make man. Religion is indeed man's self-consciousness and self-awareness so long as he has not found himself or has lost himself again. But man is not an abstract being, squatting outside the world. Man is the human world, state society.

This Humanist view is what compelled him not only to separate himself from the religious view but also from the "vulgar" atheists. Instead, it was "the human world, state, society" that preoccupied him. Naturally, the human world is, primarily, concerned with, engaged in, material production. This is what Marx meant by "material"—the basic and primary conditions of human existence. Rooted in material production, in the relations of men at the point of production, are the legal property relations as well as its philosophic concepts.

"It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence," wrote Marx in the most often quoted, and most misunderstood statement of his position, "but, on the contrary, their social existence that determines their consciousness." Far from there being anything mechanical about this materialist conception of history, the truth that social existence determines consciousness is not a confining wall, but a doorway to the future, as well as an appreciation of the past, of how men molded history. Humanizing the Hegelian dialectic which, though openly declared to be the "source of all dialectic," seemed to limit itself to thought alone as if thoughts were something "outside" the human being, Marx wrote that same year, regarding the Silesian weavers' strike: "The wisdom of the German poor stands in inverse ratio to the wisdom of poor Germany."

PIVOTAL TO the Hegelian concept of dialectical development through contradiction and to the Marxian concept of the materialist conception of history is this: the more degraded the worker, the more oppressed, the more alienated, the greater is his "quest for universality." In this "quest for universality," in this striving for freedom and the reconstitution of the wholeness of man, the proletariat transforms reality itself.

Marx's insistence that this was a scientific philosophy was backed up not alone with factual data, but, above all, with historic movement. Thus, in contrast to utopian socialism and to mechanical materialism, Marx's view was that there is neither anything "automatic" about the inevitability of socialism, nor "glorious" about science; it all depended on the human subject, on the revolutionary compulsions of the proletariat to transform reality by undermining the existing order and creating the new one.

Marx's vision of the pluri-dimensional in man as well as the creativity of his energies and passions—"the energizing principle," he called it—came from the historic concept that masses in motion, not individual genius, are both passion for freedom transformed into energy and manifestation of universal "Reason." Reason and Revolution are the inseparables in the transformation of reality. Never for a single instant, did he take his eyes off the actual class struggles that would decide the fate of men. Just as it was men who made religion, not religion men, so it was they who developed science, not science them. The human being, not science, was the stuff of revolution.

LONG BEFORE Einstein formulated the principle of transformation of mass into energy and showed that all elementary particles are made of the same stuff, energy—as against the 19th century concept of matter, the 20th century holds that "Matter exists because energy assumes the form of elemental particles" — Marx warned against the direction science had been taking. A century before the atom was split, and out of it came not so much the greatest energy force on earth as the most destructive, Marx, in 1844, wrote: "To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie."

We have been living this lie ever since with the result that Man, not just figuratively, but literally, faces his own destruction. The destructive forces come not only from science, but from the class structure of society. Indeed, it is the class structure which determines the direction of science, even as it is this class structure which spews out of its dying self racism.

The American Roots of Marxism: Against Racism

Truth is always concrete, wrote the most idealist of bourgeois philosophers, Hegel. In practicing that principle, the most revolu-

tionary philosopher, Marx, appeared "non-materialistic" to the self-styled American Marxists who tried evading the actual Civil War by covering themselves with the abstraction that they were opposed to "all slavery, wage and chattel."

Marx's reply to these would-be adherents was that, if this was Marxism, he was not a Marxist. Truth is always concrete. The greater affinity of ideas turned out to be between Marx and the American Abolitionists, both regarding their total opposition to slavery and their recognition that what defaced America could only be regenerated through association with black revolutionaries. Or, as the great New England Oppositionist, Wendell Phillips, put it, Oppositionists were 10 feet tall because they stood on the shoulders of the Negro slaves following the North Star to freedom.

Long before the civil war was in the offing, Marx argued that intellectuals were held in tow by the ruling class in their unawareness of the origins of language itself and use of certain words. Thus, they used the word, Negro, and the word, slave, as if they were synonyms. "A Negro is a Negro," Marx argued. "He only becomes a slave under certain conditions." Conditions created, not by them, but their exploiters, who, furthermore, exuded the racist language as rationale for continuation of slavery.

THE YEAR was 1847. By the time John Brown led the attack on Harper's Ferry (on January 11, 1860), Marx wrote Engels that the biggest event in the world was "the movement of the slaves in America started by the death of John Brown." When, the following year, the Civil War finally broke out, Marx threw himself into the battle spreading the words of the American Abolitionists in England and in Germany. The British proletariat had self-mobilized itself to stop their bourgeoisie from flirting with the Southern oligarchy. Under the impact of the Civil War in the United States and the strikes in Britain and France as well as the Polish rebellion, the first International Working Men's Association was established, with Karl Marx in its leadership.

Nor was the International's support of the North limited to writing letters to President Lincoln, or even extolling Abolitionism. No, it transformed, that is to say, made more concrete Marx's concepts of labor's self-development, by extending them to the question of race: "Labor in the white skin cannot be free so long as labor in the black skin is branded." This wasn't mere rhetoric. Marx proved its truth by showing that it was only after the abolition of slavery that the first national trade union was established in the United States. And this National Labor Union headed by Sylvia soon joined the International Working Men's Association. Deep indeed are the American roots of Marxism. Their long burial can no more exorcise them from American history than the exorcism of the true history of black revolt could withstand today's tidal wave of revolts.

MARX LIVED at just such a time of crisis as we are witness to today. That is what makes him so contemporary. He has something to say to us. Let us listen. Marx was asked why had he broken with bourgeois society into which he had been born; what need had he to become a radical? His answer was that no man is whole when the social order is so alien, and to end alienations, one must become a radical, for "To be a radical means to grasp something at its root. The root of mankind is man."

It still is.

6822

MAY, 1969

JUNE-JULY, 1969

75 COMMUNIST PARTIES MEET

The two topics—the Sino-Soviet conflict and the Czechoslovak "question"—that were most discussed at the recently concluded Moscow conference were not the ones that are gnawing at the vitals of the 75 Communist Parties. The way in which they were handled will, however, illuminate that peculiar brand of nationalism that, at one and the same time, tears apart and binds together state-capitalism. It is necessary, therefore, to turn to the different attitudes to the points in dispute.

BREZHNEV AND THE "DISSENTERS" ON MAO

Maoism is one question Brezhnev wanted aired and the dissenting Communist Parties wanted to avoid. To get these parties to the conference Brezhnev had to promise that the question of China would not be placed on the agenda. The excuse for the breach of faith was that "a new situation had arisen." Brezhnev claimed that "only two days ago" the Chinese press had issued "the call to prepare both for conventional and big nuclear war against Soviet revisionism . . . The combination of the Chinese leaders' political adventurism with the sustained atmosphere of war hysteria injects new elements into the international situation and we cannot ignore it." (1)

The truth, however, is that, if even we were to disregard that the Sino-Soviet conflict, begun in 1960, had reached just this high intensity during the 1967 "Cultural Revolution" with its accusation of "Russian collusion with American imperialism", the "new" situation arose no later than January, 1969 with the absolutely unprecedented identification of "Russian revisionism" as "the enemy" in the most basic state document, the draft Chinese Constitution itself. And finally, at the Ninth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, called to ratify the new Constitution in April, Lin Piao fleshed out the accusation, thus: "The Soviet revisionist renegade clique had been practicing social imperialism and social fascism more frantically than ever." (2)

Notwithstanding these vituperations, spoken in April, the "dissenters" had Brezhnev reiterate the promise not to deal with China at the preparatory conference held as late as May 23. Moreover, they did so though they were no doubt aware of the equally vituperative accusations against China of the Russian press. Defense Minister Andrei A. Grechko had very nearly called for a preventive war when, after speaking of the "chauvinist-hegemonial aspirations of the Mao Tse-tung group", he concluded: "Only by a resolute offensive can one defeat the enemy's forces." (3)

It is true that nothing could possibly have happened "only two days ago" that hadn't been happening since the January draft Constitution and the April Lin Piao speech, on the one hand, and the May statements of the Russian generals and the constantly recurring border incidents, on the other hand. But Brezhnev was not the only hypocrite at the "world" conference. The dissenters would have had to have been not merely naive, but actually moronic to have taken his promise at face value after Russia's invasion of Czechoslovakia!

THE HYPOCRISY OF THE 'DISSENTERS'

These East European state powers and West European aspirants for the same, were far from being naive, much less moronic. Indeed they were so knowledgeable in the ways of Big Brother and had so successfully resisted Khrushchev's attempt to call just such a "unity" conference that he, not they, lost his head. How then did Brezhnev win where Khrushchev lost? And at a time when not only relations with China, which is far, far away, were much exacerbated, but when a country much closer to home base, a country that was engaged, not in attacking Russia, but in trying to reform itself, had nevertheless been invaded by Big Brother's troops—500,000 strong!

Therein, precisely, lies one answer. The occupation of Czechoslovakia created terror throughout East Europe.

It is true Rumania had rejected the notorious Brezhnev doctrine of "limited sovereignty," declaring: "Limited sovereignty makes no more sense than limited honesty." Nevertheless, Ceausescu had not, as he had previously done, walked out when there was a breach of faith. It is true he wished to put down Russian hegemony: "It is not necessary to have any leading center!" (4) But it was quite obvious that the autonomy of the Communist Parties he was talking about was the very specific nationalism of Rumanian Communism. He did not even mention Czechoslovakia by name!

Another reason—a more crucial one insofar as the class nature

of present-day Communism is concerned—for Brezhnev's "victory" is that the "dissenters" are themselves either state capitalist bureaucrats like Rumania, or hoping in some way to become part of a government coalition. Thus, the Italian Communist Party, the largest in Western Europe, expects to do very well in the next general election.

The fact that its representative, Enrico Berlinguer, is the most outspoken critic of Russian monolithism, both as it concerns its "intervention" in Czechoslovakia, and its propaganda against Mao, must therefore, be related to these expectations. In a word, there is more opportunism than courage in his criticisms of Russia. This becomes especially clear in his speech on Mao where he, at one and the same time, criticized Chinese Communism and opened Russia's attempt to "excommunicate" Mao from the world movement. Enrico Berlinguer's speech on Czechoslovakia was the most outspoken one at the Moscow conference.

He may also have been under the illusion that the Italian CP had influenced the delay of this conference from the date it was supposed to have taken place—November 1968—a date altogether too close to the Russian invasion. The more likely reason, however, is that Brezhnev needed the time to create a handful of Czechoslovak Quislings.

Out they strutted just as soon as Berlinguer had finished his speech defending Czechoslovakia's struggle to be autonomous.

CZECH QUISLINGS VS. MAO

Gustav Husak rose to take issue with the speeches attacking the Russian invasion by, first, dutifully repeating what Kade Pravo had written about the "wrong attitude" of Communist Parties in the West being based on "distorted facts and false information handed out to them by counter-revolutionary journalists and even by some top party officials." Now that neither the new allegedly undistorted facts, nor the pre-conference appeal that the "comrades" should not discuss this "family affair", halted criticism, this miserable little Quisling dared to speak lovingly about the Russian occupiers of his native land, Czechoslovakia, he ended with a flourish, was bound "by ties of Communist international brotherhood with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries." (5)

To the disgust and despair of the Czechoslovak people, the Quisling leader thereby embraced "the gravediggers of their short-lived hopes." (6) Not only that; they thereby lay the foundation, for the emergence of the next tragedy—the view that Maoism has the answers to those who would fight for their freedom from Russia. For if there is anywhere where the calling of the Russian leaders "the new Tsars" sounds both true and revolutionary it is surely in occupied Czechoslovakia. The victory of creating Quislings is Pyrrhic. To see the dimensions of Communism's disintegration, we must now turn to the main absentee from the Moscow Conference; Mao.

(To be continued)

- 1) The most detailed quotations from Brezhnev's speech are in Richard Reston's article in the L. A. Times, June 8, 1969.
- 2) A full page of official excerpts of Lin's speech appeared in The N.Y. Times, April 29, 1969.
- 3) Pravda, May 9; a few excerpts from it can be found in Paul Wohl's article in the Christian Science Monitor, June 10, 1969.
- 4) Quoted by Henry Kamm in The N.Y. Times, June 10, 1969.
- 5) Ibid, June 12, 1969.
- 6) For the most knowledgeable analysis of the Quislings read "Sell-out in Prague" by Kamil Winter. The writer had been Editor of News and Current Affairs for Czechoslovak TV until the Russian invasion. His article is in the New Statesman, June 13, 1969, London.

Splintered World Communism

Part II

Mao Tse-tung dominated the Congress of the "world" Communist Parties that met in Moscow without him. The heated border incidents on the Ussuri River that erupted at the time of the June Congress were not the reasons for the absentee's dominance, although Brezhnev tried to make it appear so. Whether these border clashes were provoked by Russia or China does not matter. With or without these strangely-timed outbreaks, there was no way to hide the extreme, the totally new, the absolute shift in world strategy on the part of both giants of world Communism.

Just as the January 1969 Draft of the new Constitution of the Chinese Communist Party had made clear what had been initiated by the "Cultural Revolution", 1966-1968, (and the April, 1969, Congress had been convened to rubber stamp it) so the Kremlin, in initiating and demanding a "world" Congress, had decided to make clear beyond any peradventure of a doubt in the minds of "its" 75 Communist Parties what the new reality was: all talk about U.S. imperialism as "Enemy No. 1" was pure ritual. The new reality was this — Russia and China now considered each other as Enemy No. 1.

The very fact, however, that there were dissenters in the Russian orbit, that these dissenters were not Maoist followers, and had different problems, disclosed more than the lack of "homogeneity" in either Communist world. It revealed, albeit indirectly, that, outside of the different nationalisms (China included) at stake, there was also a dualism in Maoism. They could not face that reality either. But it is of the essence that we do.

THE DUALISM OF MAOISM

Lin Piao, in deifying (or mummifying!) Mao, laid claim to nothing short of Mao's superiority over not only living Communists but Marx, Engels and Lenin: "Chairman Mao's experience, in passing through many events, is more profound than that of Marx, Engels and Lenin. No one can surpass Mao's rich revolutionary experience."

Moreover, went on the anointed, named, constitutionalized successor to Mao, this superiority is not limited either to "experience," or to a single country: "The world has entered a new epoch — the epoch of The Thought of Mao Tse-tung." (7) And, since it is China which has unfurled this epochal, indeed eternal, banner, the new Constitution sees no contradiction in committing the Party members "to work for the interests of China" and upholding "proletarian internationalism." (8) Surely none of the 1,522 "newly minted delegates" (to use Edgar Snow's phrase) (9) doubted that China is "the world."

How, however, does one make sure that this will appeal to the non-Chinese world? First, of course, is the Marxist language. Thus, Lin Piao assures us that "From the Marxist point of view, the main component of state power is the Army." The only thing that the General forgot to inform his audience is that Marx said that about a capitalist state.

In place of the class nature of the state and its army, the ruler of a state capitalism calling itself Communist exudes paternalism: "We must carry out the great tradition of supporting the Government and cherishing the people; of supporting the Army and cherishing the people."

Nevertheless, Marxist language does appeal to rebels when the phrasing concerns "world revolution," "uninterrupted Revolution," and endless "transformation." Toward that end, Lin trotted out a new quotation from Mao: "The final victory of a socialist country requires not only the efforts of its own proletariat, it also depends on world revolution." Mao's "purism" shines forth: "The age that is just beginning, that will last about 50 or 100 years, will be a great one. It will bring a radical change in the social system of the whole world. It will be an age of great upheavals, an age without parallel in history," says Chairman Mao.

Meanwhile, "China must consider itself at war. We are threatened and encircled by the two greatest powers in the world and we must be prepared for them to launch a large-scale war on us, either conventional or nuclear." To make sure that the proper patriotic fervor animates the Chinese masses, the "new" Maoist rulers, properly cleansed of "revisionism", produced the most chauvinistic film this side of actual warfare between Russia and China, and entitled it "The Anti-Chinese Crimes of the New Tsars." (Not to be outdone by the Chinese, the Russian rulers produced their own film version of the border incidents equally chauvinistic, equally heavily edited, and equally accompanied by actual military build-up at key disputed borders.) (10)

The real shocker is not the rise of "new Tsars" out of "revisionism." The real shocker is cushioned with so much "revolutionary" verbiage that it will hardly be visible to the naked eye. But a close comparison of the ritualism with which Lenin is mentioned (throughout the "Cultural Revolution" Lin Piao assured us that

"89 per cent of Marxist-Leninist classics which we study should consist of Mao Tse-tung's writings"), and the deification with which Mao is being read back into history for a half-century (i.e., the whole mature life of Mao), reveals that 1917 has disappeared from history. World revolutionary history begins, instead, in 1919 with China.

The rollback of world revolutionary history to China, and not just when the Communist Party gained power in 1949, but back to China's first modern awakening when the Communist Party had not yet been born at all, hardly puts "the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism" on a level with "the concrete practice of revolution." The new Constitution is most specific on the timing; (Continued on Page 5)

- (7) Lin's Report was published by the New York Times April 29, 1969. The translation is the official CCP translation.
- (8) The Constitution appeared in the NYT January 8, 1969; a slightly different version appears in a translation by Stuart Schram, China Quarterly, Jan.-Mar., 1969.
- (9) "Mao and the New Mandate" by Edgar Snow, New Republic, May 10, 1969.
- (10) For a fairly detailed report of the military build-up see "Will There Be War Between Russia and China?" by Harrison E. Salisbury, NYT Magazine, 7/27/69.

"In the past half century, in leading China in the great struggle to fulfill the new democratic revolution, in leading the great struggle of Socialist revolution and Socialist construction of China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has . . . lifted it (Marxism-Leninism) to a completely new stage."

The shocker didn't influence the dissenters at the Moscow conference half as much as the dualism — the appeals to world revolution within the Sinocentric context. These appeals, as they affected the young revolutionaries of their own countries, are what underlined their whole behavior. They could hardly take issue with the nationalism since it is what they themselves practice. Nor could these self-centered, nationalistic weak dissenters separate Mao's concept, practice, and passion for "protracted war" which inheres in his view of the "uninterrupted revolution" from the long-range timing of "a century or more." Since, however, there is no other way to attack the retrogressionist content of the Maoist form of revolutionary verbiage, neither the Russian rulers nor the fake dissenters succeeded in halting the disintegration of world Communism.

STATE-CAPITALISM AND "THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY ECONOMISM"

The varied nationalisms underlying splintered Communism are neither the ordinary bourgeois type of the 19th century, nor the new revolutionary nationalisms either of the Third World against Western imperialism, or of East Europe against Russian imperialism, be that of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters of 1956, or the Czechoslovakian spring 1968.

We must not forget that Mao urged Khrushchev to launch the counter-revolution against the Hungarian Revolution. He opposed the invasion of Czechoslovakia only because by then he had broken with Russia on other grounds. Mao wants a third axis for world power created as against the "hegemonies" of the Russian or American orbits not because he was for the revolutionaries in Czechoslovakia (whom he bitterly attacked as "revisionists" until the very day of the invasion), but because the class-collaborationist third axis he had counted on, Peking-Djakarta, collapsed ignominiously.

The varied nationalisms do have a "world" character but it is not the kind Trotsky predicted would result from Stalin's theory of "socialism in one country", i.e. that each Communist Party would capitulate to the bourgeoisie in its own country — the French C.P. to France, the American C.P. to the U.S., etc. No, the national Communisms kept faithful to their world, the new stage of world capitalism, state-capitalism, with its State Plan, State Party, "Red Army". Being the highest form of centralization of capital, state-capitalism reaches out for contiguous masses of capital. Hitler attempted it with his search for "lebensraum" and in the end failed. Stalin attempted it in East Europe and succeeded. It remains the model for both Brezhnev and Mao. The collision of the two models at a still newer front only proves the non-viability of state-capitalism calling itself Communism. Like private capitalism, state-capitalism has but one way to live luxuriously — the exploitation of "its" masses. It is this which dooms it, with or without the embroidery of Marxist language transformed into its opposite.

Of all Mao's perversions of "Marxism-Leninism", none is of a more capitalistic mentality and nature than that which he calls "the struggle against counter-revolutionary economism." When Lenin first began his battles against the "economists", i.e., the intellectuals who wished to restrict workers' activities to the trade union field only, reserving for themselves the field of politics, he maintained that the backwardness of the Tsarist regime did not mean the workers were backward; that only by mass initiative and all-round political activity could Tsarism be overthrown. When World War I broke out and he found that even some Bolshevik intellectuals, specifically Bukharin and Pyatakov, opposed self-determination instead of seeing that national struggles were a "bacillus" for proletarian revolution, he lashed out against their "imperialist economism". In all cases, the fight against "economism" was a fight against intellectuals, leaders, elitists of all sorts, whose mechanical views on economic development led them to disregard the "sense and reason" of the masses, who alone could transform society.

Lenin held on to his principle that Bolsheviks could prove their "proletarianism" in one and only one way — by changing the conditions of labor — after they came to power. He lashed out against the beginnings of Soviet bureaucracy by reminding his co-leaders that Marx had but one way of distinguishing socialism from capitalism and that is by the change in labor's conditions of labor. "In Capital," wrote Lenin (11), "Karl Marx ridicules the pompous and grandiloquent bourgeois-democratic great charter of liberty and the rights of man . . . Marx contrasts this pompous declaration of rights to the plain . . . presentation . . . by the proletariat: the legislative enactment of a shorter working day . . ." Lenin drives home the point for Russia: "The 'formulae' of genuine Communism, differ from the pompous, involved, solemn phrasemongering of the Kautskys, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries . . . in that they reduce everything to the conditions of labor." (12)

Now contrast this to the pompous phrases of Mao who, at one and the same time, asks the masses "to grasp the revolution and increase production" and, at once, spells out "increase in production" not only as more proletarian sweat, but also "equalized" (read: lowered) to peasant wages, at which point Lin-Mao unloose a political barrage against workers who fight the lowering of their wages as "economists". All this is climaxed by an actual military move against workers who dare to strike. This passes for "the struggle against counter-revolutionary economism."

This is not just a perversion of theory, nor merely a rewrite of history. This is class exploitation of the masses, proletariat and peasantry, alike.

All you have to do to see that a "mass line", in Mao's China, means mass sweat, is to contrast it to the pampering of private capitalists — not the Party men who are supposed "to have taken the road back to capitalism", but the real, the existing private capitalists — who, 20 years after the Communist conquest of power, still get 5 per cent profits on their investments. Where a worker gets barely enough to live, a capitalist like Jung Ye-jen gets annually 3 million yuan in profit. Not only that; he also has important political posts, which is a great deal more important than money in a country where "politics takes command."

I do not mean to say that these private capitalists have the power of the Party, much less the Army. I do say they exist and the only reason they are still permitted to exist is because the opposition of the masses to Mao and his "hereditary" hierarchical heir, Lin Piao, is via slowdown, "low productivity", and what, when it comes to the youth, the Maoists now call "anarchism." (13)

The total hypocrisy of the dissenters in Russia was seen not so much in keeping Mao from getting excluded from "world Communism" — after all, all of the Communist state powers from Russia to China, and from Rumania to Albania, rule exactly by such exploitative means. No, the total hypocrisy was to be seen in doing nothing for Czechoslovakian Freedom Fighters, though these same loud-mouthed leaders did, in words, denounce the Russian invasion. The hypocrisy was seen as they closed their eyes to the Tartar demonstration right in Moscow.

The hypocrisy was seen in doing nothing for the brave Russians who demonstrated in opposition to their country's imperialist invasion of Czechoslovakia, and who are now rotting in jail for it. In thus, evading the Russian dissenters urging help in prevention of the recurrence of "the ominous shadow of Stalin from darkening our future," the 75 Communist Parties meeting in Moscow, including those dissenters, proved they themselves were that "ominous shadow."

Equally ominous a shadow was cast by Mao who had shown his first hostility to Russia in February 1956 when the 20th Russian Communist Party launched deStalinization "without consulting China". Obviously however, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China did know what was required

of them since, in September 1956, they convened their first Congress since coming to power in 1949, and, the new Party Constitution then adopted eliminated the expression "under the guidance of the Thought of Mao Tse-tung", replacing it with the phrase "under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism." It is the latter phrase which has now been eliminated. The 1969 Constitution both defies Mao and rolls history back not only from "socialism" but even from capitalism as it returns to the feudal, monarchical form of having the ruler name his "successor".

This rollback of history is being touted as a "new model of Communism and attracting the interest of a whole generation (sic!)", even in Europe and in the U.S." (14) That some who call themselves the New Left do indeed accept this bizarre happening as "revolutionary" only discloses a "new model" of Communist bankruptcy of thought that vies with the bourgeois bankruptcy of thought that is the seal of decadent capitalism.

On the other hand, the Chinese masses are restless, so opposed to Mao as to make his victories Pyrrhic enough. Thus, the time and place of the CCP Congress was not revealed until after it met. Thus, the open attacks on youth opposition that is suddenly declared to be "anarchist." Thus, mass opposition to Maoism and outright revolts are first now coming to light but have, in fact, been occurring for years and were the reason that Mao-Lin had called the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution." (15)

WILL WEST GERMANY SUDDENLY BECOME THE HOLDER OF THE KEY TO WORLD HISTORY?

The shift in world strategy within the Communist orbits, of necessity, involves drastic changes in all international relations. At the Moscow Congress Brezhnev accused Mao's China of flirting with "West German revengists". It is true that there has been some detente between China and West Germany. But the greater truth is that a rapprochement of relations between Russia and West Germany has begun on a vaster scale, not only in trade, but in toning down the criticisms of West Germany, including its failure to sign the anti-nuclear proliferation treaty.

So worrisome is this development to France that some have urged that its coming meeting with Germany be especially "open", that is to say, that France itself offers to sign the anti-nuclear proliferation treaty in order to get West Germany to do so. They hope to thwart both Russia which wants its European frontier "secure" for any possible war with China, and the U.S. which might be tempted actually to provide nuclear arms to West Germany and thus undermine the Franco-German Pact. (16)

There is no way to foresee all the ramifications of the present heated stage of the Sino-Soviet conflict, or to predict the possible shocking international realignments now that world Communism is so splintered. No doubt the double and triple crosses awaiting the masses will pale the Hitler-Stalin Pact. But one thing is sure, predictable, irreversible — the class enemy is always at home: the production relations between exploiters and exploited determine everything else, internally and externally.

There is therefore only one position for Marxist-Humanists to take and that is to refuse to side with "the lesser evil," no matter what that is declared to be. Nothing short of uprooting the world status quo, of being with the genuine revolutionary forces — proletarians, national minorities, women's liberation, youth — to forge a new relationship of theory and practice will, once and for all, create the foundation of a society on totally new, human foundations.

—August 7, 1969

Aug - Sept - 1969

Critique of Althusser's anti-Hegelianism

Editor's Note: In view of the great events of Spring '68 in France, which showed the non-academic character of the "critique" of Marx of the French theoretician, Althusser, the following letter by Raya Dunayevskaya, written before those events, has special significance.

Jan. 29, 1968

Dear A.R.:

Please forgive me for not commenting on "Contradiction and Overdetermination" by Louis Althusser, which you were kind enough to photo offset for me last summer. At first the delay was due to the fact that I had no chance to read the essay, as I was preoccupied with my new book-in-progress, *Philosophy and Revolution*. Then, when I finally did get to read it, I was so disappointed by the writings of a man who had so long been built up as an "original thinker, a new young French philosopher" that I could not get myself to write.

Two very different types of events prompt this letter. One is the fact that Louis Althusser has since become a leader of a pro-Maoist trend within the French Communist Party, or at least has scared the Central Committee with his influence over young students and the possibility that whereas an outright Maoist "party" failed to get much of a following in France, a Maoist position that has a philosophic Althusserian turn may speak "sufficiently in French" as to win a following and split their intellectual periphery. They have told him that, whereas he may continue his "specialty" (freedom in purely abstract discussions), he may not meddle in politics.

THE SECOND, and to me, the more important reason for this note is you, that is to say, your continuing many-sided study of Marxism that is very obviously not narrowly factional. I was told about the latest material you ordered. You have been sent my "Notes for Lectures on Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks" and the American Worker pamphlet, and I herewith enclose my 1946-47 articles on the "Nature of the Russian Economy," but I do not have Johnson's 1941 Resolution, nor for that matter, my own of the same year, with the title "Russia is a State-Capitalist Society."

But since this is 1968, not 1941, I think it is important to move on, and if I find that you do not have my piece "Marx's Humanism, Today," I will send you a copy. It is important, both objectively and "subjectively" since it also answers the question of Humanism regarding which the translator and/or editor of Althusser's article makes some snide remarks. Who was the translator—C.L.R. James?

NOW THEN, the Althusser essay, the very title of which I found intellectually abhorrent because it was vulgarly economist despite all its pretense to a non-economist approach, not to mention the fact that the word itself, overdetermination, has Freudian origins. Remember that Marx attacked not only economists and vulgar Communists but also "abstract materialists" (natural scientists)—in a word, all those who did not appreciate in full the meaning of History, as past, as present, as future; history, not as Althusser understands it as "the run of History . . . through the multiform world of the superstructure" (p. 32), but History in Marx's sense of people, workers shaping history, resolving contradictions in life and not only in thought, and thereby developing the multi-dimensional in Man.

Althusser, in typically intellectualist fashion, is too preoccupied with "infrastructure-superstructure complex" (p. 31) to be able to listen, much less hear, the Subject, Man himself. What he, therefore, tells the reader to grapple with is dogmatism-antidogmatism, and that only as those above interpret it, and thus he never confronts the living strata below, un-

less it is as something to draw out your pity. But Marx didn't speak only of "cold, hunger for his poor worker," as Althusser would have; the distinguishing distinctive mark of Marxism as against all others, all others—socialists, communists, utopians, anarchists, syndicalists—was that the worker was a thinking human being, a creative moulder of history—"Working, thinking, fighting, bleeding Paris—almost forgetful, in its incubation of a new society, of the cannibals at its gates—radiant in the enthusiasm of its historic initiative!"

SO HEAVILY does Althusser's anti-Hegelianism weigh him down, prey upon him, that it takes 17 pages out of a 21 page article before he ever gets down to the subject-matter, much less the living subject, at issue. He then attributes to Engels (to Engels, who said that there would have been no "scientific socialism" had there been no Hegelian philosophy!) a break not only with the "Hegelian principle of explanation by self-consciousness (ideology) but also with the Hegelian theme of phenomenon-essence-truth-of. We are definitely concerned with a new relationship between new terms." (p. 31).

Outside of the fact that a new relationship is not something that merely relates "terms" as if we were engaged in a game of words, the elevation of an 1890 letter by Engels as "the new" for our age is nothing but a subterfuge for saying that nothing has really been left us by our founders, that "experiential protocol" (whatever that means!) "largely remains to be elaborated." (p. 33). "Who has attempted to follow up the explorations of Marx and Engels? I can only think of Gramsci." Relegated to a footnote at this point is a reference to Lukacs.

TO BE precise, it constitutes but one sentence of the footnote; it is worth, however, a whole chapter (if I had the time to spare) for it reveals the whole degradation of thought that Stalinism has brought into the movement. (Oh, naturally, it is only "philosophically" since now that Stalin is dead and the established state authority permits one to speak of his "crimes," no one except Mao is any longer a proclaimed Stalinist!) Here is that priceless sentence: "Lukacs' essays, which are limited to the history of literature and philosophy, seem to me to be contaminated with a guilty Hegelianism, as if Lukacs wanted to absolve through Hegel his upbringing by Simmel and Dilthey."

Note, first, the little conjunction that joins very different, even opposed, fields, "literature and philosophy." These fields are opposed not just "in general" but very specifically in Lukacs since, in matters of literature, Lukacs was analyzing what others had done, whereas in philosophy he is a true original. Long before anyone, including Lukacs, had known the full extent of Marx's Hegelian roots (the Social Democracy had never bothered to publish those precious archives of Marx which they inherited), Lukacs had elaborated this relationship that, though it was written in 1923, remains unequalled to this day by any other Marxist, Gramsci included. Althusser, on the other hand, hasn't even the simple decency to refer you to that work so that the reader can check for himself.

Secondly, and crucially, note the gratuitous Stalinist amalgam-building in the reference to Lukacs' alleged "upbringing by Simmel and Dilthey." Whatever these reactionary philosophers had to do with Lukacs' "upbringing", it is a fact that they nowhere figured in Lukacs' thinking and activity over nearly half a century. That is to say, from the moment he became a Marxist, not a single grain of their philo-

(Continued on Page 7)

OCT. 1969

PAGE 5

6826

sophy is present in the matter at issue, the essays which constituted his original philosophic contribution, that were repudiated by him under Stalinist pressure when Lukacs capitulated to Stalinism, and which now are remembered, not because of his philosophic "errors," but because he dared, for a few miraculous weeks of the Hungarian Revolution, to associate himself with it.

ABOVE ALL, what is it that Althusser really means to say with his phrase "guilty Hegelianism;" he doesn't bother to explain here precisely because he isn't so much interested in attacking "Hegel" or Lukacs as he is in attacking Marx's "Hegelianism." Oh, how Hegel haunts these apologists for the State. "I shall not evade the most burning issue," concludes Althusser; "it seems to me that either the whole logic of 'sublation' must be rejected, or we must give up any attempt to explain how the proud and generous Russian people bore Stalin's crimes and repression with such resignation; how the Bolshevik Party could tolerate them; and how a Communist leader could order them." (p. 34)

Poor Hegel, he now gets blamed for Stalin's crimes! The logic of sublation, that is to say, the dialectic of transcendence, is to lead us, not to freedom, but to whitewash of Russian state-capitalism; and if it doesn't, as it surely can't and won't, then we must "drive this phantom back into the night." (p. 35) Finit. No doubt Mao will help Althusser do just that; but Marx won't.

Yours,
Raya

Oct-1969

Nov-1969
PAGE 5

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

The needed American revolution

Excerpts from Perspectives Report of the National Chairman to the NEB Meeting of News & Letters, Aug. 30, 1969.

I Attitudes to objectivity, to science, and to philosophy

The present stage of the Sino-Soviet conflict; the change in world strategy on the part of both Communist giants; the possibility that West Germany might once again become the key to the international situation; in a word, the life-and-death need of independence from all three major, global state powers, and of truly revolutionary mass action, inseparable from a philosophy of total freedom, compels us to look at mini-Maoism . . .

The intellectual who begins to doubt his ability to lead, isolated from the mass base, looks for a mass movement to which to cling. This is precisely what Communism of either variety offers and this, precisely this, is the danger.

The "attractiveness" of the Chinese form, where the Party bureaucracy is supposedly disciplined, not by the Army, not by Stalinist terror, but by the "Cultural Revolution" and its young "Red Guards" offers unification of worker and intellectual from above, externally, through "the new" Party. No thought is needed—Mao's Thought has all the answers—but there is plenty of activity, and youthful energy, a veritable new "life-process."

Thus does the bankruptcy of thought which marks the bankruptcy of bourgeois civilization in its death agony suck in the revolutionary petty-bourgeois intellectual tossed about by endless crises and wars in isolation from the masses!

II Black is beautiful — and revolutionary

The vanguard role of the black masses in the U.S. has both a past and a future. In its past, in being the touchstone of American civilization, it also had its own sense and type of internationalism. As Carter Woodson had put it in speaking of the Negro's heritage, "The race has a past and it didn't begin on the cotton and sugar plantations in America . . ."

There is not a single fundamental idea today, from Nationalism and Negritude (or Black Is Beautiful) to labor strikes and armed rebellion that wasn't born in the exchange of ideas, experiences, aspirations, in the human relationships between U.S. Negroes, West Indians, and Africans. In a word, Black was Beautiful and Revolutionary.

By now, Africans are looking for a total philosophy and not just black culture, exhilarating as that was. A philosophy of revolution demands what Hegel called "second negativity," that is to say, a theory and act that would not stop at the first negativity, of throwing off the yoke of imperialism, but would continue uninterrupted, which Marx called the Permanent Revolution.

New human relations on native grounds means new relations also between leaders and

ranks, and an internationalism that doesn't "neutrally" side with one or the other pole of World Capital, but is truly independent both by moving from political to economic freedom, and from relations based only on government-to-government, but extends, instead, people to people.

It is here where the American black can play the biggest role, not through escapism a la Carmichael or Cleaver, but by preparing for his revolution in the U.S.

First and foremost stands what we do at the point of production. Black caucuses in factories are a great deal more decisive than junkets abroad.

III Dialectics of liberation

Each generation must reinterpret Marxism for itself. Facing us immediately is the continuous black revolt, which is why it is so central to the American Revolution. The very fact that we needed to say Needed instead of "Coming American Revolution" shows that we are not in a revolutionary situation. But it is not as distant as either phillistines or Euro-centered Leftists make it appear. It is not in the millenia, as the anti-Vietnam war movement's achievements show, and that involves not only black but white, and not only youth but adult and specific new forces like Women's Liberation.

Even white labor—without which we surely could not win as it is the majority—is not as quiescent as it appears and, again, despite a goodly amount of racism, it has been acting with Black Labor, both on conditions of labor in the shop and in elections of blacks to Union posts . . .

Lenin did not get to develop cognition as a "creative force," except in the rather hieroglyphic manner in which he referred to Bukharin as not having fully understood "the dialectic." Our heritage is thus dual. We must make it single, concrete, totally philosophic and totally revolutionary.

The theoretic preparation for Revolution, begins and ends on two levels simultaneously—in philosophy and revolution and in the practice of the needed American Revolution. Marx, in his day, called it "Development of Human Power which is its own end." (Capital, Vol. III, P. 955).

This is as good an ending for our perspectives, and the hardest of all beginnings for the actual, the needed American Revolution.

Order your copy now
The Needed American Revolution
 by Raya Dunayevskaya
 only 35c
 Order from News & Letters,
 415 Brainard, Detroit,
 Mich. 48201

TWO WORLDS

By Rava Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

1970—the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birth—is sure to see a new facet of the Sino-Soviet conflict as the two state-capitalist giants calling themselves Communist vie with each other to grasp the revolutionary mantle of Lenin in order to cover up the reality of their respective exploitative systems. In this they will be aided not only by "Western" (private capitalist) ideologists who have always maintained that Stalinism flowed "logically" from Leninism, but also by some who, like Paul Mattick, consider themselves Marxists but have made a veritable profession of anti-Leninism.

The saddest aspect of the new outpouring of anti-Leninism is that some young revolutionaries show themselves to be not so new in their thought the moment they need to move from activity to philosophy. Thus, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the freshest face and most spirited voice of the near-revolution in France, May, 1968, has found nothing newer to say in his *Obsolète Communism*, than the fact that he is a "plagiarist . . . of revolutionary theory and practice." (1) which turns out, in the main to be that of Socialism on Barbie (Pierre Chaulieu), Paul Cardan, etc. Since these departures from Marxism and restatements of "The Meaning of Socialism" (2) are being played up as "the left-wing alternative" to totalitarian Communism, it becomes important to take issue with these detractors of Lenin. In this footnote I will limit myself to Cardan, but it is only because what he says here is representative of all.

THE ALLEGATION

"For some strange reason," writes Cardan, "Marxists have always seen the achievement of working class power solely in terms of the conquest of political power. Real power, namely power over production in day-to-day life, was always ignored." This vitiation of Marx's philosophy of liberation is but prelude to the hammer and tongs approach to Lenin who, Cardan claims, was "relentlessly repeating from 1917 until his death that production should be organized from above along 'state-capitalist lines.'" (Emphasis added.)

I know of no greater lie, but, for the time being, we will let it stand in order to call attention to the founda-

tion for the diatribe. As proof of the slanderous statement, Cardan quotes from one of Lenin's speeches, "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" (3) and then only those passages which relate to the possibility of utilizing the "Taylor system."

Never mind that the Taylor system was never introduced in Lenin's lifetime. Never mind that the "single" will was not a reference to foreman or managers of production. (The point of contention in that first year of revolution when the discussion revolved around "single" vs. "collective" referred to parallelism in organizations since the first national trade union organization arose only after the revolution, just when factory committees and Soviets likewise laid sole claim to running production.) Never mind the objective situation, the backwardness of the economy, four years of imperialist war, civil war and countless counter-revolutionary attacks which were still going on as the new workers state was struggling for its very existence. That speech was made when the state was but four months old. The references to "single will" and "iron discipline" are sufficient basis for Cardan to conclude: "We believe these conceptions, this subjective factor, played an enormous role in the degeneration of the Russian Revolution . . . We can see today the relationship between the views he held and the later reality of Stalinism."

Cardan is standing everything on its head. No "subjective" factor could ever have produced an objective situation—the new stage of capitalism. State-capitalism first arose during the world Depression, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, assumed its most mature form in Russia during the Five Year Plans and Stalin's most notorious Moscow Frame-up Trials. (4)

We're we to acquiesce to anything so idiotic that a single article could sum up a period covering the greatest proletarian revolution in history, would it not be incumbent upon the analyst at least to consider that article in its entirety? That speech consisted of more, a great deal more than the passages single out for quotation.

LENIN'S OWN VOICE

The speech set forth the principal task of the proletariat to be "the positive or creative work of setting up an extremely intricate and subtle system of new organizational relationships extending to the planned pro-

duction and distribution of the goods required for the existence of tens of millions of people. Such a revolution can be carried out only if the majority of the population, and primarily the majority of the toilers, display independent historical creative spirit . . . By creating a new Soviet type of state, which gives the opportunity to all the toilers and the masses of the oppressed to take an active part in the independent building of a new society, we solved only a small part of this difficult problem." (5)

Far from the Taylor system "which Lenin most certainly did not understand) being the ruling conception, proletarian democracy was the guiding line which permeated Lenin's speech. This is what the Soviets meant to Lenin. This is why he put the whole stress on the fact that the Soviet form of organization is justified because "for the first time a start is thus made in teaching the whole of the population in the art of administration, and in their beginning to administer." And he warns against "a petty-bourgeois tendency to transform the members of the Soviets into 'members of parliament,' or into bureaucrats. This must be combatted by drawing all the members of the Soviets into the practical work of administration . . . Our aim is to draw the whole of the poor into the practical work of administration . . . our aim is to insure that every toiler . . . shall perform state duties." (6)

BEFORE AND AFTER REVOLUTION

The four-months old workers' state was in "a period of waiting for new outbreaks of the revolution, which is maturing in the West at a painfully slow pace." And Lenin was holding fast to the new universal, that he had elaborated on the eve of revolution in *State and Revolution*, that unless the bourgeois state was so thoroughly smashed that production was run by the whole population "TO A MAN", and the state without bureaucracy, without a standing army, without police, was administered by the whole population "TO A MAN", there would be no socialist society. Three months after gaining power, Lenin repeated: (7)

"We wanted the workers themselves to draw up, from below, the new principles of economic conditions."

Indeed Lenin was willing to let a single distinction

(Continued on Page 7)

sum up the difference between the Second International that had betrayed the workers and the new, Third International. That single distinction was that genuine Marxists "reduce everything to the conditions of labor." (8)

Lenin was concerned about how "shy" the workers still were. They had not "yet become accustomed to the idea that they are the ruling class now." He lashed out at "lackadaisicalness, slovenliness, unskillfulness, nervous haste," of the "educated" which was due, he said, "to the abnormal separation of mental from manual labor." He urged upon these intellectuals to begin listening to these shy workers: "every attempt to adhere to stereotyped forms and to impose uniformity from above gave a great example of how to combine initiative, independence, freedom of action, and vigour from below with voluntary centralism free from stereotyped forms . . . there is a great deal of talent among the people—it is merely suppressed. It must be given an opportunity to express itself. It, and it alone, with the support of the masses can save Russia and can save the cause of socialism." (9)

Nor was he talking only against "petty-bourgeois intellectuals." He was talking about Bolsheviks, his co-leaders now that they had state power; his appeal was to the initiative of the masses from below. The famous trade union debate of 1920-21 discloses how desperately he worked toward this one truth, how he differed even on the question of designating Russia as a workers' state. His contention was that a precise description would show instead that the designation of "workers' state" was an "abstraction" while the reality was that it was a workers and peasants' state "with bureaucratic distortions." In arguing against Trotsky's administrative mentality, Lenin insisted that the only assurance there is for the workers protecting that state is through giving them the freedom to protect themselves from the state:

"The entirely organized proletariat must protect itself and must utilize the workers' organizations for the purpose of protecting the workers from their own state." (10)

This was not just a visionary concept of a Marxist who has no state power. This was the demand of a Bolshevik who had state-power, a demand that his co-leaders, his Party, recognize that the workers' state can justify its existence only when the workers maintain their own non-state organizations to protect them from their own state. There is a veritable conspiracy between the Communists and the detractors of Lenin to portray Lenin's concept of the Party as if Lenin had never changed his position from 1903 to his death. Since space does not allow me here to deal with the question of "vanguardism", which I totally oppose, I must refer readers to *Marxism and Freedom*, Chapter XI, "Forms of Organization: the Relationship of the Spontaneous Self-Organization of the Proletariat to the 'Vanguard Party'".

(1) *Obsolete Communism, The Left-Wing Alternative* by Cohn-Bendit, p. 18 (McGraw-Hill, N.Y.)

(2) *Solidarity Pamphlet No. 6* (London)

(3) *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, pp. 332, 342, 345

(4) For a full analysis of state-capitalism, see *MARXISM AND FREEDOM*, Chapter 13, "Russian State-Capitalism vs. Workers' Revolt."

Lenin was warning of the possible return to capitalism throughout the last two years of his life. Especially important on state-capitalism is his speech to the 11th Congress of the Party, *Selected Works*, Vol. IX, 322-371.

(5) Vol. VII, pp. 315-316. (6) *Ibid.*, p. 345-347. (7) *Ibid.*, p. 227.

(8) Vol. IX, p. 440. (9) *Ibid.*, pp. 419, 420, 422.

(10) *Ibid.*, p. 9.

Dec-1969

6830

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*
Chairman News & Letters Committees

This* is a most disappointing book. Or perhaps the more correct description would be: a most revealing book. In part, this is due to its sheer length (364 pages), which allows the author (Paul Mattick) to make explicit what, heretofore, as essayist, he left only implicit. But the more fundamental reason for the revelatory character of the book is the timing. Ever since the Hungarian Revolution moved the Humanism of Marxism front-center of the historic stage, it has become impossible for economism to hide its underlying anti-Marxism.

Thus, though there was no backtracking on the part of Mattick from his wide knowledge of Marxian as well as Keynesian economics, and though the lucidity of his style in book form is as illuminating as it has been these many years in essay form, the full book-length form, and the timing, revealed a shocking truth: his anti-Leninist obsession is, in reality, anti-Marxism.

Should this description of a Marxian economist sound defamatory, the reader must listen to Mattick himself. The revelation of his rejection of Marx's Humanism is his, not mine. It is he, not I, who is appalled at "the recent vogue of the socialist humanism of the young Marx, who considers the alienation of labor in capitalism a result of the 'alienation of man from his true nature.' This unMarxian Marx well fits the welfare state and can even be used in the ideological war against the ideological Marxism of the state-capitalist adversary." (p.262. Emphasis added.)

THE REWRITING OF HISTORY

How like the state-capitalist ideologists calling themselves Communists—as well as today's Trotskyists—Paul Mattick sounds! His rewriting of history, no doubt, has different motivations than either those holding state-capitalist power, or hungering to do so. But this does not turn untruths into truths.

*Marx and Keynes, *The Limits of the Mixed Economy*, by Paul Mattick. (Extending Horizons Books, Boston, Mass.)

Economism vs. Marx's humanism

It was not the "welfare state", but the Hungarian Freedom Fighters, the proletarian revolutionaries, who brought Marx's Humanism from the dusty bookshelves onto the world historic stage. It is not "the recent" welfare state ideologist's "use" of the "unMarxian Marx" that has produced the "vogue", but the ceaseless East European revolts, from East Berlin, 1953, to Czechoslovakia, 1968, that keeps Marx's Humanism alive. The "young Marx's" philosophy of liberation became, also, the underlying philosophy of the African Revolutions against Western Imperialism. Nor did Marx's Humanism, in circling the globe, come to a standstill as it reached the so-called welfare states. On the contrary. In reaching the world citadel of the "welfare states", the U.S.A., the theory of alienation of the "unMarxian Marx", far from "fitting" the welfare state, gave birth to a new generation of revolutionaries, black and white, who sought and are seeking to uproot it.

Indeed, to come from the sublime to the petty, even the aloof and mature Paul Mattick has been compelled to acknowledge the history-making long-life of the now famous 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, albeit in a slanderous form.

No doubt "the mature" Marxist economist had known of these long before now (1969, the year of publication of his *Marx and Keynes*). No doubt he knew about them long before the very first "East" European uprising of the East German workers who dared challenge both Russian Imperialism and their own state-capitalist overlords of the productive process. Simultaneously with that movement from below in the birthplace of Marx, a few brave intellectuals also confronted the Communist ideologists with Marx's Humanism. This dual movement, from practice and from theory, however, had no more effect on Mattick's economist interpretation of Marx than the very first discovery of Marx's Humanist Essays in the late 1920's by the great Marxist scholar, Ryazanov. It needed a social revolution as great as October, 1917, before it became possible to pry this unpublished heritage of Marx from the vaults of the Second International where they had lain buried since the death of Engels.

In a word, at no time from their first discovery,

through the period they made history anew in live class battles, until today, did the authentic voice of Marx—of Marx, not Lenin, of Marx's philosophy of liberation, not of Lenin's theory of the "vanguard party"—cause Mattick to question his economist interpretation of Marx.

On the contrary, instead of facing the reality of his failure to fully comprehend the philosophy of Marx, he stoops to Stalinist-type of amalgam-building. The "vogue" of Marx's Humanism, he now dares claim, "fits" the welfare state!

WHAT IS ECONOMISM?

Paul Mattick's presumptuousness in declaring the authentic voice of "the young Marx" to be that of some "unMarxian Marx" has one salutary effect upon the reader who has had to struggle through 262 pages before being thrown this curve. Till then, he had been wondering why the lucid author had thrown 42 chapters at him without doing so simple a thing as dividing the many chapters into a few leading parts to give the reader some indication of where the author was headed. Now the reader, having been wiser by this unexpected curve, feels compelled to return to the beginning of the formless book to see what is Mattick's comprehension of Marxism.

The first chapter where Paul Mattick deals directly with Marx on Marx's own, not Keynes' foundations, is Chapter 3, "Marx's Labor Theory of Value." This, and the chapters on "Accumulation and the Falling Rate of Profit" as well as the two chapters on "The Realization of Surplus Value," and "Capitalism in Crisis" are the best in the book. Mattick has always written seriously when criticising Marxists who departed from the "materialism" of Marx. On that point he is even capable of escaping his own narrow economism.

Thus, in taking other Marxian economists to task he writes: "When Marx speaks of the 'law of value' as relating to a deeper reality which underlies the capitalist economy, he refers to the 'life process of society based on the material process of production.'" (p. 29) Thus, also, he criticises George Lichtheim for identifying the Ricardian and Marxian law of value while heaping empty praise upon Marx as "the last, as well as the greatest"

(Continued on Page 7)

of the classical economists". Mattick comments: "Even though Marx accepted and developed Ricardo's value theory, he was not the 'greatest' of the classical economists, but their adversary." (p. 28)

Here he himself draws a sharp distinction between narrow economism and Marx's concept of the "life process of society based on the material process of production." Nor does Mattick limit his criticism to reformists, but extends it to revolutionary Marxists. Thus, he hits out against Hilferding for reducing Marx's materialist conception of history to the value theory: "... the materialist conception of history is not identical with the labor theory of value. It discusses social development in general, of which capitalism is only a special case." (p. 34)

Nor, Mattick continues, is it "merely a question of conscious as against unconscious regulation." (p. 35) The law of value, and, inseparably from it, the law of surplus value, applies to capitalist societies and only to them.

It is true Mattick conveniently skips over my expose of Stalin's open break with Marx's theory of value in 1943 at the time it happened, but, at least in 1969, he does write of it. It helps him also to expose Paul Sweezy's apologia of Russian state-capitalism as if statification of industry plus "the principle of planning" is all that is needed to establish "socialism." But, while Mattick hits away at reformist and Communist economists, he himself does not break out of economism's confines in the full tradition of the revolutionary Marx who did not separate philosophy from economics because his Promethean vision of a classless society united, instead of divided, materialism and idealism into that new human dimension he called "a thoroughgoing Naturalism or Humanism."

WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?

So foreign, to Mattick, is the integrality of Marx's philosophy of history with his economic categories that he makes a total hash out of Marx's original economic categories. Mattick forces into identity Marx's split of

classical political economy's category of labor into abstract and concrete labor, and the further singling out from labor, as activity, its commodity-form of appearance, labor-power. Where Marx speaks of the twofold character of labor, Mattick "restates" it as "the twofold character of labor-power." (p. 57)

The obtuseness of Mattick to Marx's philosophic analysis of the all-pervailing fetishisms of commodity-form, literally calls for him to make such false identification as if it were, indeed, the commodity rather than the activity which "produces" value and surplus value. The two-fold character of the commodity—use-value and exchange-value—is of course only the phenomenal expression, the cover-up of the exploitative relationship at the point of production, all of which Mattick "knows" very well. Then why attempt, with a single stroke of the pen, to do away with the fetishism of commodities by identifying Marx's analysis of labor, as activity, with labor-power as commodity?

Had the mature Mattick followed Marx into the labor process itself he could not have mixed up "economic categories" and could not have escaped seeing the labor-capital relationship as not only an exploitative one, but also a perverted one. Throughout the four volumes of *Capital*, the most mature Marx pounds away at this capitalistic perversion -- the reification of labor, the transformation of man into thing and the revolt of the workers against this.

Evidently, for the knowledgeable Paul Mattick, the commodity-form holds no secrets; labor and labor-power may appear synonymous to one who doesn't feel the full weight of the capitalistic perversion of subject to object, of man into mere appendage to machine, of the transformation of concrete labor into the abstraction, value. But Marx, after laboring more than a decade with the exposition of the fetishism of the commodity-form which, on the surface, appeared so simple that all "took it for granted", was still dissatisfied even after the first edition of *Capital* was published in 1867.

It was only after the workers had shown themselves anew as creative "Subject", and not merely as exploited "substance," by "storming the heavens" and creating a totally new form of workers rule—the Paris Commune; and only after Marx himself analyzed this greatest revolution of his lifetime—The Civil War in France—that he again reworked that most famous section of Chapter 1, "The Fetishism of Commodities" in the French edition of *Capital*, 1872-75. Only then was he finally satisfied with the simplicity of his answer to the question: Whence the fetishism of commodities? "From the form itself." The whole point was that not only is the form "fantastic" that makes "social relations appear as material relations between things", but that, under capitalism, that is what "they really are."

Without full comprehension of this philosophy, Mattick ends, not only by separating what Marx had united—philosophy and economics—but, inescapably, isolates himself from the voices from below in his era and thus falls prey to Keynes. This is so, not because he doesn't, as a Marxist economist, criticize Keynes as bourgeois. It is so because, in his preoccupation with Keynes, he proceeds undisturbed by proletarian attitudes to the decades from the 1930's to the end of the 1960's; that is to say, from the Depression to the technological revolutions culminating in Automation.

The result is that his only "original" category for world economic development of our era is "mixed economy." Even the concept of state-capitalism becomes subordinated to the "theory" of the mixed economy. No wonder he falls such easy prey to the Keynesian "revolution" in economics that he reverses history itself to make it fit the economic theories of Keynes. "Though carried out in the name of Marx," writes Mattick (in referring both to the 1917 Revolution and to the imperialist adventures of present-day Russian Communism, as well as the African Revolutions* which broke out spontaneously, (totally unconnected with Communism), "the state capitalist or state socialist revolutions would be better described as 'Keynesian revolutions.'" (p. 279)

MATTICK'S HOSTILITY TO THE PROLETARIAT

We have no time to waste on exposing such a fantastic turning upside down of actual social revolutions which produced phenomenal changes in bourgeois economics, not to mention Mattick's retiming of history so that Keynesian economics, which was not born until the 1930's nevertheless "fits" 1917. What is of importance is that this has led him to bring into the open, his anti-proletarian "philosophy", which both objectively and subjectively, does indeed fit in with state-capitalism and "welfare state" ideologists as well as with all who have departed from Marxism.

Like all of them, he abuses Marx's vision of the revolutionary nature of the proletariat—"The proletariat is revolutionary or it is nothing"—in order to shout loud his hostility to the proletariat: "At present it (the proletariat) is nothing . . ." (p. 337)

It is this anti-proletarian attitude that is his one true underlying "philosophy," be it in his analysis of Marx whom he is supposed to be following, or of Keynes whom he is supposed to be opposing; be it in his professional anti-Leninism or in his deliberately ambiguous degrading of the African Revolutions. It is this hostility to the proletariat that has caused his self-paralysis every time he faces the integrality of philosophy and revolution.

*For a discussion of the African Revolutions, see my *Nationalism, Communism, Marxist Humanism and The Afro-Asian Revolutions*. For an on-the-spot report directly from Africa, see my *Political Letters*, Nos. 34 thru 39. Both are available through News & Letters.

Jan. 1970

6832

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

(I am happy to print in my column this issue the following letter I just received from a worker-colleague —R. D.)

To most leftists and intellectuals I have met, the expression "two worlds" means the struggle between the two super-powers, Russia and the United States, or state-capitalism and private capitalism. Nothing could be further from what it means to me. For as any worker or oppressed person can tell you, "Two Worlds" means, to us, the world of the capitalist and the world of the working class as a whole which exist within this one physical world on which we live.

I, for instance, have never thought of this country as being one, but as two separate and distinct ones, worlds apart, and at constant war with each other. First, because I am black, and ever since I was old enough to understand, I saw white standing for racism, oppression, and exploitation (against me and all black people). As I got older and started to work for a living, I found an even larger and more antagonistic division; the one between me and my fellow workers on one side, and the capitalists and their lackeys on the other.

I MUST admit that for a while even I fell into the trick bag of viewing "Two Worlds" as the struggle between the U.S. and Russia. That is only because, when I did so, I was still young and politically unaware. I knew I didn't like anything about America, and thought that the state-capitalism (under the guise of socialism) of Russia was the way society should be. I soon changed my mind, however, after reading about how Russia crushed the Hungarian Revolt in 1956. After reading how a so-called socialist state stepped on the workers of another state, I realized that there must exist two worlds within the Communist bloc also, and that there was no difference between the U.S. and the "free world," and Russia and her allies.

And today it is even more clear to me that these two worlds exist the world over, after having grown in political knowledge. We need only to look at Vietnam and Santo Domingo on the "free world" side, and Czechoslovakia on the Communist side to see it.

'Two Worlds' are in every country

And more than any recent event to bring this fact out clearly is the tragedy of Biafra. For here we had the free world, in the presence of England, and the Communist world, via Russia, cooperating hand-in-hand with each other to aid Nigeria in its war of genocide against the Ibos of Biafra. It is so plain to see that the "Two Worlds" that divide this one on which we live are the one of the ruling classes of Russia, America, China, Europe and their allies and lackeys, and the one of the workers, peasants, national minorities, and all oppressed peoples of these and every country. So I can't see how the leftists and intellectuals limit the meaning of "Two Worlds" to just the geographical struggle between Russia and the U.S. and the ideological one between state and private capitalism.

IF THEY need further proof of what I am saying, they need only to ask the women of their own organizations. For women, too, have to confront two worlds in their daily lives: not only the class relations but also the male-female ones. As for the black woman, you might say three worlds, for she not only has to deal with class and male chauvinism, but with race too. There would not be (nor would there be a need for) a Women's Liberation Movement of both black and white women who are in and out of the movement if this were not true.

There is a second aspect of what "Two Worlds" means, in relation to theory. Again, this is something that leftists and especially intellectuals don't want to look at.

TO MOST intellectuals (who live and think in ivory towers, away from the real world and the class struggle), "Two Worlds" means that of science and that of the humanities or art. This is a superficial manner in which to treat the question of culture. To them, science and the humanities are twin cultures that are opposed to each other. To me this is a big joke which isn't funny at all. The reason I say it is a superficial way to treat the question of culture is this: they are right when they say there are two worlds in culture per se. There is the culture of the ruling classes of each country, of which the intellectuals' twin cultures (science and humanities) are a part, and

the culture of the oppressed (either fighting imperialism of a so-called "mother country" or the class struggle within a country). Thus their whole thing is superficial and abstract, since in the real two worlds of culture, science and humanities are one and the same.

But this is not surprising, really, when one considers the fact that whenever intellectuals bring up the struggle of opposites (and this is exactly what two-worlds-in-one is, a battle of contradictions), be it in history, art, the class struggle, or national struggles, it is never an objective movement through contradictions, but a petty-bourgeois "criticism and self-criticism" type of thing.

THIS IS in effect on a par with Stalin, who ordered Russian intellectuals to substitute criticism and self-criticism for the Hegelian dialectic, and Mao who says that contradictions can be "handled"—if you have his thoughts to guide you. All of this is a lie, for as Marx said, you can't have one basis for life and another for science (or in this case philosophy, which is the science of thought). But none the less, intellectuals and Mao among them, try their hardest to do so in spite of the dialectical law that proves you can't divorce theory from practice, i.e., real life, the class struggle.

And this is exactly what many leftists and revolutionaries, like the intellectuals, are doing. They are developing theories all over the place and even adopting those that have already been shown to be counter-revolutionary and anti-working class, without once looking or listening to the voices of those who will make the actual revolution. A prime example of what I am talking about are the Weathermen, who exist not only in a theoretical but also a physical world of their own.

SO HERE too it can clearly be seen that "Two Worlds" exist, the intellectuals and "revolutionaries" in one, and the struggling masses in the other.

I could never understand why so many intellectuals I've met didn't get the meaning of the class nature of "Two Worlds" or why it paid so little attention to culture. Writing this letter, however, has made clear to me the why of it. As the Chicano brothers say:

Viva la Raza,
Acid!

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

The latest news from Nigeria speaks about one bright spot—the re-emergence of political opponent forces, specifically a Marxist party, Socialist Workers party, under Dr. Otegbeye and the trade union movement led by Wahal Goodluck. This is very good news indeed, but we must also remember that it is precisely these forces who refused to answer the question: what happens after? at the time, in May 1962, when I discussed with them the question of the African Revolutions at the crossroads. With this in mind I am reproducing the Political Letter I wrote from Africa at that time, and I would also ask our readers to read the back issues of *News & Letters*, especially the report by a Nigerian in June-July 1963; an exclusive report from Ghana, August-Sept. 1963; and my own article in April 1963, "Marxist-Humanism, Africa and America: Why Not a New International?" which was also printed in *Presence Africaine*.

Dear Friends:

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

You come to Ghana, and at first you are elated for, compared to Lagos, Accra is clean, with wide boulevards where but yesterday there was bush, and the general public does feel it has had more than a change of Administration; there has been a genuine political revolu-

African revolutions at the crossroads

tion. Then you pick up the press—and the adulation of Osagyefo, the "Leader," "Our Light," "the all-knowing," "the father of not only our country but all of Africa," "Nkrumahism, our philosophy, our politics, our life, and our song" sickens all over again, as if you were watching the Kremlin in the heyday of Stalin, "the sun of the Himalayas".

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

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

YOU TRY especially hard to see the positive aspects of Pan-Africanism in the best example of it—Sekou Toure's Guinea. Here the press is not so full of the "cult of personality." Rather the numerous quotations from Toure are on a theoretical plane—and he has, not just an ego like Nkrumah's, but a theory of "full Africanization" so that the single party aspect is palatable, even "democratic" for it reaches into the smallest village level. But in the airport, or at the Ministry of Information, there is the white French CPer who sums you up in a moment, refuses a visa or follows your every move with such suspicion that even if you had

your African-speaking friends who helped you to get down to the people, you really couldn't find out much.

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

You walk with a Woloff friend who says suddenly, as he looks at the white settlers and coffee shops, and more shops and more shops, all French owned and De-Gaullist, "When the second revolution will come to Senegal, we will have another Algeria!"

You try to get away, go into the bush where not just neo-colonialism but full colonialism (wave Britannia) rules—the colony and protectorate of the Gambia. There you will meet up with the coming revolution, with the first stages of independence, where the nation is one in wanting out, where this oppression and yet the humor is there—and you even see the international aspects of tribalism. For it is a fact that, whether English or French speaking, each African country speaks that official language only in the cities and only for the whites.

AMONG THEMSELVES, not only in the hinterland, but among the sophisticated in the cities, it is the tribal language that conveys the small talk and the big ideas of freedom, freedom, freedom. And you soon find out that it is not only the language of that tribe in that country, but the tribe that was also in the other country and the one further away yet when they had their own wonderful cultures and empires. And so to this day, Woloff will take you a long way not only in the Gambia but in Senegal, much better than French, in fact, even as Hausa will be better for you not only in the north of Nigeria, but in Dahomey, and Mandingo, and Fulah, and Ibo and Yoruba, and Ewe. Whoever told you the Jews were "the rootless cosmopolitans," the "wandering world figure without a country?" Wait till you meet the

(Continued on Page 7)

African—yes, he knows someone in every part of that continent, East, West North, South and has a sense of communication with him.

Africa, my Africa, how the Imperialists have divided you up, massacred and enslaved, robbed you of men and soil, left you with neither roads nor clothes, and illiterate, ah illiterate—what of the thousands of years of history you can recount if you cannot today read the latest law of the land that tells you you cannot read "foreign" (foreign? and who are these Britishers if not "foreign") literature — "subversive," "propaganda-bred hatred," "Russian," "Communist," "Marxist."

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

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

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

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

May 28, 1962

— Raya

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

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

March 1970

6835

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

The U.S. President's strike-breaking order to U.S. troops to take the jobs away from U.S. postal workers brings to a militaristic gallop the totalitarianism that is permeating U.S. life.

The creeping, and not-so-creeping, totalitarianism that now pervades every facet of American life discloses, day in and day out, not only the abysmal degeneracy of American capitalism "in general"—that is to say, in its exploitative, imperialist, police state nature—but also, and especially, in that of the intellectual sloth. It takes no time at all for the thin veneer of democracy to turn into instant racism.

INSTANT RACISM

Thus, no sooner did the American Gestapo-type police, in the dark of the night, with shot guns blazing and tear gas making it impossible for humans to escape, raid the Black Panthers headquarters in Chicago, killing and wounding its sleeping occupants, than the intellectual-in-residence at the White House, Patrick Moynihan, fired off a Memo to the President about the "extraordinary progress" of the Negro in these United States of America!

He played informer also on a petty level—Mr. Moynihan's "erudition" extends to reading the minutiae of society columnists—thus making it possible for him to inform the Commander-in-Chief of the mightiest army in the world that Mrs. Leonard Bernstein had held a party to raise money for the defense of the Black Panthers. The society gossip was part and parcel of the diatribe against New Yorkers who might consider black revolutionaries "culture heroes" instead of "fire-setting" haters of whites: "Hatred—revenge—against whites is now an acceptable excuse for doing what might have been done anyway."

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, it may be objected, is not characteristic of the liberal intellectual breed. After all, he betrayed his "liberal" Democratic Party colleagues by accepting so high a post with a conservative Republican President that he now has Cabinet rank. O.K., let's

Totalitarianism: U.S. Style

take some Democratic Party liberals who are not on Nixon's payroll, and who even opposed Democrats of Mayor Daley's ilk. Take Senator Ribicoff.

Just last year, at the Democratic Convention, Sen. Ribicoff braved Mayor Daley's anti-Semitic remarks and helped expose the Gestapo-type Chicago police who conspired, and staged the riots for which the anti-Vietnam war protestors have been railroaded to jail. This year, the same Ribicoff found no better way "to expose Northern hypocrisy" on school desegregation than to team up with that Bourbon racist senator from Mississippi, Stennis, to so "amend" the already-watered down HEW Bill that it nullifies school desegregation!

THE INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE FOR RACISM

Moreover, this is not an exception to, but is on a par with, very nearly the whole "educated world" who have chosen this moment when Southern white mobs overturn school buses, endangering the lives of black school children, to declare that it is "indeed" time for some "benign neglect" of Negroes, time "to return to quality education." Nor can we forget that the climate for overturned buses and threatened black school children was created by the President himself coming out against busing of children to integrate schools.

The "intellectual climate" created by those who have partaken of "quality education" can be gleaned both from the organic racism of white middle-class America, and its white-hot hatred of any revolutionary youth, white, black, red or yellow. Thus, when asked to comment on the uncultured Agnew's diatribe about "kooks and demagogues and social misfits who ought to be brought in with butterfly nets," the cultured Moynihan had the gall to reply: "I think the reference was to Harvard students and I have ambiguous and complex and evasive views on them."

What is neither "ambiguous," nor "complex," much less "evasive" is the type of horse trading which, in the first place, permitted the lawless "riot" amendment to be tacked on to LBJ's "Great Society" Civil Rights Bill. What is neither "ambiguous," nor "complex," much less "evasive" is the intellectual climate, oozing out of the Moynihans which now emboldens juries, Northerners as well as Southerners, to pronounce police murderers

"innocent" so long as the crimes committed are blacks. (The latest of such acts of infamy is the Mich. jury's setting free the infamous Alvin Karpis murderers of black youth.)

What is neither "ambiguous," nor "complex," much less "evasive" is Nixon's Southern strategy which reverses everything and anything that is left of civil rights gains in order to enable him to transform creeping totalitarianism into galloping totalitarianism.

THE NIXON BRAND OF TV

Recently we have been witnessing on our TV sets a whole series of interviews in Vietnam which are intended to prove that the GIs had been "provoked" to act as barbarians at My Lai and many other places where they committed unspeakable atrocities. The "proof" consists of the fact that booby traps were laid for Americans not only by the Vietcong but also by women and children. The reporters do not venture to make so simple a comment as saying that, very obviously, the Americans have barged in on a civil war. Instead, they save their comments for the time Vietnamese who witnessed those atrocities are interviewed. And then the comments made leave the viewers with the impression that, if the Vietnamese are not tall tellers of tall tales, they certainly do not understand the "provocations."

What has become all too clear since Agnew has cowed the TV networks into submission, and they no longer dare give "instant editorializing" (that is to say, any serious criticism), is that it is not only the President's phony TV ventures that go unchallenged. We are also being brainwashed on the Vietnam war, including its most infamous crimes, the gory killings of civilians, of women and of children.

As for Nixon's unpaid-for, elaborately staged, prime-timed—prime-timed to follow comedy hours having the highest nation-wide audiences like "Laugh-In"—TV performances, they go totally unchallenged. No one challenges even so Show Biz a put-on as when Nixon, with a flourish of the pen, but with "low profile" voices the limited social security act, the SSI-SMIA HEW Bill, all under the guise of "fighting inflation." As com-

(Continued on Page 7)

trusted to the Vietnam war speeches (when some commentators braved the presidential seal to call attention to the ongoing, dirty, imperialist war), the despicable outlawing of any aid to the poor, whether it be for food or education, was not subject to any instant, or any other kind of criticism.

That totalitarian power phenomenon called the American presidency now has also full uninterrupted access to any time Nixon so wishes. And the audience is something De Gaulle couldn't conjure up in his staged press conferences. When the Russian or Chinese or Cuban heads of state take to the mass media, it is called presswashing. When it is done in the U.S. in good "show biz" manner, it passes for "direct contact with the people." By whatever name, it smells of high heaven of totalitarianism.

GALLOPING TOTALITARIANISM

Presently being rushed through Congress is the most authoritarian bill ever enacted in the US. The infamous 1798 Alien and Anti-Sedition Act, to which the present misnamed Crime Bill is being compared, pales by comparison. Not only will Americans be deprived of every constitutional right from the First Amendment guaranteeing free speech through the Fifth Amendment protecting the accused against self-incrimination. But we will also be subjected to no-knock on the door, violation of any privacy—and this is being done by a nuclear power, under automated, electronic device structures that would yesterday have been inconceivable to imagine in the wildest nightmares. All this is being palmed off as necessary ways of "fighting crime."

This isn't creeping totalitarianism. It is galloping at full speed ahead toward a police state. Already the police are reading the signs right. You needn't be black, or a youth with long hair. You just have to be stopped for no matter what minor traffic violation, have the cops spot a book by Marx or on Marxism, and you will be sure to be "interrogated" in a way SS was most proficient in doing.

Outlawing a state of mind has already become the latest of the outrages which passes for justice in the U.S. At the present moment Judge Murtagh in New York is vying with that relic from feudal times—Judge Hoffman of Chicago—for the unbridled misuse of contempt of court sentences for any state of mind—be it even just a laugh displaying "sarcasm" for the sanctimonious kangaroo courts, or holding up a sign "power to the people." Instantly you are cited for contempt of court and carted off to jail.

FEAR OF REVOLUTION VS. PATH TO LIBERATION

Let's take a second look at the state of mind of our intellectuals—and I don't mean the Moynihans, or the Cold War warriors of the McCarthyite 1950's, but the "non-violent," "moral," including some "radical" middle-class intellectuals, cut to the heart by the fear of a genuine social upheaval. Each one has his favorite story

about the hyperboles of the Black Panthers who decry the use of pigs, led by J. Edgar Hog. Each one has the latest bit of gossip about the "anarchy and violence" of the New Left who "lack all sense of history." Whereupon "history" is picked off in books, essays, and less palatable facts of Nazi concentration camps or Stalin's forced labor camps. All of which is true enough, but none answers: What about today? What about USA—imperialism, racism, "creeping" totalitarianism?

Fascism will surely have a new form here, though the Nisei who experienced U.S. concentration camps during World War II will beg to differ also on this. Totalitarianism, creeping or galloping, certainly betokens a police state even if it can still permit itself the luxury of a Madison Avenue or Show Biz approach. George Wallace surely also has a point when he jokes about not needing to run in 1972 because "Nixon will do the job for us." And the most open of all is the VFW national commander, Raymond A. Gallagher, who said: "I hate to see this country develop into some sort of police state, but to have security for our people, it may be necessary." How much that sounds like the American military in Vietnam who declared that "in order to save Hue we had to destroy it."

To put it differently, all that either the claims of the intellectuals or the George Wallace's or VFW commanders amount to is that the U.S. may very well be the first country where fascism will get in by the ballot box. The only thing that will guarantee that this does not happen is, precisely, the fact that the black, the youth, and labor, too, as they feel the brunt of degenerate state-capitalism, will prefer the road to revolution rather than the abyss to polished totalitarianism.

The wildcatting of the U.S. postal workers has added an entirely new dimension to the struggle against a government which has kept federal workers in a totalitarian vise. At the same time that they are breaking the no-strike stranglehold of the commander-in-chief, they are wild-cattling against their own trade-union leadership. They have forced all the philistines who have accepted the white-backlash as a "fact" to confront the power of black-white labor solidarity. No matter how the present strike is resolved, there is not a single strata of the American population that can any longer be taken for granted as non-revolutionary.

- *The Moynihan memo was written as far back as January 16th and was only published when the New York Times got hold of text and published it March 1, 1969.
- **The Sub-Committee on Education which is now processing the bills on education in Congress is headed by Edith Green.
- ***See "Totalitarianism Reconsidered" by Leonard Schapiro in Survey, Autumn 1969.

April 1970

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Bourgeois reviewers have heaped extravagant praise upon this two volume study by a Marxist (Trotskyist). Part of the acclaim is, no doubt, due to the author's declaration "... we have strictly abstained from quoting the sacred texts or interpreting these quotations." Bourgeois writers love to gloat over a Marxist's seeming disparagement of works by Marx as "sacred texts," especially when this is followed by: "As against that, we quote abundantly from the chief economists, economic historians, ethnologists, anthropologists, sociologists and psychologists of our times." (p.17)

Part of the encomium may be due to the author's "erudition." Ernest Mandel roams all over the world, over a period of no less than 7,000 years—from pre-historic times to the "socialist society"—and backs up his 734 pages of text with a 36 page bibliography and a 24-page index. The text carries 962 references which take up 32 pages, and lengthy, over-lengthy footnotes dot the pages of the book.

THE PRAISE AND THE STABILIZER

Ernest Mandel was especially praised for (as *The Economist* puts it) "replacing Marx's Victorian facts and statistics by contemporary empirical material..." Pragmatists have always been under the illusion that statistical data can replace methodology and refute Marx's analysis of the law of motion of capitalism as headed toward collapse. Although Ernest Mandel does not take exception to Marx's analysis, the reviewers were too pleased with the tone of the work to debate that "attitude." The author based his own interpretation of capitalist decline on modern capitalism's "long stagnation." Ordinarily the bourgeois reviewers would have rushed to dispute this contention with statistics about capitalism's "phenomenal growth." Why not this time?

Well, for one thing, there is Ernest Mandel's non-Marxist contention that capital crises are due, not directly to the exploitative and perverse relations at the point of

*Ernest Mandel, *MARXIST ECONOMIC THEORY*, (\$15, Monthly Review Press, N.Y.)

'True rebirth' or wholesale revision of Marxism?

production, but "to inadequacy... of monetarily effective demand." (p. 343)

Bourgeois authors love to tarry in the market and concentrate on money rather than go into the factory and concentrate on relations of men at the point of production. Nevertheless, this departure from Marx's theory of crisis would not, in and of itself, have pinpointed the feeling of elation among the bourgeois economists. Other Marxists, from the great revolutionary martyr, Rosa Luxemburg, to the pedantic Marxist economist, Paul Sweezy, have made similar underconsumptionist departures from Marx's strict production theory of crisis without having brought such high recognition for erudition and objectivity.

Had the departure from a strict production theory to a market analysis not been followed by the strictly capitalistic (private, and state-capitalist) corollary, that state-induced "monetary effective demand" acts as a stabilizer of the economy, praise would not have been so lavish. In a word, what produced the euphoria among bourgeois reviewers was that final market plunge by Mandel, who (after another 200 pages of "data") landed on his statst head, declaiming: "The capitalist economy of this phase tends to insure greater stability, both of consumption and of investment..." (p. 259). (We will return to this point later).

TODAY-NESS AND METHODOLOGY

So determined is Mandel not "to restrict" himself to following the dialectic structure of "the chapters" of Capital that he deludes himself to thinking that it is not a departure from the dialectic methodology, but only from the data in these "chapters," "written in the last century." (p. 17). However it soon turns out that he also disregards Lenin's analysis of Imperialism, which is very much of the 20th century.

In a word, this is not merely a question of updating statistics, or of starting "from the empirical data of the science of today." Chapters 12 and 13—"Monopoly Capitalism" and "Imperialism"—do abound in the latest statistics and the author's wide readings are here a great deal more relevant than either those on "ethnology" or "deWesternization" which reveal the Western bias by concentrating on the primitive.

The new remains pragmatic not only as to content but as to methodology. Monopoly capitalism is related to "the second industrial revolution" instead of, as with Lenin, the dialectical principle of the transformation into opposite—both of competition into monopoly, and part of the labor force into an aristocracy of labor, at the same time as a new revolutionary force arises from the national struggles against imperialism.

For the sake of argument—and because it is the determinant for all Marxists—let us limit ourselves to Marx and give Mandel the benefit of the doubt, that the only reason for not following the structure of Capital was to begin with the new, and not merely to sum up what happened in the 19th century. Unfortunately, it turns out that, along with breaking up the dialectical structure of Capital, Mandel also divests the economic categories—commodity, money, value, labor—of their specifically capitalistic nature, thereby not only deviating from Marx's analysis of the economic categories and their fetishistic appearance, but also covering up Marx's original, historic, contribution—the split in the category of labor into abstract and concrete, which Marx considered nothing short of "the pivot on which a clearer comprehension of political economy turns." (1)

Instead, Mandel begins with "Labor, Necessary Product, Surplus Product," starting "with commodities such as Minkopies (inhabiting the shores of the Andaman Islands)..." (p. 27), "the neolithic revolution" (p. 28), and before the reader can reach capitalism, the point of concentration of Marxian "economics," he must also follow Mandel upon his discovery of "a communist state in Bahrein and the Yemen which survived for over 100 years (from the eleventh to the twelfth century)." (p. 178)

TAILENDING COMMUNIST REVISIONISM

Accidentally or not accidentally, this kind of writing of "history" in a work that is supposed to detail "Marxist Economic Theory" is a way of denuding economic categories of their specifically capitalistic nature in the precise manner in which the Stalinist theorists achieved the feat, that is to say, by breaking with the dialectical structure of Capital. Without proper recognition, Mandel has absorbed the starting 1943 appraisal of Marx's

(Continued on Page 7)

MAY, 1970

NEWS & LETTERS

TWO WORLDS**'True rebirth' or wholesale revision of Marxism?**

(Continued from Page 5)

analysis of the law of value which Marx considered the mainspring of capitalism, but which Mandel, following the Russian revisionists, strips of its strictly capitalistic nature.

This is not just a question of not "beginning" with what Marx began his analysis—the famous Chapter I of Capital which Lenin had accused "none of the Marxists" of understanding because they had not understood "the whole of the Logic." Nor is it a question of beginning, instead, with what is new in the epoch an author analyzes. Rather it is a way of presenting capitalistic economic categories as if they had "always" existed—long before capitalism and long after capitalism is abolished. The Russians dared lay hands on Capital in order to attempt to clothe the naked exploitation of their state-capitalist society in "new" Marxist garments. Why does Mandel do it—keep the silence?

The Russians labored 10 years(3) before they could write as if that had always been the interpretation of Marxian economics. Mandel begins there straightaway. This is not because Mandel is the brilliant one. The Russians have a 20 year priority in that field. But the Communist state-capitalists had to, first,—upon the direct orders of Stalin—make the admission that they were changing "the teaching" of Marxian political economy. They then had to make sure that the texts prior to 1943 did a "disappearing act" in order, from then on, to begin writing without further ado about the "orthodox" interpretation of the law of value. Above all, they had to work out the consequences of the break with the structure of Capital which reveals not only the exploitative nature but also the perversity of capitalism: The

machine is master of man, which gives rise to the fetishistic appearance of commodities and presents the relations between men as if they were mere exchange of things.

Then, and only then, could the Russian theoreticians, Stalinized and "deStalinized," write as if the startling 1943 revision was "Marxism." It isn't that the erudite Mandel hadn't "read" the controversies.* Rather, the loss of memory was planned for purposes of presenting a "true re-birth": "After Stalin's death, and especially after the effects of Khrushchev's reforms had been exhausted, Soviet economic thought underwent a true re-birth." (p.726)

TO BE CONTINUED

(All footnotes will appear at the end of Part II, next issue.)

*Ernest Mandel happened to have been the person who debated me in 1947 when I presented the theory of state-capitalism, which I was the first to work out from original Russian sources on the basis of the first three Five Year Plans, when the Russians were still denying the operation of the law of value in their "socialist land." (Analysis of the Russian Economy, New Internationalist, Dec. 1942, Jan. 1943, Feb. 1943; and again in Dec. 1946 and Jan. 1947, and after World War II; analyzed the Fourth Five Year Plan, "New Developments in Stalin's Russia" in Labor Action, October 1946.) Following that conference of the Fourth International, the French Trotskyist theoretical journal, of which Mandel was an editor, published my article on the Varga controversy. (Quatrieme Internationale, January-February, 1948.)

6839

'True rebirth' or wholesale revision of Marxism?

JUNE-JULY, 1970

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

Part II

(Concluded from last issue)

Ernest Mandel* did finally call attention to the fact that Russian economists had "for a long time" debated the survival of "economic categories" in the USSR. (The quotation marks are Mandel's way of not revealing that Marxist categories are shorthand for capitalistic, and only capitalistic, production relations.)

This attempt to cover his flanks after his failure to deal with the startling 1943 revision of the Marxian law of value cites meetings of academicians, "notably . . . in 1951, in Dec. 1956, and in June 1958." The post-war (1946) Varga controversy was not an un-notable event. Since, however, his memory conveniently extended back only to 1951, he also manages to ignore it. Yet that involved the entire staff of the Institute of World Economics which Eugene Varga headed. (4)

Changes in the Political Economy of Capitalism Resulting from the Second World War, by Varga, raised the critical question so dear to the heart of Mandel—the possibility that state intervention, even under private capitalism, could prevent economic crises. And, for a moment, the issue in dispute extended itself to the problem Lenin first posed during World War I, that of state-capitalism, a question that Mandel avoids like the plague. (5)

Our concern with Mandel's studied disregard of the Russian revisions, as well as of the theory of state-capitalism, is not just for purposes of expose. Although it explodes his claim to objectivity, to a "scientific" analysis, it is not Mandel's subjectivism that is of moment. What is at issue is the non-Marxist nature of his economic theories which rests on the illusion that the state intervention in the economy, "is an involuntary homage rendered to socialism by capitalism" (p. 541).

Inexorably, this has led Mandel to see a change of goals for the proletariat during what he calls "the epic of capitalist decline" which, nevertheless, "educates the working class to interest in the management of enterprises and the regulation of the economy as a whole . . ." (p. 536).

THE CLASS STRUGGLE AND THE PLAN

Because Mandel doesn't see today's problems, the class struggle exists for him only as something past. Thus, the section that deals with class struggles turns out to relate mainly to a non-capitalist era.

He begins with slave uprisings from Spartacus to the "black slaves used by Arabs to drain the Shatt-el-Arab who rose in revolt (868)" (p. 175). The erudite Mr. Mandel then tells us about the first recorded strike in history, that of "Egyptian workers who were working, about 1165 B.C., under Ramses III, at Dehrel-Medina, on the west bank of the Nile, near Thebes" (p. 176, fn). He then goes into the peasant revolts in China. And even when we finally reach an industrial year, 1853, it turns out to relate, not to Europe which had been uprooted by the 1848 proletarian revolutions, but to Japan, beset by peasant revolts for 250 years: "No less than 1,100 insurrections occurred between 1603 and 1853" (p. 176).

No doubt all this sounded very revolutionary to Mandel. Hadn't one of Marx's most famous statements been: "All history is the history of class struggles.?"

The trouble with Mandel is that the working class exists for him, not as subject, but as object. His pragmatism makes hash out of both theory and history, of the universal and the concrete, and, most of all, of the class struggle and the plan. He seems to be totally unaware of the fact that, unless the new stage of economy is grasped in strict relationship to the self-activity of the workers, and their mode of resistance, the crisis at each stage of production which is in need of solution is "solved" technically, that is to say, through new ways of extracting more unpaid hours of labor.

This "technical trap" waits any Marxist who fails to see that the workers' resistance to the "Plan" is due to the workers' superior knowledge, that what is "ideally" the Plan is, in fact, the undisputed authority of the capitalists. Private or state, the hierarchical structure—from "lead" man on the line, through plant managers (and including political economists)—is the command to obey the dictates of the automated machines.

To Mandel, however, even when he deals with the present epoch, and though he describes it as one of "long-term stagnation" (p. 531), state intervention still acts as "stabilizer." And so great are the glories of state intervention (plus, of course, the organized workers' ability to extract a rise in real wages) that it serves Mandel as a sort of a transition point to the Russian economy, which he declares "does not display any of the fundamental aspects of capitalist economy." (p. 560). This fetishization of stultified economy holds him a prisoner to such an extent that he even accepts, as necessary, "capitalistic primitive accumulation" (p. 561).

He does admit that, at least in the distributive sphere, the Russian economy displays "the bourgeois character of the phenomenon of inequality of the norms of payment for work that exists in the USSR." (p. 565). That is to say, it is OK for wages to be poor, poorer even than under private capitalism. Nothing about the conditions of labor, not even the existence of "the system of forced labor camps" (p. 597) seems to disturb Mandel enough not to fetishize nationalized property as "transitional to socialism"!

As we see, Mandel's silence on the matter of the theoretic revisions wasn't a mere question of theory. It was a question of failing to recognize the counter-revolution in the relations of men at the point of production which came to full theoretic bloom in the revision of Marx's greatest work, Capital.

The most telling consequence of the revisions of

the Marxian law of value, insofar as Mandel's work is concerned, can be seen in his theory of crises under private capitalism.

CRISES

On the one hand, Mandel goes to great lengths to expound Marx's central point about crises—the decline in the rate of profit. He illustrates well the question of the rate of profit as a relationship of surplus value (unpaid hours of labor) to total capital (constant capital, or machinery, plus variable capital, or labor power). Since constant capital grows faster than variable capital, whereas surplus value comes from variable capital only, there is no way to escape the decline in the rate of profit.

The many counteracting tendencies—the growth of the mass of profits, the increasing productivity of labor, big capital eating little capital—allows the capitalists to luxuriate in the mass of profits, unmindful of the decline in the rate of these profits. But that

*Ernest Mandel, MARXIST ECONOMIC THEORY, (\$15, Monthly Review Press, N.Y.)

overriding, contradictory fact of capitalistic production doesn't "go away." The cyclical crises keep re-appearing to prove there is no escape from the ultimate reckoning of capitalist production as a production of values and surplus values, accumulation and expansion of surplus value, without which capitalist production stops.

On the other hand, as we've indicated previously, Mandel says, at the same time, that it is the "lack of monetarily effective demand" which is the cause of crises. He also holds the view that organized labor is able to gain a substantial increase in real wages at the expense of capital's extraction of surplus value; that is to say, even when there is no rise in the productivity of labor. He thereby forgets altogether Marx's principle that "the diminution of unpaid labor can never reach a point at which it would threaten the system itself . . . Accumulation is the independent, not the dependent, variable." (6)

DEVIATIONS

This does not end Mandel's deviation from Marx's theory of crises. He also holds that the "fundamental contradiction of the age of capitalist decline (is) the Contradiction of over-capitalization" (p. 521), as if the failure to invest is due, not to insufficient profitability at the point of production, but to lack of markets. So bedazzled is Mandel with the refinements of bourgeois political economy in market mechanisms that he falls prey even to the spurious "multiplier" and "accelerator principle."

Obviously, he has read altogether too many books by bourgeois economists on the market phenomena of crises. Contrary to bourgeois economists, however, he has a guilty conscience about remaining so long with the epiphenomenal. He waspishly reproaches them for ignoring the law of uneven development which, to him, is not only "a universal law of human history" (p. 91), but also the key to crises.

There is one thing he has failed to note. This "new" way of expressing the disproportionality between the two main departments of production—means of production and means of consumption—is the very problem that Marx deliberately excluded from consideration. This was so, not because Marx didn't know it as a fact of production, but because it isn't the key to crises. On the contrary, it would have diverted from the supreme reason for capitalistic crises—the exploitation of labor by capital through the instrumentality of the machine. That is to say, the payment of labor at value (the minimum it takes to maintain him and reproduce his kind), the extraction from him of the maximum of unpaid hours of labor through the ever greater expansion of machinery and ever decreasing use, relatively, of living labor.

No wonder that the bourgeois reviewers were so pleased with Mandel's view of the market mechanisms acting as "stabilizers." Mandel wanted to synthesize the overproduction, underconsumption disproportionality theories of crises with Marx's, which is related strictly to the law of value and surplus value. But as Marx said of Proudhon, "He wishes to be a synthesis, he is a composite error." (7)

Footnotes to part I and part II
(1) Capital, Vol. I, p. 46.
(2) The article from *Pod Znamenem Marksizma (Under the Banner of Marxism)* "Teaching of Economics in the Soviet Union," along with my commentary, was published in the *American Economic Review*, No. 3, 1944.
(3) The *Textbook of Political Economy* was published in 1934.
(4) The *Stenographic Report of the Discussion* was published in English by Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C.
(5) This is not just a question of calculatedly disregarding crucial Russian debates, such as a matter of "slighting" me who happened to have been the first to expound the theory of state-capitalism from original sources of the Five Year Plans 1926 "The Nature of the Russian Economy" in *The New Internationalist*, Dec. 1942, Jan. 1943, Feb. 1943). There is outright dishonesty in the one and only reference to a work on state-capitalism -- *The Nature of Stalinist Russia* by Ysaak Gilekstein (Tony Cliff) -- and another by one holding a state-capitalist position, Amadeo Bordiga, writing in *Diagnoses* with Stalin, instead of stating simply that both are Marxist (and one, Bordiga, was nothing less than a member of the Executive Committee of the Third International during Lenin's, not Stalin's, lifetime) the reader has been led to believe that the authors were "economists." Contrary to what is alleged by a number of economists, who try to make use of the Marxist method of analysis," reads the Mandel text in 560). To complete the deliberate befuddlement, Mandel has, between the two works by revolutionary Marxists, sandwiched in a book by a social democrat--*The Real Soviet Russia*, by D. Dallinger.
(6) Capital, Vol. I, p. 679.
(7) *The Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 137.

JUNE-JULY, 1970

Editorial Article:**NIXON'S WARS AT HOME AND ABROAD**By Raya Dunayevskaya, National Chairman,
News & Letters Committees

Inseparable from Nixon's April 30 speech about the invasion of Cambodia is the preventive civil war he is unleashing against the American people. His excuse is an ominous one: "We live in an age of anarchy both abroad and at home."

Nixon's call for attacks against the anti-war movement as well as against the oppositionists to his whole strategy of war, recession, and racism, became all too obvious in the massacres at Kent, Ohio, on May 4, at Augusta, Ga., on May 11, and Jackson, Miss. on May 14.

It is necessary to begin with the events in Augusta, rather than Kent, because the events there expose the total deafness of these United States to the peaceful revolution that had been going on down South for a whole decade. The sudden hurried trip of our neo-fascistic Attorney General, John Mitchell, to Mississippi "to investigate" must not, under any circumstances, be permitted to wash off the blood from Nixon's custom-carved Southern strategy.

TORTURE AND MASSACRE IN AUGUSTA

On Saturday, May 9, a black 16-year-old, Charles Outman, was tortured with cigarette burns on his feet, hands and buttocks and beaten to death in a jail cell. When the word got out and the blacks were getting ready to march on the city-county building, the white establishment suddenly filed charges against two black inmates for that murder.

The black demonstrators proceeded peacefully enough until they saw the state flag with its Confederate bars and stars, whereupon they tore it down and burned it. It is at this point that the cops, under the notorious Captain James G. Beck, moved in for the confrontation that erupted. They fired into the crowd and six unarmed "rioters" lay dead. The 25 wounded were likewise shot in the back.

Typical of the "rioters" is one of the dead—Charlie Mack Murphy, a 39-year old father of four, who had just left his miserable \$60 a week job, to go to his mother's for dinner. He had but recently returned home from Fort Lauderdale. His mother, Mrs. Carl Mack Murphy, wept bitterly as she spoke: "You know, it seems like he came home just to die."

This is U.S.A. May 1970, as Nixon's Southern strategy, and his imperialist Cambodian invasion, coalesce to bear witness to the new strategy of preventive civil war.

SCLC's Reverend Abernathy has called for a mass march. We will see whether it will be as massive as the demonstrations against Nixon's Cambodian invasion and massacre at Kent, Ohio.

ANTI-WAR MASS DEMONSTRATIONS

Great as was the outpouring of opposition to Nixon's Cambodian invasion and killings at Kent, the 100,000 who marched in Washington, D.C. on May 9 were only part of the thousands who marched throughout the country.

The dominant new feature that compelled even the double-tongued, deaf, superpatriot in the White House to listen was the sequence of events that began, not in Berkeley or New York, not in Los Angeles or Wisconsin, but in the heretofore staid mid-American small town, Kent, Ohio.

On April 30, just as soon as Nixon finished his forked-tongued speech about the U.S. imperialist invasion of Cambodia that "was not an invasion," the students took to the streets.

The second day, President Nixon, at the Pentagon,
(Continued on page 4)

stressed the other inseparable aspect of the war speech—the war against American youth at home by referring to the dissenting students as "bums." The students at Kent showed their intense opposition by burning down the ROTC building.

The third act of the confrontation began with Governor Rhodes' declaration of martial law—of which the students showed their disdain by gathering for an anti-war rally at the football stadium surrounded by National Guardsmen. It was then that the full fascist face of the Commander-in-Chief came through as the National

Guardsmen (who had heard ariht the Commander-in-Chief's reference to the American youth as "bums") felt free to shoot into the unarmed gathering.

So totally isolated is the White House tower from the American people that Nixon still had the gall, 24 hours later, to talk out, not against the trigger-happy National Guardsmen who shot down the four youth, but against student "violence that invites tragedy."

"AN AGE OF ANARCHY"—NIXON'S

The shocked and dismayed national outcry at Nixon's callousness was so loud that it finally penetrated those impenetrable walls of the White House. Nixon's alter-ego,

Spiro Agnew, was still cold-bloodedly declaring the tragedy at Kent "inevitable" when Nixon felt the boomerang sufficiently to call for a press conference "to explain."

Far from explaining the tragedy, much less how the objective situation had so changed in the 10 days since he last announced that he would withdraw 150,000 GIs from Vietnam because "we finally have in sight the just peace we are seeking," Nixon tried to present U.S. imperialism as the "peacemaker of Southeast Asia."

Though he was now in front of TV cameras, and, supposedly, ready for a "dialogue" with dissenters, Nixon was, in fact, brazenly repeating the double-tongued description of the invasion of Cambodia that "was not an invasion," even as he claimed that "bums" supposedly referred only to "violent rioters."

The hypocrisy of his sadness at the death of the martyred young—Sandy Scheuer, William Schroeder, Allison Krause, Jeffrey Miller—cozed out from the soft-spoken Nixon as nauseatingly as from the shrill-voiced Agnew. In a word, nothing, nothing at all could cover up the neofascist "democracy" of the Commander-in-Chief and his self-appointed moralist, Spiro Agnew, any more than the hawk-nosed Mitchell could keep his war-mongering diatribes issuing from his foul-mouthed wife.

It is clear, moreover, that Nixon, in opening the Cambodian front, was also having global dreams. It becomes necessary, therefore, to look at the Southeast Asian war in a world context.

(Cont'd)

THE SINO-SOVIET ORBITS

Now that our imperialistic government has committed its greatest blunder by the expansion of the Vietnamese war, we must face both the developing civil war in Cambodia, and its relationship to the Sino-Soviet orbits.

The satellite that China sent into orbit April 24 was the beginning of a new stage of world relations. The two nuclear titans, looking for single-word mastery, have become three. In no sense, therefore, can the Chinese feat be dismissed as "still not measuring up" to the two global powers. Whether the two state-capitalist powers calling themselves Communist will act as a unit on the Cambodian front, or follow separate paths to global conflict, the revolutionary opposition to war must not be tied to any state power if it is serious about uprooting exploitative class societies.

Truth is concrete and each conflict must be examined in itself as well as in a world context. In the specific Cambodian war, we need first to look at the new role not only of U.S. imperialism, but also of Prince Sihanouk. Having failed to establish a mass base for himself as a "neutralist" among the Cambodian peasantry who were, above all, concerned about their own poverty and misery, Prince Sihanouk is ready, via China, to collaborate with the "Red Khmers" who, if they should not be able to overthrow the new militaristic regime, can establish guerrilla bases in the countryside.

Or, as Sihanouk hopes, on the conditions that North Vietnam and the Pathet Lao also aid. In any case, Chou En-lai met with all these forces to plan the next strategy. And Mao has just issued "warnings" about World War III.

This new alliance did not go unnoticed by the most reactionary governments in Southeast Asia, who responded to a call for a new "anti-Communist front" by that most murderous and counter-revolutionary regime in Indonesia headed by General Suharto. Thus far, nothing came of it, but U.S. imperialism is looking favorably at its antics. It becomes necessary once again to return to the home front and examine the conflicting forces at work here.

MISSISSIPPI, AND AGNEW'S NEO-FASCIST "DEMOCRACY"

On May 14, some 75 white racist cops and highway patrolmen in Jackson, Miss., facing a group of black male youth clustered before a black women's dormitory at a state college, "heard sniper fire" and began shooting up the dormitory. When the bullets couldn't penetrate the walls, they turned their guns against the unarmed males on the street. Phillip L. Gribbs, 21, a student at the school, and James Earl Green, 17, a high school student, lay dead. 15 others were injured.

The racist mayhem is not unconnected with Agnewsticks such as "the spawning ground and sanctuary of the movement is the American University." So great a favorite in the South has Vice-President Agnew become that he was chosen to be the featured speaker at a Confederate memorial.

Kent, Ohio, Augusta, Ga., Jackson, Miss.—12 dead and some 28 injured — all this has happened in the first two weeks of May, long before the hot summer has started, long before the student youth who will graduate will first find no jobs waiting for them, and long before the labor contracts will expire this year of recession.

Whether it is warmongering National Guardsmen, or racist cops who shoot, bayonet and beat and burn youth to death, the point is: who is inciting these "law and order" men to perpetrate these lawless and murderous acts? Who inspired the New York police to look the other way as some racist construction workers attacked the anti-war youth?

Who, if not the Agnew-Nixon Administration, is manipulating an alleged "silent majority" to lash out against the youth "with no more regret than we should feel over discarding rotten apples from a barrel"? If such Agnewsticks are considered vice-presidential prerogative, his "freedom" no less, then why shouldn't the armed Establishment feel they have the license to act against radical youth that Agnew dares call "the criminal Left that belongs, not in a dormitory, but in a penitentiary"?

And what is the purpose other than fascistic brainwashing for the studied and persistent attacks on the mass media, especially the TV, as they photograph these super-patriots and racists in their nefarious acts against dissenters? Who other than Nixon-Agnew-Mitchell — those polluted minds and foul mouths — have made "manhood" synonymous with warmongering, and records of facts synonymous with "an effete corps of impudent snobs"?

Where do we go from here? Is it possible to conclude anything else from these gory events than the fact that the President and his alter-ego have, from the moment they got into the White House, been preparing for the undeclared war abroad to be extended into a civil war at home?

LABOR, RECESSION AND WAR

Now that Nixon has shown that his wars abroad are but extensions of his wars at home, it becomes imperative for the New Left, the anti-war movement, the black liberation movement and women's liberation movement to take a second look at themselves, at their theoretical as well as practical activities, for there are danger signals here too. Not only is there an attempt to divert the anti-war movement into the political field — to vote for "doves" — there are also elitist opponents of labor who play up the fact that some construction workers had beat up anti-war youth demonstrators.

There is no doubt that the building workers' racist union, along with some longshoremen under Mafia control, are outright reactionaries who must be fought. But to portray these as characteristic of the labor movement at this time when strikes on the part of white and black workers — from the postal workers to the teamsters and from the teachers to the welfare workers — are at their most militant, is to fly in the face of the facts, as well as to fall into the old divisive capitalist trap of separating worker from worker, and workers from intellectuals.

Of course, there are some workers who oppose the anti-war demonstrators. So does part of the student body. Of course, there are some sectors, like the construction workers, who are reactionaries. So are the "Young Americans for Freedom." Neither facts can possibly take away from the full truth and that is that a whole generation now opposes the imperialist war games, the capitalist planned recessions and the racist fabric of American life.

More characteristic of the present stage of intensified, strike and anti-war struggles are the two Los Angeles Teamster locals who distributed leaflets in opposition to the construction workers and, at the same time, asked the students to help them in their wild-cattling against both management and the labor bureaucracy (see p. 2).

could

June July 1970

copy
At the same time, it is clear that the struggle against the war must deepen to the point where it concerns itself with the struggle against the whole system which produces war — capitalism.

This stage of heightened labor struggles comes at a time when even the administration cannot hide either the fact of rising unemployment, or that the inflation continues despite the planned unemployment. The economic crisis in the country is inseparable from the growing black unrest. These two movements must be joined with, rather than kept poles apart from, the anti-war struggles.

STUDENTS MUST LISTEN TO WORKERS

Some of the student Left better ask themselves why it is that, as against the mass demonstrations for the Kent martyrs when no less than 428 campuses were shut down at least in part, only 40 black students, and no whites, gathered at the University of Mississippi campus

sum. July 1970

at Oxford to protest the shootings at a Jackson college. It behooves the white students to contrast the fact that black students at Tuscaloosa sat down spontaneously to show their solidarity with the Kent students. But, thus far, few white colleges have sprung up to demonstrate their solidarity with the blacks.

Along with the revolutionary black dimension, what is needed in the expansion and intensification of the anti-war movement, is for the youth to begin to listen, seriously to listen, to the questions that workers raise. Thus, some of the workers who did not march said that they were definitely opposed to Nixon's war, wanted all GIs out of Southeast Asia, but did not wish to march under a Vietcong flag (see page 6). They were for self-determination of the Vietnamese people, but did not want to make it appear that they preferred Russia or China to the U.S.A. In a word, they were asking for an independent stand, both against the war and for labor's rights here, against both private capitalism and state-capitalism, which calls itself Communist.

The pragmatism that permeates the "unideological" Left, who consider any unity of anti-war forces to be above an underlying philosophy of liberation, cannot for long shut out concern for the international ramifications of the latest stage in the Indo-Chinese war as well as, and, above all, for the objective revolutionary forces and their search for a totally new way of life.

Marxist-Humanists know that the class enemy is at home. But they also know that, just as no country can be seen outside of a world context, so none can be separated from the underlying philosophy which will give the spontaneous actions of the masses their direction. In a word, the freedom struggles cannot be separated from the philosophy of freedom since only as they are united can the creation of the new go hand in hand with the overthrow of the old instead of, once again, having the revolution go sour the day after the conquest of power.

To fill the theoretic void in the anti-war movement has become a matter of life and death as we fight the repressive forces unleashed by the Nixon Administration against not only its open opponents, but against the masses who, in order to live at all, must fight recession and racism.

AUG.-SEPT., 1970

TWO WORLDSBy Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

(Because of the dangerous turn to the right in England seen in the recent Tory political victory, which included the election of arch-racist Enoch Powell, we print the following letter written in 1968 by Raya Dunayevskaya. It warned of the absolute necessity for the British working class to join in fighting against growing racism in England. That need is greater now than ever before.)

Dear Harry:

The June issue of The Marxist-Humanist just arrived and, if I may, I would like to explain why I consider the article on Powellism quite inadequate. Naturally, Marxist-Humanists "must spread the revolutionary message" and thereby win over the workers, including those who showed their own racist prejudices by coming out in support of the Tory Enoch Powell. But that hardly packs the concrete punch that Marx taught us to deliver when trade unionists take a reactionary position as they took in his day both on the Irish question and on the Paris Commune. Every British trade unionist who left the Working Men's International Association because of its enthusiastic support of the Paris Commune Marx excoriated and, in his piece, put the name of a Communist. As far as the "Irish Question" is concerned—and this, as I shall show later, is not as far removed from the race question today as might appear on the surface—here is what Marx wrote:

"The English working class . . . can never do any thing decisive here in England until . . . it not only makes common cause with the Irish, but actually takes the initiative in dissolving the Union established in 1801, and replacing it by a free federal relationship. And, indeed, this must be done, not as a matter of sympathy for Ireland, but as a demand made in the interests of the English proletariat. If not, the English people will remain tied to the leading-strings of the ruling classes."

I should like to approach the question of race at the present moment by (1) showing the historic background of the National Question in general and the Negro question in particular during World War I, and during the Russian Revolution; (2) by comparing Churchill's and

BRITISH RACISM, POWELLISM AND THE WORKERS

Labour's stand during World War II; and (3) by raising the question of the African Revolutions as the only challenge to the decrepit "West" of the Suez War and the totalitarian Communism of the "East" which bloodily put down the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. It is time we faced the question that we are all products of the historic period in which we live, and that includes holding on to some of the ideas of the ruling class even when we fight exploitation.

NATIONAL QUESTION—WORDS VS. DEEDS

You are well acquainted, I am sure, with the Marxist position on the National Question, that "in principle" most stood for the right of self-determination of nations, and yet once the Russian Revolution succeeded, some Bolsheviks opposed it as "a step backward." Lenin, on the other hand, even before the Russian Revolution, insisted that "the dialectic of history and the dialectic of revolution" was such that the Easter Rebellion of the Irish played the vanguard role of bringing the proletarian revolution forward front of the historic stage. That is when he was out of power, of course. He did not change when he was in power and Bukharin then opposed giving some of the national minorities in Russia their freedom. On the contrary, he took issue with Bukharin both in content and even in matter of language. Thus, when his co-leader dared bring in the question of the Hottentots, Lenin replied:

"When Bukharin said, 'We can recognize this right in some cases' I even wrote down that he had included in the list the Hottentots, the Bushmen and the Indians. Hearing this enumeration, I thought, how is it that Comrade Bukharin has forgotten a small trifle, the Bashkirs?"

"There are no Bushmen in Russia, nor have I heard that the Hottentots have laid claim to an autonomous republic, but we have Bashkirs, Kirghiz and a number of other peoples, and to these we cannot deny recognition. We cannot deny it to a single one of the peoples living within the boundaries of the former Russian Empire. . . . Scratch some Communists and you will find Great-Russian chauvinists. . . . The Bashkirs distrust the Great-Russians because the Great-Russians are more cultured and used their culture to rob the Bashkirs. That is why in these remote places the name Great-

Russian for the Bashkir is tantamount to oppressor, swindler. . . . The past holds fast to us, grasps us with a thousand tentacles, and does not allow us to make a single step forward, or compels us to make these steps as badly as we are making them."

Now, in contrast to Churchill who had answered India's demand for independence by the arrogant "I didn't become the King's Prime Minister to preside over the dismemberment of the Empire," British Labour correctly branded him for the imperialist and their own oppressor that he was. India gained its independence, as did the African colonies, during Labour's reign. What has happened since then?

LABOUR PARTY MESS FUELED RACISM

You, of course, know the answer better than I do: the Labour Government has made such a mess of the situation since their return to power—the unemployment, the wage freeze, the travelling in company with American imperialism on the barbarous Vietnam war. All this, and more, has brought out the very worst features of racism, not only in the ruling class, but also in parts of the working class—as if the West Indian immigrant, the British citizen of Indian or Pakistani descent, or the African student had brought these misfortunes on the British working class.

It goes without saying that the exploitative classes love it when the working people of the world fight among themselves and so make the rule of their tormentors easier. My point, however, is that it is not enough to show that the capitalists have always lived by the principle "divide and rule." We must tell the proletariat of the technologically developed world they lived largely on the crumbs from the imperialist table, which was so well set because imperialism lived off the fat of the land from the technologically under-developed countries.

Marx showed the relationship between Labour's struggle for freedom and the fact that slavery was still in existence in Africa, in Asia, and the oppressed minorities within the developed country. This is why Marx hailed the British proletariat when they said that they would rather starve than perpetuate slavery on the other side of the Atlantic, i.e. in South U.S.A. And this is why he called them a "bourgeoisified proletariat" when

(Continued on Page 7)

(Continued 1

they moved away from that principle when it came to the establishment of a totally new form of society: the Paris Commune. He then moved away from the skilled workers to the unskilled, from the institutionalized workers to the unorganized, from what Lenin called the "aristocracy of labour" to what Marx called "deeper and lower into the masses" to find the true revolutionary core who would stand, not just for reforms, but for revolution.

What has happened since the end of the 1950's when Great Britain embarked on its imperialist adventure in Suez, and Russia (with the help of China) on its destruction of the Hungarian Revolution, is the defeatism that always follows lost revolutions. Instead of looking down upon the "immigrants", the British, the American, and the East European, ought to hail the birth of the new Third World, especially the African Revolutions. We should hail them for once again showing us the power of the ideas of freedom, and that the will to freedom, even when unarmed and facing the mightiest empires, can win.

The struggle for the minds of men is still the mightiest weapon of all. And now that the French proletariat and the French students have shown that these forces of freedom have not been destroyed in technologically advanced lands, it is all the more quintessential that the British proletariat rise up to its full height and, as their ancestors showed the way to the first Working Men's International, so they should now pave a new road of world solidarity between themselves and all the "immigrants" of the world. The first step in that direction is the recognition of the fact that many of them have been repeating the reactionary ideas of their own exploiters.

Comradely yours,

Raya.

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

(Editor's Note: We print below an answer Raya Dunayevskaya sent to a correspondent who had written her: "The movement now is not primarily in the factory; the consciousness is not there nearly so much as in the rock-drug culture.")

I was glad to hear that your recent activity centered around the workers' strike, and sad to hear about some of the activism of the youth that they think is revolutionary. Let's begin with the activity of the youth that was great—the support of the strike—and the elitism in the conclusions they drew from it. To say that it was adventurous or utopian or chaotic or idealistic does not get to the root of the matter because any one of these adjectives, or all of them together, would still be only a partial answer. To get to the whole answer, we would have to see it in historic context. I'm referring to the talk about "a general strike nation-wide following the elections."

Who talked that way? Obviously, it was not the proletariat. Not so obvious, I'm afraid, is the wrongness of the conclusion that whereas the ones who talked that way were revolutionaries, the workers who did not talk that way were interested only in "bread and butter" questions.

FIRST OF ALL, so-called bread-and-butter questions aren't all that unimportant for those who must live only on what they earn in a capitalist society, although to petty bourgeois youth, poverty appears minor. Secondly, and more important, is the fact that it isn't true that that is all that concerns workers. As Denby has recently pointed out, where the labor bureaucracy is interpreting "bread and butter" to mean raises and wages, the workers are demanding changing conditions of labor and their right to control the speed of the line.

So sharp is the opposition of the rank and file to the labor contract that they have begun using the expression "run away shops" not, as in the past, to mean the shops that would go South because they could get non-union cheap labor there, but to the very shops right here in the North that are the most unionized by the "left" UAW.

Nevertheless, they are "run away", that is to say,

Philosophy, 'life-style' and U.S. workers

run away from any control by workers because the labor bureaucracy is as one with management in signing away any control over the production line to management.

In a word, the way in which the workers interpret "bread and butter", the way in which the labor bureaucracy interprets it—and, unfortunately, the way in which also the elitist activist youth interprets it—are miles apart. It is this unbridgeable gulf (unbridgeable because different classes are involved, from opposite sides of the production line) that is the mark of today's "revolutionaries," who seem to think that activism, whether it is at a park, or at the point of production is one and the same thing and, since it happens more obviously at the park than at the point of production, that makes the workers "backward". Note, please, that I didn't go into the fact that you, yourself, admit that many of the workers are also anti-war but I will now go into the anti-war activities of the youth.

THERE IS NO doubt that this is the greatest event of this decade, that it has created a whole generation of revolutionaries and that, therefore, it has the potentiality of leading to a pre-revolutionary situation. But (1) that anti-Vietnam war movement did not, did not arise out of "sex, dope, rock music and communal living." It arose, first and foremost, in response to the objective situation, the imperialist U.S. bombing of Hanoi. (2) It came after the youth had experienced contact with the black revolution, from whom it learned, not only its tactics but also its black bravery. The concrete path led from the Freedom Rides through FSM (both as an affinity to the black revolution and an affinity to the Marxian concept of alienation) to the Ann Arbor teach-in.

In a word, the awakening of the youth, as a revolutionary force, was via the now much denigrated Civil Rights Movement. Of course, the recognition that the system will not be uprooted via Civil Rights tactics but through revolution is a great leap forward if revolution is understood historically, actually, philosophically, as a social revolution which, moreover, does not stop at the political phase, or on the day of revolution, but wants to make sure that the day after we are not confronted with a new statist bureaucracy but continue on uninterruptedly to totally new human relations which the

masses themselves establish and re-establish creatively and check on daily.

I do not mean to denigrate the Woodstock festival. They certainly are a superior phenomenon to the Establishment. They certainly bespeak of the quality in the existing society, that is to say, they show that there are in a class-sense, there are two worlds in every country, also in a generation, a youth, a culture-sense there are two worlds within the existing structure that undermind it. That is the proof of the dialectic, that every unit has the opposite within itself, and that the gravediggers of the old, the forces of the new, the combatants "culturally" as well as in a class sense, are lined up for the life and death struggle long before they are "armed." Does that make the ones who are "armed" the revolutionaries? Even though their chaotic acts lead to the tragic blowing up of themselves, and even though it gives the Nixon-Agnew terrorists the excuse to conduct their preventative civil war before the objective situation and the subjective forces have coalesced to assure the victory of the social revolution.

THIS TYPE OF activism is not revolutionary, it is very serious and "the alternative society." I am using the word "serious," not in the derogatory Sartrean sense, but in the Hegelian sense of "labor, patience, seriousness, and suffering of the negative." Activism, putting one's life on the line, is most serious when it means a revolutionary uprooting of the decrepit capitalist (I'm sure you realize that I am including the state capitalist as well as the private capitalist) system and not merely a violent spouting of 4 (or 12) letter words. Words must be as new, as multi-dimensional, as expressive of a whole human being as the new society that is truly human and wholly free. 4 and 12 letter words, on the other hand, are as alienated, fragmented, as expressive of the old society as are the subdued human beings the class society produces.

As against the statist, elitist, Party and cultural man which Mao's "Cultural Revolution" has produced overseas, we need a total concept of philosophy and revolution of freedom and self-development. Both individually and collectively, self-development has always

(Continued on Page 7)

(Continued)
 occurred through history, that is to say through actual class, generational and cultural struggles that have been carried on by live men and women who have been whole enough to wish to engage in a battle of ideas.

Your description of events have made me see even more clearly than before how very urgent is this need for the unity of theory and practice. When someone as brave and wonderful as your friend seems to have been ends up dead at so young an age, I am aroused, not only against this degenerate police-type of state, but also against the delusions that make a youth think that individual acts would bring about a revolution. Must the youth sacrifice their bodies to prove the repressions of this capitalistic society? Can't we go beyond aborted as well as soured revolutions? Can't we see that thinking, too, is an activity, that to think activity is only "doing," irrespective of the underlying philosophy, is not only as one-sided as the ivory tower type of thinking, but is precisely what the Establishment, what the power structures—on both sides of the Atlantic and the Pacific and the China and Red Seas and Indian Oceans—are counting on us doing? We, thereby, prove only one thing. We are as organically part of this society we were supposed to be uprooting as the society itself is, because we are operating within its pragmatic, philosophic structure.

THIS NOTE IS too long already but I do want to say one word, at least, about "living in communes." No doubt the youth think that this is very new, very revolutionary and shows that they are living in a different world, a totally different world from that of the Establishment. Unfortunately, it's also a very different world, and not necessarily for the better, from where the masses live and must live. It is a way of isolating oneself, not only from the workers who are the main revolutionary force but from the population as a whole AND it is, again, precisely what capitalism does want. That is to say, to break up the various revolutionary forces from ever finding each other.

Do you know that the Kaiser was the only one who knew what Lenin did not know, that he need not fear the Second International's opposition to the first world holocaust he was going to unleash because the socialists were so elitist, lived so much by themselves, had their own rituals for everything from marriage as "against" the bourgeois type, to naming of their children by revolutionary instead of biblical names, that they had no contact with the unorganized "backward" masses and this isolation assured capitulation? Not that the masses were "spontaneously" antiwar at that moment, and it is precisely at that moment that the socialists—had they not been isolated and therefore compelled to experience the division within their own ranks before the outbreak of war—could have played a revolutionary role. As it is, the fight of the revolutionaries to transform the imperialist war into a civil war came only after the Russian Revolution succeeded.

SO-CALLED COMMUNAL living is not new in America and is the very opposite of the Paris Commune "storming the heavens." The only ones in this country who attempted this, for a brave 72 hours, were the workers in St. Louis. As against that type of inspiration, the American intellectuals were inspired by the utopian socialists to build their "communes" at the very moment when the Abolitionists were trying to show them that

association with the blacks is the only "transcendental" gesture that meets the challenge of the times. Whether or not you would like to look into that period with Abolitionists' eyes, or only with eyes of today and as a poet, I would very much like to see a review by you of Hawthorne's Blithedale Romance.

No, I do not think that we're in an immediately pre-revolutionary situation, least of all resulting from the sex and drug culture, and neither does Nixon. What he does see is that he can take advantage of these chaotic actions to prevent any such possibility from developing out of the emerging class struggles and the possible transformation of the anti-Vietnam war movement into a fully revolutionary movement. I am enclosing our Perspectives of this year and I'm looking forward to your comments. A copy of the WL pamphlet was also sent to you; we are expanding and issuing it as a printed pamphlet. There is a new revolutionary force, and we, alone, are working to see that it does not isolate itself from the proletariat, from the blacks, towards mere escapism.

Yours,

RAYA

July 24, 1970

P.S. I'd like to recommend to you the study of one of the most beautiful works on China, especially the chapter on the "Nihilistic Revolt or Mystical Escapism." You will there see that "Being and Nothingness" had been anticipated by some 1700 years in the concept of Void. The work is entitled Chinese Civilization and Bureaucracy by Elienne Balazs. It happens that when I was in Japan in 1966, I was asked by these modern day existentialists a very "superior" question on the "Oriental Void."

My translator on the platform informed me that it was a malicious question which merely meant to show up both Marxism and Westernism. I insisted, however, on answering it quite seriously, both as it first occurred in history, and why these modern existentialists have brought nothing new with their concept of "extreme situation." In any case, I believe it will help return you to historic situations as illuminators of the present.

TWO WORLDS

NOVEMBER, 1970

Marx, Lenin, and their detractors

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

EDITOR'S NOTE: We reprint below the Foreword written by Harry McShane for the special pamphlet published by the Scottish Marxist-Humanist Group to mark Hegel's 200th and Lenin's 100th birthday anniversaries this year. The pamphlet contains two articles by Raya Dunayevskaya: "A Footnote to the Detractors of Lenin" and "Marx's Debt to Hegel."

MARX PLACED man on a higher level than that of being a cog in a soul-less machine. Man was seen by Marx as the creator of a new society with all his attributes and faculties directed toward the attainment of freedom and human development. In the first of the two articles (according to when they were written) Raya Dunayevskaya deals with the relationship of Marxist theory to the philosophy of Hegel, but because of the attention which Lenin is receiving just now we reversed the order of the articles. Both articles go a long way to kill illusions prevalent in the minds of those who know little or nothing about the extent to which Marxism has been distorted.

No one, nowadays, calls on the workers to join "the Party of Lenin and Stalin," but there are many who place the name of Lenin alongside that of Stalin for discreditable reasons. They would make Lenin take share of the responsibility for the savage policy pursued by the Russian leaders during the reign of Stalin, and inherited by the bureaucrats now ruling over the Russian people. It should be noted that the Communist Party avoid contrasting Lenin with Stalin while, of course, deploring the cult of the individual.

RAYA Dunayevskaya takes Paul Cardan, author of *The Meaning of Socialism*, as being representative of "the detractors of Lenin." Like others, Cardan ignores the persistent struggle made by Lenin against bureaucratic rule from above. Unfortunately, little is known in this part of the world about that struggle. The charge that Lenin stood for bureaucratic domination is completely demolished by the writer who shows that Lenin, in his discussion with Trotsky, insisted on the workers retaining their own organization for the purpose of protecting themselves "from their own state." She quotes from Lenin to prove conclusively that, above all else, he wanted "the workers themselves to draw up, from below, the new principles of economic conditions." He did not live to see the state he founded going in a direction opposite to what he desired. Russia has lessons for every man and woman who is really concerned about the future of society.

No limit was placed on the amount and viciousness of the slanders hurled at Lenin from 1917 onwards. Apart from a number of incurable reactionaries, no serious-minded person now questions his integrity or his devotion to the cause of human emancipation. In the field of political theory his writings reveal him as a giant compared to the political leaders, on both sides of the Atlantic, whose careers are dependent on their efforts to introduce the appearance of stability into an unstable social order. In her book, *Marxism and Freedom*, the author refers to Lenin having turned to a study of Hegel during the first World War—a point that has relevance to the subject of the second article which deals with the hearing of Hegel's philosophy on Marxism.

THIS ARTICLE will not be welcomed by these "Marxists" who refuse to look beyond the Party directive for political wisdom. It may be spurned by those who, having seen Marxism distorted to justify acts of oppression, turned away in disgust. Those who take the trouble to read it will attach greater importance to Marxism than hitherto, and they will find that the emphasis placed on the philosophic foundations of Marxism gives it a new meaning for all prepared to play a part in the struggle for freedom.

Raya Dunayevskaya, bringing scholarship to the subject, places emphasis on the dialectic and its relevance to world events. She takes account of events from the East German rising of 1953, right down to the Vietnam war. She does not, and cannot separate theory from practice.

Getting to the heart of her subject she declares that Alienation was central to the Hegelian philosophy, and was also central for Marx. Readers will be impressed by her description of how Marx, when taking up what was central in Hegel, applied it to the real world of ordinary human beings living in a particular social order. She denies, however, that Hegel was completely divorced from the real world and claims that on the contrary,

he had "his finger on the pulse of history." She makes the point that Lenin found the revolutionary spirit of the dialectic in the works of Hegel.

ON READING this article one wonders how some of us could dismiss Hegel without knowing much about him. We were content to learn that Marx turned Hegel upside down and to leave it there. No thought was given to Marx having accepted Alienation and finding its roots in capitalist production. That is where the worker sells his labor power as a commodity, and where he is dominated by the products of past labor taking the form of capital. There the worker loses his individuality and becomes the most essential element in a system of production under which human freedom is impossible. The concept of Alienation is truly revolutionary. With Marx it is a call for the overthrow of the present social order.

It is rapidly becoming obvious to most workers that emancipation does not come automatically with the abolition of private ownership. Conditions have become intolerable where private capitalists have been replaced by a brutal state machine. Alienation, which Marx detected under private capitalism, exists also under state capitalism. The masses under both systems are dominated by their products. The hope of the future does not rest with the doings of top politicians, or with technology, but with thinking and acting human beings. These articles justify our placing reliance on the struggle from below.

Harry McShane

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Lenin's Impact on the United States. Edited by Daniel Katon & Jessica Smith (New York: NWR Publications, 1970) 234 pp. \$2.25 pbk.

IT IS VERY HARD to conceive that a historic period as world-shaking as the November, 1917 Revolution in Russia, a subject as overpowering as Lenin, on topics as close to home and urgent as the impact of Lenin's thought on today's black revolution, could possibly be reduced to utter boredom. Nevertheless, the New World Review editors have achieved the feat. By taking the current Communist propaganda line of "peaceful co-existence" like a pall, and peppering the hybrid assortment of articles with statements by the likes of "Cyrus S. Eaton, Leading American Industrialist and Public Figure" (p. 201), they have succeeded in smothering. If not the revolutionary content of Lenin's thought, certainly its elan. Thus, an excellent, serious and exciting in-person description of "Ten Months With Lenin" by Albert Rhys Williams very neatly gets lost in this haphazard collection. Yet had the same article accompanied Lenin's own "Letter to American Workers", and been followed by Peter Trawin's piece on how the letter was delivered, it would have made a lively and valuable pamphlet.

OR, HAD the editors wished to present, not "the line", but Lenin's thought in a comprehensive and theoretical coverage, there certainly was a wealth of material. There is no greater departure in theory and one more cogent in its application to today's problems, both as it relates to black Americans and the Third World, than Lenin's Thesis on the National and Colonial Questions. Moreover, these Theses, presented as far back as 1920 first singled as integral to Lenin's unique position (and for which he asked for "suggestions for amendments or additions or very brief comments not more than two pages") "The Negroes in America", and "The Experience of the Polish Jews and the Ukrainians." The Negro Question was discussed again, in 1922 and had the great black poet, Claude McKay, as a reporter. It is most difficult to get this report and one would have thought the editors would have attempted to present so historic a first to the American public on the occasion of the 100th

History rewrite degrades Lenin, black masses

anniversary of Lenin's birth. Instead, although "Lenin and Black Americans" takes up a fairly substantial section, and blacks are represented (Claude McKay by a single paragraph from a piece in Crisis!), the only one who is allowed to speak theoretically on Lenin's position on the Negro as a National Question is—Herbert Aptheker! A single paragraph from Claude McKay's report to the Communist International when Lenin headed it will show clearly enough why today's self-styled "Marxist-Leninists" like to forget the true history of the Communist K-7 in the United States on this crucial question:

"The situation in America today is terrible and fraught with grave dangers. It is much uglier and more terrible than was the condition of the peasants and Jews of Russia under the Czar. It is so ugly and terrible that very few people in America are willing to face it. The reformist bourgeoisie have been carrying on the battle against discrimination and racial prejudice in America. The Socialists and Communists have fought very shy of it because there is a great element of prejudice among the Socialists and Communists of America. They are not willing to face the Negro Question. In associating with the comrades of America, I have found demonstrations of prejudice on the various occasions when the white and black comrades had to get together; and this is the greatest difficulty that the Communists of America have got to overcome—the fact that they first have got to emancipate themselves from the ideas they entertained towards the Negroes before they can be able to reach the Negroes with any kind of racial propaganda." FOUNDED CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, Abridged Report of Meetings held at Petrograd & Moscow, Nov. 7-Dec. 3, 1922, Communist Party of Great Britain, pp. 260-261.)

NOT ONLY did the editors of Lenin's Impact on the United States miss the opportunity to quote this historic report by a black revolutionary, but they also skipped self-determination as inseparable from his internationalism as it relates both to the relationship between technologically advanced lands and technologically undeveloped countries, and to the demand from even a subordinated revolution that it consider as primary "the subordination of the interests of the proletarian struggle in one country to the interests of the struggle on a world scale." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. X, p. 231.)

The readers of Telos, no doubt, are wondering about

the strictly philosophic articles. There is one, Howard Parsons' "The Influence of Lenin's Thought on U.S. Philosophers." Let any one, however, think that "Lenin's Thought" is a pseudonym of Lenin as Aptheker let him be assured that Professor Parsons goes to great lengths to establish that Lenin "was not an academic philosopher." (p. 197). Moreover, this it said, not so much in disparagement of philosophy as an academic discipline, as of Lenin, who, although "a student of philosophic talents and interests" (p. 181) was "without any formal training" (p. 193). Naturally, the condescension toward Lenin as philosopher is not made ostentatiously; it is surrounded by praise as to how this man of philosophic "interests" "presided over the formation of a large modern state, one that perhaps became one of the dominant powers of the 20th century." Philosophers from Confucius and Plato onward, a stream of presiding over or advising a new state, but before 1917 they had never succeeded." (p. 184) Professor Parsons, we see, leaves no stone unturned to show Lenin's uniqueness in being "not a dreaming philosopher but a militant revolutionary who knows how to use philosophic ideas as a guide and weapon for achieving political power." (p. 182).

ONE WOULD never guess that Lenin, as philosopher, had achieved any philosophic breakthrough, specifically siding with Hegel not only as against vulgar materialists but, also, against his Bolshevik co-readers, who "sided 'fully to understand the dialectic.' Add even when he attacked Hegel mercilessly for his abstract idealism, Lenin also showed, elatedly, his discovery that "Movement and self-movement" . . . movement and life "the principle of every self-movement" and "activity" . . . "Why would believe that this is the core of 'Hegelianism' of abstract and abstruse (difficult, absurd) 'Hegelianism'?" (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 141). It is hard, indeed, to find out from Professor Parsons what Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks are all about, although we are assured that his "philosophic world-outlook evolved in several stages from a more mechanistic position to a sophisticated (boldness that means, 7d) and subtle dialectical one." (p. 186)

All of these rapid abstractions, moreover, are set in a hodgepodge context that bears no resemblance to reality. Thus, it would appear that it wasn't Trotsky who stood for world revolution as against Stalin's "socialism in one country," but American Stalinists who rejected "in 1923

... the Trotskyites . . . who argued that American capitalism was not ready for revolution." (p. 184) Thus, as if Stalin hadn't allied with US imperialism and urged the dropping of the atomic bomb, the cold war is predicated to "the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima in 1945 . . ." (p. 183) Thus, as proof of the McCarthyite 1950's which produced "a number of works . . . reflecting the political anti-communism of the times" (p. 188), we are confronted with the citation of Herbert Marcuse's Soviet Marxism! Thus, although Professor Parsons goes way out of his way to cite all works that make no more than "passing reference to Lenin" (p. 186), we find not even a "passing reference" to the very first English translation of the core of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks: Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic. Indeed, how could Professor Parsons have found any space for such a listing when his 20-page essay so studiously avoids any mention of the pronoun: Hegel? As the latest Czechoslovak underground joke puts it: "Lenin would have been a hundred now. But he didn't want for this."

(Written for Telos) —Raya Dunayevskaya

NOVEMBER, 1970

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

EDITORS NOTE: We reprint below the Foreword written by Harry McShane for the special pamphlet published by the Scottish Marxist-Humanist Group to mark Hegel's 200th and Lenin's 100th birthday anniversaries this year. The pamphlet contains two articles by Raya Dunayevskaya: "A Footnote to the Detractors of Lenin" and "Marx's Debt to Hegel."

MARX PLACED man on a higher level than that of being a cog in a soulless machine. Man was seen by Marx as the creator of a new society with all his attributes and faculties directed toward the attainment of freedom and human development. In the first of the two articles (according to when they were written) Raya Dunayevskaya deals with the relationship of Marxist theory to the philosophy of Hegel, but because of the attention which Lenin is receiving just now we reversed the order of the articles. Both articles go a long way to kill illusions prevalent in the minds of those who know little or nothing about the extent to which Marxism has been distorted.

No one, nowadays, calls on the workers to join "the Party of Lenin and Stalin," but there are many who place the name of Lenin alongside that of Stalin for creditable reasons. They would make Lenin take share of the responsibility for the savage policy pursued by the Russian leaders during the reign of Stalin, and inherited by the bureaucrats now ruling over the Russian people. It should be noted that the Communist Party avoid contrasting Lenin with Stalin while, of course, deploring the cult of the individual.

RAYA Dunayevskaya takes Paul Cardan, author of *The Meaning of Socialism*, as being representative of the detractors of Lenin. Like others, Cardan ignores the persistent struggle made by Lenin against bureaucratic rule from above. Unfortunately, little is known in this part of the world about that struggle. The charge that Lenin stood for bureaucratic domination is completely denigrated by the writer who shows that Lenin, in his discussion with Trotsky, insisted on the workers retaining their own organization for the purpose of pro-

Marx, Lenin, and their detractors

tecting themselves "from their own state." She quotes from Lenin to prove conclusively that, above all else, he wanted "the workers themselves to draw up, from below, the new principles of economic conditions." He did not live to see the state he founded going in a direction opposite to what he desired. Russia has lessons for every man and woman who is really concerned about the future of society.

No limit was placed on the amount and viciousness of the slanders hurled at Lenin from 1917 onwards. Apart from a number of incurable reactionaries, no serious-minded person now questions his integrity or his devotion to the cause of human emancipation. In the field of political theory his writings reveal him as a giant compared to the political leaders, on both sides of the Atlantic, whose careers are dependent on their efforts to introduce the appearance of stability into an unstable social order. In her book, *Marxism and Freedom*, the author refers to Lenin having turned to a study of Hegel during the first World War—a point that has relevance to the subject of the second article which deals with the bearing of Hegel's philosophy on Marxism.

THIS ARTICLE will not be welcomed by those "Marxists" who refuse to look beyond the Party directive for political wisdom. It may be spurned by those who, having seen Marxism distorted to justify acts of oppression, turned away in disgust. Those who take the trouble to read it will attach greater importance to Marxism than hitherto, and they will find that the emphasis placed on the philosophic foundations of Marxism gives it a new meaning for all prepared to play a part in the struggle for freedom.

Raya Dunayevskaya, bringing scholarship to the subject, places emphasis on the dialectic and its relevance to world events. She takes account of events from the East German rising of 1953, right down to the Vietnam war. She does not, and cannot separate theory from practice.

Getting to the heart of her subject she declares that Alienation was central to the Hegelian philosophy, and was also central for Marx. Readers will be impressed by her description of how Marx, when taking up what was central in Hegel, applied it to the real world of ordinary human beings living in a particular social order. She goes on, however, to state that Hegel was completely divorced from the real world and claims that on the contrary,

he had "his finger on the pulse of history." She makes the point that Lenin found the revolutionary spirit of the dialectic in the words of Hegel.

ON READING this article one wonders how some of us could dismiss Hegel without knowing much about him. We were content to learn that Marx turned Hegel upside down and to leave it there. No thought was given to Marx having accepted Alienation and finding its roots in capitalist production. That is where the worker, sells his labor power as a commodity, and where he is dominated by the products of past labor taking the form of capital. There the worker loses his individuality and becomes the most essential element in a system of production under which human freedom is impossible. The concept of Alienation is truly revolutionary. With Marx it is a call for the overthrow of the present social order.

It is rapidly becoming obvious to most workers that emancipation does not come automatically with the abolition of private ownership. Conditions have become intolerable where private capitalists have been replaced by a brutal state machine. Alienation, which Marx detected under private capitalism, exists also under state capitalism. The masses under both systems are dominated by their products. The hope of the future does not rest with the dreams of top politicians, or with technology, but with thinking and acting human beings. These articles justify our placing reliance on the struggle from below.

Harry McShane

(Reprinted here is the special introduction to the French edition)

by Raya Dunayevskaya

"Contemporary China is the focus of world contradictions... Since the past few months, the class struggle has entered a higher stage... It is to overthrow the new born bourgeoisie and establish the People's Commune of China—a new society free from bureaucrats like the Paris Commune... Whither China? (Sheng-wu-lien of Hunan Manifesto), 1968.

"The revolutionary movement which began in 1789 in Circle Social, which, in the middle of its course, had as its chief representatives Leclerc and Roux, and which was temporarily defeated with Babeuf's Conspiracy of the Equals, brought forth the communist idea which Babeuf's friend, Buonarroti, reintroduced into France after the Revolution of 1830. This idea, consistently developed, is the idea of the new world system." —Karl Marx, 1844.

The revolutionary traditions in France are of such depth and magnitude that each succeeding social revolution as well as every philosophic revolution following the great French Revolution were, throughout Europe, grounded in the foundation laid in France. Because every great step forward in philosophic cognition flows from the discovery of a new way to make the plunge to freedom in actuality, the philosophic revolutions in Germany were directly related to the historic developments in France.

Thus, the Hegelian dialectic developed under the impact of the French Revolution. Or, more precisely put, it was the dialectic of the actions of men reshaping history that was transformed into philosophic method by the genius of G.W.F. Hegel.

Thus, the Marxian dialectic developed out of the creativity of the French masses in the 1848 revolution, and reached a new historic dimension as the Paris Communards in 1871 "stormed the heavens." In completing the French edition of his greatest theoretical work, Capital, in 1872-75, Marx urged all to read it because "it possesses a scientific value independent of the original and should be consulted even by readers familiar with the German language."

Thus, Lenin, to lay the theoretic foundations for November, 1917, "rewrote" Marx's Civil War in France as State and Revolution. Indeed, what better way could there have been to express his new universal, "to a man" than to describe a new social order with "No police, no army, no officialdom. Every worker, every peasant, every tiller, every one who is exploited, the whole population to a man!"

THUS, EVEN WHEN REVOLUTIONARY events are not carried to a definitive conclusion, as was true in May, 1968, the near-revolution showed anew the power of the self-activity of the masses, who, at one and the same time undermined DeGaulle and the thought of, all those who held that such things could not happen in a technologically advanced country. This near-revolution in industrialized France put an end to the self-paralyzing myth of "technological rationality" which had transformed the proletariat into one-dimensional creatures whose flesh and bones became, allegedly, part and parcel of the capitalistic system.

This revolution that had not come to full fruition had created a new form of relationship between young intellectuals and workers—Worker-Student Action Committees. Nor did these students who built the barricades and were the catalyst for the upgushing revolutionary situation have any illusions as to where power resided when a million workers downed tools and took to the streets, in all, involving 10 million in a general strike.

This Spring awakening in workers' self-activity created ways of keeping the Communist Party and its CGT at bay. The workers' occupation of the factories upset the bureaucrats' calculations and negotiations with the State on its capitalist grounds. They cooperated

with the students in creating new international relations as the movement in France broke through all bounds, going far in advance of all "real" vanguard parties.

NO ONE IN FRANCE in May, 1968, needs to be told about the counter-revolutionary work of the Communist Party which helped stifle the revolution-to-be. What does need re-evaluation is the attitude of the independent revolutionaries. Although they wished to go all the way to the overthrow of capitalism, and supported the workers in all their actions, they nevertheless felt that the unfolding of a new philosophic banner which would give these actions a direction was something they could pick up "enroute." Being, thus, theoretically unprepared to win the minds away from the opiate of Communism's ambiguity, clothed in Marxian language, they must first now rise to the challenge of the times and develop a theory based on the movement from practice and capable of uniting with it. Each, by itself, remains one-sided and, therefore, incapable of fruition.

On the other hand, cynics who claim that Gaullism without DeGaulle only "proves" that May, 1968, was "nothing," must explain why then is the frame of reference for anything and everything (and not only in France!) May, 1968, not DeGaulle, 1958-1968. This is not to say that there was a social revolution. Nor is it meant to cover up the unfinished character of revolutionary action. Rather, it is said in order to stress that new beginnings always start from the highest development of the last revolutionary situation. And not only on native grounds.

SPRING, 1968 WITNESSED explosion, not only in France, but also in Czechoslovakia. On the surface, it may have appeared that by Spring, 1968, "democratization" in Czechoslovakia could not compare with the near-revolution in France, and it certainly wasn't as startling as the new outburst in a Western land. But the tendencies of some West European revolutionaries to look only at the surface appearance as if Dubcek could forever keep confined within his reformism masses in motion, the free flow of ideas, the philosophers searching for new ways of approach to, and relations with, workers, only proves that the gulf which divides East from West exists not only among the ruling classes but also among revolutionaries.

The truth is that not only did the workers and student youth go far beyond the confines, but also the Communist Parties themselves were shaken up and produced new tendencies. On the one side were massed no less than 600,000 Russian soldiers (some thousands more than imperialist USA has in South Vietnam). On the other side, on that fateful August 20th when Russian tanks invaded Czechoslovakia, stood the unarmed Czech people resisting, to a man, the armed invaders. All this calls for more than a mere expression of international solidarity. (The French CP pretended that much.) What is demanded of us is the realization that international solidarity is not something we do "for" the Czechoslovak masses. Rather it is a way of learning something vital from them. As I wrote at the time:

A spectre is haunting Communism as it has haunted previous capitalism—the spectre of Marxist Humanism. It is this which has crossed over the boundaries between nationalities within a country and the borders between countries. It is this which transcended the boundaries that separate the generations and keeps workers and intellectuals apart, transcended, not as something super-human or supra-historical, but as the very stuff of which revolutions are made and remade. Its unifying vision of spontaneity and organization as a single force cannot be encapsulated in an elite party, but releases itself as a forward movement of the masses.

Cont'd

January 1971

rediscovery of Marx's Humanism in 1968, that they had re-discovered that authentic core of Marxism back in the immediate post-World War II world; this only proves that workers and intellectuals inhabit two different worlds in every country. In the mid-1940's, the three-cornered debate between existentialists, communists, and capitalists as to who were the true inheritors of the humanism of Marxism was discussed on an intellectual level only. None of them fought Communism as the State Capitalism it represents. No one questioned its role in World War II, either during the Hitler-Stalin Pact or after, much less raised the question of any collusion in the nuclear holocaust that American imperialism rained on Japan.

History will never absolve American imperialism for this wanton, inhuman, nuclear holocaust. Neither will it forget the de-humanization of International Communism as the bombs fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, August 8th and August 9th, 1945. Listen to what dares call itself L'Humanite, on August 8, the day between the atomic explosions:

"The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima seems to have caused considerable destruction. American reports suggest nothing less than the disappearance from the face of the earth of a town of 300,000 inhabitants. The effect of the discovery is considerable. Nevertheless, the Vatican has been pleased to disapprove of it! May we be permitted to express our surprise, because when the Nazis had the privilege of waging total war with a total cruelty the Holy See was not equally indignant."

The Italian Communist paper, L'Unita on August 10, 1945:

"The news that an atomic bomb was dropped by the American Air force has made an enormous impression throughout the whole world and has been received on all sides with a sense of panic and words of condemnation."

This shows, it seems to us, a curious psychological perversion and a doctrinaire obedience to a form of abstract humanitarianism. . . . We do not share the sense of terror which has been expressed in certain press comments because we bear in mind the concrete use which was made of the fearful engine of destruction."

And, finally The Daily Worker of Great Britain on August 14, the day before Japan surrendered unconditionally:

"There was no official hint of the length of delay that the Japanese are to be allowed before the full force of Allied power—including the atom bomb—is loosed against them in a blow intended to be final."

EVER SINCE THE DEATH of Stalin, followed, first, by the workers' revolt in East Germany on June 17, 1953 and, within a few weeks, by an uprising in the Volkhut forced labor camps in Russia itself, the movement from practice has been the challenge the movement from theory did not meet, certainly not in the "West." In East Europe where the confrontation with totalitarian Communism reached open revolution in Hungary, 1956, workers practiced Marx's Humanism by the formation of Workers' Councils, by defining freedom as freedom from Communism, by trying to establish workers' power on totally new human foundations, where the freedom of each is the basis of the freedom of all.

It was shortly after the Russian tanks, with Mao's encouragement, destroyed the proletarian revolution and dared call the re-birth of Marx's Humanism "revisionism," that I completed the writing of Marxism and Freedom, as against the beat American intellectuals who had declared the 1950s to be "the end of ideology." I had shown that the American workers, in their battles against Automation, first by a general strike in the mines, and then by wildcats throughout the auto indus-

try had raised the most profound philosophic problems when they asked: "What kind of labor should man do? Why is there such a gulf between thinking and doing?" (See Chapter XVI, "Automation and the New Humanism.")

The first edition of Marxism and Freedom (published in the United States and Italy) begins with the age of revolutions—industrial, political, social, and intellectual—that initiated the machine age, and ends with two new pages for freedom, the one in East Europe against Communism and the one in the United States against racism. I was criticized for placing the Montgomery, Alabama Bus Boycott of 1955-1956, on the same level as the Hungarian Revolution. With the birth of a new Third World, initiated by the African Revolutions, the color black, became a new force of revolution globally. It, too, however, has now reached an impasse—must one choose between existing world state power before one can achieve full freedom? For a while, it looked as if Mao's China was pointing to an independent road, different from the two contenders for world power—U.S. imperialism and Russian State Capitalism, calling itself Communism. But as the Vietnam War has proved all over again, the Sino-Soviet conflict subordinates freedom struggles to its respective power struggle.

IN PROVIDING AS EMPTY a shelter for mind, as the fall-out shelter is for the body, Communist State-Capitalism is giving full proof of the schizoid Marx had long ago predicted for the decomposition of the capitalistic system. This has never been truer than since the 1960's when Mao's China, at one and the same time, joined the exclusive nuclear club and unloosed its own barrage against the Humanism of Marxism. By the time of the so-called Proletarian Cultural Revolution, a new revolutionary opposition within China opposed to the re-establishment of the new monolithism has arisen. Calling themselves the Sheng-wu-lien of Hunan (Hunan Provincial Proletarian Revolutionaries Great Alliance), here is what it wrote in its Manifesto, "Whither China?":

"Intoxicated by his victory of February-March, Chou En-lai—at present the general representative of China's Red Capitalist class—hurriedly tried to set up revolutionary committees in all parts of the country. If this bourgeois plan had been fulfilled, the proletariat would have retreated to his grove. . . . The form of political power is superficially changed. The old provincial party committees and old military district command have become 'the revolutionary committee' or 'preparatory group for revolutionary committee.' However, old bureaucrats continue to play the leading role in the 'new political power' . . . as the masses have said, 'everything remains the same after so much ado.'"

"Victory of the Chinese proletariat and the broad masses of revolutionary people and the extinction of the new bureaucratic bourgeoisie are likewise inevitable. The world-shaking great festival of the revolutionary people—the overthrow of the revolutionary committee and birth of the 'People's Commune of China'—will surely survive."

This, too, was published in that remarkable year, 1968, Spring-1968.

Thus, as we see, new revolutionary forces have arisen everywhere to blow skyhigh the gory myth that revolutions are made for the purpose of establishing a party machine; party-monolithism is there to throttle the revolution, not to release the creativity as well as the energies of millions. Marxism is either a theory of liberation or it is nothing. In thought and in life, it lays the basis for achieving a new human dimension without which no new society has viability.

IN OUR AGE OF ABSOLUTES when revolution and counter-revolution are so interlocked, it is not only the intellectual "in general" who must leave his ivory towers; so must the Marxist theoretician. The ceaseless repetition for the need of a vanguard party "to lead" has blinded him to the fact to which the mass of people are not blind—that everyone is ready to lead them; nobody to listen to them. Yet the movement from practice during the past two decades has been ceaseless while the movement from theory has been at a dead standstill.

To rise to the challenge of the times requires altogether new banners. Marx was the first to see this in its breadth and depth—as both a birth-time of history and the realization of philosophy. Because he had put the human being in the center of all his thoughts, he could unite theory and practice, idealism and materialism, and, unarmed, throw the gauntlet down to the armed bourgeoisie. When asked why he, a bourgeois intellectual had broken with his class and become a "radical," he replied that "To be a radical means to grasp something at its root. And the root of mankind, the highest being for man, is man himself." It still is.

The second edition of Marxism and Freedom, published simultaneously in the United States and Japan in 1984, included a new chapter, "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung" which traced the development of "Mao's Thought" from 1927 to the Sino-Soviet conflict in the early 1960's. For this special French edition, I am adding an Appendix on Mao's "Cultural Revolution."

I wish to dedicate this edition to the French workers and students, who made Spring, 1968 happen, thereby heralding the coming rebirth of a social revolution that would not separate itself from Marx's philosophy of liberation, thus making freedom a reality.

—Raya Duzayevskaya

Detroit, Michigan
February, 1976.

6853

Polish uprising, protests against Russian anti-Semitism, reveal state-capitalist crises

By Raya Dunayevskaya,
Chairman, National Editorial Board

The spontaneous upsurge of Polish workers' resistance to the unconscionable pre-Christmas announcement of 20 per cent price rises on food quickly developed new forms of opposition to their Communist overlords. At one and the same time, shipyard workers at Gdansk refused to work, marched on the Communist Party headquarters, and, while singing the "International" shouted "Gestapo!" "Gestapo!" at the Communist police firing into the crowd.

On the two-mile march from the Lenin Shipyards to the party headquarters, the ranks of the 5,000 workers swelled as housewives, students, the population as a whole joined it. By the time they reached the Party offices and began throwing home-made bombs at them numbered 20,000 strong. While official statistics claimed that "only" six were dead as the uprising spread to other ports, independent reporters said the number was more likely 300!

The most momentous demonstration was in Szczecin, Poland's biggest seaport. Tanks were unloosed against the unarmed crowd, and when one mother and young daughter could not get out of the way fast enough, a tank crushed them both. A young soldier stood by and cried.

No wonder the three Russian divisions stationed in Poland kept to their barracks. Very likely, the Russian overlords felt assured that the Polish rulers would shoot down their workers, especially when the uprising spread through the land, including Warsaw itself, where a bomb had been hurled at the Soviet Embassy.

"NOBODY LISTENS TO US"

The week of open and violent revolt succeeded in toppling Gomulka, in a revocation of the fantastic price rises on food, and a few, very few, wage raises—plus a great deal of loud talk on the part of the "new" leaders about the need to close "the communications gap" between leaders and workers. The daily press is helping Polish Communism give the impression that the revolt has ended "because" workers gained what they asked for, gained "more" than during the 1956 Poznan revolt.

In truth, when the revolt was supposed to have ended completely, the revolt reappeared after the holidays, again in Gdansk, in a still newer form, a form never yet braved in a totalitarian country. For two days (Jan. 5 and 6) the shipyard workers came to work, but did not work. Instead, they demanded not only that the 200 workers arrested be released, but also that the new First Secretary of the Communist Party, Glerak, come down to talk to them: "Nobody listens to us in Warsaw."

Sympathetic sitdown strikes were also staged in drawl. It is not labor, but some of labor's misleaders position against the war and for immediate U.S. withdrawal could be spoiled—the teachers took a square mortar there were two separate ballots, either one of which tactic—you had to vote "no" if you meant "yes" an dum of all union teachers. Despite a tricky Shanker finally, this year it went to a mail-ballot referer war.

national AFT, up to now, had taken no position on the union referendum on the war took place. The Inter meanwhile, on the national level, a very important teachers belong to the union rather than the Association associated with a union, and all the young and black run it. More teachers are not so afraid now of being the meetings are well-attended and the members real ring of the year. Also, the local here is a very good on ing to 110, which is about 70 more than in the begg ditdown. The AFT gained many new members, grow

ductivity we need to look not so much at Warsaw as at Moscow. The telling years are 1967 and 1968.

1967-1968: STATE-MONOPOLY CAPITALISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

Probably by sheer coincidence—1967 was the 100th anniversary of the publication of Marx's Capital—the year of the Arab-Israeli War, the year Russia so fully aligned with the Arab governments as to stimulate a rebirth of its own anti-Semitism, the year, 1967, was the year in which Russia and its satellites, at its scholarship conferences, suddenly admitted the existence of a new world phenomenon: "State-Monopoly Capitalism."⁽¹⁾

By no accident, however, state-capitalism generates a very different milieu for anti-Semitism than did "young" capitalism, as anyone can see by comparing the effects of the Dreyfus case which shook France to its very foundations, to the near-silence produced by the Nazi genocide of six million Jews.⁽²⁾ (None need to learn this lesson more than today's so-called Left which is allowing "anti-Zionism," the not-so-hidden anti-Semitism, to enter its ranks in the wake of being for the existing Palestinian guerrilla organizations as if that were the equivalent of the social revolution.)

In any case, the 100th anniversary of the publication of Marx's Capital turned out to be a total reversal of the previously existing dogma that there is no such animal as state-capitalism; that forever imperialism would be sufficient to explain what has been happening in the post-war world. As against the recantations⁽³⁾ Eugene Varga was made to write when he published Changes in the Capitalist Economy as a Result of World War II, which propounded the new stage of world economy manifested in the fact that capitalism can plan and would "therefore" not allow a world depression again to threaten its very existence, Communist economics now not only admitted the existence of state-capitalism but predated it to the Depression.

It isn't that de-Stalinization had changed the class nature of vulgar materialism. Rather, it is that the "fully" planned state-capitalist society calling itself Communism wanted to "reform" itself, adopt more of the market manipulations of "mixed," state-monopoly capitalism while retaining the mainspring of capitalism:

the law of value—that is to say, paying the worker the minimum it takes to reproduce himself and extracting from him the maximum unpaid hours of labor it takes to keep expanding production.

Or, as the "new" leaders in Czechoslovakia (now that they are attacking Gomulka) restated Marx's principles for, once correctly: "There was a tendency to develop production for production's sake and to lose sight of the most important thing in an avalanche of statistics and indexes, namely, when and how to raise living standards." Since the 1971-75 Plan will remain substantially the same, we can be sure that nothing will change from the crucial years of 1967-68 that we are now tracing. And the essence of the theoretical discussion was that it did allow the cat out of the bag, to wit, that neither Automation, nor the world market, has changed a thing. Labor productivity is the one, the only answer. It is the source of all value. And since that is so, workers in "socialist" lands must work hard and harder:

(Cont'd)

February 1971

"Otherwise how is it possible to explain why the workers in the United States get more wages than the Polish worker?" (4)

Not a single word was mentioned about the fact that Russia, like any imperialist capitalist land, pays low prices for Poland's coal and makes Poland pay high prices for Russian iron ore. Not a single word was mentioned about the added fact that, far from the "ideal" automated industry, Polish machinery is so obsolescent that some of it predates to the beginning of the century, which means that the worker must be made to sweat the harder. And, of course, not a single one of these intellectual bureaucrats dared acknowledge that the low labor productivity of the Polish worker, far from being a sign of his "backwardness," was, in fact, the exact measure of his revolt against capitalist "norms."

State planners continued to plan. The Polish economy went into deeper and deeper crises in 1968. To make matters worse, the weather was very bad, and agriculture took a big dip downwards, so that even bread became scarce in "socialist" Poland. Then came Russia's imperialist invasion of Czechoslovakia and the outpouring also of students in sympathy with the Czechoslovak Spring and against their own leaders who had sided with Russia.

Obviously, General Moczar considered that a propitious time to challenge Gomulka's leadership, and to develop at full blast the scapegoat of "Zionism." By shouting as loudly against Zionism, Gomulka weathered that storm, got some extra grain from Russia, but no help whatsoever from East Germany, the most developed of the satellites. Evidently Ulbricht was too busy, as the still defiant Czechoslovak radio put it in its August 26 (1968) broadcast:

"We have learned at long last who is responsible for the non-existent Czechoslovak counter-revolution... 'International Zionism,' (euphemism for 'the Jews'). Apparently our East German friends have been experts on this subject ever since World War II... Allegedly 2,000,000 people are involved... Why cannot these 2,000,000 Zionists be found if the Soviet army command, or perhaps, Neues Deutschland wishes to find them? Anyhow, the Germans today are the only real experts able to distinguish with absolute accuracy between Aryans and inferior races."

Gomulka, who weathered that storm, was toppled when, in economic terms, the new Five-Year Plan was spelled out as a fantastic rise in prices, that is to say, a substantial wage cut. The "new" leaders talk differently. At the same time General Moczar has been raised to Politburo membership to assure the knot being used to force compliance, not with words, but with State Plans. And, as the trip to Moscow on Jan. 5, 1971 showed, Poland's economic plans are part and parcel of Russia's 9th Five Year Plan for the same years, 1971-1975.

RUSSIA'S GLOBAL APPETITES

Until the last two weeks of the year, 1970 had seemed to be a very good year for Russia. By the end of 1969 it had moved from border skirmishes with China that had the aspects of nothing short of war to an understanding of sorts with Chou En-lai, the exchange of ambassadors, some rise in trade and lowering of tone on both sides of the Sino-Soviet conflict. It felt especially free to pursue its global aims both in the Middle East and in Western Europe because its chief rival for world mastery—U.S. imperialism—was in deepest crises, both internally and externally. Nixon's adventurist invasion of Cambodia and shootings at Kent, O. and Jackson, Miss. had unified the youth opposition and the blacks against him, while the economic recession had brought about a new militancy on the part of labor, that it seemed an especially propitious

time for Russia to extend itself.

Having already established more than a foothold in the Middle East, it now took new initiatives in Europe, forcing its East German satellite to accept the Moscow-Bonn "non-aggression pact" and trade treaty. It was even making talk about a general European Security pact. Whether that would or would not cause new divisions within NATO, it was certainly true that the new realignment with West Germany at least worried some who had seen De Gaulle's attempt at a new Franco-German axis become a stillbirth. In the Middle East Russia felt so certain of its new prowess that it concluded a military agreement with Egypt that is practically unprecedented.

None now doubted its global status or nuclear power. No matter where the Sino-Soviet conflict would lead to, the world was indeed divided into two, and only two, big superpowers. Internally, it is true, Russia had troubles with its intelligentsia and was still very far from getting its restless proletariat "to work hard and harder so as to catch up with and surpass the United States."

Even here, however, being the totalitarian power it is, it thought it had just the right scapegoat at the right time to throw terror into the hearts of all dissidents. The "Leningrad affair"—11, mainly Jews, who were alleged to have plotted a hijacking—was ending not only with stiff sentences, but two of the Jews—Mark P. Dymshitz, 43, and Edward S. Kuznetsov, 30—were sentenced to death. Moreover, the Russians evidently thought all this would "sound" good over the air waves to Arab lands, and thus strengthen Russia's hand.

Instead, everything came crashing about them. Not only was there a world outcry against the barbarity of the sentence, not only did "the West" draw a parallel between the trial of Basques at Burgos in fascist Spain and the trial of Jews in Communist Russia, but even the Communist Parties of France, Italy, Great Britain AND Spain asked them to reverse the verdict. It was clear that, to all, "Zionism" and "treason" seemed euphemisms for Soviet anti-Semitism.

Nor, finally, was this an outcry only from the "outside." As the Moscow correspondent of Le Monde (12-30-70) put it: "Most non-Jewish Soviet citizens are not at all inclined to put up with anything resembling anti-Semitism even in covert form."

And while its clay head was revealed in Moscow, the uprising in Poland showed that each country has

indeed two worlds and that it better protect its class power without going off into a pogrom atmosphere reminiscent of Tsarist days. At the same time, it cannot forget the Sino-Soviet conflict. While China can, and is, as virulent as Russia in its "anti-Zionist" campaign—in the Middle East—it plays a different tune in East Europe. After all, it needs only call the Russians "the new Tsars," and far-away China gains an immediate following in East Europe. Russia is not unaware that ever since its invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, "Maoism" has not been confined to Albania.

And thus it came about that the totalitarian country that never listens to world opinion bowed to it, reversed the death sentence to 15 years at hard labor.

This may mean, as many Jews insist, merely a slow instead of immediate death, but it is a change in line, and does give all a breathing space in which to plan for defense against the attacks still to come not only against Jews but against all dissidents—workers, youth, intellectuals, and other national minorities—in Russia and in East Europe. The clay head as well as the clay feet of the Russian bear has been revealed in 1970.

- (1) See "Whither Modern Capitalism?," WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, December 1967, January 1968.
- (2) See my analysis of anti-Semitism and state-capitalism in NEWS & LETTERS (February, 1969).
- (3) The full translation of the full stenographic transcript of the discussion on Varga's Changes in the Capitalist Economy as a Result of World War II was published by the Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C.
- (4) World Marxist Review (Dec. 1967)

APRIL, 1971

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from Part III of the Perspectives Speech delivered to the Convention of News & Letters Committee by Raya Dunayevskaya. Copies of the complete report can be ordered from News & Letters for 35c.

Theories galore are being offered by rootless intellectuals to the youth so actively visible, not only on the anti-Vietnam war front, but also in more organic ways to reshape the world they did not make and which is rotting . . .

If theory were a mere question of reading books or being world travellers (invited world travellers, it should be added, by existing state powers, "progressive" though they be) then, of course, there would be no need to follow the movement from below, from practice. The last thing our self-styled theoreticians think about is listening to workers, to the masses. And, though they talk much about Marx, they have not the slightest conception, or even feeling, for what Marx meant by "history and its process," or how praxis, not books, led to the dialectic working out of a philosophy of revolution.

Take so simple a question as the Machine. That is where Herbert Marcuse's departure from Marxism begins. It is also, where our modern age began, and so did Marxism. Marx wrote a magnificent analysis of the Machine in *Grundrisse: Being a dialectician as well as a revolutionary*, the subject of machinery was never dealt with apart from its opposite, the laborer. But, as worked out in this first draft, the concentration was on the logic of technology's development from a complex tool to a full automaton, at which point the worker might stand outside of the production process.

This is not the place to go into the whole of the *Grundrisse*. Here we must limit ourselves only to what Herbert Marcuse quotes about being "outside of" production process. Not only does it not mean anything that Herbert Marcuse attributes to it, but what is of the essence is that Marx's decision not to publish it in 1858 was not because it was "wrong." It was not concrete enough. The changes he introduced reveal the dialectic method in full.

What is theory? 'History and its process'

Marx states that if one studied the history of inventions, he would be able to see how inseparable from it is the revolt of the workers. The worker resists the mindless substitute for every move of his hand—the machine. To counter the workers' resistance to the new forms of exploitation, the capitalist, or rather his scientist, keeps inventing every new way of getting rid of the laborers' "intractable hand." This strife between worker and machine, worker and capital, Marx, called "history and its process." The key word is process. That is to say, the concrete process of this strife discloses what the workers are doing, the numerous ways they are fighting capitalism at the point of production, and the questions they are posing on every facet from the length of the working day to the kind of labor men should do, the relationship of labor to life.

When Marx told the story of Machinery in capital in 1867, as against 1858, narrative and reason became one, and as historical materialist he launched into an attack not only on capitalists but on those he called "abstract materialists," the scientists, before whom our age bows so, and not only for not "knowing" the economic laws of capitalism, but for having missed entirely "history and its process."

HERBERT MARCUSE

Over 100 years have passed. The automaton Marx predicted has come to life. The new word is Automation. It is overpowering. The workers react one way—general strikes, wildcats, revolts. The scientists, the labor bureaucrats as well as management help defeat the workers in the first round. The academic Marxist, the one who in 1941 could write *Reason and Revolution*, by 1960 is overcome by the new technology, because he is so isolated from the modern proletariat, that he decides that the proper characterization of our age is one-dimensional society and so he names his worker, *One Dimensional Man* . . .

One Dimensional Man does succeed in proving one thing — the one-dimensionality of Herbert Marcuse's thought . . . He moved, inexorably, from departing from Marx's analysis of machinery, to throwing overboard nothing short of Marx's concept of revolution itself: "the Marxian concept of a revolution (that phrase is underlined by him, rd) carried by the majority of the exploited masses, culminating in the seizure of power

and in the setting up of a proletarian dictatorship which initiated socialization, is 'overtaken' by the historical development . . ." (and that last phrase is likewise underlined by Herbert Marcuse, *News & Letters Review*, #58, 7-8, 1969) . . .

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE

Where the "historical" Marcuse threw overboard Marx's concept of revolution, Sartre tells the youth to reject history: "What benefit can you get" (writes Sartre despite his proclaimed conversion to Marxism which was supposed to have led to his "acceptance" of history and his writing of the *Critique de la Raison Dialectique*) "from learning something about the Punic Wars or the Crusades?"

I'm not sure that I'm an expert on either the Punic Wars or the Crusades, but I know Sartre has a lot to learn from the history of Maoism, a philosophy that he has criticized even as he had previously criticized Russian Communism. And, just as he "fellow-travelled" with the Russian Communists throughout the post-war period, so now he follows Mao, or at least holds up Mao's Cultural Revolution, including the manner in which it manifests itself in France where he is presently "acting editor" of their paper.

It isn't that Sartre doesn't know that history any more than that he hadn't known the history of Russian Communism at the time. Existentialism fellow-travelled with it, Moscow Frame-up Trials and forced labor camps, notwithstanding. It is that knowledge bereft of "History

(Continued)

6856

and its Process," i.e., the class struggles, hardly helps one grasp reality . . .

Even if they do not listen to the voices from below, the movement of opposition to Mao in China itself, shouldn't theoreticians at least know how to listen to the theory of the Cultural Revolution? . . .

The truth is that despite the revolutionary-sounding rhetoric of uninterrupted revolution, retrogressionism oozes from its every pore; military "protracted war"; regarding the proletariat, "glorious production teams"; regarding thought, though guided by the Thought of "the One," the helmsman of State, "Mao Tse-tung," the ideological warfare will not be won soon:

"Decades won't do it. A century or several centuries are needed."

* * *
We have tarried so long on Herbert Marcuse and Jean-Paul Sartre, not because they merit it, but because, as philosophers experienced in manipulating the dialectic, (not Marx's and not even their own but Mao's or whatever is the latest craze), they do carry a thought through to the end. Thereby they cast an illumination on all petty-bourgeois revolutionary thinking. Acknowledged or otherwise, it is there where much of the New Left is entrapped . . .

6357

MAY, 1971

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

1971 is the eleventh year since the Sino-Soviet conflict first broke into the open. By the time, in August, 1966, that Mao launched the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, not only had Mao succeeded in designating Kussia as capitalist, state-capitalist, but all his opponents within China (all, that is, except the actual capitalists who continue to collect their five per cent interest on capital that they manage for the state) as "capitalist roaders."

There are young revolutionaries who are so enthusiastic about Mao's expose of "Khrushchev's phony Communism" (now called "Khrushchevism without Khrushchev") as capitalistic that they help cover up the greater truths, that (1) long before Khrushchev's "phony Communism" (deStalinized goulash), it was Stalin who lorded it over Russia and initiated the transformation of the first workers' state into its opposite, a state-capitalist society; (2) it was Mao himself who, in 1956, helped Khrushchev to crush the Hungarian Revolution with its Workers' Councils and struggles for a truly new social order; and (3), furthermore, Stalin is but the Russian name for a world phenomenon. Its appearance has nothing whatever to do with the Sino-Soviet conflict (which it antedated by three long decades), and everything to do with the Great Depression, and fear of proletarian revolution. Therein lies its crucial importance for our day.

THE STAKES

The real question is: What, in this period of recessions that have come to take the place of the Great Depression nevertheless, makes the global crisis so total that even Mao's China is beginning to stretch out a hand toward a little "peaceful co-existence" with the U.S.? What is being outstretched is not the hand of a ping pong player (China's own brand of phony "people to people relations"), but that of Chou En-lai at the very top of the "new" Mao leadership.

Why is it that just as the recently concluded 24th Congress of the Russian Communist Party had all its pie-in-the-sky promises rest on "greater labor productivity," so Mao's Communism, purified of "capitalist roaders," continues to lash out against "the black wind of economism"? It is this, just this, which makes both

'CULTURE,' SCIENCE AND STATE-CAPITALISM

"socialist lands" bear such striking resemblance to that super-imperialist titan, the U.S.A.

State-capitalism, not as a mere swear word spewed out against dissidents, but as serious theory, does indeed reflect reality form in twain by the decisive relations of men at the point of production, those exploitative relations of capital/labor which determine all else in society, especially its thought. Which is why the proletariat, too, in its struggles, fights under totally new philosophic banners of liberation, as the 1968 Hunan Manifesto within China itself proved once again:

"The form of political power is superficially changed . . . However, old bureaucrats continue to play the leading role in the 'new political power' . . . Chou En-lai (is) at present the general representative of China's Red Capitalist class . . . as the masses have said, 'everything remains the same after so much ado'."

"Victory of the Chinese proletariat and the broad masses of revolutionary people and the extinction of the new bureaucratic bourgeoisie are likewise inevitable . . . the 'People's Commune of China' will surely survive." (1)

In this, the 30th year of the elaboration of the theory of state-capitalism, and the 15th year of the rebirth of the Humanism of Marxism produced by the mass movements in East Europe in the 1950's, growing throughout the world in the 1960's, we must go back to theoretic origins not only to set the historical record straight, but also to test the dialectic method of the state-capitalist theory against the dialectics of liberation today.

*Evidently no one has told Mao that Black is beautiful. All the broadsheets that China directs to the Blacks in the U.S. notwithstanding, the word, black, has always (after the "Cultural Revolution" as before) been used in Mao's China as synonym for everything evil!

(1) During the "Cultural Revolution" a new revolutionary youth organization sprung up in Hunan and called itself the "Hunan Provincial Proletarian Revolutionary Great Alliance Committee" (Sheng-wu-lien). Its Manifesto, quoted above, along with two other documents by it as well as all the official Maoist attacks on it have been reproduced in Klaus Mehnert's Peking and the New Left: At Home and Abroad (China Research Monograph #4, UC, Berkeley).

THE THEORY OF STATE-CAPITALISM

Born under the impact of the shock of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, the outbreak of World War II, and Trotsky's calling for the defense of Russia, "a workers' state, though degenerate," the "state-capitalist tendency" decided to make its own study of the class nature of the Russian economy in strict relationship to Marxism and the specific form of workers' resistance to the Five Year Plans. I happened to have been the first to make a study of the Plans from original Russian sources, but it was not embarked upon solely as a Russian study. It was done as a restatement of Marxism for our age. It was by no accident, therefore, that, in the process of analyzing the operation of the law of value, that main-spring of capitalism, that I rediscovered in the early 1940's, Marx's now celebrated 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscript. It was its concept of free labor as the shaper of history vs. alienated labor which is the mark of capitalism that governed the study, The Nature of the Russian Economy. (2)

Because the law of value dominates not only on the home front of class exploitation, but also in the world market where big capital of the most technologically advanced land rules, the theory of state-capitalism was not confined to the "Russian Question," as was the case when the nomenclature was used by others. Quite the contrary. The new in the theory of state-capitalism,

(Continued on Page 7)

(2) A minority political tendency is always limited in the space accorded to it in the public press. Thus, the section of the study of the Russian economy that was based on the early essays of Marx and was entitled Labor and Society was not published either when Part I, Analysis of the Russian Economy appeared (New International, Dec., 1942, Jan., 1943, Feb., 1943), or when Part II, Nature of the Russian Economy (New International, Dec., 1947 and Jan., 1947), was finally published. Labor and Society finally appeared in mimeographed form in the Johnson-Forest Interior period Bulletin No. 5 (1947). These documents form part of the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection (Marxist-Humanism, Its Origin and Development in America, 1941-1968) that is now available in xeroxed form and on film from Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit.

(Continued)

its dialectics, its conclusions, demonstrated, first, that the State Plan, the State Party, the monolithic State, differed in no fundamental degree from the capitalism Marx analyzed, in *Capital*, where he showed that it was not the anarchy in the market, but the "despotic plan of capital" which labor confronted daily in the factory. Equally fundamental was the second point my study made: that the 1930's made it possible to prove, in the concrete, what Marx could only state in theory about the ultimate development of the concentration and centralization of capital "in the hands of a single capitalist or a single capitalist corporation." (3)

State intervention in the economy, whether totally or "in part," characterized both Hitler's Germany and Roosevelt's U.S. "New Deal," Japan's "Co-Prosperty Sphere" as well as the "Labor Government" in Great Britain. What the 1930's established is that under no conditions could The Plan be considered either "socialist" or only a "war measure" as it was during World War I. The State Plan had become part of the very organism of capitalism undermined by the Great Depression, fearful of proletarian revolution, determined to survive at all costs, be it state control or world war, or a nuclear holocaust—that is to say, destruction of civilization itself.

On the other hand, the proletariat has no intention whatever to let that happen. Its struggles against that are ceaseless, although the forms of resistance, of necessity, manifest themselves in new forms. Thus low labor productivity, far from being a sign of the "backwardness" of the Russian proletariat, is the measure of his resistance to the State Plan, the State Party, the Leader.

The masses have proven they cannot be brain-washed. All the means of communication may be in the hands of the state, but the heads belong to the same bodies that are being exploited, and they think their own thoughts.

By the time they openly revolt, their spontaneous outburst hews out new roads to freedom, to totally new human relations as well as to working out a new relationship between theory and practice. Such a new epoch opened in the 1950's when, at one and the same time, a second Industrial Revolution had begun with Automation, and the wildcats against it, in the U.S., and, in East Europe, revolts within totalitarian lands broke out.

(TO BE CONCLUDED NEXT ISSUE)

(3) Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 689. See also what I wrote in *Marxism and Freedom*: "The single capitalist, call him Collective Leadership under Khrushchev, Inc., if you will, will have at a certain stage a magnificent plant, completely automatized, or a jet bomber, but he cannot stop to raise the standard of living of the masses of the workers. He may be able to avoid the more extreme forms of ordinary commercial crises, but even within the community itself he cannot escape the internal crisis of production . . . That is why Marx, throughout *Capital*, insists that either you have the self-activity of the workers, the plan of freely associated labor, or you have the hierarchic structure of relations in the factory and the despotic Plan. There is no in-between." (p. 136).

May 1971 (cont'd)

6859

JUNE-JULY, 1971

TWO WORLDSby Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom***PART II**

Like the removal of an incubus from the brain, the death of Stalin, in March, 1953, released fantastic, elemental creativity on the part of the proletariat. Within three short months, the first uprising ever against Communist totalitarianism erupted in East Germany. This initiated a totally new epoch of freedom struggles in East Europe. The "Polish October" had not actually developed into a full revolution, but the ideological struggles, especially among the youth, were opened, many-sided, passionate and brought Humanism of Marxism onto the historic stage.

The revolts culminated in a full-scale revolution in Hungary in 1956. With the establishment of a new form of workers' rule—Workers' Councils—the workers had created also the decentralized form of relationships for all other sectors of the population so that we had Councils of Revolutionary Youth, Councils of Intellectuals as well as a proliferation of parties, newspapers, free minds.

No matter what one's point of concentration was in those three-years between the East German uprising and the Hungarian Revolution—before the Russian tanks moved in to crush the revolution, when the Russians feared the possibility of revolution, they had launched

(4) See "Marx's Working Out of the Materialist Dialectics in the Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts of the Year, 1844" by V. A. Karpushin. This article (Voprosy Filosofii #3/1955) has never been translated into English. Although many other attacks appeared, none were as "strictly" philosophic. Nor is it possible, now that Khrushchev has become an unperson and the 21st Congress of the Party has been played down, to see, how from open attacks on the Humanism of Marxism, the bureaucracy suddenly tried to usurp it for its own use by having the reigning philosopher, Mitin, then declare Khrushchev's report to contain "the magnificent and noble conception of Marxist-Leninist socialist humanism" (1). I have traced through the changes of line on the subject of Humanism for the years, 1955-59 in Nationalism, Communism, Marxist Humanism and the African-Asia Revolutions, pp. 22-29. (Left Group, Cambridge University Labour Club, England, 1961.)

'CULTURE', SCIENCE AND STATE-CAPITALISM

a deliberately abstract discussion of the dialectic, "the negation of the negation" (4)—there was no doubt whatever that the masses in revolt were a new breed. Even so simple a slogan as "Bread and Freedom" pointed to new ways of uniting economics and philosophy.

The historic, the unique, the new initiated in East Germany in 1953, climaxed in Hungary in 1956, reborn in the 1960's throughout East Europe and culminating in Czechoslovakia in 1968 (5), and, as the Polish strikes at the end of 1970 showed, the resistance has not yet ended. All these epochal developments have yet to be grasped by intellectuals for what they were, are: a movement from practice both to freedom and to theory, a still developing new dialectics of liberation.

Paradoxically, the state-capitalist tendency which had looked towards just such spontaneous outbursts, had enthusiastically hailed the East German uprising, failed to meet the challenge to theory from practice. While I had begun to pose, the moment Stalin died, the question of the relationship between philosophy and revolution, the working out of a new relationship between theory and practice that would be rooted both in actuality and in dialectics, (6), the co-founder of the Tendency was moving away from open Marxism. Whether that was due to the fact that McCarthyism was in full bloom in the U.S., or was due to his changed attitude to nationalism, the indisputable fact is that he glorified, first West Indian nationalism, then Cuba, and then raised Nkrumah to the level of Lenin, if not a notch above.

[When I first read Johnson's statement, "In one of the remarkable episodes in revolutionary history, he (Nkrumah) single handedly outlined a programme based on the ideas of Marx, Lenin and Gandhi . . .", I wrote: "I admit that combining Marx, Lenin and Gandhi is quite a feat. But for a pamphleteer like J. R. Johnson who thundered so for the Soviet United States of Europe, Soviet United States of Asia, world revolution, the struggle against bureaucracy 'as such,' the self-mobilization of the masses and for new

(5) See *Czechoslovakia: Revolution and Counter-Revolution*. (News & Letters Pamphlet, 1968.)

(6) "An Exchange of Letters on Hegel's Absolute Idea" (May 12, May 20, May 22, 1953) which appeared as Appendix in the mimeographed edition of *Extracts of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks* (News & Letters, November, 1953).

passions and new forces to reconstruct society on totally new beginnings—to end with Nkrumah as representative of the new, the new, is rather pathetic. There is nothing to add but to say with Hamlet, 'Alas, poor Yorick, I knew him.'" (*Afro-Asia Revolutions*, supra, p. 94n.) (7)

Naturally this not only did not stop the Tendency's full development into Marxism-Humanism, but also, and,

(Continued on Page 7)

(7) Perhaps this is the place to comment not only on what J. R. Johnson had written on Nkrumah, but also on his sudden rewriting of the history of the state-capitalist tendency.

Johnson's pamphlet from which I quoted p. 77, was called *Facing Reality* and carried, as Appendix, a fantastic rewrite of the history of the state-capitalist tendency upon which I did not bother to comment. The deafness to reality calling itself *Facing Reality* has since then, however, not only rewritten the history of, but published the Tendency document itself, *State-Capitalism and World Revolution*, as if it were a product of C. L. R. James alone. If we are to believe Martin Glaberman, who writes the preface to this new publication, "the author was C. L. R. James. Perhaps this will help to place James, who wrote for a number of years under the pseudonym of J. R. Johnson, in a truer light as a major inheritor and continuator of the Marxist tradition."

One thing can be said for Martin Glaberman. As against the sudden long list of names appended as prefactors to the republication of the document in England in 1966, all of whom had nothing to do with the writing of the document, and some of whom were adherents, not of the state-capitalist tendency, but of bureaucratic-collectivism, Martin Glaberman is an exponent of the state-capitalist theory. Too bad that since his grandiose pronouncements, above, he too has separated himself from James, who had not only split the state-capitalist tendency, but also split from the co-author of *Facing Reality*. It was left to Paul Buhle and *Radical America* (Vol. IV, No. 4, May, 1970) to present "with the encouragement of C. L. R. James" a new collection, without any compunction whatever to cite which are Tendency documents, and which are individual writings, on any subject whatever. It is a mishmash worthy of not-so-radical American eclecticism.

(Continued from Page 5)

above all, the objectivity of the specific form of Marx's philosophy of liberation was embraced by great masses of people having nothing whatever to do with ideological battles that appear in factional form, and everything to do with their spontaneous struggles for freedom under a concrete banner of liberation. The socialism "with a human face" was embraced first by the East Europeans who were fighting for freedom from Communism, then by the African Revolutions gaining freedom from Western imperialism, and even, at first, by Castro defeating both internal reaction and U.S. imperialism. (8)

The whole new, Third World that was born sans any "leadership" from the Communist world led to the historic split in that orbit, not because either the Russian or Chinese Communist Parties were moving together with these new "storm centers of world revolution," but because both state powers were fighting for direction of and control over, (especially the latter), a world movement which emerged elementally, independent of all existing state powers—East and West, private capitalist, or state-capitalists calling themselves Communist.

It is true that, at first, Mao's Communism appeared as the greater force of attraction—in theory, with its dictum that "power comes out of the barrel of a gun"; in practice, with the "Great Leap Forward" which promised to skip both capitalism and socialism, and go "directly" to Communism. When, however, it had become clear that the "Great Leap Forward" had ended in great disaster, and when U.S. imperialism chose to throw the gauntlet (filled with devastating, barbaric bombs), not to mighty China, but to little North Vietnam, the Third World kept away from both ends of the Sino-Soviet conflict, solidarizing, instead, with North Vietnam.

1965 ended disastrously for all of China's "foreign policies," be they for Asia or Africa or Latin America, not to mention as contender for leadership of the whole Communist world. Yet the launching of a preventive civil war, called the Cultural Revolution, soon after the collapse of the hoped-for Peking-Djakarta axis to counteract both the U.S.-NATO Axis and the Moscow-Warsaw Pact Nations, was not so much the result of "foreign policies" as the product of a retrogressionist philosophy which originated in the failure of the Great Leap Forward, and now held that, in place of "one day equals 20 years," it would take no less than "a century"—"or more" (!) to establish socialism. What preceded the "Cultural Revolution" of 1966, and may, indeed, be called its first form—the Socialist Education Campaign (1962-3)—rested on an attack on Marx's Humanist Essays. (9) Though, in the 1960's, it was directed mainly against "Russian revisionism," the truth is that both Russia and China decided jointly to call the East European Freedom Fighters "revisionists." The Russian

theoreticians maintained their leadership of the Communist world and grounded the struggle with alleged revisionism in a "critique" of Marx's Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts because that had become the banner of the revolutionary proletarian opposition to existing Communism.

The only contribution the Chinese Communists made to this struggle with revisionism was to constantly accuse their dissidents of wishing to establish "Petofi circles" in China (10). Then, when the Sino-Soviet conflict erupted, the Chinese added the adjective, Russian, before the noun, "revisionism," without, however, erasing either the adjective, Hungarian or Humanist. Clearly, a spectre is indeed haunting Communism, haunting it from below, from practice—the spectre of Marx's Humanism.

Both giant Communist state powers were alike also in substituting science for the self-activity of the masses as the "proof" of the "superiority" of their social order, thereby proving, instead, the correctness of Marx's Humanist attack on science: "To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie."

THE LIE OF SCIENCE

This is where where state-capitalism calling itself Communism shows its affinity to private capitalism. Since, however, science's "equalizer" (the H-bomb) notwithstanding, Russia (much less China) has not yet "caught up" with U.S. industrial might, both Communist powers are looking for trade. And, since there is no way for U.S.'s industrial might to escape economic crises and strikes and opposition movements from youth to anti-war to Black revolutions, it too wants trade. The present mild flirtation with China has, of course, other "balancing" features in mind as it competes with Russia for world mastery. But nothing changes basics: the non-viability of state-capitalism, as of private capitalism, due to the exploitation of labor, reveals the more clearly science's impotence.

In a word, the lie of science shows itself nowhere more glaringly than in the attitude to labor. Thus, Khrushchev, at the height of his power, proclaimed: "It is only logical that the country of victorious socialism would have . . . blazed a trail into outer space." When, however, the paeans of praise to science came down to earth, they turned out to be pure capitalistic admonitions

for workers to work hard and harder. (11) Thus, while Mao canonized the superiority of science into the Constitution itself, the dictum for labor remained what it had been through "Great Leaps Forward," all on the backs of that labor, most concretely spelled out: "Each person must work ten hours and engage in ideological studies for two hours a day. They are entitled to one day of rest every ten days."

(8) The New Left Review, Jan.-Feb., 1961, reproduced Fidel Castro's 1959 declaration: "Standing between the two political and economic ideologies or positions being debated in the world, we are holding our own positions. We have named it humanism, because its methods are humanistic, because we want to rid man of all fears, directives and dogmatisms. We are revolutionizing society without blinding or terrorizing it. The tremendous problem faced by the world is that it has been placed in a position where it must choose between capitalism, which starves people, and communism, which resolves economic problems but suppresses the liberties so greatly cherished by man . . . That is why we have said that we are one step ahead of the right and the left, and that this is a humanistic revolution, because it does not deprive man of his essence, but holds him as its basic aim . . . Such is the reason for my saying that this revolution is not red; but olive-green, for olive-green is precisely our color, the color of the revolution brought by the rebel army from the heart of the Sierra Maestra."

(10) See especially Mao, On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People.

(9) See Chou Yang, "The Fighting Task Confronts Workers in Philosophy and the Social Sciences," speech delivered at the 4th Enlarged Session of the Committee of the Department of Philosophy and Social Science of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Oct. 26, 1963: "The modern revisionists and some bourgeois scholars try to describe Marxism as humanism . . . In particular, they make use of certain views on 'alienation' expressed by Marx in his early Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, 1844 . . . in the early stage of development of their thought, Marx and Engels were indeed somewhat influenced by humanist ideas . . . But when they formulated the materialist conception of history and discovered the class struggle is the motive force of social development, they immediately got rid of this influence."

(11) see next page.

6861

By no accident whatever, glorification of science is the mark not only of the ruling classes in the age of "scientific and technological revolutions," but also of theoreticians busy revising Marxism. Not the deliberate statist misnaming of revolutionary proletarian opposition as "revisionist," but the genuine historic revisions have always used "science" in the fight against "the Hegelian dialectic" which turned out to be the fight against the proletarian revolution, for the "defense of the fatherland." Eduard Bernstein was the first, back at the end of the 19th century; Louis Althusser is the latest but he is sure not to be the last since, of necessity, these proponents of "science" and opponents of "philosophy" are sure to keep reappearing so long as capitalism is not torn up, root and branch, the world over.

Jane Kelly
1971

What concerned us here was, on the one hand, the achievements of the state-capitalist theory which kept revolutionaries from tail-ending Stalinism into imperialist war, and, by relating the new stage of world capitalist

development to the specific forms of workers revolt against it, aligning with the latter. On the other hand, the inadequacy of the state-capitalist theory which, without development into Marxist-Humanism, could not cope with the actual movement from practice that refused to be only the muscle of revolution and let the intellectuals do the theorizing.

The masses—all the new forces of revolution—have shown how different proletarian "subjectivity" is from petty-bourgeois subjectivity. They refuse any longer to be only the forces of revolution, for they are also its Reason, active participants in working out the philosophy of liberation for our age. Now that they have done so, isn't it time for intellectuals to begin, with them, to fill the theoretic void left in the Marxist movement since Lenin's death? At no time has this been more imperative than now when a new generation of revolutionaries has been born, but is so disgusted with "the old" as to turn away from both theory and history as if actions, without those unifying forces of historic and theoretic continuity, can devise shortcuts to revolution. Jean-Paul Sartre's advice to youth to reject history notwithstanding, a "newness" that treats history as if it weren't there dooms itself to impotence. A Hitler with his Mein Kampf could break with history; a revolutionary youth movement cannot. Nor can one continue to delude oneself that theory can be gotten "en route." To turn one's back on philosophy is as big a lie as is the lie of science separated from life.

Marx foresaw the impasse of modern science not because he was a prophet, but because he had made the human being the subject of all development and saw that there was no other answer to: can mankind be free in an age when the machine is master of man, not man of machine. There is still no other answer. It is from this ground that we today face what Hegel called "the birth-time of history" and Marx called the unity of theory and practice, of philosophy and revolution, of mental and manual labor, the new human dimension, "thoroughgoing Naturalism or Humanism."

May 1, 1971

(11) The just-concluded 24th Congress of the Russian Communist Party reiterated that it was most based on the 22nd Congress. Though none of the promises have been realized which were made at the Congress a full decade ago, the full concentration on labor productivity remains. And the 1961 Program was most explicit:

"... it is necessary to raise the productivity of labor in industry by more than 100 per cent within ten years . . . To increase labor productivity and reduce production costs . . . implies a higher rate of increase in labor productivity as compared with remuneration . . . (and in) the second decade every family, including newlyweds, will have a comfortable flat conforming to the requirements of hygiene and cultured living."

6862

Aug - Sept 71

EDITORIAL ARTICLE**Nixon to Peking: 'journey to peace' or to new alliance for world war?**by Raya Dunayevskaya, National Chairman
NEWS & LETTERS COMMITTEES

The Nixon speech that didn't rate headlines was his July 6th address to newspaper editors in Kansas City. Since no one knew then that Nixon's chief National Security Adviser, Henry Kissinger, was secretly flying to China with just such a "position paper" for the more receptive ears of Chou En-lai, the not-so-alert daily press missed the new stage in global power politics. Suddenly Nixon christened Mao's China a "superpower" that would determine the world "economic future and the future of the world in other ways in the last third of the century."

**CHINA ABOUT TO RIDE ROUGHSHOD
OVER NORTH VIETNAM**

Within nine days Nixon knew how to rate headlines the world over. He asked for prime TV and radio time, letting none know what the speech was to be about, or how long it would last. Never before have 90 seconds so shaken up the whole world. The part of that minute and a half which announced Nixon would visit Peking was being made public simultaneously in Mao's China which, until that moment, had designated Nixon as "a god of plague and war!"

Whether or not what is now mere talk, will, in fact, become the global turning point of "the century," there is no doubt at all that the alleged super-revolutionary, Mao, has taken the actual super-reactionary Nixon off the hot seat on which he was placed by the Vietnamese most of all, but with them also by the massive US anti-Vietnam war movement as well as the Black Revolution.

None of the millions on July 15th who were listening to Nixon's 1½ minute talk (that took hours of meticulous doubletalk to work out) could have been more shocked than the Vietcong and North Vietnam. Mme. Binh tried bravely whistling in the dark. China would never, she said, settle with Nixon over the heads of the Vietcong. But soon the terror of a doublecross showed through. For how long can one cover up terror at betrayal when unexplained events of the past month fall into place?

Thus, clearly, (1) the reason Nixon hardly visited when his only "patriotic" covering on the hot seat—demand for release of American POW's—had been pulled

from under him by the Vietcong-North Vietnam peace proposals which offered to release all POW's; and (2) the reason Kissinger paid no attention whatever to the peace negotiators in Paris who had offered to meet him "in private," was that Mao-Chou were secretly negotiating with Nixon-Kissinger at the expense of the Vietnamese.

The Vietnamese masses had brought down the American Goliath, only to find themselves facing the enemy from within the Communist orbit! What Mao had in store for the Vietnamese came out when the Australian Labor Party leader, Gough Whitlam, that same week, reported that Chou En-lai favored a "Geneva type" conference, that is to say, a repeat of the so-called peace conference in 1954, at which China and Russia had compelled Vietnam, despite its victory over French imperialism at Dien Bien Phu, to accept the partition of their country into North and South.

The pained outcry of North Vietnam—and the solidarity of the anti-Vietnam war movement the world over with it—caused the China News Agency to claim that this was not what China meant. But this denial cannot be taken seriously, since not a single step has been taken to stop the secret dealings for the Nixon trip. The truth is that ever since the Sino-Soviet orbit became the Sino-

Soviet conflict, the possibility of war between these two state-capitalist giants calling themselves Communist has predominated over all else.*

The recognition of this as the centerpoint for the planned Nixon-Mao meeting led to North Vietnam finally finding its tongue. Still couched as an attack only on Nixon, it could easily enough be read as a questioning also of Mao. Thus, Nhan Dan, the official Hanoi newspaper, in its criticism of Nixon for "running about wildly in search of a way out," stated also that "he has gone to the wrong place. The exit door has been opened, yet he has fumbled into an impasse."

Paris, the paper insisted, is where the representatives of the people doing the fighting are working out ways to peace, and it is with them Nixon must negotiate. The very description of what Nixon was doing, was pointing toward Mao "dividing the socialist countries, winning over one section and pitting it against another in order to oppose the national liberation movement and carry out a counter-revolutionary peaceful evolution in the socialist countries."

Now, no matter under what designation counter-

(Continued on Page 4)

*See "Can There Be War Between Russia and China?: the Non-Viability of State-Capitalism" in MARXISM AND FREEDOM, 1964 American edition, and 1971 British edition, which includes a new chapter, on Mao's "Cultural Revolution, or Maoist Reaction?"

Nixon to Peking: 'journey to peace' or to new alliance for war?

(Continued from Page 1)

revolution is being carried out, it is the enemy. And it is that enemy that North Vietnam addressed when it said that the days are gone when Big Powers could "make small countries bow to their arrangements."

Are those days gone?

US ENTERS SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT

"10 years overdue," read the jubilant approvals of the new Nixon line of a rapprochement with China. When the Sino-Soviet conflict burst into the open in 1960, part of academia has been whispering into the ears of various Administrations that (1) there was no reason why "we" need fear that Mao's revolutionary verbiage was directed against the US; the contiguous enemy No. 1, for China, was Russia, not the US; (2) that the Communist world wasn't a "monolith," which meant the US had global elbow room; and that, therefore (3) peaceful co-existence with China was both possible and desirable. Why entertain illusions about the bear hug of a country astride both Asia and Europe who had placed missiles in Cuba?

The last person in the world, however, who academia thought would initiate a 100-degree turn in foreign affairs was Nixon who had risen to prominence under the McCarthy aegis, been a pupil of the Eisenhower-Dulles Pactomania girdling the globe, via NATO, SEATO and CENTO, not to mention Nixon's friendship with the ultra-reactionary China Lobby.

Yet, while the scholars were thinking of going at it "step by step," dreaming about China's admission to the UN with a seat on the Security Council (that is, with veto power), Nixon is moving on so many fronts all at once that he left out in the cold, not merely academia, but Taiwan and Japan, which means the whole of East, South and Southeast Asia. What is called into question is the "Nixon Doctrine" itself, from "Vietnamization" of an ongoing war to all sorts of reactionary alliances, stretching from Indonesia to South Korea and from the Philippines to Japan. All old alliances are now up for grabs.

Whether or not the Nixon trip to Peking comes off as presently planned; whether or not Mao's China can get North Vietnam to agree to a repeat of a 1954 type of Big Power conference (sans Russia); and whether or not a Sino-American alliance would ever become a reality, primarily against Russia, the fact is the very projection of a Mao-Nixon meeting discloses, if not several double crosses, surely the possibility of the most

fantastic political reshuffle since the end of World War II, Mao's conquest of power in China, and the Korean War.

THE WORLD CRISIS, PAX AMERICANA, AND MAO'S "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

The 1960s ended with a disclosure that ever-widening world crises keep appearing in the post-World War II world even during periods of prosperity. First and foremost, there is the truth that world economic development, be it private, mixed or state-capitalist calling itself Communist, is in a generalized state of stagnation. Not only has it been impossible to industrialize the technologically underdeveloped countries that are in chronic crises, but the Big Powers themselves, be they nuclearly armed like the US and Russia, or in a forced state of non-militarization and experiencing "miraculous" rates of growth, like West Germany and Japan, can nevertheless not reach "full automation," much less full employment, not to mention that, without militarization, they do not carry weight in this imperialistic world.

CHINA: VOICES OF REVOLT

Excerpts from the document "Whither China?", written by a revolutionary opposition group inside China itself, SHENG-WU-LIEN. It is a strong attack on "the bourgeois state machine,"—OF CHINA!

ONLY 25c

Order from:
News & Letters
1900 E. Jefferson
Detroit, Mich. 48207

Put differently, extraction of ever greater amounts of unpaid hours of labor from living labor being the motive force of production, while the method of production calls for ever greater machines and ever lesser amounts of living labor, makes the crisis total. Thus, "affluence" notwithstanding, present-day capitalism is still faced with a drop in the rate of profit, no matter how lush the mass. The result is a generalized global state of economic stagnation which keeps the world in social crisis moving in a circle of perpetual economic recessions, phenomenal militarization, actual wars, and back again down the same path of crisis.

Secondly, friendly trade wars being as characteristic of capitalism as actual class wars, the US is now being

subjected to savage competition from Japan and a challenge to its dollar standing by West Germany. So serious is the situation that Nixon, this January, created a Council on International Economic Policy to be the counterpart to his National Security Council which just initiated the Nixon-Mao talks-to-be. Computerized or otherwise, facts cannot hide the reality: the end of the Korean War did not regain for Pax Americana its place in the world market. From 1955 to 1970 the share of the US in trade of industrialized countries dropped from one-third to one-fifth of world trade. The Commerce Department last month announced that for the first time since 1950, not only had the US exported less than it purchased from abroad, but if the deficit continues throughout the year (and, with the Vietnam war expenditures continuing, so will the deficits), it would signify something that had not happened in the US since 1893!

With neither unemployment nor inflation abating, even the "hard hats" will not vote for Nixon in 1972. In a word, were even one not to look at the breaking points—the Black Revolution and the Youth revolt, the anti-Vietnam war movement and Women's liberation, rank and file labor wildcatting and official strikes—it is clear that what used to be called the "American way of life," much less the Nixon Administration, is not the way of the majority of the American people.

As for the other Big Power, Russia has long since learned, that the state of economic stagnation, of militarization, of war, cannot be circumvented through the most grandiose Plans. Russia, too, was subjected both to economic crises and social revolts, especially in its satellites. Nor did this come about only in rebellious states like Czechoslovakia that fought for its freedom, and was crushed by the tanks of the superpower. 1970 ended and 1971 began with Poland, which had toed the line in the field of foreign policy, bursting out in strikes and uprisings against economic oppression, excessive price rises, uncontrolled inflation, a stifling life.

That nothing, nothing short of a social revolution can totally uproot the exploitative capital-labor relationship in the modern world can be seen also in that allegedly most revolutionary land, China, during the so-called Cultural Revolution. Ostensibly directed against "capitalist roaders" and "revisionists" it was in fact, a preventive civil war against the Chinese masses, including the youth who had taken seriously Mao's dec-

(Continued on Page 7)

Nixon to Peking: 'journey to peace' or to new alliance for war?

(Continued from Page 4)

laration that "it is right to rebel." All one has to do to see the real conditions in China is to read "Whither China," the document of that extra-ordinary revolutionary phenomenon, Sheng-wu-lien.**

At the moment, Mao and Chou take great pains to explain they have put down the "ultra-left," and, indeed, they couldn't move so openly, so shamelessly, into the dirty arena of class-compromisist politics had there been a "second revolution." Instead, the poverty, the exploitative relations, the workers demanding different conditions of labor, the actual strikes in the cities and general discontent in country, as well as the critical international situation, from the collapse of the Djakarta-Peking axis to near-war conditions with Russia, compelled the rulers to take a "deeper" look at the world as is.

At one and the same time, the rulers of China put down the "ultra-lefts", saddled the country with a Constitution in which the military is the decisive force and General Lin Biao is already anointed as the one to rule after Mao's death. On the international front, the biggest reversal is yet to come as they act out their "discovery", that Nixon is "less bad."

COUNTER-REVOLUTION BY ANY OTHER NAME

While this hardly equals the Russian accusation (not yet public, but sent to those who side with Russia in the Communist world) that Mao's China, for "nationalist, chauvinist" reasons is aligning with U.S. imperialism against Russia, it does disclose that China is ready to play the same game Russia has been playing with the U.S.

Why should the Movement be interested in games the rulers of the world are playing? Shouldn't it be all too obvious that to Big Powers, be they private capitalist or state-capitalist calling themselves Communist, the national liberation movements are expendable? Why for that matter "take sides" in breaks within the ruling class, be they the right wing critics of Nixon who claim that Mao-Chou are such shrewd bargainers that if we are sending such "novices" as Nixon-Kissinger, we better also throw in Vida Blue? Or be they the proponents of Nixon who claim that Mao is taking the Nixon

Doctrine "seriously", believe he is "fully" withdrawing U.S. troops from Indochina, and, "therefore", China feels it can do business with the U.S.?

Any such concerns would only lead to the greatest delusion of all—the propagation of the view that Chou En-lai is only "flirting" with Nixon, but his heart, soul and "principles" are all in Vietnam. The only thing of China's that is in Vietnam is its double tongue. The single grain of truth that makes possible any willful delusion is that Vietnam is not the centerpiece of China's worry. Russia is. This being so, however, means that no price is too high to pay, including a sellout of Vietnam, if, in exchange, Mao can either achieve an alliance against Russia, or see Russia engaged a two-front war.

This should have been clear ever since U.S. imperialism started raining bombs on North Vietnam in February, 1965, and yet China refused a united front with Russia in defense of North Vietnam. Indeed, the aid

he did give was nowhere on the scale Mao's China gave Pakistan in its war with India when Chinese troops were moved to the border with India. And Mao is sticking to that alliance with West Pakistan when the enemy is not India, but the East Pakistani masses, against whom the fascistic generals, with much military help from China, are practicing genocide.

As for U.S. imperialism, it has no intention whatever of withdrawing all troops and arms from Vietnam unless the American people compel it to do so. From Truman who aided French imperialism to try to hold on to Indo-China, through Eisenhower-Kennedy-Johnson who created American puppets and turned the civil war into a full-scale American war, to Nixon who has to face the reality of the American defeat and the massive opposition at home by withdrawing the main body of the "land army" in Vietnam, but keeping "a residual force," there has been no fundamental change in the basic line of keeping U.S. imperialism dominant in Asia. With or without Asian "allies", U.S. imperialism is out for global mastery. And this it cannot hope to achieve unless the present revolutionary opposition forces are destroyed.

It is here, at home, where the contest will be decided. There will be no peace abroad any more than at home except through social revolution. It is here that Nixon will meet his Waterloo.

THE ANSWER IS AT HOME

The wars abroad go hand in hand with the unceasing wars at home—against the Black Revolution, against labor, against the anti-Vietnam War movement, especially the youth as its decisive force. Whatever illusions

Nixon has about trying to win that 1972 election by going to Peking and thereby, he hopes, fragmenting the anti-Vietnam war movement, they will come to naught, provided the Movement neither falls into the trap set by Mao's "Cultural Revolution", nor, at home, separates the anti-Vietnam war movement from the class struggles as well as the Black Revolution, much less keeps the struggles separated from a total philosophy of liberation.

Therefore, the demand for total and immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam must show itself to be equally against any pole of world capital, East or West.

Therefore, the demand for national self-determination for South Vietnam must not be subordinated to North Vietnam. Indeed, the national liberation movement in South Vietnam fought many years before ever it finally got support from North Vietnam. Self-determination is violated when made dependent on any pole of the existing state powers, be it a bi-polar or a tri-polar world, or, for that matter, a world divided into quintuplicate by Western Europe and Japan likewise demanding their "spheres of influence."

This is the challenge the anti-Vietnam war movement must now face. Otherwise it will suffer fragmentation. The mere announcement of a projected Nixon-Mao meeting has already deflected from the courageous act of Daniel Ellsberg in making the secret Pentagon Papers public as well as blunt the impact of the revelations of three decades of deception of the American people. Just as we must not allow Nixon-Mitchell to railroad Dr. Ellsberg to jail, so we must not allow the Sino-Soviet orbit, in conflict or otherwise, to channelize our thinking and our doing. Only a Movement independent of all existing state powers can remake the world on totally new, truly human foundations because only its banner will be un sullied by exploitative power and have self-development of mankind as its motive power. That is the only freedom worth dying and living for.

**The Hunan Revolutionary Committee (Sheng-wu-lien) had three of its documents published in China, and these are now translated and reproduced in Peking and the New Left, by Klaus Mehnert, China Research Monographs, U.C. Berkley, 1969. Key excerpts have been mimeographed by News & Letters.

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1971

TWO WORLDSby Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom**(In this issue I am giving over my column to a letter I received from two colleagues who have just returned from an European trip. RD.)*

Dear Raya:

We arrived in Glasgow just in time for the greatest demonstration there since the "Hungry Thirties." Over 100,000 workers left their jobs, and nearly 40,000 of them marched to a rally at Glasgow Green, to support the Upper Clyde Shipyard workers' campaign to save their jobs. Almost every industrial plant in the West of Scotland was shut down, including plants which had no record of strike action at all before. They came from big firms like Singer and Rolls-Royce, and from small biscuit factories, and were cheered by office workers leaning out of windows all along the route.

Unemployment has increased all over Britain in the past year, but in Scotland it is at crisis proportions.

Scotland, England, France—and Marxist-Humanism

In Glasgow it is at the highest level since the Depression, with over 36,000 out of work already, 30 percent of the male work force (which is how the statisticians count it; I suppose women out of work don't count). The threatened closing of the shipyards would affect 8,000 more workers directly, and an additional 30,000 indirectly. The workers countered by threatening to occupy the shipyards and run them, themselves, and the papers today report they have done just that!

(Editor's Note: See letter from Harry McShane, below)

IN BRITAIN AS a whole, expectations are that unemployment will top a million by this winter, adding to the woes already piled on the working class by the Tory government. In only one year of Tory rule, inflation has risen by 10 percent, charges for children's school meals have been increased, free milk has been abolished, and medical prescriptions and dental care costs have been raised.

On top of that, the most vicious anti-labor legislation, the Industrial Relations Bill has just been passed. This bill almost makes our Taft-Hartley Slave Labor Act look like pro-labor legislation. One key provision tells all that needs to be known: it will be against the law for a British worker to even advocate a strike! The bill requires unions which register to sign an agreement with the government not to strike. If a member of the union then talks about striking, he can be fined or jailed for contempt of contract.

It is also clear that British racialism threatens to increase viciously. As unemployment worsens there is the fear that the colonial immigrants—East and West Indians, Pakistanis, Africans—will become the scapegoats. Bernadette Devlin, whom we met at a rally she addressed in Barking, did a beautiful job of exposing the lies of the racists. She got a warm round of applause from her heavily working-class audience when she pointed out that before they had the blacks to blame for everything, they blamed the Irish. And she tied it all to the need for labor to fight the Immigration Bill as fervently as they are fighting the Industrial Relations Bill. During the discussion period, we were also greeted warmly by the audience when we extended socialist greetings to the rally from the Second America.

ONE THING WE had expected to encounter at the

meetings we had been invited to address (we spoke at nine—three in Scotland, and three in England) was the feeling that U.S. workers were backward, and that the European workers were far advanced because they had their big mass Communist Parties or Labor Parties. But this did not happen at all. Not once. As a matter of fact, everyone we spoke with was very eager to hear of the activity of the workers in the U.S., and many of the people attending our meetings, realized that the U.S. workers in their battles with Automation could teach them plenty about what they had in store for them—unless their society was completely changed.

This was our experience in France, as well. We did not have much opportunity there to speak with workers themselves, but had interviews with both the more traditional Left press and with the New Left press. We found them alike in their delusion that American workers had been so co-opted into the system that they could not be considered a revolutionary force any longer. One reporter went so far as to ask if it is correct to even speak of a working class in America? They appeared to be impressed with our news of what American workers are actually doing.

There has been a great amount of searching for answers since the near-revolution of May '68 in France. The publication of the French edition of *Marxism and Freedom*, itself, is part of that development. New groups were formed when youth left their old parties in disgust, and by now many of these groups have gone through further shifts and splits. The New Left youth we spoke with felt that their greatest lack was any real links with the workers. They were especially struck by the fact that our editor is a worker. The several Trotskyist groups, on the other hand, do have workers in their ranks—but the relationship between the workers and the intellectuals is not fundamentally any different than that of the Communist Party.

THE SAME THING WAS true in Britain. We found that the activists we met in the Women's Liberation Movement were very struck with our pamphlet, *Notes on Women's Liberation*, precisely because they felt so keenly their own lack of any links with the Black and working-class women, which our pamphlet demonstrated. The Trotskyists and the anti-Trotskyist-Trotskyists, on

(Continued on Page 8)

Aug Sept 1977

TWO WORLDS Scotland, England, France—and Marxist-Humanism


(Continued from Page 5)

the other hand, are all so permeated with the concept of the "backwardness of the workers," that some told us that the idea of having a worker as editor of our paper was "idolizing" workers.

The idea that workers can not only speak for themselves, but that they are the source of all theory seems impossible for those who consider themselves the "vanguard" to conceive. They are so concerned with becoming "mass" organizations, with influencing the struggles by proposing the best strategy, that they cannot see that "organization" begins with organization of your own thought. And for our age that means recognizing that there is a movement from practice—from the actual struggles of our day—to theory, which demands a theory to meet it. Listening to the thoughts of the workers, the minorities, the women, the youth, far from being intellectual abdication, is the beginning of a new stage of cognition.

That is why we felt that of all of the questions we were asked—and we were asked many—the most basic was raised by a young worker in Edinburgh, who asked simply: do you believe in the vanguard party? The conception of Vanguard party to lead equates the role of the revolutionary party with recruiting all of the advanced militant workers who, together with the leadership of the party, would lead the workers to socialist victory. All the workers would have to do is recognize that these leaders represented them and would create a new society in which the working class would be free. After the workers made the revolution, that is.

We pointed out the administrative mentality reflected in this conception of leadership, and the difference in the philosophy presented in the pages of Marxism and Freedom. But it is not easy to overcome such entrenched ideas. What helped to show the idea was our report of the continuing wildcat strike experience of



Workers marched in Glasgow to protest threat of closing Upper Clyde Shipyard.

the U.S. working class, and especially the revolutionary role of the Blacks both in industry and in life as a whole.

THE BRITISH AND the French editions of Marxism and Freedom were never more needed. The need for theory, as contrasted with the endless pursuit of the

"right tactics," or the "right strategy," to which so much of the Left has reduced its politics is made more urgent than ever by the objective situation, which is explosive.

Your new introduction to the French edition, which analyzes that crucial year, 1968,—and the new appendix which reprints the Sheng Wu Lien document as the new voices of revolt from inside China—are essential for the French Left to grapple with. And Harry McShane's new Preface to the British edition puts the challenge on the level of urgent necessity for that country.

In fact, Harry, who added a tremendous proletarian and philosophic dimension to all of our meetings, bringing his life-long history of labor and socialist struggles to bear in all the discussions, made it impossible for anyone to brand theory as abstract or academic. He summed it up best at the meeting in Hull, where the dramatic situation of the Clyde Shipyard workers was being discussed. As Harry put it:

"The question that has been raised by the shipyard workers is a very important one, and it seems obvious that it cannot be solved by the shipyard workers alone. The crisis of unemployment all over the country, and especially in Scotland and Northern Ireland, raises the question of the final solution, the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a new social order. And that, of course, is the subject of Marxism and Freedom, where it is taken up without ignoring a single immediate issue. The immediate issue is bound up with the ultimate solution. When you ask, is industry to decide the future of man; or is man to decide the future of industry and control his own destiny, you are asking the question that motivated Marx all his life. There is a vital connection between theory and the actual class struggles that cannot be ignored any longer."

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Editor's Note: The review of MARXISM AND FREEDOM which appeared in LE MONDE, Sept. 3, 1971, was so scurrilous that Raya Dunayevskaya felt it necessary to concentrate her brief reply to the editor on the slander of associating her name with that of her enemy, James Burnham. We reprint below, first, excerpts from the review; her reply follows.

"Two Revisionists": Karl Marx, by Karl Korsch; *Marxism and Freedom* by Raya Dunayevskaya

Two classic works, as famous as they are marginal, have just been translated into French: the critical study that Karl Korsch devoted to Marx, and *Marxism and Freedom* by Raya Dunayevskaya. Although their points of departure are very different—German ultra-Leftism for the one, a deviant Trotskyism eaten up with anti-Communism for the other—the two works join together in the end in their common desire to "de-Bolshevize," to "de-Communistize" Marxism . . .

A CLASSIC OF ANTI-COMMUNISM

It is from Hegel and from a fundamental hostility to Lenin that Raya Dunayevskaya draws the theoretical justification for her project. *Marxism and Freedom* proposes not only to "de-Bolshevize" Marxism, but to "de-Communistize" it. This book is important for the problems it poses, but distressing in the manner in which it resolves them. Wishing to understand the unity of theory and practice in Marxism, Dunayevskaya offers us a classic of anti-Communism. It is not without interest to recall that in 1937-38 she was Trotsky's secretary in Mexico, and that he separated himself from her as soon as the Second World War broke out on account of her totally negative opinion of the Soviet system, in which she saw only a "state-capitalism"—a theory maintained by another notorious "Trotskyist" James Burnham.

If Raya Dunayevskaya is to be believed, it was through a series of aberrations that Marxism, a theory of liberation, came to be identified with "its opposite, Communism, the theory and practice of slavery." *Marxism and Freedom* tries to reconstitute for us the very essence of Marxism: "Humanism," through a critique of Lenin-Trotsky-Stalin-Maoism. Even more, it tries to show the American roots of Marxism. In fact, the shameful revision she offers us is, itself, very American.

The idea was nonetheless an interesting one: to

Slanderous book review nailed by author's reply

return to Marx and Hegel in order to understand the Stalinist caricature thereof. But the author's anti-Communist spite spares no analysis . . .

The most astonishing thing is that Dunayevskaya attempts to justify her anti-Communism through Marx himself . . . Dunayevskaya's book . . . bears witness to the impossibility of separating Marxism from those who transformed History in the name of Marxism.

—Jean-Michel Palmier
Sept. 13, 1971

Editor, *Le Monde*:

I was shocked to find, in a review of my work, *Marxism and Freedom*, by Jean-Michel Palmier (*Le Monde*, Sept. 3), a manifestation of a rather subtle form of amalgam-building between myself and "another notorious Trotskyist," . . . James Burnham." Mr. Palmier introduced the name James Burnham on the alleged ground that my analysis of state-capitalism is a thesis "defended by . . . James Burnham." James Burnham, however, far from being an exponent of the theory of state-capitalism, is the originator of the theory of "managerial society." Moreover, this generation knows him better as the arch-conservative he now is than as the dissident Trotskyist of the 1930's. Pray tell, what possible reason could Mr. Palmier have for dragging in the name of an American neo-fascist when reviewing the work of an American revolutionary Marxist? Mr. Palmier did not deign to explain, proceeding unabashedly onward. In a tone of finality, as if that, in itself, were sufficient to condemn Marxism and Freedom till kingdom come, he assessed my work as "very American."

I DO plead guilty to attempting to demonstrate the American roots of Marxism. It was Marx, however, not I, who wrote that, just as the American Revolution of 1776 "sounded the tocsin" for the French Revolution of 1789, so the American Civil War sounded it for the working-class revolutions of the mid-nineteenth century. All I did was to show how, under the impact of the Civil War in the United States, Marx restructured the whole of Capital, and how, under the impact of the Paris Commune, Marx deepened his analysis of the fetishism of commodities as well as the law of motion of capitalism in the stage of concentration and centralization of capital "in the hands either of a single capitalist or a single capitalist corporation," Marx's own projection of state-capitalism.

Interestingly enough, American reviewers in the

McCarthyite 1950's criticized me as sharply as does this French reviewer in 1971, for carrying through the American roots of Marxism, from Marx's day and his defense of the Abolitionists, to my heralding of the Black revolution initiated in our epoch by the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955-56. Permit me to quote from my comments when I contrasted the scepticism which greeted my projection of the Black revolution to the treatment of the same revolution as a veritable cliché by the mid-1960's: "Yet the fact that a revolution can be treated as a mere journalistic phrase only further reveals the failure to grapple with the truth that the American Negro has always been the touchstone of American civilization which had an ever expanding frontier but no unifying philosophy." (p. 12) Evidently, Mr. Palmier considered the American roots of Marxism so outlandish that, instead of citing any, he busied himself with the contention that I was out to "de-Bolshevize" Marxism. Where did he read that? Not in my work. I was too preoccupied proving that Stalin completed the total "de-Bolshevization" of Marxism—or to put it more precisely in my own terminology, the vitiation of Marxism and Leninism as well as the transformation of the first workers' state into its absolute opposite, state-capitalism, which Stalinism (be it Russian or of any other nationality) calls Communism.

THE REVIEWER, not I, linked into a single unit (all duly hyphenated) "Lenino-Trotsky-Stalino-Maoism." I, on the contrary, not only made the gulf between Stalin and Lenin unbridgeable, but also demonstrated that it was Lenin who saved Marxism when World War I caused the collapse of the then-established Marxism, the Second International. If the reviewer stopped reading before he reached page 168, the section entitled "Lenin and the Dialectic: A Mind in Action," he certainly had read the third paragraph of my special preface to the French edition, which states: "Thus, Lenin, to lay the theoretic foundations for November, 1917, 'rewrote' Marx's Civil War in France as State and Revolution . . . 'Every worker, every peasant, every toiler, every one who is exploited, the whole population to a man!'"

Since Mr. Palmier considered my personal past as Trotsky's secretary "not without interest," may I recommend to him the documented archives ("*Raya Dunayevskaya Collection*"), "*Marxist-Humanism: Its Origin and Development in America, 1941-1969*," available on microfilm through the Wayne State University Labor Library in Detroit, Michigan?

—Raya Dunayevskaya

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from Raya Dunayevskaya's Perspectives Speech to The National Editorial Board meeting of News & Letters Committees. The full speech is available from News & Letters for 35 cents a copy.

So real are the world crises that in this period of "peace," a quarter century after World War II has ended, the world is spending no less than \$220 billion annually on militarization! Indeed, the only reason we have thus far had only "little wars" instead of another world war is that this time a world war would be nuclear, and this would spell the end of civilization as we have known it.

So real have the world crises continued to be at the end of that holocaust, that even the one victor who remained standing on its feet, the unchallenged Goliath of the world over—the U.S.—has been incapable of establishing any Pax Americana. The absolute opposite is the case.

So real are the world crises, including those in the industrial-military-nuclear complex, that this Behemoth has not been able to win even over little Vietnam.

Nor is it a question of a defeat rather than a victory. Rather, the totality of the crisis—both abroad and at home—is such that the lifeline of capitalism itself is at stake. Thus, not since the end of the Korean War has the U.S. been faced with so much unemployment and inflation and such a stagnant economy, automated production and flights to the moon notwithstanding. "Affluence" only places racism on as taut, as shaky a foundation as the U.S. has not been subjected to since the Civil War.

WERE WE EVEN, for the moment, to exclude the possibility of a social revolution—and it is such fears which transformed the President into a stunt man—were we even to exclude the new passions and new forces, hungering to uproot capitalism, and keep the view of the crisis confined to inter-capitalist relations, it would still be a fact that not only is the U.S. being challenged by the other nuclear titan, Russia, that has moved into the Middle East with a sweep the Tsars only dreamed about, but the U.S. is also being challenged by its private capitalistic allies—West Europe and Japan whom it has put on their economic feet after very nearly total destruction in World War II. It isn't that these countries aren't undergoing crises. The truth is—as the

The 'ground' for the Nixon-Mao meeting

reappearance of neo-fascism in Italy has reminded us—that not a single fundamental problem was solved by World War II . . .

Japan had to be taught a lesson even if Nixon had to induce an economic and political crisis. The stunt man went to town—a town in the sense in which Lin Piao had used in his famous 1965 speech on war, i.e. the town was the whole globe. Nixon no sooner pulled the political shock of the post-war era in announcing his trip to Peking than he followed through with global economic changes—and this time inside the American economy package. First came the induced gold crisis . . .

Next, Nixon slapped a 10% tax on imports. Aimed both at West Germany and Japan, it hit Japan hardest, since no less than 30% of its trade is with the U.S. Not only that. Most of Japan's Asian trade is based on the Asian rulers' belief that Japan will be the political power in the Pacific as it is its economic giant. Japan itself had every capitalistic right to believe that, as it set about to implement the Nixon Doctrine.

Now that all old alliances are up for grabs, will that, too, have to be scrapped? Even Russia, after decades of procrastination, has spurred forward to conclude a Berlin agreement . . .

NOT ONLY IS everything still very tenuous. Not only can much happen that will once again reverse all sides. Not only are there things that are not Mao's to give, as the Vietcong-North Vietnamese have shown by insisting that Paris, not Peking, is the place to bargain. Without a way to get out of Vietnam in what Nixon calls an "honorable" way, the U.S. anti-Vietnam War movement will see to it that the 1972 election will surely not be Nixon's.

But, above, all, what about China? Surely, it hasn't invited Nixon just to assure Nixon his 1972 victory! To China, Japan isn't the mere arrogant competitor Nixon wishes to discipline. Japan is the industrial giant of Asia. It started World War II against China two years in advance of WWII. Then there is that other giant, Russia, the contiguous and ideological Enemy No. One, i. e. state-capitalist and worldly as China herself.

And, first and foremost, is that internal crisis. Recently Chou was practicing the English understatement as he admitted (interview with Edgar Snow, published in *Epoch*, 2/71) that the Cultural Revolution had caused chaos and "una certa diminuzione" in production. No figures were given to show just "how little." He claimed all plans had been fulfilled, but without giving figures, this time not even about population,

though on all other occasions, 700 millions is always thrown about to show that China is one-fourth of the world's population. In any case, he did admit it was "technologically backward" (indeed, he said also culturally backward!), and that it was a "poor country," not to mention what a very poor standard of living exists for the masses!

It is clear that the economic crisis is every bit as crucial as any foreign crisis . . .

THERE IS HARDLY a place on earth that Mao's China isn't playing power politics, be it with the fascist generals in West Pakistan actually practicing genocide on East Pakistanis, or trading with South Africa as well as the military junta in Greece; be it with "left" Palistinean "Liberation Front" and the sudden love they discovered for Czechoslovakia whom they had previously declared to be the worst of the revisionists, or paying court to the Shah of Iran; and now it is, at one and the same time, talking about being all out for the Vietcong and North Vietnam while choosing Yayah Kahn to be

the intermediary to arrange for the secret meeting with Nixon, whom they now find "less bad."

If this is not a super-power play of world "mastery," it is playing global politics and not just "nationalism" vs. Russia, whom they now declare to be "storm-troopers of the world." That, indeed, was the key point of the so-called Cultural Revolution—teaching Mao's own leadership that, not the U.S., but Russia, was Enemy No. One. As they love to talk of "four firsts," they can, should the U.S. deal fall through, have a place for it. Meanwhile, Japan will do as "second" first. And they never forget, as any capitalist, private or state, never forgets, that the "enemy" is at home: their own masses. Whether India will be the "fourth first," or whether they will leave a lot of blank spaces for all sorts of possible changes, as of now Nixon is not only "less bad," but they are toying even with the idea of selling out the fraternal ally, North Vietnam.

That surely is a fundamental reason for Nixon's trip to Peking—to see whether Mao cannot save the 1972 election for him, and after, by allowing what Nixon calls an "honorable" way out of the disastrous war which he has lost not only militarily, but also politically. And not only the world over, but especially in the U.S., where the indigenous anti-Vietnam war movement has helped create a whole new generation of revolutionaries. The immediate and long term enemy for Nixon is the American masses . . .

TWO WORLDS**Women's liberation: reason and revolutionary force**

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from an article by Raya Dunayevskaya included in "Notes on Women's Liberation: We Speak in Many Voices" (News & Letters, \$1). After taking up Literature and History; the Black Dimension; and the Newness of Today's Women's Liberation Movement, the article deals with Marx's Humanism and Today's Marxists:

THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT AS REASON AND AS REVOLUTIONARY FORCE

As against the past, all of the past, including some of the revolutionary past, and the women who made it in a man's world, today's Women's Liberation Movement not only refuses to stop short of total freedom, but refuses to wait for "the day after" the revolution to obtain it. On the contrary, she will be part of that historic process of making freedom real for all . . .

What is involved now is a whole new philosophy. Where Hegel had moved the myth of Adam and Eve from the theology of sin to the sphere of knowledge, Marx looked at history as a development of labor, and, therefore, of the need of a totally new way of life, a philosophy of liberation he called the new Humanism. In his early Humanist essays, he kept reiterating that so long as we talk only about different property forms, we will never get to new human relations, least of all the relationship of man to woman. Private property, Marx insisted, has made us so stupid that we think only of possessions. We are constantly substituting a "to have" for a "to be." But the abolition of private property would not, alone, bring about a new society, as the vulgar communists thought; this, Marx insisted, only "negates the personality of man," not to mention the most fundamental of all relations, that of man to woman.

It is this type of totally new relations that many in the Women's Liberation Movement are aspiring to . . .

INSTEAD OF EITHER grasping the link of continuity of today's strivings with that which Marx saw emerging, or listening to new voices, today's "Marxists" themselves are the best examples of Marx's concept of ideology as false consciousness. They look upon themselves as "the leaders," or at least the politicians who can offer "a rational reassessment of feminist ideology," and look down upon today's new women rebels as "apoliti-

tical," as if politics were the equivalent of a philosophy of liberation. They are insensitive to the distrust the rebels entertain toward them because they cannot conceive that the Women's Liberation Movement has a point when it considers the politicians as no more than still another group that wishes to transform them into mere auxiliaries of other movements. Whether they are asked merely to form a "Committee to Support the Socialist Workers Party Candidates," or they are invited "to build a labor party," their disgust is the same. They are sure they are being used, when someone like Claire Moriarty rushes to the wrong conclusions that "Just as the 'Negro problem' is, in reality, a white problem, chauvinism should be the concern of men."

The truth is the exact opposite. While socialists were busy proclaiming the impossibility for Negroes to solve the "Negro problem" "by themselves," the blacks proceeded to create their own independent mass movement. It is not labor or "socialism" which acted as catalyst for both the anti-war movement and, indeed, gave birth to a whole new generation of revolutionaries, but the black revolution which was both catalyst and reason, and continues to be that ceaseless movement today. To hold that the women rebels are now to consider male chauvinism "the concern of man" may sound as thunderous as Simone de Beauvoir's *Second Sex* (it is she who proclaimed it early and loudest), and may produce a few more women who have made it in a man's world. But the movement was created, not by her, but by these "apolitical" women who took matters into their own hands.

THE WHOLE ATTITUDE of today's "Marxists" to Women's Liberation is not helping, but endangering the movement just when it is trying to overcome its own empiricism and distrust of ideologues and is beginning to search for theory, for a total philosophy that is a way of life in search of other life forces of liberation who would look to be whole men as they look to be whole women. Communists, Socialists, Trotskyists, Maoists and

**Most of the quotes that follow are from Claire Moriarty's article "On Women's Liberation," New Politics, Spring 1970. However, I'm actually taking issue with the whole left, old and new—Stalinists, Maoists, Trotskyists, independent socialists. It just happens that Claire Moriarty has expressed these politicians' views best.*

even Fidelistas cannot, after all, hide the fact that, despite the countless revolutionary women, and many martyrs, there has been one, only one, woman who has served not only as revolutionary muscle but revolutionary theoretician—Rosa Luxemburg.

We need theoreticians who can face today's problems. It is true that women theoreticians can be "created" neither via isolation from men, nor by spending all their time denouncing male chauvinism. But why be so fearful of "excesses" on the question of fighting male chauvinism, and why be so eager a beaver in getting women "to participate" in the working out of "political strategy" that you are led to plunge into asinine assertion? Thus Claire Moriarty writes so glowingly of technology that it would appear it has indeed "eliminated" nothing short of the "inconvenience of pregnancy"!!! Naturally she didn't mean the absurdity that loose phrasing makes it sound. But how could she have slipped into such bizarre expressions?

THE ANSWER LIES deep in the recesses of the concept of the backwardness of the apolitical women. So weighted down is she by this elitist concept that she is led inexorably to vulgarize Marx's greatest discovery:

(Continued on Page 7)

**Notes on
Women's Liberation
We Speak in Many Voices
Black, Chicana, Oriental, White**

A new force for freedom . . . student, worker, youth, adult, theory and practice.

Price \$1.00

Includes "The Women's Liberation Movement as Reason and as Revolutionary Force" by Raya Dunayevskaya

Order from: News & Letters
1900 E. Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. 48207

Historical Materialism. She so sharply separates the ideal from the material that she can write: "Given our position as historical materialists, we understand that changes in consciousness do not precede but accompany institutional change, hence, it is relatively fruitless for women to attempt to combat male chauvinism."

There, the cat finally is out of the bag. Along with the concept of the backwardness of the apolitical women is the concept of the immobility of the males from their dominant position. Poor Marx! To all the vulgarization the bourgeoisie attributes to his discovery of historical materialism, we now have an independent socialist blaming that historic discovery for making it "relatively fruitless for women to attempt to combat male chauvinism!"

Material conditions, it is true, determine consciousness, not vice versa, as we look at a historical stretch of the development of mankind through history. History is process, is dialectics. Every unit is invested with its opposite. The future is inherent in the present. The opponent forces to the existing society not only fight it, but gain the consciousness both about the significance of their fight and a continuation of a direction toward that future. Otherwise Marx would never have been able to work out a philosophy of revolution; we would have remained the one-dimensional men and women Herbert Marcuse thinks we are.

THE UNIQUENESS OF today's Women's Liberation Movement is that it dares to challenge what is, including the male chauvinism not only under capitalism but within the revolutionary movement itself and speaking even with female voices. To fear to expose this male chauvinism leads to helplessness. To face reality, and to face it not through sheer voluntarism, but with full awareness of all the forces lined up against us, is the one way to assure the coalescence with other revolutionary forces, especially labor which is so strategically placed in production and has its own black dimension. No doubt we will not fully overcome male chauvinism so long as class society exists. But we can and will break up its monolithism. We can and will witness the development of women themselves not only as force but as reason. We can and will be a catalyst not only for our development as all-round human beings, but also for that of men. The first step in that direction is to meet the challenge as it appears, everywhere it appears, any time it rears its head, under no matter what disguises. The first act of liberation is to demand back our own heads.

That, when Congress was shocked at the cabinet Nixon policy of not cutting military hardware to Peking in face of its boisterous war against its own people and voted on not to provide aid until for Peking, Nixon still found ways to keep them open to the military junta China supported. This is further confirmed by the U.S. delegation's personal statements to the UN.

Then—and this is above all—Mao was so anxious to secure Mao of some success about the power struggle WITHIN China, and anxiety about his own role as a leader did not prevent him from the fact that Piao then (Mao's) was once again rebuffed. This time he finished the date of Washington's birthday?

The stakes must be high persistence in the coming weeks of Nixon's face.

Vietnam, not to be of U.S. imperialism involved in such the reform has tion movements are interests national in the big p

CHINA

In the 1970s, Mao's policy was to play the two superpowers against each other for the benefit of China. This was a classic Maoist strategy of playing the big powers against each other.

China's foreign policy is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence. This means that China will not ally itself with any major power against another major power. China's goal is to create a multipolar world where no single power dominates.

All these hidden intentions were clear. For the moment what is crucial is the relationship to the India-Pakistan war. This is a global issue—the power struggle which is in this we must turn if we are seriously to grapple with the new relations to be between the U.S. and China.

LIN BIAO AND MAO TSE-TUNG

Following the granting of all powers to China, the consolidation of the national revolution. Oct. 1 celebration of Communist victory, and the continued failure of any public appearance by the designated heir of Mao—Lin Biao—was perceived as Mao's "hidden intention" as part of the "struggle within" all we have got from the official Chinese press are a few reports that Lin Biao "photo" and how China with "Mao's" No "photo" photos.

Lin Biao was the world's most powerful man. He was the second most powerful man in the world.

Lin Biao's "Revolution" was a "hidden intention" of Mao's. It was a "hidden intention" of Mao's to play the two superpowers against each other for the benefit of China.

Lin Biao's policy was to play the two superpowers against each other for the benefit of China. This was a classic Maoist strategy of playing the big powers against each other.

China's foreign policy is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence. This means that China will not ally itself with any major power against another major power. China's goal is to create a multipolar world where no single power dominates.

All these hidden intentions were clear. For the moment what is crucial is the relationship to the India-Pakistan war. This is a global issue—the power struggle which is in this we must turn if we are seriously to grapple with the new relations to be between the U.S. and China.

(1) See "Mao and the New World" by Brian Sims (New Republic, April 1970).
(2) U.S. and Russia Edge Middle East Conflict (News & Letters, 20 April 1970). Mao's "hidden intention" was to play the two superpowers against each other for the benefit of China. This was a classic Maoist strategy of playing the big powers against each other.

JANUARY, 1972

And China makes Three**Super powers line up as new war explodes between India, W. Pakistan**by RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA
Chairman, National Editorial Board

Open war broke out between West Pakistan and India on Dec. 3. Prodded by the U.S., the Security Council of the UN rushed into special session to consider the Resolution calling for "a cease fire." It displayed an alacrity it failed to show either when the U.S. rained bombs on Vietnam, a bestial imperialist war it keeps up to this day, the seventh year, or when Russia invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968. Whether the present speed is due to the fact that now that China is in the UN, there are three super-powers, or whether it is easier to deal with middle powers, the rush was useless. The veto power of the super-powers exposes the UN's built-in impotence.

U.S., CHINA, RUSSIA

Russia vetoed the Resolution in an emotionally-charged speech about the issue at stake being neither West Pakistan nor India but the liberation of East Pakistan. It most assuredly is true that the question in Pakistan is the East Pakistani mass struggle for independence from its Big Brother, the exploitative West Pakistan state which had invaded the Bengali nation after it voted overwhelmingly for autonomy. For India, much less Russia, however, it is not true that they support it because they are great exponents of the national liberation struggle. Rather, they began to support it only after they discovered a way to use it for specific chauvinistic purposes even as China is supporting West Pakistan for its global purposes.

In a word, the tragedy is the same as befell the Spanish Civil War. Just as Nazi Germany and Stalin's Russia were using that struggle as the European testing ground for World War II, so now the East Pakistani liberation struggle is being used—this time by three superpowers—as the Asian testing ground for World War III!

At first the U.S. tried speaking out of both sides of its mouth. "Absolute neutrality" means accusing India of "aggression," though it also had to admit that "the beginning of the crisis can fairly be said to be the use of force by Pakistan." It is not accidental, of course, that Nixon found it easier to recognize an affinity to the West Pakistan fascist military junta that had unleashed a genocidal war against the East Pakistanis for voting for autonomy from its Big Brother. No less than 10 million East Pakistani refugees streamed into India.

China, however, understood perfectly. It voted for the U.S. Resolution, did not ask for a vote on its own Resolution, and proceeded to lobby unrestrainedly not only for calling India "the aggressor" and totally absolving the West Pakistan military junta, but also for demanding the end of Bangla Desh (the Bengal Nation), the national liberation front which it declared to be a "social imperialist plot." (Before the new-found love between Mao and Nixon, China used to call it "a CIA plot!")

In the specific instance of China it is also a way to bring the Sino-Soviet struggle into the UN as well as "teaching" the UN that when it comes to global

purposes, civil wars may be reduced to the Maoist version of "a social-imperialist plot."

THE BANGLA DESH

China did more than turn a deaf ear to the mild telegram Maulana Bhashani of the Awami Party had sent to Mao in April. "The ideology of socialism is to fight oppression . . . and if Mao refuses to protest against the atrocities of the military junta, the world may think you are not the friend of the oppressed." China was at that very moment aiding the West Pakistan military junta in its continued massacres of its own people as well as assigning Pakistan a prestige job: arranging for the secret trip of Kissinger to Peking.

With such superpower attempts for new world realignments in the works in April, of what concern was the Bangla Desh to the "pure revolutionary" Mao?

None can know the consequences of the Bangla Desh "Government" now that it has allowed India to use it for its own war with Pakistan. Indeed, those two governments will, in turn, become pawns of the three super-powers aiming for world mastery.

We are yet to see what happens to a national liberation movement like that of the East Pakistanis when it subordinates its movement to another capitalist government, instead of working out a common front with the West Pakistan masses who are equally exploited by the same military junta—and who were carrying on a struggle against its rulers that was strong enough to undermine Ayub Kahn. Some West Pakistani scholars in this country not only had great sympathy for the East Pakistani struggle, but full awareness of the global implications.

Thus, one, Eqbal Ahmad (1), wrote: "The leaders of the Awami League in East Pakistan failed to understand how important West Pakistan was to the Nixon-Kissinger strategy of building an informal anti-Soviet alliance of dependable clients around the Mediterranean and Indian oceans—from Spain and Portugal, through Greece and Israel, to Iran and Pakistan." Meanwhile it is the Indian and Pakistan masses who are the victims. The war goes on while superpower plots are hatched.

NIXON'S CHANGE OF COURSE

Judging by the present U.S. action in the UN what had originally appeared as accidental—the first Kissinger trip to Peking via Pakistan—now discloses a pattern. Clearly, nothing—absolutely nothing—is permitted to divert from that global change in possible new war alliances.

Thus, though crucial to that change in course was the possibility that Mao could get Nixon off the hot seat in the Vietnam war, there was no deviation in the main course even when North Vietnam made it as clear to Mao, as to Nixon, that it would under no circumstances become a pawn in a new Big Power game simply because the locale would be changed from Geneva to Peking. The time between the 1954 "peace" and 1971 war has been endless war for the Vietnamese—not the Chinese or Russians, but for the Vietnamese alone.

(1) See his "Letter to a Pakistani Diplomat" in *The New York Review of Books* (September 2, 1971).

Thus, when Congress was shocked at the callous Nixon policy of not cutting military hardware to Pakistan in face of its barbarous war against its own people and voted an end to monies set aside for Pakistan, Nixon still found ways to keep doors open to the military junta China supported. This is further reaffirmed by the U.S. delegation's present maneuvers in the UN.

Thus—and this is above all—Nixon was so anxious to assure Mao of non-concern about the power struggle WITHIN China, and anxiety about his own trip, that no sooner did rumors appear about the fall of Lin Piao than Kissinger was once again rushed off to Peking. This time he finalized the date of the trip—the eve of Washington's birthday!

The stakes must be high indeed to account for such persistence in the wooing of China and for Mao's embrace of Nixon in face of the U.S. continuing war in

Vietnam, not to mention his own previous "philosophy" of U.S. imperialism as the world's Enemy No. 1. Involved in such historic global turnabouts, who among the rulers has time to pay attention to a national liberation movement as that of the East Pakistanis? All rulers are interested in but one thing: how to throttle the national liberation movement and keep it from spoiling the big game!

CHINA, IN AND OUT OF THE UN

In these first three weeks of China's presence at the UN, the one subject on which China seemed to act its old self regarding U.S. imperialism, as well as playing Chou En-lai's low profile role of a non-super-power, was the vote with the majority of the UN against the U.S. decision to trade with Rhodesia. Unfortunately, for any who knew China's past—is it only past?—on the question, it, too, contained a joker. Back in 1966, when not only had the UN called for an embargo on trade with racist Rhodesia, but Mao himself had engaged in "one more battle—in many ways the most audacious and astounding of his life" (2)—the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution—China bought some 18 million dollars' worth of Rhodesian tobacco!

It is this type of fake, retrogressionist, pseudo-leftism which was manifest in China's present announced stand for the "Palestinian revolutionary cause." Chiao Kuan-hua had separated himself from the UN Resolution which had called upon Israel to return all lands occupied by it in the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, pointing out that China "resolutely" supports Palestinians to regain land lost to Israel in 1948.

In a word, Mao's China does not recognize the creation of Israel and is for her being driven into the sea. China gave free reign to the outright fascist and open anti-Semite Al-Shukary to propagandize that drive from its shores. Shukary, in turn, stressed how outside of the Arab countries, China alone had never recognized Israel. He had not bothered to inform his Arab listeners in 1967 (3) any more than had Chiao Kuan-hua in 1971 called the UN's attention to the simple fact that Mao's China itself had not yet been born!

All these hidden chickens will first come to roost later. For the moment what is crucial—not only in relationship to the India-Pakistan war but also, and above all, globally—is the power struggle within China and it is to this we must turn if we are seriously to grapple with the new relations-to-be between the U.S. and China.

LIN PIAO AND MAO TSE-TUNG

Following the grounding of all planes in China, the cancellation of the annual mammoth Oct. 1 celebration of Communist victory, and the continued failure of any public appearance by the designated heir of Mao—Lin Piao (whose investiture as Mao's "closest comrade-in-arms" is part of the Constitution itself)—all we have got from the official Chinese press are a few cryptic notes about "plots," and how there will "always" be people who "hatch plots."

Whatever it is that China will finally tell the world, one thing is sure: China cannot stand another such

"victorious Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" as it took to remove from power that other "close comrade-in-arms," Liu Shao-ch'i. And yet nothing would be more incorrect than to conclude from all this, merely that Mao is a genius at miscalculating "closest comrades-in-arms," whom he nevertheless has a consuming passion to designate. It would be too easy a way out. It would tell us nothing at all about the objective situation in China and how she sees the world she "rejoined," and it would lead us into the subjective trap of viewing it all as a "mere" power struggle.

A power struggle is never "just" a power struggle. It always reflects the state of the economy and politics as well as global aims even if not of the actual relations. Even if Lin had lost out in the power struggle "precisely because" he was concerned "only" with assuring his becoming "No. 1" when Mao dies, the greater truth would still be that such personal delusion could emerge because the Army was the force that assured Mao's victory (not so much over "capitalist roaders" as from the actual Left the Cultural Revolution unleashed); because the decisive force in getting workers to work hard and harder was, again, the Army; and because, finally, it was the Army that brought order out of chaos and power back to the leadership so that Chou En-lai could resume the office of foreign affairs, of global politics, not empty-handed.

If "the Party that controlled the gun" switched violently from U.S. imperialism as "Enemy No. 1" to Nixon as "less bad," that also was no surprise to the head of the Army. After all, what was the Cultural Revolution all about if it was not to train the Chinese that RUSSIA, NOT THE U.S., was Enemy No. 1?

Put differently, even if the fall of Lin Piao was not a result of any change in line leading to China's entry into the UN and intensified flirtations with U.S. imperialism, even if it was "only" a power struggle, "purely personal," its significance is not what did or did not, will or will not happen to Lin, but what has happened to Mao's China, as people, as "Thought," (4) as time. And on that high level, the fall of Mao's "closest
(Continued on Page 8)

(4) And we do mean "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung," and not just his personality. From the very start of the Cultural Revolution we posed the question whether Mao was being "deified or mummified." (See "China's Self-Created Turmoil," News & Letters, October, 1966.)

(2) See "Mao and the New Mandate" by Edgar Snow (New Republic, April 10, 1969).

(3) "U.S. and Russia Enter Middle East Cockpit" (News & Letters). So blind to the lacunae in "Mao's Thought" are the "Left" scholar-specialists in China studies that one defended to me China giving sanctuary to the likes of Al-Shukary on the ground that it was done "only for politics and not because there is a grain of anti-Semitism in Mao!"

comrade-in-arms," who initiated drenching the masses in "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung," originated long before the Cultural Revolution.

Ever since 1956-7 the Revolution in Hungary, on the one hand, and "100 Flowers" campaign in China, on the other hand, forced Mao to face reality: the overwhelming truth that the revolutionary masses were moving away from Communism; that the Opposition in Communist states came, not so much from the right as from the left. As one who had been a revolutionary, immersed in "permanent revolution," and was now a Communist ruler, Mao searched for ways "to get there faster," with or without the proletariat. It wasn't too hard a thought, since he never had much confidence in the proletariat, though he had thought the peasants were revolutionary. In any case, first came "The Great Leap Forward." But far from achieving "20 years in one day," the country, with the help of natural disasters, came to near-famine. Then, in the 1960's, with the birth of a Third World, came the Sino-Soviet conflict. Counting on "the new storm centers of the world" to help him make China the center, Mao worked for a new global axis (Peking-Djakarta). Finally, came the "uninterrupted revolution" that gave an indelible tinge of revolutionism to Mao.

In actuality, however, the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was preceded by that year of crises, testing and judgment—1965. That was the year that began in February with U.S. imperialism raining bombs on Hanoi thus making it, not Peking, the testing ground. The year ended in October with the collapse of the Djakarta-Peking axis. This time the pressures for a change in line came not only from the masses, but also from the leaderships; and, not only from other countries that sided with China in the Sino-Soviet conflict, but also from his own Political Committee that evidently had not excluded a united front with Russia, at least insofar as helping Vietnam is concerned. In a word, the dictum that, not the U.S., but Russia, remained Enemy No. 1 in spite of the totally changed world situation had to be "taught" all over again. By the time Mao launched the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" it wasn't only Khrushchev that was being attacked but "China's Khrushchev," Liu Shao-ch'i.

BACK TO REALITY: THE TIMING DEVICE

The final straw was added when the youth who had taken Mao at his word, worked, indeed to pull down the "Red capitalists"—headed by Liu Piao and Chou

En-Lai.(5) It was then that Mao turned completely around and, with his "closest comrade-in-arms," struck out against the masses he now called "the ultra-left." He called a Congress to re-establish state power, military order, foreign realignments.

Put simply, once you move away from the masses; once you hit the jackpot, with Nixon taking the initiative to establish "a dialogue"; once the global vision is not world revolution, but world power—the road through the UN, leading to big power politics, beckons.

The shock is not that state-capitalist China calling itself Communist took that road. The shock is that the "Left"—and not only in the UN that dared not oppose China's H-bomb test on the very day "disarmament" was being discussed and China attacked Russia "from the left"—but the independent anti-war and revolution-

ary movements proceed with their delusions about "revolutionary Maoism."

Whether it is full global realignment or just markets (plus, of course, 1972 election) that Nixon is looking to, the high mountain on which one must stand "to watch the fight of the tigers" begins and ends—for Nixon, for Mao, for Brezhnev—with time. It will not be India, Pakistan, or Arab-Israel, or Rhodesia-Zambia that will be allowed to set the timing device, and certainly it will not be any national liberation movement! The super-powers have but one preoccupation: it is they, and not their masses, who must rule. Unless the masses, however, do have the last word, it isn't any "timing device" that will be the victim. Time itself will be thrown out of joint as the world blows itself up.

It is this we must stop now, must stop, to begin with, by turning away from the super powers' ground. Otherwise, neither the dialogue nor the action can possibly uproot this exploitative world, whether it has the private capitalist form or the state-capitalist form calling itself communist.

(5) See *Whither China? Manifesto of Sheng Wu-lien*. (Excerpts published by News & Letters in Voices of Revolt from China.)

FEBRUARY, 1972

NEWS & LETTERS

PAGE 5

TWO WORLDSBy Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

EDITOR'S NOTE: For the second time, *LE MONDE* has failed to publish any answer to their slanderous attack on *MARXISM AND FREEDOM*, which appeared in their issue of Sept. 3, 1971 in Paris. We print below an exchange of letters between *LE MONDE*'S reviewer and Raya Dunayevskaya. Excerpts from the review and Dunayevskaya's first brief reply appeared in *NEWS & LETTERS*, October, 1971.

September 25, 1971

Chere Madame,

I have received your letter concerning my review of your book in *Le Monde*. It's impossible for me to develop in a few lines the criticism that I could make regarding your undertaking, and I hope that we will one day be able to talk about it orally and clear up a number of these points. I will attempt only to enumerate some points of contention which are not only mine, but which are also shared by a number of my friends who have read your book:

1—Your intention is significant: to understand how Marxism, a theory of liberation, could give birth to repressive practices: Stalinism and neo-Stalinism. But your book makes use of all the anti-communist cliches and in no way analyzes the problems. You constantly speak of "communism's putrescent smog," of the "theory of slavery," of the "most barbarous regime on earth," of "toxic vapors that befog students." This is not an analysis.

2—The return to Marxism starting with the early texts is a myth. The texts of 1844 are without meaning unless considered within the ensemble of Marx's work.

3—Your historic analyses are often surprising; you associate facts which do not at all have the meaning that you give them; for example, the association of the intervention in Prague with the war in Vietnam, of the 1956 struggle in Hungary with the humanist revolt, of the workers of East Berlin with American Blacks.

4—Your analysis of the degeneration of Soviet Marx-

Letter exchange blasts Marxist slander

ism is not radically different from the thesis of Burnham.

5—That you were attacked by the McCarthyites does not prove your Marxist orthodoxy. Reich, raving mad, was also prey to these attacks, and he was an anti-Communist.

6—I would like to know your position on the Angela Davis question, for example; What do you think of her ideas?

7—I know little about your past and if you could send me some documentation on your work and your life, I would be happy to speak about it in the future in *Le Monde*.

8—I do not in any way dream of associating you with the present-day Burnham, who, as you say, is truly a neo-fascist.

In the hope of hearing from you soon, I send you my highest regards.

Dr. J. M. Palmier
Professor of Philosophy and Sociology

October 11, 1971

Dear Dr. Palmier:

Your letter of Sept. 25, 1971, has just reached me in Canada where I happen to be on lecture tour. I was glad to see you dropped any reference to the American roots of Marxism as if that were an invention of mine; also that you no longer refer to Lenin as if I have placed him in the same category as Stalin, Khrushchev and Mao. Now then, the questions you now pose:

First comes the serious matter of the transformation of Marxism, a philosophy of liberation, into its opposite, the theory and practice of state-capitalism calling itself Communism. My theory of state-capitalism was first developed in 1941, was the first study based on original Russian sources—the three Five Year Plans, 1928 to the outbreak of World War II. The study of this data takes up no less than 46 pages (p. 233-278) of *Marxisme et Liberte*, which proceed to prove the operation of the law of value in Russia, and cite such horrendous new features as forced labor camps, all of which was being dished up as "socialism," where the law of value is supposed to be inoperative. Furthermore, the life in forced labor camps, far from being what you

call my cliches, is told in the words of the actual inmates during the uprising in Vorkuta in July 1953. And, may I call to your attention that the title of that analysis is not "putrescent smog," but, "Russia is More Than Ever Full of Revolutionaries" (p. 273).

CHAPTER 13, WHICH sets out the actuality and not just the theory of Russian state-capitalism, does end with an expose also of Russia's (not my) revision of Marx's theory of value. This revision too I had been the first to translate into English as soon as it appeared in Russia in the journal *Pod Znamenem Marxizma* (*Under the Banner of Marxism*), which had not arrived in U.S. libraries. The debate over this startling revision, which in the United States lasted for a whole year (1944 to 1945), reverberated on the Continent directly after World War II. (One of my articles, "Nouvelle revision de la theorie economique marxiste," appeared in *La Revue Internationale*, 9 octobre 1946. Another and later summation of my position that appeared in French is "Bureaucratization et capitalisme d'Etat," in *Arguments*, no 12-13, janvier-fevrier mars 1959.)

Because the practice of state-capitalism is a great deal more painful than the theory, I stressed in the Preface: "Russian Communism rests on the mainspring of capitalism—paying the worker the minimum, and extracting from him the maximum," (p. 32). Because this is central to my whole work, I proceeded to prove this contention in the context of the book (Part Five). Because theory is not at all the abstraction it appears to be to many, and Marx himself did anticipate such a development if "the law of motion of capitalism" went "the whole way," and because this affected even great revolutionaries who slipped off the fundamental ground of Marx's "abstract" analysis, I also dealt with the question in my analysis of crises developed by Marx in Vol. III of *Capital*. May I call your attention to the end of Chapter 8, which takes up Rosa Luxemburg's theory of accumulation of capital, and contrasts it to Marx's ("Appearance and Reality," p. 151-156)?

SECONDLY, I AM most sorry to see that you believe the 1844 Manuscripts to be "unmythe." This is your
(Continued on Page 7)

6875

privilege, of course. However, I did not leave the question of the Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts (Chapter 3 of *Marxism et Liberte*) to its formulation by Marx in 1844, or to the Russian attacks on it in 1955, but carried through the Humanism of Marxism throughout the four volumes of Marx's *Capital*, to which I devote no less than four chapters. Thus, Part Three, "Marxism: Unity of Theory and Practice," lays heavy stress, not on the Humanism of 1844, but on "The Humanism and the Dialectic of Capital, Vol. I (1867-1883)." Again, it is impossible to divide theory from practice, and not just in Marx's day but in our own, when we deal with Marxism.

Therefore, what I emphasize is the actual appearance on the historic stage of Marx's Humanism in the Hungarian Revolution, 1956. It has remained front center on that historic stage ever since. I was most pleased to have been one of only three Americans asked to participate in the international symposium, *Socialist Humanism*, edited by Eric Fromm. I regret that you see no relationship between the Russian counter-revolutionary interventions in East Europe, either in Hungary in 1956 or in Czechoslovakia in 1968, and the barbaric American imperialist actions in Vietnam. I doubt that those who have to live under Russian totalitarianism in East Europe see no parallel in these two imperialisms. And it is a fact that the American masses—Blacks and youth mainly, but not so distant from the rank and file labor as is made to appear—who are fighting their government's savage imperialism against the Vietnamese people, do see a parallel.

NOR IS THIS parallel seen merely for "propaganda purposes," as in the moving letter from a Birmingham jail in 1963 by Martin Luther King, Jr., who drew a sharp parallel between U.S. racism and Nazism, on the one hand, and on the other hand, between the Hungarian revolutionaries and the Black revolutionaries. Last year, for example, when the Polish workers rose up in strikes and demonstrations against their conditions of labor, we witnessed demonstrations in sympathy here.

In any case, insofar as I am concerned, I do not believe in the theory of the lesser evil. The one time that I participate in any actions with Communists is when the reactionary American government strikes out against revolutionaries here, especially Blacks. Thus, in the question that you raised about Angela Davis, I am of course part of the Free Angela Davis movement. This needs further explanation because I do think there is a misunderstanding in your conception of what my anti-Communism supposedly leads to. I fight the Communists, whom I consider state-capitalists, globally. Being an American revolutionary, this in no way stops me from fighting American capitalism.

As you no doubt noticed, Herbert Marcuse, who introduced my work, disagrees with me sharply, particularly on the role of labor, and I disagree even more sharply with him. Yet he felt that my analysis of "the Marxism oeuvre" was such an original contribution that someone in academia must introduce it. At the present moment, the C. P. is carrying on the most vicious campaign against him, but this has not stopped him from working for the freedom of his most important protégée, Angela Davis. In a word, neither of us consider either that we should hide our differences, or that our differences should keep us from working together against capitalism.

YOU WILL PARDON me if I do not go into still another discussion of Burnham. I would like to believe you when you say, "I do not dream of associating you with the present day Burnham." Why then have you dragged this neo-fascist into our discussion, when he nowhere appears in my book, and I am damn sure I nowhere appear in his? My theory of state-capitalism, which was never separated from its opposite, workers' revolutions, was never his, and his theory of managerial society, which he had considered "the new society," was never mine. Wasn't it bad enough that I had to explain my "past" (which has always been a revolutionary past) for *Le Monde*? Why should I again have to sink down to Burnham's ground of argumentation? Can't you see that *Le Monde* does publish my public answer?

Yes, I would like some day to meet and discuss more with you in person, but you must realize that I have suffered through many slanders and relegation to the status of un-person, both in Russia and the United States, ever since I became Leon Trotsky's secretary at the height of the most infamous Moscow Frame-Up Trials in 1937. I trust, therefore, that our dialogue can continue on the ground of my own work rather than on the ground of Other.

Yours sincerely,
Raya Dunayevskaya

TWO WORLDS

By RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA,
Chairman, News & Letters Committees

In this Black Liberation Month* of February—whether we look back to Frederick Douglass as the symbol of victory both of Abolitionism and the Civil War, or to the Black high school youth in Greensboro, N. C., who initiated the Black Revolution of our day in February 1960, "Africa Year"—it becomes necessary to take a second look at the life of the recently deceased Ralph J. Bunche.

Because the UN and the white ruling classes the world over sent representatives to attend the funeral services at the Riverside Church in New York, it would appear that the only two events worth remembering are that this man they labeled "Diplomat" had won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1950 for negotiating truce between Arabs and Jews in 1949, and headed the imperialist so-called peace-keeping mission to the Congo in 1960. Because the very next year, in February 1961, the great African revolutionary who tried to keep his country independent of imperialist stranglehold—Patrice Lumumba—was assassinated, the revolutionary Black youth wish not to remember Bunche at all. But to transform him into an unperson only helps the ruling class hide the revolutionary pages of Ralph J. Bunche's life. Why should we allow the rewriting of Bunche's life story as if nothing but the UN happened between his birth in Detroit in 1904 and his death in New York in 1971, or as if living Black and poor in racist U.S.A. was all worth while because Bunche did get a Ph.D. from Harvard—even if it still meant not teaching at Harvard, but at Howard? Let's instead bring into the light of day his Black revolutionary activities, in fact and in thought, in the bleak days of Depression when holding onto his career wasn't half as important as trying to change the course of history.

SHARECROPPERS AND URBAN WORKERS REVOLT

The two most important pages relate to aiding sharecroppers in their revolt in the South, and in the North

*The Black Liberation Month, as calendar, can be obtained from: People's College, Box 5747, Nashville, Tenn. 37208.

Two forgotten pages of Ralph Bunche's life story

establishing the National Negro Congress to try to unite workers and tenant farmers, domestics and intellectuals, racial organizations and unions and churches and radicals; in a word, to shake up the system that had dethroned King Cotton but not King Capital.

In the Spring of 1935, when Bunche, as Chairman of the Division of Social Sciences at Howard University, had conceived a form of a mass organization to organize the urban North—the National Negro Congress, the Socialists had organized the Southern Tenant Farmers Union. The terror campaign, not excluding outright murder of organizers, with which the Bourbon South had met the organizing drive, led to the calling of a cotton choppers strike in 1936. The landlords and their "law and order" deputy sheriffs—one was actually convicted of practicing outright peonage (1)—brought the destitute living conditions there to the breaking point, as the landlords also drove sharecroppers off the land.

There are few enough books on that hard page of history, and none at all on Ralph J. Bunche's role. Yet he had organized one of the most effective inter-racial committees in Washington, D.C., to aid the sharecroppers. And he himself was never too tired to speak in still one more out-of-the-way church or civic or radical group to raise funds to help the sharecroppers, to give workers to those who had to abandon the land and come to the nation's capital that was, except for the street cars, Jim Crow.

Along with John P. Davis of the Joint Committee on National Recovery and A. Phillip Randolph, President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, the Sponsoring Committee for the National Negro Congress received support also from Communists, Socialists, and many others. The Congress was off to a fast start when it convened in Chicago in 1936. No less than 819 delegates, representing 525 organizations—from churches to farm

organizations, from women's groups to trades unions, from professional groups to political groups and parties—were present. Indeed, out of these also were born many of the organizing committees that were to become the CIO.

Clearly, Professor Bunche wasn't sitting in any Ivory tower. Clearly, this intellectual didn't keep himself separated from the great masses in motion, Black and white. And just as clearly, though no doubt surprising to the Communists, he wasn't under any illusions as to why the Communists were in it at the moment, and how quickly the "line" from Moscow could change. Change it did, with the outbreak of World War II. The demise of the National Negro Congress soon followed.

THE TRANSITION POINT

Along with activity in mass organizations came philosophic development. Ralph Bunche became critical not only of the economic, political and social status of the Negro, but of all existing Negro organizations that strove to ameliorate this condition. He called them "philosophic and programming paupers." He was critical likewise of all Negro leaders who, he said "think and act entirely in a black groove." In his pamphlet, *A World View of Race*, he even comes up with a solution to the Negro problem:

"The Negro must develop, therefore, a consciousness of class interest and purpose and must strive for an alliance with the white working class in a common struggle for economic and political equality and justice."

This high point of his self-development as "social

(1) The infamous Sheriff Peacher was the only one convicted, but by no means the only one who practiced it. The more exciting history to follow is the daring and ingenuity of revolt. See Howard Kester's *Revolt Among Sharecroppers*; also *The South in Progress* by Katherine Lumpkin; Stuart Jamieson, *Labor Unionism in American Agriculture*.

scientist"—who is as intense about working out a philosophy of liberation as about actions to shape the course of history—coincided with the outbreak of World War II. The high point that was reached "perished," to use the Hegelian concept, and the move backward in thought and in activity began. At first the direction was not altogether clear. Thus, the collaboration with Gunnar Myrdal not merely in the research but rich analysis for *An American Dilemma* did not seem to signify that Bunche would allow the bourgeois sociologist's "value premises" to supersede his world view of race, concept of class and philosophy of liberation. Bunche's comprehensive "Memo" — "The Progress, Ideologies, Tactics and Achievements of Negro Betterment and Inter-racial Organizations" (2)—is far superior to Myrdal's pallid "value premises." Though Myrdal understood well that the Negro would not continue to be "submissive" but "will organize for defense and offense," (*American Dilemma*, p. 1004) he asked from the benighted South only for enfranchisement of "the higher strata of the Negro population" (p. 519). Nevertheless, Bunche, the most radical of radicals then, along with everyone from W.E.B. Du Bois to the lowliest intellectual Black "assistant", kept from seriously criticizing Myrdal and allowed him to use their works for the conservative ends of the Carnegie endowed project. (3)

In a word, the radicalism of Bunche proved to be illusory, that is, radicalism of the chair only. And while he kept from criticizing Myrdal, Mr. Myrdal did not hesitate to attack Mr. Bunche.

"In passing it should be observed that the academic

(2) Along with this are the other contributions to the study of the Negro that Myrdal did not use in *American Dilemma*. Bunche's document is in the Schomburg Library (N.Y. Public Library, 135th St. & 7th Ave.) and should by all means be studied.

(3) The 1944 review I wrote was reprinted in total in *News & Letters*, Feb. 1961. The pagination above refers to the original (1944) hard cover edition by Harper Bros.

radicalism of Negro intellectuals exemplified by the citation from Mr. Bunche, can easily come to good terms with the type of liberal but skeptical *laissez-faire* (do nothing) opinion so prevalent among white social scientists, writing on the Negro problem . . . Since neither party is very active in trying to induce or prevent an economic revolution, it does not make much difference if the Negro radicals look forward to an economic revolution and the white sociologists do not." (Page 1398, footnote 13.)

THE UN AND THE CONGO

It was the beginning of the end of the revolutionary road for Ralph Johnson Bunche. It wasn't that he had become an Uncle Tom. Ralph Bunche tommed to no one. To the intelligentsia, white as well as Black (and after Hitler's attack on Russia, spurred on by Communists), World War II looked like the "democratic" answer to Nazism. (For that matter, the greatest hot-house transformation into opposite was the CIO's vying with capitalism in the transformation of the American production process into the world armaments center, misnamed "arsenal of democracy.") Ralph Bunche plunged into the preliminary work for the to-be UN, and then became second in command in the UN. Total self-delusion came with becoming the architect of the Middle East. As he was to express it, "the single most satisfying work I've ever done . . . for the first time we have found a way to use military men for peace instead of war."

Then came the Congo. As if in mere answer to Premier Patrice Lumumba's request for aid in keeping the rich Katanga province from seceding from the newly-born Congo Republic, UN troops, misnamed "peace-keeping mission" and headed by Bunche, were dispatched to the Congo. Rooted in this UN intervention was the true face of UN as "collective" imperialist as well as the new form of struggle between the two nuclear titans—the United States and Russia. This was not just the beginning of the end of Bunche as "revolutionary"; it was the end of Bunche as Black, as man, as "world view of race". All that remained was total self-delusion.

—February 13, 1972

APRIL, 1972

Editorial Article

Nixon-Mao extravaganza: new 'peaceful co-existence' — with whom? for what?

by Raya Dunayevskaya
National Chairman, News & Letters Committees

Now that the Mao-Nixon-Chou-Kissinger TV spectacular is over, and Nixon's old "Nationalist" China lobby is yelling "Sell-out" while the equally stupid new liberals likewise single out the abrupt change on Taiwan as the key point, it is time to assess, not the non-existent victory-defeat scoreboard, but the truly new direction in global power-politics.

Nothing sheds more light on how alike the new Nixon is to the old than the 180-degree turn from TV saturation on the wonders of ancient China and the new Nixon; through that historic week (Feb. 21-28) that was supposed to have "changed the world"; to Nixon's total silence presently on all questions except his reactionary position against busing. In a word, when it comes to the home front, the Black home front, Nixon, new and old, is all too anxious to roll the clock of history back, all the way back, to pre-1954 U.S. Supreme Court racist position on "education."

HERE AND OVER THERE

Nothing remains more the same than change when that change is initiated by rulers, be they American or Chinese. All one has to do to see the affinity of those two opposites is to look at them at home. Or, if you wish, as they look at home via satellites. Compare Mao welcoming Nixon into his study while hundreds of thousands of Chinese with bent backs, and hoes, shovels and straw brooms are clearing the streets for visitors from the land of "Enemy No. 1." Now glance at Nixon, table-hopping at the luxuriously red-carpeted "Communist" Palace while the unemployed and welfare lines grow ever bigger as his aides are busy working out ways of controlling wages, strikes, and doing nothing at all about the disasters and deaths in West Virginia mines, and mining towns.

This doesn't mean that the Nixon-Mao Communique didn't contain some startling reversals in global politics. But it does mean that these were all within the context of national Big Power politics. Put differently, despite the overriding truth about those two "unchangeables," Mao and Nixon, nothing on the world scene will ever be quite the same.

This is so, not because there are any "achievements" between Peking and Washington to chalk up, for internal or external consumption. It is so because, in this case, the form of this TV spectacular transmitted live via satellite to all foreign chancelleries, had the desired global impact as against the murky content and forked-tongue language in the Communique. And, though it was not "the week that changed the world," the TV extravaganza did, in a flash, illuminate the terrifying possibility that if those two men willed it, they could, have made it so.

We must, therefore, turn away from the strange admixture of large pleasure with small terror, and turn instead to the Communique.

VIETNAM, NOT TAIWAN, WAS SOLD OUT

It is true that the 1,800 word Communique conceals more than it reveals. But since Mao-Nixon-Chou-Kissinger are not the first masters and henchmen to torture language to state untruths as truths, it is not too difficult to get to the root of the matter. Take the question of Taiwan. Supposedly this is where Chou gained most and Nixon lost most. The truth is that

neither gave anything that was not theirs to give—or take—and not even that which was theirs to give.

Thus, the 8,000 army men there now were not in Taiwan when the infamous Dulles 1954 Pact was initiated. Except for a few hundred, they were first put there as the Vietnam war escalated in the LBJ era. Now that the cold-war warrior Nixon has become the exponent of "peaceful co-existence"; now that the quoter of Mao's poem—"Ten thousand years are too long, / Seize the day, seize the hour!"—asks that "the moment" be seized; and now that this loud-mouth talker of "a generation of peace" in place of "containment of Communism" has become adept in transforming "the long march" to his nuclear jet-set travel, wasn't it time at least to set a date for that small gesture? No.

The declaration of but one China notwithstanding, the promise of withdrawing "all U.S. forces . . . from Taiwan" is hedged with nothing more specific than "objective," while the time factor is put off into the millenia as "ultimate." And as if the Communique wasn't clear enough on that point, our modern Metetrnich, Kissinger, makes it clear in his briefing of the press, that the Nixon Administration means to take the slow boat to Taiwan in order to have "leverage," as China's relations with the U.S. move from words to action!

It isn't that Chou En-lai was bornswoggled by the likes of Nixon any more than it was a matter of Nixon coming to China "to surrender Taiwan." Rather, it is a case of both national powers "facing reality," that is to say, acknowledging that since Taiwan is not an immediate issue while global realignment is, let's put Taiwan in the deep freeze so that the plunge to "normalization" of our Big Power relations proceeds with dispatch.

In any case, it wasn't Chiang Kai-shek who was "betrayed." It was Vietnam. And not the Thieu gang in South Vietnam, but the Vietcong and North Vietnam, the true besieged fortress, that was being violated daily with U.S. genocidal saturation bombing while Mao proceeded, undisturbed, to prepare for the big meeting with Nixon.

It is true that one of the original reasons for Nixon's decision to go to Peking was to get Mao to take him off the Vietnam hotseat. In 1970 that had a certain priority since it was all too clear that not only could Nixon not win the second Indochina war, but also, at home, the anti-Vietnam war movement had reached its most massive and intensive high point that truly shook the country to its foundation after the Kent massacre.

But, though Mao was willing to take Nixon off that hot seat, the outcry of North Vietnam was so unequivocal that Chou was compelled to deny he ever had made a proposal for a "summit" conference to decide the Vietnam war. By 1971 when the internal crisis within China led to the removal of Lin Biao, Mao's designated Constitutional "closest comrade-in-arms and successor" (my emphasis) it was clear to Nixon and Mao alike that, if they were to take the plunge into uncharted seas of world realignment, they better let nothing, absolutely nothing, stand in the way of their projected get-together.

The Communique tries covering up affinity to U.S. imperialism and betrayal of "socialist ally" by having the U.S. and China each reaffirm "its own position" behind respective allies. The only trouble with such "opposite" positions is that while the U.S. continues to rain bombs on both Vietnams no action of any sort

flows from China's unctuous words about "self-determination," "national liberation," "people's revolution." Betrayal by any other name stinks as badly.

Still, what possible "unifying force" could bring those opposites, Nixon's U.S.A. and Mao's China, together—at the expense of Indochina, at the sacrifice of the leaders of his "Cultural Revolution," to the disorientation of the revolutionaries who had followed him in proclaiming this to be the epoch of "world revolution" against the "revisionist" Russian espousal of "peaceful co-existence?"

Let's take another look at that Communique and see this time whether we can discern what it doesn't say in what it does say.

BANGLADESH OR RUSSIA?

The one point in the separate sides that states the same thing is agreement with the "United Nations Security Council Resolution of Dec. 21, 1971, (calling for) the cease fire between India and Pakistan, and the withdrawal of all military forces within their own territories . . ." Neither has said anything about the new state of Bangladesh which neither has recognized. But now that they admit to speaking with one voice on "International relations," the two stated that . . . "neither should seek hegemony in the Asia-Pacific region and each is opposed to the efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony . . ." (my emphasis.)

And, having declared their opposition to "any other country" seeking "hegemony," China and the U. S. moved further in unison. Both sides are of the view "that it would be against the interests of the peoples of the world for any major country to collude with another country . . ."

Since they are the two countries openly in collusion at the moment, while the country that has established itself on the sub-continent at the birth of Bangladesh is

Russia, it is not too hard to guess the unnamed country the U.S.-China declaration had in mind. How reminiscent of the days when the Sino-Soviet conflict broke out in 1960—when Russia constantly would name "Albania" when it meant China, and China would designate "Yugoslavia" when it meant Russia! Presently all the talk of Pakistan and India is, in fact, talk about Bangladesh and Russia.

In China's part of the statement, Chou En-lai added to China's approval of the UN Resolution of yesterday "on the India-Pakistan question," that, furthermore, China "firmly supports the Pakistan government . . ." That was always so, whether that government was run by Ayub Kahn or Yahya Kahn, who unleashed the genocidal war against the East Pakistani liberation movement. Now that All Bhutto heads West Pakistan, China has transformed its hefty loan into an outright grant. It

has never varied in its designation of Russia as the "boss" of India, and Bangladesh as its "puppet."

Kissinger's lying statements at the press briefing in Peking notwithstanding, it is clear that this, just this anti-Russian stance, is the unifying force between Nixon's USA and Mao's China. It was this, just this anti-Russian stance, persisting directly into China's New Constitution in April, 1969, that led Nixon, at the very start of his administration, to send out feelers for "normalization" of relations with China, and to reverse his predecessors' policy of treating world Communism as a "monolith."

*See "Can There be War Between Russia and China?: the Non-Viability of State-Capitalism" in *MARKISM AND FREEDOM*, 1964 American edition, and 1971 British edition, which includes a new chapter, on Mao's "Cultural Revolution, or Maoist Reaction?"

*The Hunan Revolutionary Committee (Sheng-wu-lien) had three of its documents published in China, and these are now translated and reproduced in Peking and the New Left, by Klaus Mehnert, *China Research Monographs*, U.C. Berkeley, 1969. Key excerpts have been mimeographed by News & Letters.

In a word, the cold-war warrior was becoming an exponent of "peaceful co-existence" with some Communists, not because there was any fundamental change in his "philosophy," but because there was a serious break in their outlook. That government "liberals" didn't grasp the shakiness of the structure of the Communist world only goes to show—say the newest exponents of "peaceful co-existence,"—how "ideology" blinds where

American pragmatism opens your mind to "alternatives."

In any case, whether or not the Mao-Nixon "philosophic" dialogue ever will become an outright alliance, or the Nixon journey to Moscow in May will turn the U. S. back to "old" perspectives about possible alliance with Russia against China, there is no doubt whatever that, one, it is Russia's nuclear might and expansionism into the Middle East, into the sub-continent, not to mention its close alliance with Cuba where it once stored missiles, that is Nixon's worry; and that, two, the U. S. has, in every previous war, preferred to ally with a weak or exhausted partner, who is easier to dominate.

AS FOR MAO'S CHINA

Chou En-lai's protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, China is acting as a super-power, a state-capitalist, nuclearly-armed Asian power that is aiming as much for world mastery as are Russia and the United States. Because Russia is the contiguous and therefore most feared rival power, China let nothing stop her from her outright counter-revolutionary role as she propped up such a neo-fascistic regime as Yahya Kahn's Pakistan. And she did the same for "socialistic" Ceylon as she, along with the U. S. and Russia, helped arm Mme. Bandaranaike to slaughter the guerrilla movement that considered itself Maoist!

What is new in 1972 is the internal and not only external. It began in 1971 when Kissinger surfaced in Peking. Whether Lin Piao, Mao's designated successor, balked at concretizing Russia as the enemy to mean that U. S. A. is the friend, we may never know. What we do know is that between Kissinger's first appearance in July 1971, and September 1971, all airports in China suddenly closed down, and Lin Piao was no more. Or, as Chou euphemistically put it, Lin had been "liquidated politically."

And what is now clear is that after Lin Piao's "political liquidation," Nixon hurried Kissinger for his second trip, not only to assure Mao that Nixon still wanted to come but that he wanted to do so with greater dispatch than was first promulgated. The two No. 2 men, Chou En-lai and Kissinger, then drafted the memo we first now have seen, polished up as the Communique.

But while this mentions not a word about Lin, what is indisputably clear is that the 1969 Constitution—which not only designated Lin as Mao's "successor," but also declared this to be the epoch of "world revolution"—is as dead as the Defense Minister who co-authored "The Thoughts of Mao Tse-tung," both as dogma and as preventive civil war, as well as spelled out "Long Live the Victory of Peoples' War!" as: "Defeat U. S. Imperialism." Not that Mao couldn't initiate still another turn and even "unite" with Russia, but, to both, U. S. Imperialism is livable with "peaceful co-existence!"

JAPAN, THE ASIAN POWER

That the specious and deceitful Communique can be exposed only by the masses in each country locked in class battles, became utterly clear as Russia, that had first yelled that Mao was colluding with Nixon against "Socialist Russia," suddenly breathed a sigh of relief and began preparing for its own type of collusion. That is to say, knowing that more than two can play the game of "peaceful co-existence" (and she surely has the greater experience), she recognized in Nixon's runaway rhetoric about the "matchless wonders of ancient China," his actual not-so-total political victory in Mao's China.

Nixon hadn't closed the doors to other alliances if they can get him out of the impasse on the international scene. Take what the Communique didn't say about the Middle East. After all, what can China possibly give Nixon there where it has no power, not even enough to pretend "to ease tensions." Russia has. Lots. It is the

new power there, and enough not only to influence Middle East events, but to challenge U.S. imperialism and perhaps kick-off World War III. So, Russia has only to beckon. And beckon it did, not, however, as mere supplicant.

Quite the contrary. Ever since the Nixon trip was first projected, Russia was busy not only on the sub-continent, but also directly with Japan—which is too big a power for the U.S. to think for one moment that they could throw it aside like Taiwan. Kissinger's "philosophic" talk about "history's imperatives"—which, for the press, he equated with the reversal of policy regarding China—exposed its totally contradictory character in the manner in which Japan was treated.

First and most important, not only was the subject treated entirely separately by China and the U.S.—with neither giving an inch—but Marshall Greene was at once dispatched to spell out the Communiqué's statement as to how "to develop the existing close bonds." The old-new Nixon wasn't about to forget the "Nixon Doctrine" which cleared the way for Japan to become the super-power in the Asia-Pacific area. In any case, being the big industrial power—the third in the whole world—Japan was playing its own imperialist game. Having been forced to soften its full competitive threat to the U.S. in international trade, it proceeded, at one and the same time, to disregard U.S. strictures against North Vietnam by establishing relations with it and to talk with Russia about participating in the buildup of Siberia facing China!

If Nixon was deluding himself that U.S. in 1971, can play in Asia what his predecessors played in Europe in World War II—aligning with defeated or near-defeated powers to come out holding the decisive hand—and establish a "new order in the Pacific," he most certainly has not the slightest notion of "history's imperatives" even in inter-imperialist rivalry, much less as to what faces him on the decisive home front!

Some booing could be heard even at the staged welcome for his return to Washington and his "patriotism" appeal to the unbending old China Lobby. That was the slightest indication of what the election year of 1972 holds in store for the man who imagines himself

to be both a Marco Polo and the anticipator of racist hysteria against school busing by offering to whitewash that "damned spot" with "quality education."

THE TEST IS HERE

*"Out, damned spot! out, I say! . . .
What, will these hands never be clean?
. . . Here's the smell of the blood still;
all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten
this little hand."* —Lady Macbeth

Mao may prefer Nixon as President, but the decision will not be made in China, but in the U.S.; 1972 is the year of testing. Whatever it is Nixon brought home from his sojourn to Peking—and the one historic thing, relationship with China, cannot ever be shut old-Nixon-tight again—the totality of the crisis here has not abated. The unemployment has become a permanent feature of automated decadent capitalism and with it, "welfare." The whole U.S. economy, in fact, though it remains the "mightiest," has sunk to second place even at the level of technology, i.e., productivity, for the good and substantial and pivotal reason, that labor refuses to produce endlessly without question as profits and corruption govern both industry and the government.

And, pervading all these, for there we have the unending, relentless, and revolutionary Black force, is the racist counter-revolutionary U.S. Government axis. Nixon is under the illusion that he has achieved "mass support" because liberals, too, have joined the hysteria against busing.

The one thing he has forgotten, as had Goldwater before him, will defeat him. It is the class question. Even though a section of the working class is as racist as the middle class, the truth is that, on the labor question, they so turned against Goldwater—and will against Nixon—that he did lose the election. Furthermore, Nixon is in the same position as Johnson was when, having won against Goldwater, he thought he could continue with the Vietnam War. Mao may allow Nixon to delude himself by making it appear that

"global" issues outweigh any "small war" issue, but not the Vietnamese who have fought imperialism, Chinese included, for centuries. And neither will the anti-Vietnam war movement, the youth especially.

The very fact that even the Black Maoists here cannot stomach Nixon, and are at this very moment trying to see whether they can't organize a Black movement, shows the direction, the true historic imperative of a truly independent mass force—labor-Black-youth-Women's Liberation—that will strike out, first and foremost against the capitalist enemy at home, and refuse to follow state-capitalist forces that dare call themselves "Communist." There can be no freedom when one chooses a "lesser evil"; it is only the sure way to land with the "greater evil." The final and only answer will rest with the masses who will strike out for so deep a unity of philosophy and revolution as to make freedom the reality.

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairman, News & Letters Committees

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from a brief summary of a Conference on Women's Liberation held with Raya Dunayevskaya last year. The summary was prepared by the N&L-WL Committee, and is available, complete, through NEWS & LETTERS for 25c.

A welcome was extended to those who had accepted the invitation to come to the Conference to help Raya Dunayevskaya in the writing of the final chapter of her new book, *Philosophy and Revolution*, which deals with "New Passions and New Forces". Those attending included students and workers, both Black and white, more non-members than members of News & Letters Committees.

Raya began her presentation by pointing out that the core of the dialectic as a movement is the number two, and then went into some of the dangers in this number two: We live in an age when even those opposites that are not antagonistic contradictions, such as capital and labor are, nevertheless reveal the struggle of opposites: men and women; workers and intellectuals; theory and practice; spontaneity and organization; philosophy and revolution. This duality in reality is the knot to be unravelled and we therefore might as well make it the focal point of this discussion as well.

EVERYTHING CAN BE divided today into: I—the Idea as such, and II—the Idea whose time has come. For the Idea as such there are two dates in history to take up: 1844 when Marx wrote his famous *Economic and Philosophic Essays*, and 1947 when these essays were translated into English by Raya Dunayevskaya. For the Idea whose time has come we will have to take up 1965 when it was the "new", and 1971 when we must begin to consider our perspectives.

Marx called his philosophy a "new humanism". In those 1844 Essays he lashed out against both capitalism and vulgar communism. In the Essay on "Private Prop-

Women's Liberation and the search for philosophy

erty and Communism" he said that the most fundamental relationship of all human relationships is that of man to woman. In 1947 when Raya translated the Essays, however, what she stressed was Marx's anti-capitalism and anti-vulgar-communism, as she was exposing the true state-capitalist nature of Russia which called itself "communist". . .

The transition point between "Idea as such" and "Idea whose time has come" is 1955, when News & Letters Committees wrote their Constitution and women were singled out as one of the forces of Revolution. We alone did that, and even reserved a special section of our paper for Women, just as we had for Black voices. But because the women's movement had not yet appeared, it nevertheless remained "Idea as such."

BUT THE 1960's is a totally new stage: It is true that we have always pointed out the inter-relationship of the Abolitionist Movement and the Women's Movement. It is not denigrating that tremendous page in history to stress the "new" that has now appeared, and is different from all the past. There have been women's struggles throughout history, but the simple truth is that none before ever did what the new women are doing today . . .

But despite all this "new", the Women's Liberation Movement has found the need for philosophy. The division in SDS was precisely on philosophic questions. Their disintegration was the result of their total disregard for philosophy. It has brought the WL Movement to an impasse, too. But the movement is so objectively valid that no matter what, it will keep rising up, over and over again. The most important point of the whole Movement is that the women are objecting to being object, instead of Subject, to use the Hegelian term. They are seeking to become whole human beings.

There is a division of Theory into two stages. (If you want to read it for yourselves it is discussed by Hegel in the *Phenomenology* on pages 77 and 80.) He says that everything depends on grasping It not as Substance, but as Subject as well. The initial stage has to be alone, because otherwise the new will not come out.

This is why Lenin kept talking about the shyness of workers; and why it was important for Blacks not always to have some white standing over their shoulders. This independence is, however, not for separation, but to be able to develop to another stage. Then there must be a return to philosophy to develop positions in your own organization. This self-consciousness and "taking back our heads" is being done to free everyone, not to make the same mistakes as men.

NO ONE KNOWS when the revolution will occur, it is spontaneous. Nobody knows what will spark it. That is not the question. The question we are discussing is that you have to have something new to say, if you are serious about developing a theory. Raya took one article in our pamphlet, *Notes on Women's Liberation: We Speak in Many Voices*, as an example of what happens when you are not grounded in philosophy. The article was so anxious to establish that Marx was wrong that it claims that Engels' theory was what Marx drew on for his theory of Historical Materialism. That is totally wrong factually, of course, which would be simple to prove even chronologically. But the most important error is not the factual one, but the methodology involved.

Marx's historical materialism demonstrated that exploitation of labor by capital is rooted not only in the division between mental and manual labor, but in the relationship of man to woman. And Marx showed that all history was movement. History is not "past". It is present, too. All history is the history of class struggles. But you have to understand that part of the oppression is what the rulers do to rob you of your thought, as well as the fruits of your labor. They don't want you to think—just to work. But the great truth is that no matter how much they may be oppressed, men and women do think, and they think their own thoughts. In fact, the more alienated you are, the greater you are, because the greater is your quest for universality.

FINALLY, RAYA DEALT with Philosophy and Revolution, her book-in-progress, which we were there to help her finish: It has three major Parts. Part I takes

(Continued on Page 7)

up Hegel, Marx and Lenin. One of the most important parts for us here is the section that deals with how Marx concretized Hegel and at the same time broke with the whole concept of what is theory. This is where history as process comes in. Part II deals with Alternatives: Trotsky, Mao and Sartre. And Part III is "New Passions and Forces", which deals with the Blacks, youth and women.

We have been able to show why the Black dimension and why the youth are these new passions and new forces, because, in fact, the Blacks throughout American history, and specifically since the Montgomery Bus Boycott, as well as the Blacks in Africa, had raised questions of deep philosophic import, whether it was Robert Moses on education or Fanon on the whole African revolution. The same reason—that is, concrete questions that were raised—enabled us to show this on the part of the Youth, as well, whether it was Savio on alienation, or the French Revolt in May, 1968, where the new forms of student-workers committees were established. In the case of the Women, we have not succeeded in hearing quite that many new voices. What we do know is that self-development means that you will gain a new dimension in yourselves, will feel a totality in the new person you are becoming, as you give expression to what you are feeling and thinking. The proof of Marxist-Humanism will be in your own self-development.

The floor was opened for discussion to women only for this first session. Raya was asked to discuss the distinction between philosophy and theory, and explained that a new philosophy appears only very rarely in history . . . The important point is that we are all living in the period of Marx's philosophy. He captured a whole age, and while his philosophy was based on the study of years and years of human activity, past and present, it contains the germs for the future. Theory means taking a part of the philosophy and developing it for your particular period. There are divisions in theory. You can anticipate, but only "in general", not the particular. The important period is when you are able to single out the new category, for your age.

Raya spoke of the development of the state-capitalist theory which was analyzed in 1941, but for which the humanist dimension was not re-established until 1947. Every new stage of cognition comes only when a new stage of objectivity has been reached. Thus theory means recapturing the movement that was present in the philosophy, but not real yet. What it means is that when a new force arises, you can catch it if you are rooted in the philosophy.

A 10-year-old who was present asked the last question in this first session by posing: What kind of freedom does Women's Liberation want?

The afternoon session took up the organizational questions flowing from the theoretical groundwork, and posed some of the concrete tasks of the N&L—Women's Liberation Committee specifically.

JUNE-JULY, 1972

Two Worlds**Nixon's global politicking: Phase II**By RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA,
Chairwoman, News & Letters Committees

As Commander-in-Chief, Nixon had, on May 8, announced that he had ordered the mining of Haiphong, an act of war not even LBJ had dared to commit. After 14 days of gleefully watching the bloody consequences of this unprecedented step—combined with accurate laser-bombing of railways, and indiscriminate, ceaseless bombing deep in the heartland of a country we have never declared war against—the President embarked on still another "journey for peace": the trip to Moscow.

Nixon had pulled off some very real assurances from Brezhnev that, no matter what Nixon did to destroy Vietnam, Russia would not try to stop him, and signed a SALT pact. Flashed by the victory of his second summit, Nixon staged still another spectacular, though Moscow was supposed to be all "substance," and not just "froth." Having flown from Russia to Iran, and from Iran to Poland, and from Poland directly to Andrews Air Force base, Air Force One landed on cue. Nixon transferred to the presidential helicopter which proceeded directly to the Capitol Hill steps, where all TV cameras waited to record him entering Congress to a standing ovation.

BARNUM & BAILEY, AND BREZHNEV, TOO

Barnum & Bailey couldn't have put on a greater show, not after the recent Peking extravaganza, but then they didn't have the power of the presidency. And any one who might still have thought it was impossible to outrank "the week that changed the world," was now asked to look at the real super-powers, the "substance" beneath the superabundant froth, "a new age in relationships."

It is true that Mao, too, had met with Nixon as he had escalated the Vietnam war. But Brezhnev managed to outdo Mao's welcome of Nixon. In addition to the Communiqué at the end of the eight days of talk, Brezhnev and Nixon issued "A Declaration of Principles."

The attempt to cover up Russia's betrayal of North Vietnam with a paragraph which pointed to the different views the two super-powers had on the war in Indochina was worse than hollow. The attempt to raise "peaceful co-existence" to a first principle, one demanded by "the nuclear age which leaves no alternative," could only bring to mind another unprecedented and outrageously unprincipled historic act: the Stalin-Hitler Pact which had given the green light to World War II.

Twelve points (covering everything from cultural to commercial relations and limitations of nuclear arms to which we'll return later) are listed in the infamous "Declaration of Principles" but, in truth, there is one and only one "first principle" from which all others flow and to which they all return. That first one states that the U.S. and Russia "will proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful co-existence."

BETRAYAL BY ANY OTHER NAME

The single grain of truth in Nixon's report of that summit was that three-fifths of the world's population had never known what it was to live in peace, outside of nuclear terror. The rest of that sentence was an unmitigated lie. It contended that the Moscow summit, especially SALT, would be the road to peace.

None, least of all the Vietnamese against whom Nixon was perpetrating his carnage, could have been surprised by that oily speech. But what a chill must

have run down the spines of the Vietnamese revolutionaries—those who are still alive after a quarter of a century of fighting for their national independence—as they read in this unprincipled "Declaration of Principles" about "peaceful co-existence" just when their land was being despoiled and their people napalmed by the mightiest nuclear-armed imperialist land in the world. And to hear this from "a fraternal ally" who was assuring them that its collusion with the U.S. was all for purposes of "peaceful co-existence" that was stopping a nuclear holocaust!

Betrayal by any other name is as hard to bear—and smells as badly, if not high in heaven, then in the abyssal depths of hell.

It is high time to turn to that never-never land of promised peace called strategic arms limitations treaty which, as one of the many brainwashed reporters put it will make us all "sleep more peacefully than we did when we left with President Nixon for Moscow."

THE HOOPLA OF SALT

Once Nixon began his "report" on the Moscow summit, there was no end to his flattery of Congress that he had been heretofore treating as an adversary. The reason was that SALT cannot become law until Congress approves it. He isn't concerned with the extreme Right that thinks he "gave away" too much. He knows he has given away nothing. But he wishes to appear as "the man of peace," and he never tires of his phony claim to initiating nothing short of "a generation of peace."

Actually the strategic nuclear arms limitation treaty had been ready long before he got to Moscow for the ceremonial signature. Moreover, though the economic crisis in each country is so great that both the U.S. and Russia would like to find a way of stopping some of the fantastic costs of nuclear build-up, neither trusts the other to actually undertake any serious disarmament. The hoopla continues for two reasons. One is that since each has enough to destroy the world ten times over, none loses anything by a gesture that looks like an end to build-up. The second is that it is important to try to create euphoria at home as if this treaty would permit "the reordering of priorities for welfare at home."

No one is pretending that any nuclear arms in existence will be destroyed. All that even the rulers claim is that it will freeze certain arms, at the present level. Is it true that the level reached is "frozen"?

No. For example, there is no limit either to the number of warheads or the power of each that is affixed to the missile. Here the U.S. has a great advantage since both the power and the number of warheads—MIRV—is far superior to what the Russians have.

Also, not a word had been said either of the 500 U.S. so-called tactical fighters in Europe and elsewhere, nor of Russia's 700 medium range ones aimed at Europe or wherever. And, in any case, there is no on-sight inspection of even those that are frozen at their present levels. Already the Russians are hurrying to develop MIRV since that is not among the forbidden items.

Worst of all is the rush in this country to build up all sorts of new "defenses." Should any be so naive as to think about any "reordering of priorities," or even just a lessening of defense budget, then all they have to do is listen to Laird. First, far from cutting the defense budget, an additional \$2.3 billion is being asked to meet the ceaseless bombing in Vietnam. Secondly, the U.S. is launching a program for new submarines where the Russians are supposed to be the superior. Thirdly—as if that is insufficient—there are new long-range submarine missile launch projects (ULMS) for which the military is planning to ask another \$12 billion!

6884

It isn't the Russians Nixon is trying to fool. It is the American people.

TRADE AND VIETNAM

Brezhnev-Kosygin-Podgorny desperately need trade (on favorable terms) and the "knowhow" America still has when it comes to computers. Just as in the 1930's and 1940's Stalin made a fetish of the tractor and belt-line production, Ford-style, so, in the 1970's Brezhnev is making a fetish of the computer and automation. The economic crisis, the desire to industrialize Siberia (in which Japanese technology is already involved), the fear that the U.S. might have concluded some agreement with China against Russia, all led to leaving all stops out in going through with summit, no matter what. And actually it wasn't SALT, but trade, that Russia was after, most of all. For that they were willing to give much—but Vietnam was not theirs to give.

Thus, Nixon came, he saw but he didn't conquer. He wanted more than a principled betrayal of Vietnam.

He wanted Vietnam capitulation as if it were Russia's to give. Nixon's insistence on linking trade to that "substance" (naturally not openly acknowledged) very nearly turned the Moscow summit into as great a misadventure as the Chinese. Russia, no more than China, can exact from Vietnam what the Vietnamese revolutionaries are determined to decide for themselves—their own destiny in their own hands. And for that right they have earned the solidarity of the masses of the world!

No doubt, though the only thing in trade agreed upon was to establish a commission to look into the matter, some sort of trade agreement will be initiated in July which will be nearer to election time. Nixon depends heavily on his "great achievements" in Russia to help him get elected. But the point is why wasn't a trade agreement signed in Moscow since the U.S. capitalists likewise want it badly for their economy? Ah, there is the rub; there is where Nixon had to become state-capitalist.

NIXON AS STATE-CAPITALIST

What Nixon calls "the new age of relationships" is by no means limited to global politics. It starts and remains at home. Ever since 1970 when he was overwhelmed by the totality of the crisis—from his invasion of Cambodia which brought about the greatest anti-Vietnam war outpouring, and not only of youth, through the near-collapse of the dollar on the world market and the most unprecedented trade deficit ever, to rampant inflation and unemployment—in a word, a galloping recession, Nixon embarked on shock treatment for all. Like rats leaving a sinking ship the Nixon Administration abandoned the holy "self-regulating magic market mechanism," and initiated a "new" state order. From the New Economic Policy flowed government interven-

tion in the economy, first as a freeze on wages and prices, but not profits, then as control of wages, but again not on profits. That was supposed to bring jobs—thousands upon thousands upon thousands of jobs, with capital accumulation helped by the state, but expanded investment left to private capitalists. Having become a state-capitalist overnight, the private enterpriser thought all problems solved—at least enough to assure him reelection next time around.

Here it is a year later, and the profits have skyrocketed but the unemployment has remained as steady as a rock. The private capitalists who know exactly what rise in labor productivity means (and are as greedy as only their unconscionable souls can be), not only introduced more automation, but failed to hire any new labor.

Instead of thousands of new jobs, labor was speeded up. Instead of openings for "Black capitalism," big capital kept eating up little capital. And instead of new openings for returning vets or for youth, especially Black youth, the U.S. remains a series of closed corporations. They are doing almost nothing to stop inflation—not when the government keeps jacking up its non-profitable expenditures (a never-ending destructive military complex), its bureaucracy, its trade deficits, and ever-expanding budgets.

The Stabilization Act of 1970 stabilized nothing but profits. The Productivity Commission got its wish—labor has never been more strangled in wages and speeded-up in production. And now the Government has to face Congress with showing a whopping \$26 billion deficit for 1972, a new bureaucratic apparatus to control wages and prices but not the rising government debt.

Nixon is ready to stop talking about bringing employment down to an "acceptable level," and ready, instead, to define "prosperity" as end of inflation, but on that he is demanding that Big Capital help him before inflation erodes all of his victories. Hence, he withheld trade agreement with the Russians. Hence he is holding out the prospect of lush Russian contracts—if, if, if. There will no longer be any separation of economics from politics—which is precisely what state-capitalism is.

On the other hand, it all ends where it always has with capitalism, private or state, with the capital-labor relationship. For unless that is mollified—especially the restless Black dimension—nothing, absolutely nothing, will work.

THE PROBLEM IS HERE

The carnage in Vietnam is exposing the Big Lie about "winding down the war" even as it relates to bringing "the American boys back home." The latest transfer of GIs from Vietnam to Thailand hardly brings them home or assures their not dying just because the lawless and murderous flights originate at Thailand rather than South Vietnamese bases. Not only does the unemployment refuse to go away, but, as against the "average" 8% unemployment, unemployment among veterans is 8%, and among the vets in the age group 20-24 it is 10.4%. And it is twice as high among Blacks. As for the inflation, which likewise was supposed to go away with the Phase II price freeze, it keeps ever going up along with the profits above and the restlessness of the masses below. In a word, what Nixon has returned to is a country full of crises, heightened by the white racism he has helped bring to a white heat, from Wallace to his Supreme Court. Now that he has succeeded also in getting Congress to roll back the clock of history by legislating anti-busing racist education, he must face the Black disgust which wants not only to bring him down, but to change the whole system.

In a word, "the new international relations" he is supposed to have established in Russia, are bringing about peace neither abroad nor at home. At home what he will be compelled to face is not "peaceful co-existence" but the eye of the storm.

TWO WORLDS

Ways to combat 'Pax Americana'

(Editor's Note: Below are brief excerpts from three sections of the draft Perspectives Report for the coming convention of News & Letters Committees. The full report can be ordered from N&L for 35c plus 15c postage.)

The Vietnam War and Global Summity

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 Lai 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 . . .

Racism, State-Capitalism—and Global Summity

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...

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 be seen in the film, "The Sorrow and The 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 . . .

The Almost-Revolution and the Almost-Dialectic

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 equiv-

alent 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 II 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."

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.

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, provide 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 . . .

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

(Editor's Note: Below are excerpts from the Introduction and Part I of the *Perspectives Report* delivered to the Convention of News & Letters, Sept. 2, by Raya Dunayevskaya. The full report can be ordered from N&L for 50c plus 15c postage.)

LORD NIXON, OR SUPER-PATRIOTISM AS LAST REFUGE OF SCOUNDRELS

We've all recently suffered through a deluge of words from the euphoria-ridden Republican Convention, which deprived all words of any meaning. . . .

From the start, "honorable peace" meant to Nixon transformation into opposite: 1) Vietnam war turned into a full-scale Indochina war; 2) bringing of the wars abroad home against the anti-war American youth, against Blacks, and finally against labor; and 3) Vietnamization — i.e., carrying on the Vietnam War to the last Vietnamese, or exchanging the color of the dead bodies.

To see these in a world context, we need to take into account still another word—invented by Kissinger as cover up for the greatest nuclear colossus of the world: Pentagonal.

Whatever Freudian slip of the pen entered into the coining of a word bearing such striking resemblance to our Pentagon-run world, the intellectual had in mind, not the residence of the military staff of the imperialist colossus. Rather, the intellectual was out to prove the existence of the many powers. . . .

A PENTAGONAL WORLD? OR A STATE-CAPITALIST WORLD IN CRISIS AND DISARRAY?

Let's begin with Japan, since that is the country to which, it was said, just last year, the 21st century belonged.

In industrial strength, Japan certainly is a giant. Came 1971, and that nuclear imperialistic colossus, USA, slapped a tax on Japanese imports that forced the Japanese industrial giant to discover its clay feet, stuck in the quagmire of too many exports in a world market that is both Western-oriented and state-capitalistically controlled. At once, politics and economics fused. . . .

No, Japan is not a "pentagonal" power in a non-existent pentagonal nuclear world.

FOR THAT MATTER, take a true nuclear titan which certainly is challenging the U.S. the world around — Russia. We have heard a great deal as to how "superior" Russia is to the U.S. in some fields, how it is the only one to make headway in the Middle East, and has more submarines, and the equivalent of MIRV — and how we just must not stop doing the same.

People, however, do not eat ICBMs. The discontent of the Russian masses, though not as obvious as that in the East European countries, is there. . . . The truth is that both in absolute terms and in decisive industries, Russia is "receding", not "surpassing" the USA.

Where Russia does have the advantage over the U.S. is on the ideological front. Counter-revolutionary state-capitalist society was born out of a revolution; though it was transformed into its absolute opposite, Russia does remember the betrayed revolution's words. Leszek Kolakowski may still hope Communism can be "reformed" (under pressure, of course). Trotskyism may continue to speak of revolution while it tall-ends Stalinist nationalized property. And Herbert Marcuse may remember that one needs at least one technologically advanced land whose proletariat "could" help the third world, which "should" learn about some sort of "peaceful co-existence" with such a land as Russia. But the truth is that Russia is out for world mastery just as is U.S. imperialism.

FOR THAT MATTER, so is Mao's China, which, at least since the 1960's, has been motivated by a single "principle", that it has never openly announced but always practiced: Russia is Enemy No. 1, and must be so recognized by the "revolutionary movement" the world over. Just now it is gloating over Egypt's expulsion of the Soviet "advisors." Sadat did not expel Russian imperialism for revolutionary perspectives, but only in order to exchange, or at least bargain for more, be it from American imperialism or Qaddafi's militaristic Islamism. . . . China does more now to clothe outright imperialism and genocidal warfare in a Pakistan in Marxist language and play the Uriah Heep "little

people" game than even Russia, which has the greater counter-revolutionary experience.

It is no accident that Mao, who understands power very well indeed, wanted first and foremost to learn all about atomic power. His disdain for any fear of it may have shocked Nehru straight out of his wits in 1957, but insofar as Mao was concerned, the moment it was clear that Russia would not let him be privy to that power, the parting of the ways of the two "Communist" powers was inevitable.

And it is no accident that though in all other respects, China is still a most backward country where per capita income is one of the lowest in the world — \$145 per capita per year, China at once gave priority to the military. . . . In three years it did what it took more industrialized and richer France eight years to achieve. And this year, 1972, China deployed a handful of new missiles with a range of 2500 miles. (Moscow is less than that from Chinese soil.)

This does not mean that they are yet a match for Russia's awesome nuclear power, but China did begin to look like a serious threat to Russia in the wake of China's flirtations with U.S. imperialism, which was transformed by Mao from Enemy No. 1 into one for whom the red carpet was rolled out.

IN A WORD, whether it is Russia, which has become an industrial power, but not the equal of U.S. imperialism, or whether it is China, which is nowhere near the U.S. or Russia—the "equalizer" in a nuclear world is the bomb. . . .

But would the beginnings of nuclear know-how — if you were in the center of Europe, faced Russia on the one hand, and, on the other hand, did not have the so-called nuclear umbrella of the U.S.—really make you a global power by economic strength alone? Let's examine Western Europe and see. Let's go on the assumption that it is a unified pentagonal entity — which it isn't. But it is an economic power. Its GNP is no less than \$640 billion — that is, two-thirds of the strength of the U.S., no mean wealth.

1973 is supposed to be its "year of decision", as not only Great Britain becomes part of the Common Mar-

(Continued on Page 7)

ket, finally, but both France and West Germany face elections after very critical periods, especially in "Social Democratic" West Germany which initiated so phenomenal a turning point in post World War II politics as Ostpolitik.

Nevertheless, far from meaning a united West Europe, West Germany's new independence in its political stance was the major reason for France finally voting Great Britain into the Common Market . . .

What was needed, in France's eyes that looked at the land mass all the way to the Urals as "Europe", its Europe, were a great many "counterweights". It is smiling at NATO again and rushing headlong right back to deGaulism, as it fears that May 1968 may not be quite as dead as it had thought.

That Russia now considers Ostpolitik a great victory for itself (and has made East Germany toe the line accordingly) itself shows a very changed world from 1964 when Khrushchev's very mention of contemplating a trip to West Germany contributed mightily to his downfall.

But what kind of change? Ah, there is the rub.

THE REALIGNMENTS are not of a class nature. They are inter-imperialist, inter-state-capitalist realignments, all aimed against the proletariat, the internal class enemy. And that class enemy, not in Ostpolitik of West Germany, but in true East Europe, has not stopped revolting for two full decades . . .

There is no doubt whatever that it is precisely because of the economic crisis, the class discontent, the alienated restless youth, new forces of rebellion (watch how the nationality problem worries a Tito and brings ever new strains in both East and West Europe)—that the changes have come. But to conclude from this that the Cold War is over, that there are multi-centers of nearly equal power, is to substitute the convolutions of one's own head, for the class reality.

The class reality shows that the richest, the mightiest super power, U.S. imperialism — West Europe's, like Japan's "nuclear umbrella" — has not only not escaped from any of the ordinary ills of private capitalism, but likewise has had to plunge into a form of state-capitalism.

Let's examine the Nixon-style in the NEP, so tightly tied to the ceaseless Vietnam War, and we will see that there has been no stopping of what Marx long ago called "the law of motion of capitalist production", which like a tidal wave carries capitalism to its downfall, even where this concerns the single mightiest power on earth.

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya,
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

The intellectual's alienated life in a world in crisis and disarray, his organic empiricism and isolation from the worker, bid fair to inundate us with still more books on the "backwardness" of the proletariat. As if the 308 pages of *Alienation** weren't proof enough of that being its underlying concept, Bertell Ollman, its author, informs us: "I intend to explore the workers' difficulty in attaining class consciousness in greater detail in a forthcoming work." (p. 307)

This promise is no individualistic exception. Hard as it is to believe that academia will once again attempt to return us to the McCarthyite 1950's when bourgeois intellectuals were busy proclaiming an "end to ideology," the Nixon age unnerves even some intellectuals sympathetic to Marx. This has been a fact of life ever since the near-revolutions in 1968 proved to be still-births. Not only does the mass passion for a philosophy of liberation, when so many aborted revolutions are all about us, appear incomprehensible to the intellectual separated from the workers by a wall of books, but Marx's works themselves, if not totally incomprehensible, get so fragmented as to become abstract, losing their proletarian pivot as well as their dialectic totality.

Thus, where the left intellectual, in the activist mid-1960's, would not have thought of trying to bring about a division between Marx's theory of alienated labor and its inseparable absolute opposite "the quest for universality," the same intellectual, in the early 1970's, strives so intensely to be original as to attribute to Marx a theory of human nature he never enunciated, while denying Marx his new continent of thought—historical materialism as a "new Humanism." Professor Ollman acts as if the "attempt to make Marxism 'respectable' to a hostile American public" compelled Erich Fromm

* *Alienation*, by Bertell Ollman, Cambridge University Press, N.Y., 1971.

Pitting 'human nature' against Marx's humanism

"to abstract his (Marx's) remarks on human nature from the rest of his theories in order to present him as a humanist." (p. 75)

THE UNITY OF IDEALISM & MATERIALISM

It wasn't Fromm, but Marx, who spelled out his new Humanism as "a thoroughgoing Naturalism, or Humanism, (which) distinguishes itself both from Idealism and Materialism, and is; at the same time, the truth uniting both . . . (and alone) capable of grasping the act of world history." (1) Moreover, this historic unity of idealism and materialism was expressed by Marx over and over again throughout the now famous *Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, 1844* that dealt so profoundly with the concept of alienation which is the centerpiece of Ollman's book.

So determined was Marx, in his critique of capitalistic alienated labor, to present the absolute opposite of this—labor as creative activity—that he separated himself also from "vulgar communism" which thinks that alienated labor can be abolished through the abolition of private property. Marx, held that, crucial as it is to abolish private property, a new form of property (though it be collective) would not abolish what is most dehumanizing in all class societies: the division between mental and manual labor.

Therefore, though he credits communism with being "transcendence of private property," he concludes: "Only by the transcendence of this mediation, which is nevertheless a necessary presupposition, does there arise positive Humanism, beginning from itself." That, and that alone, would denote the end of the pre-history of mankind imposed by class society, and begin the true self-development of men and women and children by creating the new human dimensions which can come only with total freedom. Then, and only then, would we

(1) There are many translations finally available of the Humanist essays of Marx, but I was the first to translate them for the American public, and I am quoting that translation which appeared as Appendix to the first (1958) edition of *Marxism and Freedom*.

know "human nature." Then, and only then, would a new society initiate "the development of human power which is its own end." (2)

Ollman would not deny this. Why then could this scholarly left intellectual not grasp the dialectics of Marx's analysis of alienation and humanism, of the capital/labor relationship not merely as an "internal" versus an "external" relationship, but as so antagonistic a class relationship that he couldn't possibly have written so narrowly, so one-sidedly and in so non-revolutionary a manner as Ollman about alienated labor, i.e., the very subject who is destined to achieve self-emancipation?

DIALECTICS VS. EMPIRICISM

Far from having to go in for abstractions as to "human nature" to get a view of "future" "communist" society, as the professor has him do, Marx was most specifically, rigorously and solely concerned with the concrete capitalistic society under which he lived, its "law of motion," its antagonistic class duality, its reified labor (its reified labor, not reified products) out of which, nevertheless, dialectically emerges the "new passions and new forces" for uprooting the old and reconstructing society on totally new, humanist foundations.

Just as Marx couldn't have written of capital without writing of its opposite, its gravedigger, so he couldn't have written about the theory of alienation without its opposite, the philosophy of liberation Marx called "the new Humanism."

(Continued on Page 7)

(2) It is important to hold in mind that this is not from the early Humanist essays, but from Marx's greatest mature theoretical work, *Capital* (Vol. III, p. 954). This does not mean, as Bertell Ollman implies, that Marx's 30 years of mature work was a matter of gathering "supporting material" for his early works. That unhistorical view tells the whole story about Ollman's disregard of Marx's self-development as well as of the historical development itself in those critical three decades when Marx was writing *Capital*.

DIALECTICS VS. LINGUISTICS

The trouble with Professor Ollman, as with all empiricists, is that he has reduced dialectics to a question of linguistics. The very first chapter of his book on Marx—"With Words Like Bats"—holds that Parot has thereby made the most "profound observations . . . on our subject" for "one can see in them (bats) both birds and mice." (p. 3) That attitude carries through the last chapter in which he writes: "If Marx is given highest marks for creating Marxism, he can only be given a mediocre rating for his skills as a communicator." (p. 236) This is hardly an original critique on the part of academia. The great English economist, Joan Robinson, told me in all seriousness that she wished Marx had told all his views to Engels and had him present Marx's discoveries since Engels wouldn't have had Hegel "stick his nose between Ricardo and me."

Ollman does her one better. He invents words for Marx! Marx's whole philosophy of liberation, his analysis of the law of motion of capitalist production, along with the antagonistic capital/labor production relationship, get subsumed under Ollman's description of Marxism as a "philosophy of internal relations." In pursuance of his original "discovery," especially the capitalization of Relation, miracles are indeed wrought in "Marx's vocabulary" as Ollman not only treats Marx and Engels as one on the very subject—dialectics—on which they most certainly were not identical (as none, indeed, knew better than Engels), but elevates Dietzgen's primitive dialectics as the equivalent of Marx and Hegel! (3)

I doubt that a single worker will understand Professor Ollman's "vocabulary," but to the extent that it has helped some intellectuals understand Marx's historic analysis of reality (judging by the rave reviews *Alienation* has received), to that extent it has made a contribution which will, of necessity, send them to the study of Marx's work themselves. Or so we hope.

(3) Marx did all he could to spread Dietzgen's writings because he was a worker and did try to grapple with dialectics, but in the serious correspondence about him, he bemoaned the fact that Dietzgen hadn't studied Hegel. As he put it in his letter to Engels on Oct. 4, 1888: "My opinion is that J. Dietzgen would do best to condense all his ideas into two printer's sheets . . . If he publishes them in the size he is proposing, he will discredit himself by the lack of dialectical development . . ."

NOVEMBER, 1972

China-Japan treaty paves way to build new world power axis in Asia

by Peter Mallory

The brief communique issued after five long days of discussions in Peking between the Prime Ministers of China and Japan from Sept. 26-30 conceals a great deal more than it reveals of the new world situation. It was clear from Nixon's journey to China that even cold-war warriors had decided that the time has arrived to brush away the ruinous nonsense of ignoring the most populous nation on earth, and begin to face reality. But the speed with which Tanaka concluded a new agreement with China was a shocker.

Although all preceded it was but a "natural follow-up" to Nixon's earlier journey to Peking, the truth is that not only is the China-Japan treaty a great deal more substantive, but a wholly new power-relationship has arisen in Asia.

For one thing, Tanaka wasted little time in establishing diplomatic relations, while Nixon employed more "face saving" gestures than Orientals commonly use. For another, the trade advantages will be both substantial and immediate.

OF TRADE, MILITARISM, AND OTHER THINGS

This is not only a question of the usual capitalistic lust for lush markets Japan hopes to get in China, or to ease the U.S.-Japanese balance of trade, which is such a total disaster that U.S. put extra pressures on Japan to sell its goods elsewhere. Rather, Tanaka's leap into trade was way in advance of anything conceived by Nixon.

Nixon may have thought that he was using China to discipline Japan by threatening possible new alliances, and then humoring Japan by showing it new avenues for the surplus Japan had been dumping on the American market. Bound by such grandiose illusions empires fall.

Neither China nor Japan, however, were following Nixon's script. Quite the contrary. Japan is now using China to get some elbow room from U.S.'s overpowering grip, even as China is using Japan to gain some elbow room for itself away from Russia's grip. Meanwhile neither the U.S. nor Japan's "abandonment" of Taiwan means any break in trade relations with Taiwan. The billions invested by both in Taiwan will not be withdrawn. Gradually the missions will be named "trade mission" and the output of Taiwan will continue to flow into the markets of the world.

The real elbow room is not in Taiwan. The first thing Tanaka did upon returning to Tokyo is announce that Japan will double its military budget by 1976, beginning the increase at once and beginning at once to build her own fighter planes instead of depending wholly on the U.S. And that trade U.S. imperialism did wish, but the urging that Japan should continue to buy all jet fighters from the U.S. because it was "cheaper" was disregarded by Tanaka.

WHY IS CHINA READY TO FORGET ALL?

The Joint communique issued by China and Japan on Sept. 29 expressed joint "friendship." While Japan had to do no more than say it was "sorry" for its past aggressions against China, China in fact gave up a great deal. Nothing was specified of the 41 years of Japan's attacks against her, beginning back in 1891 with the seizure of Manchuria, nor even the outright continuous military invasion 35 years ago, and continuing through World War II. Moreover China gave up all claims to war reparations. Considering how much other

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from Page 1)

countries invaded by Japanese militarists for much briefer periods had gained from Japan, that was no little thing to give up.

The indecent speed with which such continuous imperialist warfare against her was swept under the lush Chinese rugs, not to mention the silence on the present Japanese militarization Chou En-lai had been loudly talking about to American reporters just a few months back, makes it necessary to take a second look at that brief communique. The new element was not in giving up reparations, nor in the proclamation of "friendship."

The new element was global. It resides in a single statement that not only are China and Japan supposedly not seeking "hegemony in the Asian-Pacific area" but that "each country is opposed to the efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony." This innocent appearing clause is aimed especially against Russia, and therein lies the whole "secret" of China's readiness "to forget all."

GLOBALLY SPEAKING

The anti-Russian stand has been the dominant factor in China's politics ever since the Sino-Soviet conflict came into the open in 1960, reached one type of climax during the border incidents with Russia in 1969, and has been moving globally with the rolling out of the red carpet first to Nixon and now to Tanaka.

Clearly, Mao was as anxious for new relations with Japan as Japan with China, and not only for economic reasons, but also with the political aim of undermining Russia's equally opportunistic goal when it sought agreements with Japan to industrialize Siberia. No doubt the whole idea of Russian-Japanese joint exploitation of Siberia's natural resources will have to be re-negotiated now that Japan has a few more cards up her sleeves.

If shivers run down Nixon's spine as he sees what a Pandora's box his little exploratory experiment in new global alignments has opened up, he isn't letting on. Which doesn't mean he isn't aware that the new stature Japan has gained in Asia was not just as a great industrial power, but as a political "friend" of China. Already some of the pundits are reminding the Administration that with China being the most populous nation in the world, and Japan the most industrial in Asia, the U.S. should not pressure Japan too hard.

Japan, for its part, has already informed the U.S. that it will not revalue the yen "unilaterally," no matter what pressures are put upon her — unless there is an "international agreement." Although politicians and

pundits alike are relying on the "natural," that is to say class, interests that bind the U.S. and Japan, none are forgetting the double-crosses they are also expert at playing. If Stalin-Hitler could negotiate a military pact, there is no reason to exclude the possibility of a Chinese-Japanese alliance.

AND WHERE IS THE NEW LEFT?

Big Power politics plays many deadly games, all at the expense of the masses, especially those in their own countries. There will be more than one double-cross among the Big Powers and the little ones when the chips are down. That isn't the concern. What is of concern is the silence of the Left which can sow illusions in the masses.

In desperation over the new reality, the Left has taken to talking about such irrelevancies as the Leninist stand on "monopoly of foreign trade" and elections. The truth is that the decisive anti-Vietnam war movement is being paralyzed as much by the Sino-Soviet orbit and conflict, as by Nixon's genocidal war (See Editorial, p. 4).

The silence of the "new left" on these events shows how anxious they are to take the China-Japan communique only at face value and to evade the fact that China is playing global politics with militaristic Japan

as well as with Nixon carrying on a genocidal war in Viet Nam.

In the game of global politics it is clear that both Russia and China are quite willing to betray North Vietnam for the sake of their "larger" national and world objectives, just as eventually Nixon will abandon the many new openings to the so-called Communist World for his Pax Americana.

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Editor's Note: When the daily papers carried a story that Cuba intended to keep three Black hijackers, Henry Jackson, Lewis Moore, and Melvin Cole, "in 4 by 4 by 4 ft. cells," we received several letters from Black readers, shocked beyond belief, who asked, "What has happened to the Cuban Revolution? And what is your position?" Below is what Raya Dunayevskaya had written December, 1960, only one year after the Cuban Revolution shook off American imperialism. Other articles will follow as the trial of the Black hijackers opens, and the underlying global politics is disclosed.

The Cuban Revolution: The Year After

In a few weeks the Cuban Revolution will mark the first year of its victory. It is no accident that its enthusiastic and uncritical alliance with the Russian orbit of power is almost as old. Contrary to the claims of the old radicals, who can no longer remember what constitutes principled working-class politics, this was not the only path open to it when it shook off the American imperialist yoke. The revolutions that preceded it—in the Middle East and in Africa—took advantage of the global division into two nuclear-armed blocs fighting for world power to play off one against the other to its own national advantage. If Cuba chose to disregard this precedent and align itself with but one of these power blocs, the answer cannot lie outside of itself.

FIDELISMO

Forget Russia for a moment—it was nowhere around when Fidel Castro marched into Havana at the head of the July 26th guerilla movement. Neither it nor the native Cuban Communists supported that movement during the seven years it hid out in the Sierra Maestra Mountains. The revolutionary petty-bourgeois lawyer who led this movement had been so little concerned with Communist theory that he gained financial help from many a Cuban, and even some American, liberal bourgeois who had had their fill of the corrupt Batista.

The guerilla fighters from the mountains, the peasants in the Oriente province, the proletariat and students of Havana merged to bring the greatest revolu-

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

STATE-ISM

As for Castro's attitude to the industrial workers, from the very start his bossist, administrative mentality stuck out from the very first day of victorious entry into Havana when he demanded that the revolutionary students and workers there put down their arms. He proclaimed his movement alone to be the government, his army alone the army. Nevertheless, the overwhelming enthusiasm for the revolution made the proletariat, despite its reservations, lay down its arms, and willingly tighten its belt even as the unemployed continued to be silent. When it did, in due course, at the first trade union congress question some economic policies of the new government, Castro ran out of the convention, calling it a "madhouse."

It is at this point that a kinship was established between the new regime and the native Communists, for it is they who used their leadership of the trade unions to transform them into a pliant tool of the new armed state. Together with world communism Fidel Castro shared the conception of the "backwardness of the masses" who had to be led. The State would henceforward give the orders, the workers and peasants would continue to work harder while the leaders continued to lead and set foreign policy.

Just as the peasant found that, in tilling the soil, he was responsible, not to a committee elected by himself and subject to his recall, but to the state, so the worker found that he too had no organization responsible to him. Despite the lower rents, there has been no change, except for the worse, in the workers' conditions of life and labor. Unemployment continues as do poor wages. Worst of all, there are no Workers' Councils or any other form of free expression whether in their own organization

or in the press. Those who had hailed the revolution had by now as little freedom to criticize any action of the government least of all its total embrace of all things Russian, Chinese, East European, including the bloody regime of Kadar's Hungary.

The stream of refugees are by no means restricted to "Batista's supporters" or "agents of American imperialism." Every one from the editor of *Bohemia* to militant trade unionists have attempted to escape; and if the price isn't always the firing squad, it is always silence. When only a Castro-Fidel or Raul—or a Che Guevara have endless voice here and abroad while the masses are made voiceless; when all spontaneously becomes hypostatized into state grooves; when relations with the outside world are not as people-to-people but through armed-state powers; and when all this occurs in a world whose division into two nuclear-armed powers which threaten humanity's very existence— isn't it time for a new realistic balance sheet to be drawn up? Least helpful in this regard are the old radicals.

OLD RADICALS

Trotskyists, who have spent years in exposing Russia as "a degenerated workers' state" headed by a counter-revolutionary bureaucracy, now feel that it is necessary to whitewash that regime "in order to fight the main enemy, Yankee imperialism." Even some radicals who have spent many years exposing Russian Communism as just another form of state capitalism feel that it is their "revolutionary duty" to spend all their time attacking American imperialism, and none exposing the other pole of world imperialism—Russian totalitarianism.

What is it that impels such self-imposed blindness to the tragedy of the Cuban Revolution which still has a chance to compel its leaders to follow an independent road? Why should the workers and peasants in Cuba be allowed to think that in the Chinese "commune" the Chinese peasants are any less oppressed than the Cubans were by the American plantation owners? Why should the Cuban workers be kept in ignorance of conditions of labor in totalitarian state capitalist Russia? Why should the Cuban people know that the Guantanamo base is a threat to their existence and not know that the

(Continued on Page 8)

Russian tanks rolled over the Hungarian Freedom Fighters? Why should they only know of the discrimination against the Negroes in the South but not know of the extermination of nationalities opposed to Stalinism in Russia?

Why should literacy be equated to illiteracy of the realities of a world divided into two, and only two, nuclearly armed powers out for conquest of the world? Why not allow your new hero, Castro, to know some things about Russia—its cynicism in foreign policy—which might easily result in its dropping of Cuba the minute it could get a "peaceful co-existence alliance" with America? Why, for that matter, not make yourself aware that this petty bourgeois lawyer is just as cynical and could as easily slide into alliance with the American State Department if it came to face the only truly independent third force—the masses wishing to mold their own destiny in their own minds sans Fidel Castro, Che Guevara and the newly-arisen state bureaucracy?

There is one reason, and one reason only, behind all this self-imposed blindness to the realities of our state capitalistic world. One and all are Planners who fear the spontaneity of the revolutionary masses more than anything else on earth, including state capitalism.

Fidelistos, like Communists, Trotskyists like other radicals who thirst for power, share the capitalistic mentality of the "backwardness of the masses." All are ready "to lead," none to listen.

It has been said of Jesus: "He could save all others. Himself he could not save." It needs now to be said of the old radicals: They could save no one, and now they do not even want to save themselves. The one consoling feature is their impotence. Far from being capable of dooming the revolution, history will show them to be the doomed ones.

6894



JANUARY, 1973

Two Worlds**Russia, China bring pressure on Hanoi to accept Pax Americana**

By Raya Dunayevskaya,

National Chairwoman, News & Letters Committees

The Deputy Premier of North Vietnam, Le Thanh Nghi, suddenly flew into Paris on Dec. 10 as the Le Duc Tho-Kissinger talks were in recess; but the technicians were in session, General Haigh had flown to Washington, and the rumors of peace were countless. The Deputy Premier had come directly from Moscow, where the day before he had concluded a new agreement with Russia for "large-scale deliveries of goods, equipment and other property of great significance."

The "large-scale deliveries" have been infinitesimal in relationship to what the U.S. has been pouring into South Vietnam and were also less, even in Russian terms, than what Russia had given to Egypt. Nevertheless, the present timing and the pressures put on North Vietnam, ever since the U.S. mining of Haiphong went unchallenged by Russia, have indeed opened a new stage.

THE TINY CARROT AND THE BIG STICK

China, which had been giving even less to its "great socialist ally," had likewise dangled a little carrot and a big stick to make North Vietnam forget 25 long years of struggle and battle victories for independence, and instead, accept U.S. imperialism's phony peace offers. Ever since it had unrolled the red carpet for Nixon, China, like Russia, worked for Nixon's victory at the polls, which Chou proclaimed to be "good news because he did play a role in improving relations between the U.S. and China."

China's criticism of Russia on this question was its usual forked-tongue kind: "The Soviet Union has publicly expressed the wish to see the war in Vietnam come to an end. But it is very difficult to differentiate between their true and false words."

For that matter so did Nixon promise North Vietnam "to help rebuild it" at the very time he was carrying on the genocidal bombing of the country and the unprecedented mining of its harbors. Anything, anything at all, in order to get North Vietnam's signature to a piece of paper that would create the illusion of peace while everyone sets about to prepare the battle lines for the next war.

That three such opposing big powers as the U.S., Russia and China can all be out for the same thing—to christen a temporary truce, bent toward saving more than the face of Nixon-Thieu, a veritable "generation of peace"—shows the abysmal depths of global politicking out to still the movement of freedom for national independence. Whether or not the long-promised end of the Vietnam war, even if only in a "cease-fire" form, is achieved this month, the point is that it is not only U.S. imperialism that will not change its class nature, neither will the Sino-Soviet world.

The fact that Both Russia and China want the war ended doesn't mean they both wish the same thing. Each wants to be the dominant force—and not only in North Vietnam but in Southeast Asia. Yet the very fact that China can still look "revolutionary" makes it imperative that we probe deeper into its present role.

WHAT ABOUT CAMBODIA AND . . . ?

All Chou had to say on the question of Cambodia is that it was "more complicated" than the question of North Vietnam. That certainly isn't all he had to

say before Nixon's visit to China. Quite the contrary. The one time that China acted in a revolutionary way was at the time of the U.S. invasion of Cambodia. Moreover, this was not merely because it attacked U.S. imperialism's invasion; Russia did as much. Nor was it only because, unlike Russia, China did not continue its relations with the Noi counter-revolutionary regime and gave sanctuary to Prince Sihanouk.

Rather it was because China had the good sense to stay in the background while the Khmer revolutionaries of Cambodia, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong, as well as the revolutionary forces from Laos and Thailand, met to work for a united fight against U.S. imperialism in the whole of Indochina.

All this changed the minute the flirtation with U.S. imperialism became serious. All talk of the "continuous revolution" becomes nothing but a whitewash for a "philosophy" of counter-revolution as Mao's China sets out to double-cross Cambodia and help betray North Vietnam.

What has characterized China as well as Russia ever since those fateful meetings with Nixon is that their ally, North Vietnam, counts for nothing at all. And when North Vietnam dared to continue its own battle in the spring offensive last year, both Russia and China were big on words and nil on action as U.S. imperialism reacted with the most massive bombing ever. There is, in fact, evidence enough that Nixon planned this in full confidence that Russia and China would not come seriously to the defense of North Vietnam. The whole operation against Hanoi was carefully planned to coincide with the announcements of trips to China and Russia.

THE UNHEARD VOICE

North Vietnam's plea (Aug. 17, Nhan Dan editorial) read: ". . . to carry out the 'Nixon doctrine' U.S. imperialists have applied the policy of reconciliation toward a number of big powers in the hope of having a free hand to consolidate their forces, oppose the world revolutionary movement, suppress the revolution at home, bully the small countries, break the national liberation movement while not relinquishing its plan to prepare a new world war . . . if out of the narrow interests of one's nation, one tries to help the most reactionary forces avert the dangerous blows, (it is) just like throwing a life-buoy to a drowning pirate . . ."

The fact that Russia and China can march in opposite directions so long as each one's national interests are concerned, and yet hit against the same target once there is an independent movement for national liberation, shows just how alike are these state-capitalist countries calling themselves Communist. That has been the characteristic ever since the Sino-Soviet orbit became the Sino-Soviet conflict in 1960. But never before have their actions been so tied in with the dominant world imperialist power, the U.S.

The tragic truth is that to each of these "Communist" big powers, the Other, not the U.S., is Enemy Number One.

North Vietnam, in peace as in war, will remain a

battleground where the relationship among the Communist-powers becomes the more incestuous the more it moves to the "ideological field."

Neither Russia nor China has any intention of letting the other be the dominant "influence" in North Vietnam. The jockeying for position started long before the latest economic agreement between the U.S. and Russia. As soon as the first "feelers for peace" were put forth, China at once announced it would under no circumstances participate in another type of Geneva agreement that had settled the first Indochina war.

What it meant was it will not participate in anything where Russia has a voice. The latest rumors hinted that Russia would not be part of the "international commission" to supervise the peace but Poland and Hungary, along with Indonesia and Britain, would. Despite the fantastic 1965 massacre of Chinese and hundreds of thousands of Indonesian Communists who had followed the Mao line, even Indonesia seemed preferable to China. In any case Chou En-Lai has let it be known that China intends to have veto power on any "international guarantees."

In a word, North Vietnam's problems are by no means ended; they are simply moving to a different level. Why then are some in the "New Left" still entertaining illusions about Mao's "continuous revolution"? Surely it isn't because of any "revolutionary" actions on the part of China, since it joined the UN and vetoed Bangladesh's request for entry. Surely it isn't because of any of its actions anywhere in the world from Pakistan to Palestine and from Yugoslavia to the counter-revolutionary assault on its own left, the Sheng Wu-Lien, and the destruction of Lin Piao.

"CULTURE" VS. REVOLUTION

No, the truth is that in our state-capitalist age the administrative mentality has long ago replaced confidence in proletarian revolution. Every leader is out for "a shortcut," even though that be via protracted war, an outflanking not only of cities but of the self-activity of the masses which they fear most of all.

Everything and anything that can be done to lessen the hard labor of leadership needed to work out a new relationship of theory to practice is touted because it is so much easier to rest on some state power, to lean on The Leader, to substitute the thought of One, "the helmsman."

And Mao is a genius in the brainwashing of intellectuals! Presently he claims, and the "New Left" agrees, that by the chaos of 1966-69 he has saved China "from taking the capitalist road like Russia" and that in a July 1968 letter to his wife at the very outset of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" he questioned both Lin Piao's "revolutionary elan" and "rightism."

Mao genuflectors like Han Suyin are busy spreading the word that Lin Piao was, at one and the same time, "the real backer of the ultra-left" and a rightist and a "dissembler": "... Lin Piao is worse than all other 'dissemblers' because he is guilty of parricide, for the attempt to kill one's teacher is to kill one's spiritual father." (New York Times, Aug. 27, 1972).

The question however is: Who ordered that the Cultural Revolution be stopped if it was not Mao? Who united with "Enemy Number One," USA imperialism, if it was not Mao? Who except Mao ordered as big a turnabout in relations with Tanaka's Japan? And who except his co-Communist enemy, Russia, is now compelling the Vietnamese revolutionaries to accept Pax Americana?

The tragedy is that Vietnam is not merely geographically the key to Southeast Asia but is, above all, the only revolutionary force that brought the American Goliath to its knees and could also expose the clay feet of the Sino-Soviet world, in orbit or in conflict. If the New Left cannot see this staggering truth, if they cannot transform the anti-Vietnam war movement into a movement for social revolution, then the state capitalist age has won. That cannot be, that must not be. The self-activity of the masses will see that it will not be.

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Part I

1973 marks the 50th anniversary of the publication of *History and Class Consciousness*, and is sure to increase the deluge of articles, pamphlets and even whole books about its late famous author, George Lukacs. These have been pouring forth the past few years from both the New Left (1) and the official Communist press.

1956 STANDS BETWEEN 1923 AND 1973

In 1956, on the other hand, when Lukacs briefly participated in the Hungarian Revolution despite a full quarter century of capitulation to Stalinism, the Hungarian Communists who helped the Russian counter-revolution destroy the revolution and execute its leader, Imre Nagy, expelled Lukacs from the Party and unleashed still another vitriolic attack on his 1923 seminal study on Hegelian-Marxian dialectics.

The tragedy lies not in any change in the stance of the Communist Party between 1973 and 1956; it hasn't changed its counter-revolutionary nature ever since the first workers' state, Russia, was transformed into its absolute opposite, a state-capitalist society. The tragedy lies in two altogether different spheres. One is Lukacs' new, monumental work, *Social Ontology*, which he considered the greatest of his life, which he was completing when he died on June 4, 1971. Whether only because this philosophic work was abstract enough to be incompre-

(1) As one example, see *TELOS*, which not only devoted two special issues (Winter 1971 and Spring 1972) plus a "memorial statement" (Spring 1971), but this was preceded by a detailed study by Paul Piccone, "Lukacs' *History and Class-Consciousness*, Half a Century Later" in the Fall 1969 issue. See also a book of essays, *The Unknown Dimension*, edited by Dick Howard and Karl E. Klare (Basic Books, N.Y., for a hefty \$12.50).

Lukacs' Philosophic Dimension

hensible, or because in reality it was not all inimical to the ruling Communist Party, the fact is that we suddenly began seeing the belated publication of Lukacs' 1923 work, *History and Class Consciousness*, with a most ambient new Preface included. (2)

The only reference the 1967 Preface makes to the 1956 Revolution is that there is no "inconsistency" between "the fact that in 1956 I had once again to take on a ministerial (!) post" (p.xxxi) and the fact that he had given up political activity in the mid-1920's. As if taking on political activities — "making revolutions" — hadn't related to revolutionary dialectics, and "giving up politics" hadn't "coincided" (in Stalin's day and now!) with renunciation of, and retreat from *History and Class-Consciousness*, Lukacs concludes that he is glad to be out of politics since even when he was correct "there must be grave defects in my practical political abilities." (p.xxxi) Well, it isn't his "political abilities" we are concerned with. The reason for detouring to the Preface is not "politics" but the disjointedness of revolutionary philosophy from revolutionary activity.

THE 1967 PREFACE

It isn't the political double-tonguedness that manifests Lukacs' philosophic retreat from working out today's revolutionary dialectics in the forthcoming *Social Ontology* (to which we'll return later). In the Preface this manifests itself in places where he is full of praise of Lenin, but in fact doesn't stand on Lenin's philosophic ground. And I don't mean Lenin's pre-1914 mechanistic Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, but his groundbreaking 1914-15 *Philosophic Notebooks* (3), which laid

(2) *History and Class Consciousness*, Studies in Marxist Dialectics, by Georg Lukacs, Merlin Press, London, 1971 (includes 1967 Preface).

(3) See my article, "The Shock of Recognition and the Philosophic Ambivalence of Lenin" in *TELOS*, Spring, 1970.

the philosophic foundation both for the Great Divide in Marxism, and for the Russian Revolution as well as for new world revolutionary perspectives.

Lukacs rightly shows how his work had caught the revolutionary spirit of the period, 1917-21: "A momentous world-historical change was struggling to find a theoretical expression." (p.xv) He also points to the truth that "undoubtedly one of the great achievements of *History and Class Consciousness* (was) to have reinstated the category of totality in the central position it had always occupied throughout Marx's work . . ." This, however, is followed up with a declaration about not knowing that Lenin was "moving in a similar direction." (p.xx) Suddenly there comes the arrogant and supercilious untitled reference to Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks* as "philosophic fragments" (that) were only published nine years after the appearance of *History and*

Class Consciousness." (p.xx) (4)

Now, to have discovered, no matter when, that the revolutionary spirit of the age was not only caught as it objectively developed, but prepared for by Lenin back in 1914 via his "return" to Hegel after the collapse of the Second International, should have been so exciting an actual and philosophic adventure that the profound philosopher Lukacs, couldn't have possibly slipped into factual dating of publications relative to one "knowing" or "not knowing" about these in 1919-22, if his 1967 ear had been attuned to the living revolutionary forces. Shouldn't his recollection of the "momentous world-historical change (that) was struggling to find a theoretical expression," 1919-1922, have led him to concretize his praise of "Lenin really brought about a renewal of the Marxist method," by grappling with Lenin's Notebooks instead of skipping over those "fragments?" 1967 is, after all, a good distance from 1932, by which time not only Lenin's Notebooks, but Marx's 1844 Humanist Essays had finally been published. It is true that Lukacs' 1923 work had anticipated the essays on "Alienated Labor" and "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic." But Marx's Essays also contained the sharp conclusion that "communism, as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society," which Lukacs neither anticipated, nor knew how to relate to.

In any case, Lukacs never reviewed either Lenin's or Marx's strictly philosophic works. This failure has nothing whatever to do with dates, but a great deal to do with the fact that Lukacs is developing the dialectics, not of revolution, but of ontology. Whether his monumental work, *Social Ontology*, will prove to be not only his greatest work, but that dialectics of the concrete which the New Left expects all revolutionary forces to be grounded in, the indirect references to it in the new Preface to *History and Class Consciousness* does not help enhance that Preface. It isn't the Preface that will enter history, but the original work. The ambience of the Preface can no more detract from that epoch-making event than the author's renouncement of the book under Stalinism could keep it from having a most exciting underground life of its own.

One final word must be said before we can finally turn to its contents, and that is that *History and Class Consciousness* isn't a book, i.e., a whole. (5) It is a collection of essays, and not all are of historic import. The two philosophic essays carried on a subterranean existence for a full half-century which has romanticized the whole, but the historic-philosophic breakthrough resides in those two central pieces—*What Is Orthodox Marxism?* and *Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat*. It is to these we now turn.

(To be Continued)

(4) Actually, the dating is wrong. Even before Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks* were published in Moscow, not in 1932, but in 1922-30, sections of them began to be published soon after Lenin's death, as various factional fights developed. In view of the fact that many among the "New Left," with malice aforethought, are deliberately mixing up the Comintern's June, 1924 attack on Lukacs' work with Lenin's 1920 critique of the politics of the ultra-left in "Left-Wing" Communism, an *Infantile Disorder*, it should be made clear that Lenin lay on his deathbed, totally paralyzed, for a long mute tormenting months in 1923. Lenin's activity was finished when the second stroke hit him on March 10, 1923; he died Jan. 21, 1924.

(5) Lukacs himself, in the original (Christmas, 1922) Preface, made this clear with his very first sentence: "The collection and publication of these essays in book form is not intended to give them a greater importance as a whole than would be due to each individually." (p. xli.)

MARCH, 1973

'What is orthodox Marxism?'

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

PART II

"Hegel's tremendous intellectual contribution consisted in the fact that he made theory and history dialectically relative to each other, grasped them in a dialectical reciprocal penetration . . ."
—Lukacs.

It was the most unorthodox character of "What Is Orthodox Marxism?" that fired the imagination of German revolutionaries when it was first published in 1919 and again when it reappeared in revised form as part of the book, *History and Class Consciousness*, published in 1923.

When, by the end of the 1920's, the work was repudiated by its author as he made peace with Stalinism, the essay carried on many subterranean existences in many languages in different parts of the world: first, for those who had broken with Stalinism in the 1930's and 1940's; then for some of the "new philosophers"—French Existentialists, especially Merleau-Ponty—in the mid-1950's; and, finally, for those in the new generation of revolutionaries in the 1960's who, out of their own experiences, were turning away from sheer activism to reaching out for a "world view" of the dialectics of liberation.

The enduring relevance of the essay is proof of the fact that its explosive effect was by no means limited to the fact that it had anticipated the rediscovery of Marx's now-famous 1844 Manuscripts which demonstrated how deeply rooted in Hegelian dialectics and theory of alienation were Marx's "Alienated Labor" and "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic."

In re-establishing Marxism as a totality, never once separating the young Marx from the mature author of *Capital*, Lukacs proved himself as uncompromising in his refusal to bow to scientism as to reformism.

THE REVOLUTIONARY DIALECTIC

In naming names of those who had not worked out the full implications of the revolutionary nature of the Marxian dialectic, Lukacs did not stop short of criticizing Marx's closest collaborator, Engels, who "does not even mention the most vital interaction, namely the dialectical relation between subject and object in historical process" (p. 3).

The whole weight of this study in Marxian dialectics was its stress on "the transformation of reality": "It is at reality itself that Hegel and Marx part company. Hegel was unable to penetrate the real driving forces of history." (p. 17) It is true that Lukacs himself so overstressed "consciousness" of the proletariat that it overshadowed its praxis which was both material force and reason so that it left room, at one and same time, for a slip back into the Hegelian idealism of "the identical subject-object," and into substituting the Party that "knows" for the proletariat.

But none noted this in the excitement generated by the essay's recapture of the revolutionary dialectical dimension of historical materialism which gave action its direction: "Marxist orthodoxy is no guardian of traditions, it is the eternally vigilant prophet proclaiming the relation between the tasks of the immediate present and the totality of the historical process." (p. 12) And that "historical process" was then concretized by the internationalism proclaimed in the Communist Manifesto and in the Paris Commune which Marx specified as having "no ideals to realize" but "to liberate the elements of the new society."

"REIFICATION"

The essay, "Reification and Consciousness of the Proletariat" has neither the movement and verve of the first essay, nor its "orthodoxy" (and I'm using the word in the Lukacsian sense of authentic Marxism). There is no doubt, however, that it is the center of *History and Class Consciousness*.

This is not simply a matter of it being the longest piece. (As against the 28 pages of the first essay, the essay on reification totalled no less than 132 pages.) Lukacs could have called it a book, but, instead, took care to cast it in essay form. Where he shied away from claiming for it a totally new departure, a worked-out whole alternative, the intellectuals took it as such. It be-

came the fashion to talk about "reification," "the reified world we live in." They may very well have anticipated, by three full decades, the intellectualistic rage around "One Dimensional Man," "One Dimensional Thought," "technological rationality," the move away from Reason to irrationality, or the retrogression from ontology to technology.

The "masses" (the rank and file) in the subterranean discussion of Lukacs' book, on the other hand, kept their peace not merely because of lack of knowledge of "the history of philosophy," but because of a solid proletarian instinct that this was not merely a restatement of Marxism for a new epoch, but rather that it contained elements deviatory from that which was authentic Marxism.

First and most important of the distinctions between the two concepts of reification is that Marx had limited his analysis to the reification of labor, transforming it into thing, a mere appendage to a machine. Lukacs on the other hand, had transformed reification into a universal, affecting the whole of society equally: "Reification is, then, the necessary, immediate reality of every person living in capitalist society. It can be overcome only by constant and constantly renewed efforts to disrupt the reified structure of existence by relating to the concretely manifested contradictions of the total development, by becoming conscious of the immanent meanings of these contradictions for the total development." (p. 197)

Here, then, we see that reification is universalized, made a veritable "human condition"; "every person" is affected equally.

And "becoming conscious" is endowed with a "neutrality." Though Lukacs is a revolutionary and quotes endlessly from Marx as to how the proletariat, and the proletariat alone, is the revolutionary force to create new human relations, it does not flow either logically or objectively, either historically or dialectically from his original theory.

Where Marx, the practitioner of the revolutionary dialectic, analyzes reification as resulting from the specifically capitalist production process of the reification of labor, pounding labor into thing, and thereby creating in the laborer the absolute opposite—the "quest for universality" and the revolt—Lukacs blurs totally the Marxian concept of "freely-associated labor" stripping the fetishism from commodities, overcoming alienation, shaping history.

Ironically enough, it was Lukacs who—in recapturing the Hegelian dimension in Marx; in delivering mighty blows to the revisionists by showing how very inseparable was their reformism, their turn away from revolution with their abandonment of the dialectic—made his greatest contribution to authentic Marxism by interrelating and making central to his dialectic the interrelationships of the concepts of "totality" and "mediation."

In reviewing, in the 1967 Preface, what he had meant to do and what he had done, he thinks that, on the one hand, "alienation" sans objectivity was "in the air," and, on the other hand, "messianistic utopianism" led to a residue of idealism. And he adds that concerning the whole question of the relationship of "mediation to immediacy" of "economics and dialectics" that he had begun reworking in Moscow in the early thirties: "Only now, thirty years later, am I attempting to discover a real solution to this whole problem in the ontology of social existence." (p. xxxv)

**PART III
THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION VIS-A-VIS
"SOCIAL ONTOLOGY"**

The 1956 Revolution, with Lukacs suddenly appearing as participant, revived hopes that, despite his quarter of a century of capitulation to Stalinism, Lukacs would continue the revolution in thought he wrought in the early 1920's.

Every new stage of cognition is, after all, not born out of thin air. It can be born only out of praxis, the praxis of new revolutionary forces uprooting the existing social order; and the Hungarian masses were directing their revolt not against private capitalism which had already been abolished, but against the existing exploitative, ruling Communist state-power, or, more precisely put, state-capitalism calling itself Communism. With this new mass upsurge, its plunge to new freedom, there was every reason to expect the old philosopher would catch what, in the 1920's, he had called, "a momentous, world-historical change . . . struggling to find a theoretical expression."

The criticism levelled against Lukacs by independent Marxists seemed to lose its validity, especially as much of it had the character of Monday morning quarterbacking raised to "wisdom" by the knowledge of some three to four decades of objective development. Considering the excitement of the new generation of Marxists over the philosophic dimension of Lukacs and its impatient waiting for the comprehensive Social Ontology he had been writing for a decade and to which he had referred in his last years as having been the product of three decades of thought, it would indeed have been a joy to report so great a historic breakthrough—a new stage in cognition that met the challenge of the spontaneous upsurge from below, the Hungarian Revolution.

Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is that, whatever deviatory—deviatory, not reinterpretative—elements were implicit in the "Reification" article, "reification of consciousness" affected Lukacs, who reduced socialism to the perfection of industrial production achieving the Plan! (6)

"MEDIATION"

Take a most crucial Hegelian category, and one central to Lukacs' dialectics, Mediation. As concretized by Marx, and the one Lukacs tried to extend, it was, first, inseparable from the most fundamental of all Hegelian categories, their summation, Subject. Secondly, and most important—since that revealed a totally new continent of thought, Historical Materialism—Marx historically, philosophically, dialectically spelled Subject out as Proletariat. In a word, Marx didn't simply stand Hegel "right side up," didn't only critically transform Hegel's concept of labor as process of man's becoming, much less leave it in the realm of thought. No, as laborer, the proletariat was both opposing the capitalistic exploitation and reduction of all his concrete labors to one abstract mass by that "pendulum of the clock," and seeking "universality." Thus, he became reason as well as force, reshaped history, created new beginnings for totally new human relations.

Whatever duality there was in Lukacs, and whatever abstractions—because of the emphasis on "morality" and "ethics"—the point is that the concert of concrete totality escaped him, despite the fact that totality,

(Continued on Page 7)

itself, was one of his central categories. Having never grounded his concept in the concrete struggles at the point of production, in the factory he never entered; having never made the actual voices of the workers the new point of departure, labor is seen not as the laborer in revolt; labor is no more than the exercise of labor-power in the most specifically capitalistic form: socially-necessary labor time.

Where Marx used the category, socially-necessary labor time, to define that which is uniquely capitalistic, oppressive, chaotic, Lukacs denudes it of its class character and makes it applicable to all societies. No wonder he begins this excursus with the statement: "Above all, we propose to examine what economic necessity consists of. At the outset, it would be emphasized this is not a natural, necessary process, though Marx himself, in his polemic with idealism, occasionally used such an expression."

As Lukacs himself put it, he was ready "simply to skip over the most important mediating areas." By then mediation was no longer the class struggles, much less outright proletarian revolution. Mediation became subject-less; "totality" became cult. (7)

We hope we are wrong when we think that the attraction Lukacs has for the New Left is due to the fact that they never were "weighted down" by any concept of the revolutionary role of the proletariat and, with Lukacs at least philosophically, they are ready to scuttle Marx's theory of proletarian revolution.

FOOTNOTES:

(6) It no doubt is both incomplete and unfair to judge Social Ontology, since the work has not yet been published. But, no matter how the whole will reveal some partial brilliant flashes and dialectical insights. It is impossible to think that it could reverse the direction of what has been stated by Lukacs in his many world interviews on the subject, in the references to it in the 1967 Preface to the 1923 work, and in the two chapters of his late writings. One was published in Telos, Fall, 1970. "The Dialectic of Labor: Beyond Causality and Teleology"; and the abbreviated publication of "The Ontological Foundations of Human Thought and Activity" in Contemporary East European Philosophy, Vol. III, 1971. (See especially pp. 223-4, pp. 228-230, the above quotations are from those pages.)

(7) Istvan Meszaros, who had once been a pupil of Lukacs, and remains the most profound of his sympathetic critics, calls attention to the duality in Lukacs' concepts. "Even the most recent Lukacs—the author of a massive Social Ontology—insists on a duality, on a dual causality, and on an ultimate autonomy of decisions between alternatives . . . on the basis of his Ontology, the positive outcome can only be envisaged as the impact of a 'sollen' . . . an ought to change their way of life." (p. 53, 64, George Lukacs, The Man, his work, and his ideas, ed. by G. H. R. Parkinson, Vintage, 1970.)

March 1973

APRIL, 1973

Two Worlds**Mao & Nixon move closer together**

by Raya Dunayevskaya,
National Chairwoman, News & Letters Committees

On March 15 Nixon announced that on May 1 a "liaison mission" would be opened in Peking and would be headed by David Bruce. If the euphemism of "liaison officer" could possibly have fooled anyone, Mr. Bruce's super-ambassadorial past put an end to such delusions.

Ever since Nixon made his trip to China, a year ago, every writer has been stressing the somersaults executed by Nixon, the China Lobby man, the anti-Communist, the war hawk. But in truth, the greater transformation into opposite was Mao's embrace of "Enemy Number One" in the specific person of what Mao's China used to call "that ugly imperialist chieftain."

Thus, nothing either of the internal crisis — which brought about nothing short of the death (execution?) of Mao's "closest comrade-in-arms and successor," Marshal Lin Biao — or the external condition that there is but one China, not the "two" Nixon sponsored in the UN and still recognizes as "China," i.e., Taiwan, was permitted to slow the speed-up of closer relations with the U. S.

Thus, the joint communique had originally stated that the U. S. would "progressively reduce its forces and military installation on Taiwan as the tension in the area (Vietnam) diminishes." Nothing of the sort was done. For that matter, hardly anyone believes that peace has come to Vietnam. China's anxiety to move ever closer to the U. S., however, is so great that no imperialist action by the U. S. against others can stop it.

No wonder that Nixon in the very same news conference in which he made his announcement of new relations with China, used his most authoritarian voice to warn North Vietnam that if the cease-fire "violations" continue, he would not hesitate to bludgeon it back to acquiescence to Pax Americana.

MAO AND KISSINGER

Splashed over the front pages of all three major publications in China — The People's Daily, The Red Flag, and The Liberation Army Daily — were pictures of Henry Kissinger with Mao Tse-tung. Day in and day out, during the four days Kissinger spent in Peking, the Chinese press followed up the picture display of Mao and Kissinger with commentary that stressed to the Chinese masses that Mao was talking to a very good friend: They had talked for over two hours. That was twice as much as with Nixon. He was telling his very good friend to be sure to greet another and greater friend, the President.

Promptly the Western "specialists" began writing, "this aside was almost as significant as the meeting itself . . . It set the stage for further development of Chinese-American relations" (David Bonavia, Times, London, Feb. 18, 1973). And so it did.

No wonder that Kissinger's smile upon his return looked like that of the cat who just swallowed the canary. This "canary" was no less than the chieftain of the vast expanse of China where one quarter of mankind live. The delusions that float in the brain of Dr. Strangelove Kissinger might well rival Mao's famous "great leap forward." By now, however, Mao is girding for a global leap that he expects will put Russia in the shade!

If this is not obvious from the single statement that the official China News Agency issued, that Mao and Kissinger "had a frank and wide-ranging conversation in an unconstrained atmosphere," it is nevertheless this, precisely this "unconstrained atmosphere" which worries Russia. She is sure that secret agreements, directed

against her, are in the offing. What is of more immediate and painful consequence of the new global game between China and the U. S. — and in this Russia is equally guilty — is the sell-out of North Vietnam.

It is necessary to take a second look at the war that is now called "peace with honor."

VIETNAM, AGAIN AND AGAIN

Nothing so tells the might of U. S. imperialism than the fact that first they got Russia and China to work with them to bring North Vietnam to sign a Nixon-style "peace with honor," which meant that Vietnam was giving up its main demand for an agreement that would not separate politics from the military. Once Nixon's number one priority in Vietnam — keeping Thieu in power — was agreed to and the POW's were released, Nixon was free to test many other avenues of global realignment.

For that purpose, this time as enemies and always as Big Powers, China and Russia are lining up. In 1954, when they were "one," Russia and China worked in concert to compel North Vietnam to give up its victory against the French for "peaceful coexistence" with U.S. imperialism. In 1973, when they themselves are engaged in a life-and-death game, they still work equally hard to make North Vietnam the sacrificial lamb.

As the arrogant Dr. Strangelove Kissinger put it to Marvin Kalb of CBS: Vietnam took on "a different perspective" the minute it was recognized as only "an appendage to the land mass of Asia." Put into human language, it means that the Vietnam war, "localized," can continue on endlessly and not a single one of the three big super powers will give a hoot. No matter what, Vietnam will now be kept on the back burner, will not be permitted to influence global realignment, much less the timing or the plans for world holocaust.

Nothing demonstrates more clearly in our nuclear age not only that small countries count for nothing, but that there are Three (and only three, not five) Super Powers, than the disdain with which the international conference was held in Paris. First, it was clear that the international "peace" conference had been convened merely to sign what had already been worked out by the U.S. and agreed to, not so much with Vietnam, North or South, but with Russia and China.

Secondly, everything ground to a halt the moment Nixon announced he was dissatisfied with the delay in the release of the POW's and ordered Secretary Rogers to get North Vietnam moving faster and faster.

Thirdly, even while it was in farcical session, what really counted was Roger's meeting with China's ambassador on the matter of the \$250 million of private American claims against China, and the \$78 million that the U.S. had impounded of Chinese money. The fact that this too was agreed to so speedily shows that everything, absolutely everything, was subordinated to Mao's pre-occupation with getting Nixon to see Russia as "Enemy Number One."

THE SOMERSAULTS OF THE MASS MEDIA

The daily press, the mass media, the "academic community" have, in concert, projected the counterpart to Nixon's political somersaults that rival brainwashings in totalitarian lands; moreover, they are self-inflicted.

So great is the totality of the crisis in the country; so total is the fear of something worse even than the Vietnam nightmare, as "peace with honor" is shown to be a continuation of the war with slightly modified means that might end in a global holocaust; so absolute is the frustration at everything turning into its opposite right before their eyes while butting their heads against the stone wall of Nixon's retrogressions on the home front

(cont'd)

6901

that, at one and the same time, an unparalleled cynicism pervades the land, and, with it, ironically enough, the compulsion to compensate for the old capitulation to the China Lobby during the McCarthy period.

One famous columnist, Joseph Alsop, let one cat out of the bag. That super hawk anti-Communist has been writing like any true "Maoist" on all the super-achievements of Mao's China, especially so in the transformation of man himself—700 million souls at that. In summing up his great adventure of the month (NY Times Magazine, Mar. 11 and 18, 1973) he has admitted that the reason for his invitation to visit China evidently

was that he had been writing, exposing Russia's military buildup in Russia on territory facing China.

And, in truth, no sooner did he step off the plane in Peking than he was met by Chinese officials—first with the Foreign Ministry Information Department; then with editors of the People's Daily and the China News Agency; then the "brilliant Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chiao Kuan-hua"; and finally, "the climactic talk with Chou." All the conversations "were unquestionably planned as a unitary process," all revolving around and against Russia, all on the single topic of an alleged "preventive war" Russia is planning against China. Chou, Alsop reports, spoke grimly of Russians "seeking to organize support for just such an attack among other Western Communist countries."

No wonder that, rather than facing such a horror, every one from hawk to the true Maoist is ready to back up the vast expense China has been putting into building underground air shelters. Thereby they hope to create a besieged atmosphere to get their masses to work endlessly. All the while, the leadership is preoccupied with nothing short of an alliance with "the devil himself" — Nixon of the USA!

WILL MAO AND NIXON MOVE INTO AN ALLIANCE AGAINST RUSSIA?

Alsop also called attention to the fact that the British and Italian foreign secretaries — Sir Alec Douglas-Home and Giuseppe Medici — reported that this was "all but the exclusive subject" that Chou had with them. In a word, what is involved in the whole move towards relations with the U.S. is a feeler towards an alliance against Russia.

The collaboration with the USA is nowhere near such a fantastic stage. Cultural exchanges are hardly the equivalent of MIRV knowhow. Nor are the somewhat more important economic relations — be it China's \$150 million purchase of Boeing's airplanes, or the \$250 million of American business interests' claims against China and, in turn, the \$78 million America impounded that belong to China.

What is important is (1) the speed with which all this was initiated, and (2) that the international conference to co-sign the Vietnam "peace" was subordinated to the meetings that Secretary of State Rogers was having with China's Foreign Minister, Chi Peng-fei on these claims and counter-claims — outstanding for over two decades but resolved in two days. The door is opened to closer relations — but that is all.

Nixon is also keeping an even wider door open to Russia. And he is trying to mend the fences he broke down with allies — Western Europe and Japan — when he moved unilaterally against both as he faced money crisis and overtures to China. Nixon, the total retrogressionist on the home front against Blacks, against labor, against youth, moving simultaneously, both for and against state intervention in the economy, has not changed an iota his reactionary views of Pax Americana the world over.

Nixon's spectacular journey to Peking was to open doors and give himself, and himself alone—i.e., U.S. imperialism—new options for global realignment. This didn't mean only an opening toward China. As his "follow-up" journey to Russia showed, he wasn't closing that door.

Since then, the journeys by Kissinger and Spiro Agnew to Southeast and East Asia were to assure everyone from Japan to Thailand of U.S. imperialism's "continued presence." The intellectual Kissinger may grab more headlines, but Spiro Agnew's studiously quieter journeys prove, to all the reactionaries in Asia, Nixon's abhorrence of "political vacuums," his clout to see no such vacuum exists, and his assurance to one and all that he is no "isolationist" and means to stand up to U.S. "global responsibility."

At the same time, the Nixon journeys got both of the contending "Communist" super-powers to collaborate with him even as he was bombing North Vietnam. They forced North Vietnam to the signature table and gave Nixon his "peace with honor" by not demanding the removal of his puppet Thieu. As for the journalists, they do Nixon one better by writing as if China can prove her allegations about Russia's "threat of a preventive war" and as if they have proof that the Sino-Soviet Conflict reached its high point only after Russia invaded Czechoslovakia. The facts speak differently.

SINO-SOVIET RIVALRY

There is no doubt about two of Russia's imperialist acts: one, the invasion of Czechoslovakia; and the other, the build-up of the northern frontiers facing China. Another truth, however, is that Mao's China took the initiative against Russia long, long before the latter's invasion of Czechoslovakia. No sooner had Stalin died than Mao wanted to abrogate, not so much the Tsarist treaties, as the one he made with Stalin in 1950.

Whatever shock Khrushchev may have gotten from Mao's request that Mongolia be returned to China and whatever he put in the back of his head to be sure to remember if they came to blows later, it did not at once become the basis for their relations. On the contrary, what help China did get from Russia — and it was a great deal more than she ever got from Stalin — was during the Khrushchev period. The disagreements that came to a boil in 1960 were, again, due to Mao's initiative.

You may call them theoretical if you wish. You may call them revolutionary if you dare. The point is that by the mid-1960's, when U.S. imperialism rained bombs on Vietnam, Mao refused a united front with Russia to help Vietnam. He still kept up the claim that, not so much Vietnam as China was the besieged fortress. Nothing, not even his own Political Committee, could make him modify his line to boldly and sufficiently aid Vietnam. On the contrary. It is then, precisely then, he unleashed the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" and even allowed that to stop some of Russia's shipments to Vietnam.

This doesn't mean Russia gave all it could to Vietnam. But to write as if it never dawned upon China to fight a war against a "co-Communist" until that state invaded another "socialist land" is to participate in one vast whitewash. Indeed, Mao has gone so far into playing global politics not only in Asia but in West Europe as to practically "approve" NATO, i.e., not to oppose U.S. presence in West Europe — anything, anything at all that might be used against Russia. The fact that Russia plays the same global game proves that neither is a "socialist land." Both are state-capitalist countries.

It isn't that Russia differs from China; it, too, pursues its own national interests which in our nuclear age includes Big Power imperialism. It, too, considers China "the enemy," as the military build-up and frontier "incidents" in 1969-70 show; and it, too, flirts with both Japan and the U.S. Above everything else Russia, like China, is in a big enough crisis at home to need everything from economic "aid" from the U.S. to possible collusion in any realignment of global powers. Nothing

(Contd)

Apr 1973

6-9-73

has yet been decided. Everything is up, if not for grabs, then to be gotten at a very high price.

The worst thing possible would be for the New Left to take sides instead of striking out on an independent road.

**THE ANTI-VIETNAM WAR MOVEMENT,
WHERE TO?**

Two equally wrong tendencies vie with each other within the "New Left." One sees the "revolutionary nature" of any (especially the Chinese) attack on "Russian revisionism." The other concentrates on one thing and one thing only—to aid in the reconstruction of Vietnam—even if this means working somewhere within the establishment.

As if there hasn't been enough disorientation with

"single-issue" preoccupation in the anti-Vietnam war movement, I. F. Stone (*New York Review of Books*, March 3, 1973) now writes, "the peace movement has no more important task than to focus attention on the Church-Case and Bingham bills" to tie Nixon's hands against renewed intervention. It would also tie the New Left's hands to a section of the bourgeoisie.

The only thing that will get us out of the mess of tailending any state power, least of all U.S. imperialism in its Nixonite era, is to recognize that, just as the enemy is always at home and so is the revolution, in that same integrated whole there is no way to separate philosophy from revolution without assuring the road, not to revolution, but to retrogression. It is high time to strike out on an independent road to total freedom.

April 1973

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya,
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Editors Note: We have not written about Watergate up to now, not because the depth of the corruption is not horrifying — but because corruption is so inherent in capitalism that it is almost as characteristic of the system as the extraction of surplus value from the worker. The bright young manipulators that Nixon has drawn around him in the White House—the Deans, the Zieglers, the Haldemans, the Magraders, the Etlichmans, et al.—are a breed we have seen before, as the "Two Worlds" written Feb. 20, 1954, during the McCarthy hearings, which we reprint below, dramatically reveals. The difference is that 1973 is not 1954, and Nixon is no mere Senator McCarthy. He is president of the most powerful, nuclear-armed country on earth. The danger of McCarthyism was one thing. The danger of a President whose attempts to invoke "executive privilege" reveal his absolute-dictator-mentality is quite another. We ask you to read this 1954 article with 1973 eyes.

I remember when I first saw the announcement in the paper that Roy Cohn would be McCarthy's attorney on the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. It sent a shudder through me. Without even reading the story of his life, the picture revealed the type. The worldly young man endowed with brains and wealth, through no effort of his own, believing that he can, with no roots in any civilization, do anything and everything; believing only in his own personality and using it unashamedly to breeze through any opposition.

He was only 25 then, the son of an old-line Democrat, a New York judge. Too young to be in the second World War, he had whizzed through Columbia University and law school during the post-war period in three and a half years, graduating so young that he had to wait a year

Gang lawyer for the establishment

and a half before he could take his bar exam. Every college student knows the type, the opportunist with brains and connections who develops them as fast as possible in order to put them at the disposal of the highest bidder. Cohn didn't have to wait long. The moment he passed his bar exam, a job was waiting for him as Confidential Assistant to the United States Attorney in New York.

OUTSIDE THE LAW

The Government gave Cohn the opportunity he needed. The Communists were being prosecuted for conspiracy. While the legal forms were being maintained in Court, a special department was set up by the Attorney General to deal with all radicals. The boy who had been born with a silver spoon in his mouth was now worth his weight in gold. While other government attorneys hesitated to bring in anti-Communist radicals under the same law which prosecuted Communists, Cohn was uninhibited by any democratic tradition. The end justified the means, legal or not. The older more respectable attorneys protested, but in the end they always capitulated. Cohn knew that he could always sweep them along. All they wanted to do was go more slowly but their ends were no different than his. Cohn gathered around him a gang of younger men, as rootless and ruthless as he, anxious to put their highly-trained brains at the service of the most powerful bidder.

Now that his ability to bully his more liberal colleagues into illegal short-cuts had been proven, Cohn did not stay long with the U.S. Attorney. He was looking for more fertile fields. The new U.S. Attorney was anxious to move more slowly, to stay within the law. McCarthy needed a lawyer on his staff, as unscrupulous and as brazen and as shameless as he.

McCarthy and Cohn joined forces. McCarthy's smears are as unscrupulous as Cohn's, but his manner is shifty, sneering. Cohn brings to the proceedings the vigorous

brassiness which paralyzes the opposition with its offensiveness.

INFORMER'S BEST FRIEND

The whole tradition of the American people fills them with horror and distaste for stool pigeons. But everything the Administration, Democratic and Republican, has done drives them towards identifying the informer with a patriot. When Louis Budenz, Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers and the whole army of lesser fry stool pigeons take the stand to finger people, they are aware of the revulsion of the whole community. Cohn is there to give them the immoral courage to continue. Without any ifs, ands or buts he stands for the philosophy of glorifying informers. When he is present, they feel that...

it takes guts to be an informer. He bathes their dirty work in the aura of being with the elite. His very presence reassures them that if they lie, he will find the means legal or illegal to protect them. The American public knows the gang lawyer, the legal brain who puts his skills, experience and connections at the disposal of the gangsters and fixes everything for them. It also knows the prosecutor who uses the state's witnesses against criminals. But the type who is both prosecutor and gang lawyer is a product of a world in which all society is in such total crises that the gangsters have taken over the government.

LIBERALS ARE HELPLESS

Cohn totally disregards and demolishes all civilized values. Respect for the individual, respect for truth, respect for freedom; he has none of this and he prosecutes any dissenters, not to protect democracy but to destroy one gang in behalf of another. The only question he is concerned with is this: whose side are you on? Anybody who is not in his gang, ready to go the limit with him, is on Moscow's side, to be mowed down.

In the face of this totalitarian philosophy, the liberal is completely helpless. The liberal press shouts against Cohn, but all it could do when Cohn and Schine made their 17 day book-burning junket abroad was ridicule them as spoiled brats and wail at the cost to American prestige abroad. The liberals are genuinely anxious to preserve democratic rights. They despise, loathe and fear Cohn as a menace to everything valuable in the American tradition. But in their minds also the only two worlds are Russian Communism and American Democracy. They cannot put up a resistance to Cohn's totalitarian gangsterism here any more than the liberal intellectual abroad can put up a resistance to the totalitarian gangsterism of Communism. They feel the crisis but they have no total opposition to the system in the concept of a new society built by the workers.

6904

JUNE-JULY, 1973

Editorial Article: Politics of Counter-Revolution**Watergate and the 'Year of Europe'**By Raya Dunayevskaya
National Chairwoman, N&L Committees

Brezhnev's mid-June salvage operation in Nixonland, undermined by Watergate, hasn't saved Nixon's lily-white skin. As against 1972 (when Mao, too, was directly involved in shielding Nixon), the second time around for Brezhnev-Nixon summitry could not cleanse Nixon of the Watergate stench.

As for the "Year of Europe", the Nixon-Pompidou non-event in Iceland May 30 should have shown our Emperor's intellectual footman, Dr. Strangelove Kissinger, that the warm and secret relations between Nixon and Brezhnev could only further arouse the suspicions of Europe that a repeat of Yalta (which decided Europe's fate without the presence of Europe at the end of World War II) may be in the making between the two nuclear Goliaths.

Indeed it needed no ghost come from the grave (not even DeGaulle grandeur) to see through Kissinger's arrogance in reducing Europe's national interests to "regional" ones, while raising Nixon's Pax Americana ambitions to global vision for "all".

Meanwhile our totalitarian President's criminal attempt to set up a Single Party State within the two-party system was too fascinating a tale to keep the people from watching the TV spectacular: the Senate Watergate Hearings.

WHAT THE TV HEARINGS DON'T SHOW

Ever since Senator Ervin's Committee opened TV hearings on the Watergate criminality, Nixon has unloosed a new set of surrogates. True, they look a lot cleaner than those who got him elected. Nevertheless, the new "independents" like Cox are trying to get the TV hearings called off. Whether by pleading for the rights of indicted men who may still be "innocent", or by peddling high sermons about "new world relations" and "national security", the result is one more cover-up.

"National security" for what? For forging papers to implicate a dead president* in the murder of Ngo Diem? For ordering the burglary of Dr. Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office? For infiltrating McGovern committees? For creating a new Madison Avenue image of Nixon — a totally new unrecognizable form of fascism, called "The Presidency" and fully enveloped in "Executive Privilege"? All this in order to have Nixon sound more learned and self-possessed than the Nixon who called Adlai Stevenson "the appeaser who got a Ph.D. from Dean Acheson's College of Cowardly Communist Containment", and ranted about "the Truman-Acheson-Stevenson gang's defense of Communism in high places"?

Though these quotations from Nixon's past are not now being heard from the TV tubes, Nixon fears that his 23-year poison-pen career as "master spy catcher" would reveal his start in politics back in 1946 when he first set the low standard both of slander and excessive rightism.

THE CONTINUOUS LINE—1946 to 1973

After all, there is a most continuous line from 1946 when he accused Congressman Voorhis of accepting money from the "Communist-led Political Action Committee of the CIO"; through the 1962 dummy committee he set up to collect money "for Democrats" who opposed the duly-nominated Governor Pat Brown; to the "laundered" money for his 1972 election campaign. Nixon's position seems to be that "campus bums" are not entitled to know his sordid past now that he has become so great a "statesman" that he opened doors to China despite his 20 years of strenuous labor to keep them closed on the ground that only "Communist appeasers" would wish them opened.

Where the 1952 super sleuth trick backfired and Nixon lost the election, the man (H. R. Haldeman) whose brainschild it was, went all the way up to the White House in 1972 when his new-brainschild won re-election of Nixon.

The \$75,000 sunk into "committee for Democrats" in 1962 is nothing as compared to the 1972 moneys, "laundered" and otherwise, that went unreported, though most willingly given by corporations from ITT to Vesco. (He no doubt considered the \$200,000 he gave the Nixon campaign small potatoes compared to the \$224 million he milked out of a multinational company he headed and didn't wish the Securities and Exchange Committee to investigate.)

One single fact does already stand out: the TV hearings have compelled quite a change in the stance of Nixon. In August, 1972, the globally preoccupied Nixon (allegedly too busy with matters of state and world "responsibilities" to pay attention to such a lowly preoccupation as his election for "four more years") maintained that none in the White House "was involved in this very bizarre incident." April 30 of this year, when he had to admit some "personal wrongdoing" on the part of his staff, he was still lecturing the public that they must "understand how highly motivated these individuals⁴ were. By May 22 he not only had to point to others' "wrongdoing", but himself admit to setting the "climate" for "overzealousness". The one single word of truth is "climate".

(Continued on Page 5)

*Why they had to forge documents when it would have been so much easier to get "proof" from the notorious Mrs. Nhu remains as great a mystery as the narrowness of those two burglars who keep turning up at the Committee to Re-Elect the President, at Watergate, at Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office, not to mention that most sacrosanct inner White House "Intelligence Evaluation Unit."

(Cont'd)

Politics of Counter-revolution: Watergate and the 'Year of Europe'

(Continued from Page 1)

That one single word of truth—the "climate" Nixon created — was, however, by no means limited to the year, 1972. Rather, the criminality in the Nixon-created "climate" of police-state rule was initiated with his first election in 1968.

Near-revolutions created universal panic that year the world over — in Paris, in Prague, in Peking, and in the U.S. It was to stem the tide of the anti-Vietnam war movement as well as the continuous Black mass revolt in the U.S. that our "law and order" President unleashed a governmental crime wave. The flood of crocodile tears for the "rights" of those hurt by TV publicity preceding their day in court flow from the contention that Watergate is a "bizarre incident" that happened on June 17, 1972; that it needs to be "untangled" from matters of "national security" and "new relationships among great powers."

In truth, the crime wave which began as soon as Nixon gained power was cut short at Watergate because Nixon was no longer contending with small groups of radicals, much less elemental mass revolt, but with another capitalistic party commanding some state power. Far from needing "untangling", what needs revelation is not so much 1972, which climaxed Nixon's police state tactics, as 1968 when he conceived "ending" the Vietnam War by bringing the battlefield home and completing his counter-revolution here and now.

Thus, he was no sooner officially installed into power in 1969 than he worked out new police methods both at home and abroad. Those were not so much against "the enemy," as against the CIA that kept giving him intelligence reports that did not jibe with what Kissinger had called the "philosophical underpinnings" of U.S. global policies. These "philosophical underpinnings" turned out to be, not the ending of the Vietnam war he had promised in order to get elected, but its extension to Cambodia.

In that same first year of Nixon power, Dr. Strange-love Kissinger (who had never opposed the Vietnam War) at once ordered that the telephones of the academic colleagues working for him be bugged. In a word, long before Watergate, long before the "Pentagon Papers" and the "leaks" to newspapers, wiretapping, infiltration of dissenters' organizations, burglarizing and "dirty politics" of unparalleled scope were in full bloom. Outright murders followed.

"NEW RELATIONSHIPS" WITH CHINA AND RUSSIA

By 1970, when the faked peace moves turned out to be the transformation of the Vietnam War into the Second Indo-China War — and the mass outpouring against Nixon was the most massive ever — Nixon's hysteria knew no limits. Just as the Nixon "climate" had

led the National Guardsmen to shoot into unarmed students protesting Nixon's Cambodia invasion, and Mississippi storm troopers were inspired by Nixon's "Southern strategy" to shoot up a Black women's dormitory at Jackson State College, so our Mr. Clean who was not all that clean, Dr. Kissinger, was asked "to research" "new relationships among great powers."

Our Harvard professor with the studied German accent (who allegedly loves Spinoza more than Metternich) thought no human sacrifice too big to, on the face of it, totally reverse the Nixon policy toward China. First came the 1971 "tilting" of U.S. policy toward the fascist regime of General Yahya Kahn and his genocidal war against East Pakistan so that Kissinger could secretly go to China via Pakistan. There is nothing worse than the corruption of the mind. It needs such little secrets as the China trip via Pakistan, never once stopping to bemoan the millions left dead, mutilated, raped, starving. All so that his Boss and he can "make history".

The truth was very different. The historic milestone did nothing to change Nixon. He remained Nixon, the Cold War warrior who blamed the Democrats for "losing" China, at the very moment when he became Nixon, the "world statesman" embracing Mao Tse-tung in the latter's library.

What was involved in both the trips to China and Russia was, first, that these two powers were all too eager to get Nixon off the hot seat on which he had been put by the American people, and thus help him get elected in 1972.

Secondly, "new" relations among global powers were overdue by a whole decade; the Sino-Soviet conflict had burst into the open in 1960.

MAKING RETROGRADE HISTORY

Thirdly, and above all, Nixon had never given up his vision of "the American century" which lasted but a few years in the euphoria of the immediate post-World War II universe when all the world lay prostrate and America alone had the A-bomb. Nixon, being a most ambitious man, determined "to make history" his own retrograde way, is ready to turn the clock of history back. He is a man of the Taft-Hartley era, who wants to make sure the Black Revolution of the 1960's will not only be stopped in its tracks, but be rolled back forever.

Hence, his "Southern Strategy." Which is why the Watergates and all election chicanery cannot be disentangled from his concept of "national security" and "global responsibilities." On June 11, the many investigations of Watergate (nine are ongoing) disclosed that, whereas informers were sent into selected campuses, all Black student organizations were riddled with informers, wire taps, actual assassinations.

What is most ironic is that even a man like J.

Edgar Hoover, who had received his training in the notorious Palmer raids in the post-World War I hysteria (and he practiced that type of illegality all his life) actually became worried over Nixon's wholesale illegality which did not exclude setting up still another secret service directly within the White House. In any case, he refused to approve such a new home spy plan unless he had a written request from the President.

Our totalitarian president now claims no such new spy network against dissidents at home was set up once Hoover opposed its structure. But, in truth, the disapproved 1970 plan became the "Intelligence Evaluation Committee" towering over the CIA, the FBI, and all things legal. This cover for secret police mayhem had access, as an AP dispatch put it, to "virtually all agencies of government, and used that access to intercept mail, tap telephones, audit income-tax returns and plant informers."

No wonder that on May 19, when Judge Byrnes dismissed the case against Daniel Ellsberg, he did not limit himself to citing wiretapping and burglary (not to mention the attempt to bribe the Judge himself by telling him during the process of the trial that he was being considered as J. Edgar Hoover's successor as head of the FBI), but spoke of the "totality of misconduct."

All this Nixon is trying to make us forget. Instead, we are supposed to keep in mind his concept that this is not the year of Watergate, but "the year of Europe." "THE YEAR OF EUROPE" AND BATTLEFIELD NUCLEAR WEAPONS

What, however, has produced the so-called year of Europe is the totality of the American crisis — from Watergate to runaway inflation, from the unrelieved international monetary crisis to the unprecedented deficit in trade. The search for holy market places may seem to have nothing to do with Watergate. In fact, each reveals the abysmal depth of both the economic crisis and the depravity of the policies of counter-revolution.

Nixon's chief researcher into "philosophical underpinnings", Kissinger, has called Nixon's State of the World message "probably the single most important piece of paper published in the world each year." Europe, however, considers it not only a way to impose on Europe Nixon's "conceptual framework" but a way to transfer to Europe America's economic crisis; exporting to Europe everything from its inflation to its cheap Georgia chickens while threatening to remove American troops unless Europe pays for their upkeep. The very unfeeling title — "new Atlantic Charter" — has so revealed Europe, that Nixon has had to take a few steps back by "assuring" Pompidou the troops will remain, and stressing "a common security concept."

Therein lies the most horrifying news of all. Hardly noted at all in the American press is a new technological

(cont.)

horror — a very small, "battlefield" nuclear weapon. It is to be introduced into European defenses. Lord Chalmers — no revolutionary he — described this technological gee whizzery as an idea that is "misconceived, logically indefensible, and almost criminally dangerous."

His article from the London Times was reproduced in the Toronto Globe and Mail on May 19. I have seen no reference to this Nixon-Kissinger-Pentagon inventiveness in our daily press. Yet it is this which should be shouted to the rooftops about "the Year of Europe." Here is what Lord Chalmers writes:

"What is misleading is to suggest that in doing so (in setting off the very small, extremely precise nuclear weapon), it is possible to separate nuclear blast from radiation. The miniature nuclear weapon is technologically feasible, the elegant, 'clean' battlefield nuclear weapon is pure Strangelove fantasy."

Whether or not that will buy Nixon "a new Atlantic charter", there is no doubt about the following: As opposed as West Europe is to Nixon-Kissinger's attempt to blackmail it into granting trade advantages for American products in the Common Market, and helping it shore up the American dollar linked to a "common defense concept", the point is that America still is the nuclear and industrial giant; that the economic crisis is in Europe (West and East) as well as in the U.S. West Europe is fearful of shaking the boat — world capitalism in crisis.

One can pick up any French newspaper and find that the government has yet to forget 1968. Whether or not they agree it was a near-revolution, all admit that nothing has been the same since. And that is exactly where the politics of counter-revolution was born.

And so goes capitalistic politics, dirty or "clean". At best, muckraking exposes contradictions; it doesn't

and can't solve them. Just as Congress will do all in its power to save Nixon from impeachment, so West Europe will devise something to let him save face, when autumn comes and Nixon gets to Europe.

The only way to move out of Nixonland is to uproot it lock, stock and barrel, including its "intelligentsia." The Henry Kissingers are there. The lesser breed of intellectuals, like Irving Kristol, wait in the wings not only for those jobs, but to become the Censors for Public Broadcasting System. There are other "openings." Nothing is new about the "new" conservative. Academia has ever been part of the military-industrial complex, or what Marx long ago called "the prize fighters for capitalism." It is not that which is new and worrisome to the left.

WHAT NOW?

What has brought the Movement to an impasse is the blindness to the need for a philosophy of liberation without which no revolution can succeed. Scaring capitalism witless as the near-revolutions in 1968 in Europe, and the 1970 anti-Vietnam upsurge in the U.S. have done, only increases its desperation — and brings on new forms of fascism, the politics of counter-revolution without scruples by "highly motivated individuals" and their very own academia. The one thing that Watergate has accomplished is to show just how inseparable is the depth of corruption, when it is not to line individual pockets, from the bankruptcy of thought, the true seal of bankruptcy of civilization.

Once we do not stop either at muckraking or concluding that "therefore" we need a "new" political party, the politics of counter-revolution will become the shock that will make us work out so new a relationship of theory to practice, philosophy to revolution that the two will never again be separated, and thus will a totally new foundation for truly human relations be laid.

June-July 1973

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of *Marxism and Freedom*

Excerpts from an abbreviated summary of a speech delivered at UCLA's Women's Week, in April.

OUR SECOND WOMEN'S movement has to realize both the continuity and the discontinuity from the first women's movement. The greatness of history is that in it you see your own age in a totally new light, and begin to know what to single out. For example, the greatest thing is the Black Dimension. The first women's movement arose from the anti-slavery movement. They were a different world from the slave society they were fighting against, not only because so many of the Abolitionists were slaves who had followed the North Star to freedom, but because the entire relationship among the Abolitionists, their whole idea of freedom, was so different.

Take such a simple thing as one's name. We are all very conscious now of that, and a lot of us aren't using our husbands' or even our fathers' names. But way back in the early part of the 19th century, when one Black woman was asked her name she said, Sojourner Truth. They asked her how she ever got that name, and she said: I asked God and he said to sojourn, to travel all over the world and tell the story of how we are exploited, tell them about freedom, tell them the truth. So that is the name she took. Look at what a simple thing that is—a name. But it wasn't only that she didn't want to have anything to do with her slave name, or with slavery. She wanted the idea of freedom and travelling all over the world—"the world is my country." That kind of identification of national and international means that the name she created was not just a name.

Or take the white, middle-class women who were also an important part of the Abolitionist movement. All they were doing was preparing sandwiches and making picnics and raising money. Important as that might be, they began to see it wasn't the same as what

Women's liberation, in fact and in philosophy

the Harriet Tubmans and Sojourner Truths were doing. They began to question why they shouldn't also be free. When the suffrage movement arose from within the Abolitionist movement it was on the basis of what they had seen women, Black women, could be—revolutionary force and Reason.

THE SECOND STAGE of the first women's rights movement was a very sad stage. Once the Civil War was over and the 14th Amendment was finally passed, women still had no suffrage or other legal rights. The weakness in the dialectics of liberation at this point however, was its isolation from the Blacks, and from the new kinds of struggles being fought by the working women who were going into the factories.

Susan B. Anthony had a paper called "Revolution" and the motto under it read: "Men can have all their rights and nothing more; women must have all their rights and nothing less." You would think that with such a vision and a philosophic view, they would have realized that isolating themselves from the Black and labor dimensions meant they were cutting their own throats. Lucy Stone was worse, and became an actual racist. She said she was not asking for freedom for the "dregs of society." She made such class and racial distinctions about who deserve freedom that, no matter how brave they were, it not only took all the way from 1868 to 1920 to get the vote, but when they got it, it didn't mean anything.

When an Idea's time has come, there are just as many contradictions and challenges as when the Idea was first thought of. In this country it is the Black dimension, the Black masses as vanguard, that is the crucial element. It is because it isn't just an idea, but a movement. It's going to act, to try to make the idea of freedom become real. And it is the kind of philosophy we have that will determine if we constantly check ourselves to see what has to be opened up, and enable us to see ourselves not as the fragmented people class society makes of us.

Otherwise you wind up with less than freedom.

You may not be limited to just making sandwiches, you may even be able to enter the arts. Isn't that great? The trouble is that you're not changing society at its roots, at its exploitative, male-dominated roots. For those who think it's enough to be for women's rights, to go out for any and all careers, and to keep away from a revolutionary organization, means that they not only exclude themselves from the most serious, total work of reorganizing society, but cut themselves off from the working women, who are the source of the very theory they need.

WHAT WE'VE BEEN looking at in studying the first women's movement was what was happening objectively in the world, objectively in this country. When we come down to our own age we have to ask what was happening objectively again, that suddenly the quiescent 50's, when the youth were supposed to be the "beat generation" burst out into the revolt of the 60's.

In the 60's we're once again back to the Black Dimension. People laughed uproariously at *Marxism and Freedom* which had just been published, because I said the Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1958 was an entirely new stage that was related to the new stage in the Workers' Councils of Hungary, where they had got rid of capitalism but wanted to be free from Communism, too, because it was just another form of state-capitalism. It became a world phenomenon, and a national phenomenon in 1960 when the Black youth in Greensboro, North Carolina refused to move until they were served at the lunch-counters.

The white students who were supposed to have been the beat generation went South—they thought they were going to do something for the civil rights movement of the Blacks. But when they got there they found that the Blacks who were asking them to set up schools had an idea of education that they had never dreamed of. Our education is factory-made, completely administered, designed to prepare those who will oppress others. But the Freedom Schools were asking totally different questions: they wanted an education so they could find

(cont'd)

6908

out how to get rid of the Bull Connors for good. The white students suddenly realized that instead of helping the Blacks like social workers, they were learning a totally new dimension themselves. They came back North and realized that it wasn't only the worker who is alienated, but the comfortable, middle-class whites going to a "great university" like Berkeley were just numbers put into a computer.

IT WAS IN February of 1963, when L. B. Johnson first rained the bombs on Hanoi that, instead of having either just a Civil Rights movement, or a Free Speech movement, we suddenly had the birth of an entirely new generation of revolutionaries who were questioning everything in this society. The one thing, unfortunately, they still didn't question was philosophy. They were all very proud of their pragmatism—but it didn't help them too much.

It was at this point that the women began saying: "Now this is strange. I'm part of this great movement, and yet I'm cranking the mimeo machine instead of writing the leaflets." Nobody could accuse them of not being revolutionary. They were questioning whether something wasn't wrong with a movement that supposedly believed in a new society and yet practices the same division of labor as the one we live in. Not only that. Nobody could accuse them of being against Blacks. But when it came to the woman question there was Stokely Carmichael saying "the only position for women is prone." The women's questioning brought us to an entirely new stage.

We were moving to the high point of 1968, and it was a high-point internationally. In this country the anti-Vietnam war movement was still growing. And for the first time in an advanced country like France we had a near-revolution. It started as a student movement,

but they suddenly realized why Marx said the proletariat was the force for revolution. When you have 10,000 students in Paris on strike it looks very great, but if you have 10 million workers putting down their tools and stopping production, it is a very different situation.

WHY DID WE get only a near-revolution out of all this? Those who were concerned with where the philosophy was, were likely to be told, whether by Mario Savio or Cohn-Bendit, "We will pick it up en route." All they picked up was an aborted revolution . . .

SDS wound up in completely mindless activism. The women who had just begun the Women's Liberation movement wound up "following their men" in all of the splits and factions. But it isn't quite true they were just following their men. It was worse. They voted for the same resolutions the men did because that is what they really believed.

In a word, once you do not have a total philosophy of liberation, once you do not see that the dialectics of liberation are forces and reason, then there is no place to go but the so-called male-dominated, pragmatic, revolutionary groups that thought they could pick up philosophy "en route."

We have to realize that even though we have an independent movement, even though we are not in isolation from the men or from the children, for that matter, even though we are not isolated from the other movements, it takes a great deal more than just activity. It takes the kind of unity of objective and subjective where you suddenly see that you cannot have a successful revolution without having the underlying philosophy that is the liberation of humanity . . .

Copy-Sept 1973

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *Marxism and Freedom*
and *Philosophy and Revolution*

(Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from one section of the "Draft Perspectives Report" prepared for the Convention of News & Letters Committees. Copies of the complete report are available for 50c from News & Letters, 1900 E. Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. 48207.)

Phase 4 should have been entitled "How to Bring on a Recession." Like the planned unemployment when the Nixon Administration first faced unemployment and the falling profit rate it was determined to shoot upward, it has now removed price controls so that uncontrollable inflation can go hog wild. Among other things, this forces the poverty-stricken Blacks to face the very question of survival altogether, the poor whites to spend more, and even the middle class to save and borrow less, not to mention the slowdown in production.

Does Nixon expect us to have suffered a total loss of memory when, in his plunge to the state-capitalistic Phase 2, his Economic Report read: "By the end of 1972, American anti-inflation policy had become the marvel of the rest of the world . . . Largely because of this change, the rest of the world is willing to hold increasing amounts of dollars." Since then, the dollar has had to be devalued twice; wholesale prices rose 25 percent annually, profits and food costs skyrocketed and unemployment remained at an "average" of 5 percent, though it was actually over 8 percent in industrial cities, and twice that amount among Blacks, especially youth. Now rush to individual free enterprise and uncontrolled multi-national corporations and you are assured that the booming profits will hasten recession in 1974. Already we have a considerable lowering of production and no hold on wild inflation.

AS AGAINST THE labor bureaucracy that was playing around with management over "30 and out" and still continues to do so, the proletariat broke out into wildcatting, first and above all, over the inhuman conditions of labor, and secondly, for a decent wage

Economics phase-out, global politics phase-in

to stop running a continuous losing race against runaway inflation. The very UAW bureaucracy—whose class-collaborationism did not stop even at the point of odious informing on who were the "radicals" at Chrysler plants, but went the whole hog to the class enemy when it called upon the police to eject workers from the factories they occupied—had, at the same time, to admit the unsafe conditions that would now have to be given a high-priority rating.

Whatever cover-up the labor bureaucracy will desire for its class-collaborationism and its sure betrayal at contract-signing time, nothing can hide the fact that it is the prop for the whole exploitative system. The stench of Watergate may not be on them, but that is only because Nixon never invited them that high up. The point is that the lying, forensic style of the President characterizes the labor bureaucracy as well. They are indeed the last barrier to labor's control over its working conditions. But it is clearer to see the profound corruption inherent in patriotism as the last refuge of the scoundrel in the Watergate Hearings.

THE ANALYSIS OF Watergate has already been dealt with in "The Politics of Counter-Revolution: Watergate and the 'Year of Europe'" (News & Letters, June-July, 1973). The "Year of Watergate" with its profound corruption, endless flow of money, enemy lists, bugging of the Oval Office so that anyone who entered that inner sanctum was unknowingly and with malice aforethought taped, clearly put the "Year of Europe" in the shade. It will not end when the Watergate Hearings end. It will remain a continuing sore with its ambience over international as well as national developments . . .

The latest technological horror in the global "perspectives" (1) is the "battlefield nuclear weapon" the U.S. wishes to impose on Europe, specifically West Germany. Such a dehumanized way of fighting inhuman wars is what Dr. Strangelove Kissinger has the gall to call "the philosophical underpinnings of a common defense concept." On the more immediate front, Nixon wishes this "common defense concept" linked to the trade advantages he wants from the Common Market. Nevertheless, so great is the nuclear and economic

might of U.S. imperialism, so fearful are the European ruling classes of a "repetition of 1968," that, despite West Germany's fear of and Western Europe's resistance to Pax Americana, the International Monetary Fund has helped shore up the dollar; the deviations have made U.S. goods so attractive abroad that this has gained a surplus in foreign trade. No doubt some sort of trip, though no "summit," will be convened to allow for "new principles" that can be passed off for a "New Atlantic Pact" before the "Year of Europe" ends.

Or will they "move" 1974 into 1975 to continue with France's delusion that she is "middleman" when not only U.S.-Russia are conniving sans her benefit, but West Germany is definitely not bowing to the lesser economic power? Where the two superpowers listen at all, it is China, not Western Europe or Japan, who is heard. Though she is in every way in as big a crisis, it is not only "in the long run" that none can disregard 700 million human beings. At this very moment she holds

the ace in Cambodia which means the whole Indochina peninsula and the "presence" of both the U.S. and North Vietnam.

WHETHER OR NOT the "Nixon Doctrine" of making Asian kill Asian continues to operate in Southeast Asia depends not so much on U.S. might as on the Sino-Soviet conflict, plus the Prince who cast his eyes aside when his own country was first bombed, and now labors to make sure there will be no unity in the Indochina peninsula. Put more concretely, Sihanouk is actually flirting with the U.S.—Chou En-lai made sure his telegram to Sen. Mansfield promising "peace with honor" was no mere show. Sihanouk is as anxious as Mao to have an "American presence" there! What each calls the struggle against "Russian hegemony" actually means a struggle against a North Vietnamese "domination" in any unified Indochina peninsula. To close one's eyes to the sinister moves by Mao's China is to help U.S. imperialism remain in Southeast Asia, in Europe, and throughout the world—everywhere that China-Russia cast their eyes for "equal" world domination.

The world crises, the intra-imperialistic fighting, whether called private capitalism or state-capitalism, the two-party or the single-party state, the overripeness of its decay, demand that we prepare for uprooting the system before the multiplicity of its crises the world over retrogresses humanity to a stage of barbarism.

* For that matter, Chou told a similar thing to the Japanese ruling politicians: that he "understood" their treaty with the U.S.; that it was necessary to remain under the U.S. nuclear umbrella (see *The Manchester Guardian*, 2/14/73). And long before then, at the very moment he touts a "revolutionary" line in East Europe, he tells West Europe, West Germany especially, that an "American presence" is needed.

New introduction distorts Marx's 'Grundrisse'

NOVEMBER, 1973

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
 Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
 and **Marxism and Freedom**
 (Editor's Note: **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**, by Raya Dunayevskaya, deals extensively with Marx's 1857-58 Notebooks, now world-famous as the **GRUNDRISSE**, in Chapter Two: "A New Continent of Thought: Marx's Historical Materialism and Its Inseparability from the Hegelian Dialectic." At the time **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION** went to press, however, the **GRUNDRISSE** had not yet appeared in an English translation. So fantastic did she consider the Introduction by Martin Nicolaus, when it did appear, that Raya Dunayevskaya wrote an informal letter on it, from which we print brief excerpts, below. The full letter can be obtained for 25c from *News & Letters*, 1900 E. Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. 48207.)

Grundrisse has finally been translated into English and published in full.* Unfortunately, this edition is burdened by so fantastic a foreword by its translator, Martin Nicolaus, that we must all over again divert from Marx to his interpreters.

By stating that this foreword is "fantastic" I do not mean it departs in any fundamental way from established Marxism, which, with reformism, began demanding the removal of the "Hegelian dialectic scaffolding" of Marx's works. And I certainly do not mean that "orthodoxy" rested with Stalin who threw out "the negation of the negation" from the "dialectic laws", much less with Mao who perverted contradiction from the elemental class struggle to "principal" and "subordinate" forever changing places in "bloc of four classes." (The latter two, especially Mao, get praised to the skies, so that we read that *On Contradiction* and *On Practice* "are at one and the same time strictly orthodox in the Marxist sense and highly original," p.43, fn. 39.) I mean that the pull of pragmatism, state-capitalism, and the administrative mentality that characterizes our age are so overwhelming that all the years put into the translation, the recognition that "The Grundrisse challenges and puts

* The Grundrisse, Penguin Press, London, England.

to the test every serious interpretation of Marx yet conceived," (p.7) and the subjective wish to be revolutionary, are still no shield from the objective pull of our state-capitalist age once your ears are not close to the ground so that you hear all the elemental forces from practice uniting with the self-determination of the philosophy of liberation.

From the very first page, first paragraph, Nicolaus announces that the 1857-8 Notebooks "display the key elements in Marx's development and overthrow of the Hegelian philosophy." (p.7, my emphasis.) With this as his ground, how could the translator possibly learn anything from the 893 pages?

THE NEXT 15 pages of this Foreword Nicolaus devotes to background plus a few pages in trying to summarize the first chapter of Marx's *On Money* and into the first section *On Capital*. All is devoted to the translator's view of "the structure of the argument" (p.23) only to conclude: "All that follows in the remaining 400 pp. of the Grundrisse is built on the basic elements here outlined."

Having thus cavalierly virtually dismissed one-half of the book (he will later return in bits and pieces), he is off on his own. It is here, then, that we have to search for his method and aim and originality of contribution. Quoting Marx on the difference between a method of presentation and a method of inquiry, which Nicolaus translates as "method of working", Nicolaus concludes that this is the unique feature of the Grundrisse. Directly after this he once again quotes Marx, this time Marx's letters to Engels (Jan. 16, 1858) on the fact that Marx did indeed find Hegel's Logic of great service "in the method of working." Unfortunately, Nicolaus has no comprehension whatever, either of this sentence or the one he quotes from Lenin that it was "impossible completely to understand Marx's Capital, especially Chapter One, without having thoroughly studied the whole of Hegel's Logic." Far from basing himself on either, Nicolaus is on his way to construct something altogether different.

While this flies in the face of Marx's critique of the dialectic as rooted in history, self-development, the self-making of labor, Nicolaus stresses how "profoundly contrary to Hegel's method" is Marx's. (Nicolaus here limits himself to the concreteness of Marx's concept of time, especially on the question of production, which is, of course, crucial, but we will see later that what he leaves out, in turn, is the whole of Marxism: SUBJECT, self-development, masses as reason and not just as labor time.)

AT THE MOMENT Nicolaus was altogether too busy denying Hegel: "The idealist side of his philosophy was that he denied the reality of what the senses perceive." (p.27) Not a word about the fact that, according to Marx, so great was Hegel's discovery of second negativity, and so rooted in the revolutionary period, that Hegel had to "throw a mystical veil" over that reality. It is of course at reality where Marx did transcend Hegel—and so did the historic period of 1848 as against 1789—but, again, it was the Subject, the proletariat, that made the Great Divide between Hegel, the bourgeois

(Continued on Page 7)

(cont'd)

PAGE 5

...ase-in
 ...ful are the European
 ... 1968," that, despite
 ... Europe's resistance
 ... al Monetary Fund has
 ... evaluations have made
 ... hat this has gained a
 ... bt some sort of trip
 ... nvened to allow for
 ... sed off for a "New
 ... of Europe" ends.
 ... 1975 to continue with
 ... iddeman" when not
 ... ans her benefit, but
 ... bowing to the lesser
 ... superpowers listen at
 ... pe or Japan, who is
 ... in as big a crisis, it
 ... t none can disregard
 ... ery moment she holds
 ... the whole Indochina
 ... of both the U.S. and
 ... on Doctrine" of mak-
 ... operate in Southeast
 ... might as on the Sino-
 ... east his eyes aside
 ... at, bombed, and now
 ... no unity in the Indo-
 ... otely. Sihanouk is
 ... on En-lai made sure
 ... promising "peace with
 ... nouk, is as anxious as
 ... "there! What each
 ... n hegemony" actually
 ... Vietnamese "domina-
 ... ninsula. To close one's
 ... ao's China is to help
 ... east Asia in Europe,
 ... here that China-Russia
 ... domination.
 ... imperialistic fighting,
 ... n or state-capitalism,
 ... state, the overripeness
 ... prepares for uprooting
 ... of its crises the world
 ... tage of barbarism.
 ... similar thing to the
 ... ho "understood" their
 ... necessary to remain
 ... (see The Manchester
 ... fore then, at the very
 ... line in East Europe,
 ... many especially that
 ... d.

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

philosopher, and Marx who had discovered a new continent of thought that was not merely materialism vs. idealism but the unity of the two in "the new Humanism", and that carried through into Vol. III of Capital as "Human power is its own end."

So preoccupied is Nicolaus with contrasting material-



This contemporary cartoon on the suppression of the paper Marx edited, "Rheinische Zeitung" shows Marx chained to the printing press while the royal Prussian eagle gnaws at his vitals. The original lithograph appeared in 1843 without any accompanying text, since printed comment was forbidden by the censorship.

alism to idealism that he forgets the true uniqueness of Marx and repeats outworn revisionisms about "Hegelian language" to tell us that "Before Capital found its way into print Marx discarded most of this lexicon as baggage which had served for its journey but outlasted its day." (pp.32-3) Then what did that "service" that Hegel rendered Marx achieve? Nicolaus' answer is indeed the most petty-bourgeois intellectualistic idealism yet heard: "The usefulness of Hegel lay in providing guide-lines for what to do in order to grasp a moving developing totality with the mind." (p. 33)

Now if it is nothing less than "guide-lines" that Hegel provided and if he also provided "a grip on the entire realm of the 'independent objective Mind' which Hegel had sent floating into the heavens . . .", what exactly was new in Marx's discovery? Where was that proletariat Marx held on to as the Subject for transformation of society, the shaper of history, the mass that is a product of history but also "makes" it? Nicolaus can't seem to get further than "standing Hegel right side up" and "removing mystical shell from rational core"...

THE RESULT IS self-paralysis, blindness to that

Marx's 'Grundrisse'

crucial Chapter One of Capital, which (1) Lenin called attention to as requiring the whole of Logic but which Nicolaus reduces to zero stating "It would be a misreading of Lenin's intent to argue that . . . This is a project for a long term in prison." (pp.60-1) (2) He never once questions himself as to that constant reappearance of Chapter One at each revolutionary period and counter-revolutionaries demanding it be thrown out of the teaching of Capital, as Stalin did in 1943. Moreover, and above all, (3) what exactly is Chapter One, and its 1873-5 re-writing by Marx himself of final section "Fetishism of Commodities" and why did Marx ask readers of the German edition which did not have that essential part to please read the French edition following the Paris Commune?

Nothing, nothing whatever, is greater proof of the recreation of the dialectic on the basis of this elemental outpouring and the self-development of Marx's Begriff of Commodity. In "nothing whatever" I include all the great dialectical development in Grundrisse, even its Hegelian-Marxian "absolute movement of becoming." For the most mature, most creative genius learned from the Parisian masses that that perverse form, a commodity, the value-form of a product of labor, can never be stripped of its fetishism except by "freely associated labor." So his beginning, as against Hegel's in Science of Logic, was not only concrete, tangible as against abstract universal of Being, but it was also the not-concrete, not-tangible bourgeois fetish which reduced labor itself to the commodity, labor-power. And this was not only production explicitation vs. market equality, but that Absolute, the specifically capitalistic stage of production, whose Notion had to be split into two: bourgeois reification vs. freely associated labor showing it is all relations of production that must be uprooted and recreated on altogether other foundations. . . .

THE NEW IN the Grundrisse even now is not merely "method of working", great as that is. It is the continuity of the affinity of the Marxian and Hegelian dialectic. From the moment of break with bourgeois society, 1843, all the way through Grundrisse and total break with vulgar materialists (not merely as utopians or Proudhonists but as Lassalleans) to Capital and the First International, Marx's self-development is in no sense a break from the young Marx that discovered a new continent of thought.

Any who question, as Nicolaus does, whether "it is any longer necessary to read Hegel's Logic in order to completely understand Capital" when Grundrisse is finally available; and then claim that Grundrisse is just to see a mind at work, are indeed the worst kind of petty-bourgeois "idealists". They are completely dead to the whole of the past two decades when from below, from the East German Revolt in 1953 on to Paris and Peking, 1968, as well as from "above" (self-determination of Idea finally catching up with self-determination of nations) "new passions and new forces" have arisen. This movement surely has passed by progeny of the Stalins, Maos, not to mention the Trotskyists and all who thought they can catch theory "en route." The task for us, however, has just begun.

Raya Dunayevskaya
July 1, 1973

Nov 1973

6912

NOVEMBER, 1973

THE MIDDLE EAST ERUPTS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
National Chairwoman, News & Letters Committees

(Editor's Note: As we go to press, the two super powers have re-entered the Middle East cockpit, allegedly to gain a "cease-fire"—which has not stopped the firing. The latest developments have changed nothing in the fundamental analysis written on October 12 by Raya Dunayevskaya, which we print below.)

Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan on Oct. 8 pronounced the highly charged imperialistic statement: "The same road that leads from Damascus to Tel Aviv also leads from Tel Aviv to Damascus." To try to defend such reactionary militarist statements by pointing to the fact that it was not Israel, but Egypt and Syria who first crossed the 1967 cease-fire boundaries, is to fall into the typical capitalistic-Communist trap about "aggression."

It is never a question of who fired the first shot. Israel had six years during which she had not returned so much as one inch of Arab soil.

Not only that. She had behaved as any imperialist—occupying territory that was not hers, expelling people whose land it was, and proceeding to remake it in her image both as to land and as to settlers. Therefore, to keep harping on the timing of the surprise attack, blasphemous or otherwise, is to talk in a language that is absolutely foreign to the masses who are doing the dying, Israeli as well as Arab.

This is not a matter of "approval" of either Arab or Israeli rulers in this war. Nor can the question possibly be limited to the two sides, in disregard of the super-powers—U.S. and Russia—who have been in the Middle East cockpit ever since the 1967 war.

THE BIG POWERS ARE LINING UP

Take Kissinger's frightening statement: "We shall resist aggressive foreign policy. Detente cannot survive irresponsibility in any area, including the Middle East."

Our double-tongued Secretary of State tried to give the impression that he was threatening Russia. In fact, judging by today's (Oct. 12) press conference, he was also saying the opposite—that Russia is a "responsible" power and as "worried" as the U.S. about the Middle East.

What it all adds up to is that the U.S., like Russia, has no intention of letting either the Israelis or the Arabs enjoy self-determination; that, once the battle lines are "clear," the Big Powers will do the deciding.

So far to the right have the Israeli leaders moved, so imperialistically-minded are they now, that already Premier Meir dares to say that "after victory," Israel will no longer be satisfied with the borders of Oct. 5, 1973! Does that woman really have the gall to see herself driving into occupied Cairo? Or Damascus? Or wish to dam up the Suez Canal? Where and when will all this madness stop? Can they not face reality?

Just as the Maginot Line failed to protect France, the Bar Lev Line fell to Egypt. In both cases it was a question of militarists believing in technology rather than in people. Moreover, the Bar Lev Line was not outflanked; the Egyptians are reoccupying their own land. Even where Israeli technology helped Israel, it still is not the decisive factor. The Arabs in Israeli-occupied Sinai surely look at the Egyptians as liberators who they wish would come closer. That fact cannot be changed even if Israel mounts a counter-offensive and wins.

As against the 1967 Arab war rhetoric which showed its unmistakable anti-Semitic spirit with its sloganeering of "driving Israel into the sea," Premier Sadat of Egypt this time is not questioning Israel's right to existence, but its right to occupy Sinai. Whatever be his "gamemanship," it comes after last year's display of willingness to

open the Suez Canal to international traffic, including that of Israel. It was Premier Golda Meir who had hardened her stand and would not budge.

Presently, she is trying to shift the eyes of the Jews (Israeli and Russian) toward hated Russia: "we are fighting against the Egyptian Army and Syrian Army, but the rockets, the tanks, the planes—everything that is in the hands of the Egyptian and Syrian soldier—all this comes to him from the Soviet Union."

It is true that the arms are Russian, even as it is true that Israel's are U.S.-made; exactly what Third World country produces tanks and missiles and planes? It is not true that the Arabs are fighting Russia's war; they are fighting Israel's imperialism. What is true, above all, is that in the entire quarter century of Israel's existence, she has done nothing to solve the question of the Palestinian refugees.

ISRAEL: WHAT IT WAS; WHAT IT IS

What has happened to the humanity, the greatness, the daring of the Jews who escaped Nazism and fought the British imperialists so successfully that they inspired Nasser?

There is no doubt that a new dimension surged up with the creation, in 1948, of the state of Israel in the Middle East, whose politics heretofore had been dominated by oil. Although the fact is now conveniently forgotten, it was the anti-imperialist struggle of the Palestinian Jews that so overwhelmed the young, then unknown, Colonel Nasser, who had come to sign the pact ending the Arab-Israeli war, that, instead of dwelling on the armistice terms, he was plying the Jews with questions as to just how the outgunned, outnumbered force could have overcome British occupation. And Nasser did, indeed, apply the lessons he learned from the Jews, as he himself tells it in his "Philosophy of Revolution."

What has happened to the Jewish revolutionaries who were during those World War II years also trying to establish solidarity with the Arab masses who would fight for freedom from imperialism? To point to the reactionary regimes in the Middle East, their monarchies and shiekdoms, cannot possibly substitute for Israeli injustices to the Palestinian masses who know no other life than that of refugees.

OIL, AGAIN AND AGAIN AND AGAIN

In the Middle East, oil is "the oldest profession." It has always been a corrupting practice which kept feudal monarchies, shiekdoms and emirs in power, the masses in poverty and illiteracy, the countries underdeveloped. With state capitalism as the dominant feature of world economy, oil has assumed a still newer form: reactionaries as well as "radicals" have learned all about nationalization, price gouging, and using their American counter-parts to put pressure on U.S. imperialism to tilt policy toward the Arab oil monopolists rather than Israel.

This is volatile enough, but what is one to say when this late in the century we are confronted, at one and the same time, with a call from the rightist William F. Buckley, Jr. for re-colonization, and from a former leftist, Walter Laqueur, with a statement that "a Western military presence" is a present need?

Here is what Buckley wrote before the Middle East erupted: "Somewhere along the line, the nations of Western Europe should make a preemptive moral strike against hardening Arab policy. It would have the nature of saying: Mideast oil must be made available." (Published in New York Post, 10/9/73).

The liberals may not have the gall of a Buckley, who christens colonization "a preemptive moral strike." But one and all are busy pointing to the U.S. need for a mallet (let in the Middle East, and espousing the idea that Israel could become that supreme weapon not only against the oil powers but also against the nuclear power, Russia.

6913 (cont'd)

Is this where it all is now? Are revolutionaries supposed to "take sides" on such imperialist ground, be it U.S. or Russia, Arab or Israel—or, for that matter, China, which is playing the wildest game of all, since it has nothing to lose and anything gained is a "victory" against its enemy, Russia.

MAO'S CHINA AND THE THIRD WORLD

Along with the terrorists (and outright fascists like Al-Shukairy whom Mao's China sheltered in the 1967 war), China prides herself on never having recognized Israel's right to existence. Never mind that the People's Republic of China didn't exist in 1947-48. Never mind that even a Stalin (to whom Mao bowed and still does) was the very first to recognize the newborn State of Israel. Never mind that "Marxism-Leninism" that Mao claims to espouse is supposed to stand for social revolution rather than individual terror, much less kingdoms or sheikdoms. All that we are supposed to see is that Russia is "Enemy Number One," and all else is subordinated to that single overpowering "fact."

On this, Golda Meir and Mao are one. In this, though on opposite sides of the firing line, and though one (Mao) claims to be the spokesman for the Third World, those

two are the only rulers who seem not to shy away from any consequences of their politics, even where that might lead to a nuclear holocaust.

The possibility of World War Three is by no means excluded. The jockeying for position is not only among the warring powers but among the nuclear super-powers. The Middle East war is by no means over yet, either as between the countries at war or the super-powers lining up behind closed doors, much less within each country.

WHERE TO NOW ?

Where the 1967 war, with its anti-Semitism and anti-Israel-as-state only served to unite class opponents within Israel, this war can open new ways out if any unfold a new banner of solidarity across national boundaries. This is the only area where revolutionaries outside of Israel can take part.

The "New Left" which thinks being against Israel in toto proves them to be "real" revolutionaries aligning with the Third World, and that the Third World as it now exists means a new world social order, are creating nothing but fatal illusions. No revolutionary regimes exist in Jordan; nor is Mao's China the equivalent of socialism.

Quite the contrary. All that such false identification shows is that its exponents cannot think of liberation without hanging onto existing state powers—rulers who strike out against their own masses.

All one has to do to see that is to look at recent events: King Hussein's massacre of the Palestinian rebels; Mao's turning against his own "ultra left" youth because they followed the Cultural Revolution's slogan, "It is right to rebel."

For that matter, the "Left" in Israel, who thought the way to oppose their rulers was to become spies for Syria, demonstrate that they have no conception of the

fact that the struggle for liberation within one's country is not, and cannot be, turned over to an outside state power. Which does not mean that the Israeli Left has no way out and must capitulate to its rulers in the on-going war.

This war is one too many for both sides in the Middle East conflict. For the situation to have moved off from dead center only to erupt into a full scale war transforming this, for the second time since 1967, into a war of global proportions. That is to say, the two super powers enter to take away the right of self-determination of both the Arab and the Israeli peoples. All the more imperative is it for the Middle East masses to see that the final answer will only come from revolutions within each country, and that includes a revolution in Israel.

In the U.S., the "Year of Europe" has become the year of Watergate has become the year of wildcats has become the year of counter-revolution in Chile has become the year of the Middle East. Sadat calls it "the year of decision." That may well be so, but not in the way Sadat means it. Neither the "limited war" he is espousing for the moment, nor the oil interests pressuring the United States, will have the last say. The Big Powers, nuclearly armed, have no intention of allowing anyone but themselves to do the deciding—not even such middle powers as Western Europe or Japan, who do wish to see a tilting toward the oil monopolists.

The point is that for revolutionaries, there can be no simplistic answers. For they are no substitute for seriously working out a method of struggle inseparable from a philosophy of liberation, all integrally related to masses in motion. There simply is no substitute for a social revolution within each country.

Oct. 12, 1973

*See my Political Letters on the 1967 war and the 1969 Iraqi outburst which personified anti-Semitism, anti-revolution, anti-philosophy. (Available from News & Letters for 35c).

Nov. 1973

DECEMBER, 1973

THE U. S., GLOBAL POLITICS AND THE MIDEAST WAR

By Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairwoman, News & Letters Committees

At prime time, on Nov. 25, the President took to the TV and air waves to tell us about the energy crisis. As if reducing house and office temperatures to 68 degrees and auto speed to 50 miles an hour would solve the crisis which caused him to create still one more bureaucracy, the Energy Emergency Action Group, the overconfident but distraught Mr. Nixon unfolded still another fairy tale: by the end of the decade the

U.S. would be so totally self-sufficient in energy that we would be independent of any other land, the Middle East—or whatever!

The gilding of the lily for the 1980s hid from us that this Administration is doing nothing whatever "to discipline" the oil monopolies, although it is they who are neither producing enough oil nor in any way "disciplining" the oil kingdoms, sheikdoms and emirates who are so totally dependent on the know-how and technology of "the seven sisters" (BP, Shell, Jersey or Exxon, Stancal or Chevron, Texaco, Gulf and Mobil).

WHAT NIXON DIDN'T TELL US

That was not all that we did not hear about in Nixon's hurried 15-minute address. Not one word was uttered about the Middle East war and the total disarray this has caused among the West European powers plus Japan—all U.S. allies.

The wolf-eat-wolf policy is practiced not because they have much interest in either side of the Arab-Israeli war, but because the question of oil is as potent a weapon and impotent a political principle as ever was Munich.

Most deceptive of all was the silence about the one simple and overriding truth that faces us: a recession, a deep one. No serious economist now denies that unemployment, far from receding, will reach unsatisfactory levels in 1974. The average, by spring, may reach eight percent—and that never falls to mean that for Blacks it is unbearably twice that high.

To get to the depth of the crisis we have to turn away from Nixon's lollipop chat about no lighting for the Christmas trees and turn to the myriad contradictions in U.S. relations with the Mideast, with West Europe, with Japan, with the world, especially Russia.

THE NEW ANTI-RUSSIAN STANCE

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's whirlwind "peace tour" through the Middle East ended in, of all places, Peking, and there on Nov. 14 achieved a totally new set of relations. To the surprise even of Kissinger, he was presented that morning with a change in the paragraph from the joint communique with Nixon in 1972. In place of the 1972 communique making Taiwan the crucial question obstructing "normalization" between China and the U.S., the 1973 paragraph limited itself to affirming "the principle of one China."

Even before the moment, on Nov. 11, when Chou greeted Kissinger as "the Mideast cyclone," it was clear that the Mideast war had brought U.S.-China relations to a sort of joint anti-Russian stage.

For one thing, China had not used its veto power against the U.S.-Russia sponsored cease-fire resolution in the Mideast. Secondly, and crucially, it was not Russia's sponsorship that kept China from using its veto power. Rather, it was China's appreciation of the new U.S. anti-Russian stance.

When Russia threatened to enter the Mideast imbroglio, America called a world alert. As against West Europe that refused to let the U.S. use its ports or air space, China declared that the U.S. had to do so "to forestall the Soviet Union from sending troops un-

(Continued on Page 5)

ilaterally to the Middle East." As the China News Agency put it, it was only because Russia understood "that the U.S. 'really meant business' that it backed down."

China has but one preoccupation—its own national interests which hold that Russia is "Enemy No. One." Because that is so, it quickly forgot that it was "totally" for the Arab side, up to and including "driving Israel into the sea." No sooner did the Middle East war look as if it might become a Russia-U.S. confrontation than Chou moved for a global position for itself WITH the U.S. This, too, was not the first time China moved for a rapprochement with the U.S. on a great deal more critical issue than trade and "cultural relations."

First, it helped take the U.S. off the hotseat in Indochina. Then, during the SALT talks (which it ridiculed), it nevertheless began egging West Europe not to oppose a "U.S. presence." In the Mideast it was even more intensely interested in preferring a "U.S. presence." China all too well understands the titan nuclear power that the U.S. is.

The only one who didn't understand what was involved in the Mideast eruption as it edged toward an "East-West" confrontation—or didn't care to face its global implications—was West Europe. It was neither willing to sacrifice its immediate, national interests as they were bound to Arab oil, nor was it willing, as the West European press put it, to risk "nuclear annihilation without representation." And it was a great deal angrier at the U.S. than at Russia.

"THE YEAR OF EUROPE" THAT WASN'T

Not only did Nixon-Kissinger's "Year of Europe" never come to be. But the intra-imperialist rivalry between West Europe and the U.S. split open at all seams, and not only over the Middle East war which brought it all to a climax. Rather, it began to question also the "philosophic underpinnings" of globalism.

During the critical two weeks, between the U.S. world alert on Oct. 25 and Nov. 8 (when Kissinger departed for the Mideast tour), the statements from the State and Defense Departments, and the White House itself, were endless. At first, Nixon tried reducing the new tensions to an economic level: "Europe which gets 80 percent of its oil from the Mideast would have frozen to death unless there had been a settlement—and Japan, too."

Then Kissinger, the "architect" of the "Year of Europe" exploded: "What concerns us is that for two weeks, while the U.S. had to make significant decisions, the Europeans acted as though NATO did not exist. The Europeans seemed more interested in gaining marginal advantages. I don't care what happens to NATO I'm so disgusted."

The Europeans, angered both at Nixon's material vulgarity and the Defense and State Departments' arrogance of nuclear alerting without consultation, let it be known* that European and U.S. interests are NOT the same in the Middle East: "It's Dullesian hypocrisy on the part of Dr. Kissinger to pretend that they are."

West Europe, at one and the same time, tried narrowing the disagreement to the Mideast which "was never a part of NATO's origin or purpose," and expanding the Mideast stance to an anti-U.S. one, holding that Washington was tottering on the edge of hysteria because of "a Zionist lobby."

NIXON-KISSINGER'S VISION: Pax Americana

But their anti-U.S. unity did not succeed in forging a common stand as to itself. They were united in taking a pro-Arab position but not a pro-Europe stand. They rejected, for example, the Dutch motion that they "share oil within the Common Market community."

Dr. Strangelove Kissinger did expound one "truth." As against those West European rulers who, since they have no place to go, do not know how to get there,

(Cont'd)

6915

Nixon-Kissinger have a "vision": Pax Americana. Hence, they keep referring to the need, first of all, for a "conceptual basis." More realistically put, Nixon-Kissinger are accusing West Europe of failing to see that "if" the U.S. was "on the edge of hysteria", it was not over Israel or the "Zionist lobby"—surely not when no election is at hand—but over a possible nuclear confrontation with the other nuclear titan, Russia, over who shall rule the world.

Not only is "the Year of Europe" the year that wasn't. But "the new Atlantic charter" that is evolving is the absolute opposite of what Nixon-Kissinger called for.

Even when tempers had cooled considerably, Le Monde declared that "U.S. authorities, brazenly calling their allies to order for their 'lack of cooperation' during the Mideast crisis," were in truth showing that it was not for European defense that "it is absolutely necessary to keep U.S. troops in Europe" but "for America's own security."

In a word, the single Kissinger truth is that, far from the Zionist lobby or Arab oil being the mainspring of the present confrontation, it is "U.S. presence" versus Russia that is pivotal, that overrides all other questions, that has won China, half neutralized the Arab world, gotten concessions from Israel, and is the question that has put a question mark over the very existence of NATO.

Of course, it isn't only West Europe that "doesn't understand." Neither does Kissinger's own assistant, the specialist on the Mideast in the State Department—

Sisco. So happy was he over Kissinger's 48-hour miracle of getting Sadat to sign the six-point "peace plan" that he declared that he was "convinced that Congress, despite the Zionist lobby, is now beginning to see the situation much more clearly. The mood is changing in the U.S. in favor of the Arabs." The reason? "Oil and our strategic interests." But those two areas of interest are not similar, and Sisco is no "expert" in global strategy a la Kissinger, his boss.

THE NEW ROLE OF SADAT'S EGYPT AND 'THE LEFT'

There is no doubt that there has been a shift on the Middle East. Kissinger is ready enough to force concessions from Israel and therefore can appear to have a more "even-handed" policy. But what is of far greater importance—indeed, is the overriding aim of Nixon-Kissinger—is to keep Russia out of the Middle East.

That was the trump card he used to get the Arabs to be for the "peace plan." With it, he hoped not only to get Sadat's signature but to neutralize Faisal. Though the Saudi Arabian monarch is still using oil as the political weapon both to exact high prices AND to separate West Europe from the U.S., he himself fears "radicals" sufficiently to back Egypt to the hilt, including possible "peace" in Geneva.

At the same time, Nixon took steps to appease Europe, to play down any craveness and play up "interests of the alliance as a whole": "if the U.S.S.R. learns that it can exploit the Middle East to separate the U.S. from its European alliance, this could be very disastrous for Europe and the world." That "48 hour miracle"—U.S. as "peacemaker"—is the imperial counterpoint to Europe's "new unity." What hangs in the balance everywhere, however, are the crises at home. And since much of this is related to using oil as political weapon, all eyes are on the new role of Sadat's Egypt.

On the one hand, there were some demonstrations in Europe against their own rulers buckling so easily to the demands of oil for anti-Israel stance—"Are we going to witness another Munich?" On the other, and more massive hand, however, the Left, in its correct stand against Israel's occupation of all the Arab lands and total disregard of the Palestinian refugees, is acting as if Arab oil equals "revolution."

The truth is that the reason Sadat's Egypt achieved "Arab unity" in the use of oil as political weapon is not due to his being a revolutionary. Quite the contrary. Nasser's Egypt never could get the oil kingdoms to use their resource as a political weapon against "the West" (which suddenly now includes Japan!), because they feared him as a revolutionary nationalist who also stepped outside Egypt's borders. As against that, the oil kingdoms have total confidence in Sadat who will not only do nothing "to interfere in internal affairs" but will also do all in his power to discourage revolutionary movements against any exploitative, reactionary feudal regimes.

MIDDLE EAST AS KEY

What the Left refuses to face in this Egyptian victory is that, far from it being what Western imperialism calls "colonialism in reverse"—the masses in the underdeveloped countries really hitting out against imperialism, the simple truth is that neither "the West" nor the oil kingdoms fear Sadat. What Sadat did achieve, in addition to Arab oil being used as a political weapon, is to let Nixon and Brezhnev know they cannot put the Mideast on the back burner forever.

As against not only Israel but also U.S.-Russia, Sadat's Egypt took the initiative in making secret plans for the attack, in choice of date, Yom Kippur and Ramadan, for that surprise attack. The success of the crossing of Suez into Sinai was in no small part due to the fact that it was a surprise. In any case, politically it was a total success and Brezhnev and Nixon rushed to the alert, not necessarily on the same side even where detente demanded it.

The new, the global new in all this is that, instead of the "Balkanization" which Kissinger, the Euro-centered intellectual, thinks it is, the Middle East showed it can become the key to the world situation, as Germany was in World Wars I and II. So the whole "conceptual basis" of "Atlantic Alliance" better look at itself first, and perhaps for the last time.

The Left must not forget that its "conceptual basis" is the simple truth that the enemy is always at home, with its class rulers. In Israel, too, unfortunately, much of the Left, and not only the moderate doves, is tail-ending the hawks. It cannot be otherwise so long as its perspectives are not totally revolutionary, not nationalistic, and truly independent of the U.S., Russia, China, or any other state power.

BACK HOME

Where Nixon thought the Middle East War would get him off the Watergate hot seat and show him as the world statesman in full command of the global crisis, the masses are so disgusted with all the lies pouring out of the White House that they even thought the world alert but one more prop of Tricky Dicky.

Whatever the worries—and they are many, beginning with the tightening of their belts that are tight enough already—there is everywhere a new search for something to replace Nixon-Kissinger's "conceptual basis" and "philosophic underpinnings" of Pax Americana. In the ghettos a passion for philosophy is no academic question. Rather, the search for a new relationship of thought to action that underlies the tense quietude is that of the eve of many storms, none of whose direction is known, so that all are preparing for the worst. This does not mean that they will submit to the worst, but that they are working out new forms of opposition.

*Le Monde's editor-in-chief, Andre Fontaine, didn't satisfy himself only with calling for the return of all 1967 Arab territories, but also employed the euphemism used by Arabs when they mean it as a time-bomb planted for extermination of Israel: "the legitimate rights of the Palestinians." Andre Fontaine concluded thunderously: "It is unthinkable that Europe say amen to all American initiatives. Europe must forge its own unity if it is to make its weight felt."

A more moderate British publication—the London Sunday Times—likewise pushed to an anti-U.S. stand. "It has never been a term of NATO membership that European governments should support the Zionist imperatives weighing upon American presidents."

Dec 1973

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

(Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from Part 1 of the Perspectives Report delivered to the Convention of News & Letters Committees on Oct. 20, 1973, by the National Chairwoman, Raya Dunayevskaya. The complete report is available from News & Letters, 1800 E. Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. 48207, for 35c plus 15c postage. See full ad, page 7.)

The few phases of Nixon's counter-revolution that have aborted (or at least been exposed) and have given us a momentary breathing space, have been followed with Congressional and academic euphoria around the new intellectualistic Secretary of State with the mallet fist. Too many have already forgotten that it was Kissinger who kept the Vietnam War going for "four more years" to extract, or rather to fool the American people that Nixon has extracted "peace with honor"; forgotten that Kissinger had never opposed the Vietnam War—not when it began with "advisers" in the Kennedy regime, not when it became genocidal war in the Johnson years, much less during the Nixon regime.

Dr. Strangelove Kissinger had always practiced "benign neglect" that made sure wars would erupt in Latin America, indeed, made them erupt, be it during the Bay of Pigs (and let's not forget those CIA agents, practiced in incompetence there, were the ones directing Watergate) or the Chilean counter-revolution.

The wars at home — against the anti-war youth, against labor, against the Blacks, especially against the Blacks — were the specialty of those Eastern intellectuals so favored by the Western president for their "theory" of "benign neglect" and practice of not-so-benign neglect.

The precise expression for their Eastern as well as Western so-called intellect is: militarism. They practice militarization of the economy—and in this they also carried Congress with them . . .

War and practicing war by other means

IT BECOMES INCUMBENT upon us to examine carefully the three new threats that have surfaced with the present state of world counter-revolution:

First, in Chile itself, with the brutal murder of Allende (the duly elected president with his illusory parliamentary majority), there has sprouted a new neo-fascistic "mass base"—the middle class, including the professionals, the housewives, the rightist college youth.

Never before has this type of base been that active, that organized, that "respectable", and that willing to be led by the outright fascist "Fatherland and Liberty" military junta that began its "patriotic mission" by destroying the country's national palace, its whole history lying in ruins, spattered by the blood of its leaders extracted by the counter-revolutionary junta and continuing with the murder of thousands of workers.

Second, so abysmally corrupt is the Nixon Administration (and as the Vice President on the take showed, their corruption is by no means only morally so) that the ITT offer of a million to stop Allende's election was far from being the lowest point reached by the Republican Party.

Rather, the key to American Imperialism's stranglehold on Chile—the U.S. intervention in Chilean affairs—was everywhere, from having the World Bank withhold credit from the Allende parliamentary government, to keeping money flowing freely to the junta planning that coup. . . .

Third, that which was so phenomenal, so historic, so sharp a 180-degree turnabout—Nixon's spectacular trip to China—is already in a thousand little pieces . . .

SO OVERWHELMED, HOWEVER, were both Congressmen and journalists by the "brilliance" of the Harvard professor, so great the "pride" in their own "democracy" that "a Jew born in Germany" has become Secretary of State, that none paid any attention to the truth that, in fact, they just voted for the most militarist-minded man ever in civilian clothes to handle foreign policy.

It would indeed be foolhardy to be deluded (as, no doubt, the conceited egotist Kissinger is) that it is that "brilliant professor" and not the dirty rightist politician and trickster, President Nixon, who is setting foreign policy. Nixon, not Kissinger, sets policy; Cold War policies have become hot "peace" ones.

Nixon, no doubt, has underestimated just how great was the opportunity that came his way with the Sino-Soviet conflict. For the other truth is that it was not so much the Nixon Doctrine that opened new doors. Rather, it was the new reality of power in a nuclear superpower world, when one of the two nuclear titans is undercut by China—with a little nuclear know-how, 700 million human beings and a lot of Marxian verbiage. On top of it all, China has the longest-in-history common border with its "Enemy Number One," Russia. In a

word, this third "little" nuclear power sits astride both the borders of Russia it claims, and those of Southeast Asia that the U. S. has failed to conquer.

Thus did the "new world relations" arise from world realities and detente become the new form of sharp confrontations . . .

So much attention has been given to Kissinger's predilection for studies of Metternich's "concert of Europe" and "balance of powers" strategy that hardly any time was left to the "study" he was practicing. I'm referring, of course, to the "study" that suited Dr. Strangelove Kissinger best: Clausewitz's infamous theory that "war is extension of politics by other means." In reverse, Nixon-Kissinger, the practitioners of never-ending wars, are now practicing politics as an extension of war by other means. It is so at home, and abroad; with friends and with enemies; in Nixonland, it has become a way of life.

TWO WORLDS ONLY MINERS' CONTROL OF SAFETY WILL REDUCE DEATHS

It is with special pride that I turn over my column, TWO WORLDS, to the following report by Andy Phillips on the latest struggles of the miners in Kentucky, Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The activities of those same miners, in the general strike of 1949-50, initiated a whole new epoch of movement from practice to theory which gave MARXISM AND FREEDOM its theoretical form. I trust that, in turn, PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION will be felt by the miners to have met that challenge from below so that we can, together, forge a unified movement that will uproot this exploitative system.

—Raya Dunayevskaya


"Every single day that you go into that mine, you never know if you're gonna come out alive or dead. Only you can't think about it. You'd go crazy if you did. You'd never be able to even go down there, let alone do any work."

As expressed by a West Virginia miner, and known by every coal miner in the nation, the overriding daily fact of life for them all is . . . death. It is this reality which, more than any other, shapes their values, philosophy and character.

It is a reality which they reject and have always fought against, as seen in their bitter battles during the '30s and '40s when they were deservedly called the "shock troops of American labor"; in their nine-month long strike in '49-50 against automation which first hit and devastated the coal mine industry and to which the miners responded by raising the still-to-be-resolved historic question of "what kind of labor should man do as a human being."

THROW OUT BOYLE

Their opposition to those who failed to respond seriously to their literal life and death needs was more recently shown in their decisive defeat of do-nothing United Mine Workers President Tony Boyle, replacing him with the relatively unknown Arnold Miller who had campaigned on a platform of returning the union back to the miners.



—Angela Terrano

First and foremost in the minds of the miners, this means ridding the mining industry of the unsafe conditions of work by insisting that violations of safety provisions will not be tolerated, and if they are that the violators be punished.

It has now been a year since UMWA President Miller was elected. To date, the miners appear to have given him pretty good marks, but they are not taking anything at face value.

"Miller's done some pretty good things about safety," said one Pennsylvania miner. "The union went to court here in this state to back up the right of the miners who walked out because they felt their mine was unsafe. And we won the case in the lower court. But the operators took it to the Supreme Court, and they said that the men couldn't walk out, that they had to go through the contract grievance procedure. Maybe those guys know something about law, but they sure don't know anything about the mines. You could be dead before you could file a grievance. I can tell you right now that if I don't think

a mine is safe, I'm walking out . . . Supreme Court or no Supreme Court."

TAKE "WAIT AND SEE" ATTITUDE

But then he added, "Only there's lots more than this. We'll just have to wait and see what Miller does at contract time. Then we'll be able to tell more."

This same sentiment was expressed by other miners in West Virginia and Kentucky, with all eyes focusing on the coming December, when the UMW contract with the coal operators expires. This was also high in the minds of the delegates to the UMW convention held the first part of last December in Pittsburgh.

The fact that the convention was held in Pittsburgh indicated a change in itself. For the past 15-20 years, UMW conventions have been held outside of the coal region — in places like Miami, Atlantic City and even further away — to avoid the pressure of the rank-and-file miners. Miller obviously selected Pittsburgh to keep it in the heart of the coal region, open to the pressure of the rank-and-file.

While increased wages, a reduced work week, sick pay, vacation benefits and other fringe improvements were voted for, the Health and Welfare Fund was pointed to as the most important. It is this fund, into which coal operators now pay 80c per ton of union coal mined, that provides the money for hospital and medical care and retired miners' pensions.

HEALTH AND WELFARE FUND IS KEY

The reasons are long-standing. When the Health and Welfare Fund was established in 1947, first financed by 10c a ton royalty, then 40c a ton, it provided not only full medical care for miners and their families plus a \$100 a month retirement benefit, it also paid sick benefits, widows' and survivors' benefits and medical care, plus the money to build and staff 11 hospitals in coal regions where there had never been anything approaching adequate medical care for workers in the most hazardous industry in the nation.

Following automation of the mines in the early '60s, the fortunes of coal went down. From a work force of

(Continued on Page 8)

(Continued from Page 5)

450,000 union coal miners in 1943, by the end of the '50s there were perhaps 120,000 union miners. Non-union strip mining shot upward, going from about three percent of the coal mined to 20 percent. Coal also lost much of its market to other fuels.

Cuts were made in the Health and Welfare Fund benefits. Widows' and survivors' benefits were cut out completely, as were sick payments. Miners off work for a year lost their medical protection—and these numbered in the tens of thousands. The eleven hospitals, built at a cost of many millions of dollars, were sold or transferred to other organizations with staggering losses. Pensions were cut to \$75 a month.

WANT BENEFITS RESTORED

The miners want these benefits restored and improved, and make their feelings immediately known in any conversation on this point.

"Take my case," said a Black miner in West Virginia, stopping every couple of sentences to spit up blood and mucus into a tin can. "Here I am, 52 years old and I'm already finished after putting in over 25 years in the mines. I've got Black Lung, have had two heart attacks and have got to watch every thing I do just to stay alive. I haven't worked for a year and a half, but the bills keep on coming in. Lately, I've started to get some Black Lung payments from the state, and that's what has been keeping me and my family going, plus my wife's working. But you've got to have more than that to live decent. Nobody should be allowed to be thrown on the scrap heap just because they can't work anymore because they're sick."

On the inside of the mines, there have been some changes — but many things remain the same, like the drive of the coal companies for coal regardless of what it costs in human lives.

"All the company and their bosses are interested in is that ton of coal," another West Virginia miner declared. "We just had a mechanic electrocuted on the midnight shift. He was an afternoon shift mechanic, but had stayed in overtime to splice a cable to have the machine ready for the midnight shift when it got in, and had disconnected the electrical power from the

machine. Now when a crew gets to the section, the boss is supposed to make a run of the section to make sure that everything is o.k., then get back to the men and tell them that everything's all right before they put power on to the machines.

"But there's a big difference between what you're supposed to do and what is done. Power was put on that machine while the mechanic was splicing the cable and killed him."

DANGERS PERSIST

He went on to detail serious safety violations, like methane gas sensors on continuous mining machines that didn't work and exposed workers to the deadly danger of explosion; like defective water sprays on machines which increase the dangers of Black Lung as well as dust explosions that rip through mines with chain reaction force that twists steel railroad rails into pretzels and shreds human bodies.

When asked if he could see any change since Miller had been elected President of the UMWA, he said, "I sure can't see any difference. Consolidation Coal Company and bosses are still getting away with the same things they have always gotten away with — and that's killing miners because they want that ton of coal, that production."

Another West Virginia miner told of another young miner's grisly death. The guys on the section had just finished having lunch around the continuous miner. (This shouldn't be done. They should go to a designated dinner place to eat . . . but if you eat around the continuous miner, you might be able to save a few minutes and produce a few more tons of coal.) When they were through eating, the continuous miner operator turned on the power to the machine, which is not supposed to start any moving parts. Instead, the machine was defective, and the rotating steel bits, like the rotating bits of a chain saw, suddenly began to turn. The operator's helper, unseen by the operator, had been leaning against the bits — and was ground to pieces.

WILDCAT STRIKES ERUPT

This is the stuff of wildcat strikes in the mines. And there were two of them in action in northern West Virginia in January — at Blackville No. 1 and No. 2 mines. The strikes were set off because Consolidation Coal Com-

pany, which owns both mines, decided to violate the contract provisions on job postings. Both mines have a large number of young miners, many of them returned Vietnam war veterans. Both have a history of wildcat strikes in the past couple of years unmatched in the coal fields.

"The job posting is a clear cut case. The company just violated, like they do a lot of things," a striking miner said. "But it's like everything else. The company has gotten away with so many things that we know are wrong, but we can't always make a case out of them. It all builds up. Every day. This is such a cut-and-dried violation that everybody just went out to show. Control that they can't get away with it."

In Kentucky, where the UMWA union had been broken in the late '60s, striking miners at the Brookside mine near Harlan were determined to win the union back. On strike since Sept. 23, these miners and their wives and families have fought injunctions, police harassment and physical threats and jailings to gain UMWA representation.

"We lost more than a lot of us knew when the UMWA was busted in the late 1960s," said one striking Brookside miner. "That Health and Welfare card is worth more than \$10,000 to us. And we mean to have it. That's in addition to the kind of safety enforcement we have. Too many men around here and their families have to suffer because of the lack of safety enforcement. This is what the UMWA means to us right now. And we're fighting to get it. If we win, we'll help to get this whole region organized again. If we lose, it will be a step back and it will take a long, long time for the UMWA to make it up again."

MINERS ALONE HOLD SOLUTIONS

The one thread that holds true for all of these miner reactions to the present and expected developments is the conviction that the miners, and they alone, must have the power to enforce safety in the mines. This is a position the rank-and-file has always both understood and insisted upon, because they know very well that until they have the authority to enforce the safety provisions, there will never be any effective enforcement of safety in the mines.

March 1973

--- CONFUCIUS WHO?

APRIL, 1974

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION*
and *Marxism and Freedom*

The linkage of the name of Lin Piao with that of Confucius as if neither the 2,500-year span separating the two, nor death separating both from the living against whom the current mini-"Cultural Revolution" is directed, has not stopped the China specialists in the pragmatic West from the most far-fetched speculation. After all, it, too, is off on an exorcist binge.

Crises, despair, frustrations, alienations are so rampant, East and West, that the indulgence in wild escapisms is all-pervasive. Thus the European as well as the American press is once again not only busy deciphering the big character wall posters, but is also building these analyses on the untenable presupposition that the aged Mao remains the ever-young, ever-pure, ever-uncompromising world revolutionary who has set out to create a new China Man in his own continuing revolutionary image.

RUSSIA, MODEL; RUSSIA, ENEMY NO. 1

The truth, however, is that even before Mao gained state power, when he was a practicing revolutionary, it never was as a world revolutionary but as a Chinese revolutionary nationalist who so distrusted the proletariat that his most original contribution to "Marxist strategy" was to outflank the cities and have the army take over while the proletariat continued to work at their benches and the peasants in the fields. The great achievements of winning over both imperialism and the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek, as well as unifying the country, were no sooner accomplished than Mao set out to rule in Stalin's image. The commanding Communist heights in the state regime rested on a state-capitalist base that was openly so acknowledged as they followed the first Five-Year Plan.

When seven years later the opposition to Mao's regime turned out to come from the left, he showed

as little tolerance as Russian rulers do for theirs. Indeed, nowhere was this clearer than in the break with Russia when the Sino-Soviet conflict came to a climax in the so-called "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution." Even though the American bombs were raining on North Vietnam, making it the besieged fortress, the Chinese xenophobia disregarded all comradely pleas for a united front of the anti-war forces in support of Vietnam. And finally, and again, Russia and China each practiced the exact same state-capitalist game in rolling out the red carpet for Nixon.

Nothing, however, seems to stop the self-willed delusion of the so-called left in the West that somehow only Brezhnev is the revisionist while Mao remains the untainted revolutionary.

And now, just as the end for Mao's "closest comrade-in-arms", Lin Piao, came as Nixon was declared "less bad" than Enemy No. 1, Russia, the new mini-"Cultural Revolution" has, not accidentally, come wrapped in a special Russian spy story.

THE ONGOING "REVOLUTION"

Allegedly the new almost-upsurge began last January with a performance of a new opera, "Three Ascents Up Peach Mountain." The Peoples' Daily has castigated it as "an outrageous attack on Mao"; no more than a re-make of a 1968 opera which spurred on the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution." Like it, the present opera, instead of promoting "the class struggle," exuded the "Confucianist notion of the kingdom of gentlemen." The centerpoint of the present opera—or was it the 1968 one—was a crippled horse that couldn't gallop, that is to say, make the Great Leap Forward as Mao had ordered way back in 1958.

Now, whether one starts with the current attack on the TV and radio coverage of the play as not recognizing just how "counter-revolutionary" that opera was, or one looks, "realistically," at the new no. 3 man on the Politburo, Wang Hung-wen, as the "radical" who's

challenging Chou En-lai's foreign policy, the deeper truth is that the Red Flag denunciation and warnings against "settling old scores" and "dividing into this or that faction" are actually attempts at once to make sure that the mass dissatisfaction with what is present policy at home and abroad does not self-develop. Mao-Chou are presently bent on seeing that the opposition does not take on the proportions of the "Great Cultural Revolution," 1966-69, when a section of the youth, like Sheng Wu-lien, took Mao at his word that it was "right to rebel," and both in the factories and in the fields questions are raised as to conditions of labor.

I'm not saying that there are no divisions within the leadership, much less that the leaders aren't already fighting over who's to wear Mao's mantle when

he dies. Nor am I saying that there isn't an attempt to curb the military power which no doubt gained ascendancy at the Ninth Party Congress, over which Lin Piao presided and was named Mao's closest comrade-in-arms. But the truth is very obvious: the greater role of the army wasn't due to any "conspiracy" by Lin Piao. Mao always set a high priority for the military and specifically called it in to put down the left whom they began calling anarchists.

The present shuffling about of military commanders from "their own" provinces to new locations is just that, just a shuffling about, intra-party, intra-elite, within the ruling bureaucracy. Not a single one has been removed; many old CP hands have been returned back to power. And above all, the detente with American imperialism goes on apace everywhere and anywhere, including the Middle East and West Europe where China prefers American imperialism to Russian expansionism. Russia, of course, does the exact same thing in bidding for the U.S. hand against China.

WHY MAO'S GROUND?

What is it we're supposed to read into the Chinese poetic flair which now declares that Confucius and Lin Piao are "like two cucumbers on the same root?" Whose side are we supposed to take when it's now alleged that Lin Piao defamed both Mao and the Chin Emperor who had unified China and did so by a mammoth book-burning? Was that supposed to represent "suppressing the reactionary scholars" just as Mao once said, whereas those who followed Confucius were "the reactionary scholars and gentry?" Isn't it more reasonable to think, not of a period B.C. but very much of today, 1974, where the educational system is being questioned, before and after the "Cultural Revolution?"

Why should anyone take seriously the critique of Beethoven as a "revisionist" when in fact what really concerns the masses is conditions in the factory? Wasn't it a fact that during the "Cultural Revolution" the epithet, "economism," suddenly was bestowed with the fantastic meaning that workers who dared ask for higher wages and better conditions of labor were guilty of economism when, in fact and historically, among Marxists it had always stood for reformist leadership who wished to restrict the workers' activities only to trade union matters instead of the political field?

And isn't the present accusation of Russia's desire for nothing short of transforming China into "a Soviet colony" in fact a cover for once again preferring Nixon-Kissinger as not only "less bad" but the preferred ally against any developing revolutionary situation outside China?

It is hardly a secret that the "Independent" journalists care not a farthing about revolutionaries, and less still whether China or Russia represents "true" Communism. Consciously or unconsciously, the compulsion to present Mao as the world's greatest revolutionary toes the Pax Americana line of breaking up the Sino-Soviet orbit to its own global designs. That the New Left populist-anarchist interpretation of Mao also helps the myth of Mao, the unsold revolutionary theorist, only goes to prove what strange bedfellows politics makes.

~~The non-commercial Jean-Paul Sartre~~

MAY, 1974

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

*Editor's Note: A new biography of Jean-Paul Sartre, by Francis Jeanson, has just come off the press. So much of it rests on Sartre's own autobiography, *The Words*, that we felt this critique of the work written by Raya Dunayevskaya was appropriate to share with N&L readers, although space prohibits printing more than brief excerpts. We suggest that it be accompanied by a reading of Chapter 6 of *Philosophy and Revolution*, "Jean-Paul Sartre: Outsider Looking In." Now that Sartre calls himself a near-Maoist, it will be interesting to watch his actions in the May 5 elections in France.*

THE SHOCK OF Jean-Paul Sartre's autobiographical *The Words** is its seeming ambivalence on the author's famed concept of commitment . . .

The author has created a strange admixture of reminiscence and recollection that is more ideological essay than autobiography. Great sections seem to be written as if they were illustrating various existentialist theses . . .

The remembrance of things past is written not alone in the present, but in the future tense. A master wielder of the pen, Sartre so intersperses the next projection into the retelling of the past that one isn't always sure which is actual experience and which analysis . . .

The descriptions are too "objective", too distant, as if not the child, but the adult philosopher of existence, was substituting a constructed existence for a lived one. This is the cause of the ambivalence of the book as a whole, and the last section in particular.

When the book first appeared in France the ambivalence made the reviewers sit up with a start. Sartre's statement, "I have changed," seemed to them to refer, not to the change from the bourgeois child to "Marxist",

**The Words* by Jean-Paul Sartre, translated from the French by Bernard Frechtman, (George Braziller, New York, 1963) \$5.

but from writer to one who values literature very nearly for its own sake. "For the last ten years or so," wrote Sartre, "I've been a man who's been waking up, cured of a long, bitter-sweet madness, and who can't get over the fact, a man who can't think of his old ways without laughing and who doesn't know what to do with himself. I've again become the traveler without a ticket that I was at the age of seven . . ." (p. 253). When the reviewers implied that he had changed his position on commitment, Sartre felt impelled to grant an interview to *Le Monde* in which he not only restated his old position, but questioned the value of any literary creation "in a society that is hungry." Later, in refusing the Nobel prize, he once again restated his choice of sides between "socialism" and "capitalism."

DUE WEIGHT MUST, of course, be given to both statements. Nevertheless, it is inconceivable that so great a master of language could not have expressed with precision and from the start exactly what he felt and thought. *The Words* will have to stand on its own feet.

D. H. Lawrence expressed most profoundly the problem we face here when he was confronted, in his *Studies in Classic American Literature*, with the contradiction between teller and tale: "An artist is usually a damned liar, but his art, if it be art, will tell you the truth of his day."

Sartre was born in 1905. *The Words* tells the story of the first twelve years of his life, but the book does not limit itself to these years. Various other years are brought in, generally quite suddenly, but not contingently. Each year beyond 1917 that is referred to has its special reason for being. One especially is brought in several times. Its purpose is to serve as a turning point of darkest life, the transition from a bourgeois, meaningless existence to one where the writer as artist goes beyond a situation, projects himself, is witness to being uprooted. The year is 1935.

The crucial reason, for making a veritable philosophical category of the year was that it is the year Sartre wrote *Nausea* . . .

(cont'd)

THIS IS THE PERIOD also, although Sartre does not mention this, when he returned from his stay in Berlin. Just as he and Simone de Beauvoir had gone for vacation in Italy—and gone “without scruple”—because Mussolini had cut railway prices 70 per cent to attract tourists to the Fascist Exhibition, so he proceeded to Hitler Germany to study at the French Institute. It wasn't that he sympathized in any way whatever with fascism. Quite the contrary. He considered himself of the Left and was saddened during his stay in Germany when Dollfuss crushed the Austrian socialist revolt. As Mme. de Beauvoir puts it quite frankly in her memoirs: “We would not set our own shoulders to the wheel of history, but we wanted to believe that it was turning in the right direction; otherwise we would have had too many problems to rethink.” (*The Prime of Life*, p. 146)

So instead, Sartre went on with the study of Husserl's philosophy in whose phenomenological style Sartre was then writing, “*The Transcendence of the Ego*.” Evidently they were either unconcerned or unaware of the fact that the philosopher whom they so admired was barred from the library of his university since he was a Jew and thus was not permitted access by his most famous pupil, Martin Heidegger who was then Rector of the University and an active Nazi.

Now, Sartre was surely not an Anti-Semite; he was apolitical, totally so. The shaking off of what his grandfather imposed on him when he was a child—bourgeois idealism, writing at destiny's calling, which Sartre refers to as his “*Imposture*,” books as a substitute for life as well as the catharsis of literary creation that he experienced when he was on his own, which he felt first when he reached the age of thirty and wrote *Nausea*, all this and more made him famous as writer.

BUT IT IS NOT this which established him as very nearly the spokesman for a generation. That only came with the Resistance and directly after liberation when he became “committed.” This is the “conversion” that is crucial. It is true that that period is not within the province of *The Words*, but not a single marker is set up for it while many are set up for the year 1935. *The Words* does not give us the slightest sense of inner crisis; it doesn't give us that man, and this isn't because Sartre has changed again. Sartre makes no effort of any kind to give us the quality of that inner crisis because there was no “conversion.” Sartre remains—Jean-Paul.

The “I” that changed, the quality the critics saw as a reversal on the question of political action, is but a continuation of apolitical politics. The Resistance was broad enough in its composition and intense enough in its action, in its enforced sense of urgency, that no philosophical clash of the various political tendencies emerged. The minute the war was over, however, and the varied tendencies clashed, that minute Sartre's inherent evasiveness reappeared.

This evasion was not merely one about taking sides between “others”, the varied tendencies within Marxism. The evasion, the flight from contradiction was a flight into his own existentialist philosophy and its concept of individual freedom as against Marx's concept of humanity's freedom. Note, please, I said Marx's not Marxist; I did so because Sartre is often double-tongued on the question. A quick look at a major philosophical essay in the period after Liberation will show what I mean.

DEVOTED TO EXORCIZING the materialist “myth” from the philosophy of revolution, *Materialism and Revolution* appears to argue against Communists and Trotskyists, but is, in fact, a direct attack on Karl Marx. Thus Sartre writes: “Let us make no mistake; there is no simultaneous transcendence of materialism and idealism here . . .” (p. 401) In a footnote he refers to the fact that Marx thought otherwise, but, instead of quoting him, Sartre quotes Communist interpretations of Marx. Had he quoted Marx, Sartre could not, of course, have made the point that, without existentialism, the human element gets swallowed up in “dialectical materialism.”

Marx went to great length in his *Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, 1844*, to show why he does not consider Communism “the goal of human development, the form of human society;” why he insists, instead, on designating his philosophy as a “thoroughgoing Naturalism or Humanism” which distinguishes itself from both Idealism and Materialism: “it is, at the same time, the truth uniting them both.” Sartre's criticism of Communists, on the other hand, went hand in hand with his reiteration that the Communist Party was “the only revolutionary party.” (p. 429) Again: “We shall call revolutionary the party or the person in the party whose acts intentionally prepare such a revolution . . . In the same way, we cannot call the American Negroes revolutionaries, though their interests may coincide with those of the party which is working for the revolution.” (p. 406) . . .

What should be obvious is that the contradiction in Sartre is not between philosophy and action. The gulf is between two opposing philosophies: Sartrean existentialism and its corollary, the myth invented by it of the Communist Party being “the only revolutionary party,” and Marx's Humanism which sees no need for bourgeois or Communist idealism manifested in a party of the elite, “a party to lead.” . . .

May 1974

TWO WORLDS

Negritude as revolution and counter-revolution

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

I'm very happy to give my space this issue for re-printing excerpts from the section on Negritude contained in a speech delivered by the great Haitian poet, Rene Depestre, to the Tricontinental Congress in Havana in 1968. Complete copies can be obtained from INVISIBLE CITY, 6 San Gabriel Drive, Fairfax, California 94930.
—Raya Dunayevskaya

Haiti today is the country where one can most trace the adventures of negritude, because ours is the land where, as Aimé Césaire has said, "it took its stand for the first time," and where it now is the ideology which feeds the most monstrous tyranny in contemporary history. That's why a critical examination of the concept of negritude, in the light of the horrible Haitian experience, can have an efficacious significance for all oppressed blacks. We know that all ideology, in so far as it represents something real and pursues certain objectives, has a tendency to give to the particular aspirations of one class an imaginary value. Marx called mystification such a process of deformation of reality.

In Haiti, pseudo-sociologists such as François Duvalier, studying the role of negritude in our national history always consider the concept as a thing in itself, rather than analyzing it in its relations with the true history of social connections. By separating the racial question from the economic and social development of Haiti, and assigning it an absolute character, by making it mythic, they have debased Haitian history by a chaotic succession of merely ethnic conflicts between mulattoes and blacks . . . In the Haitian case, the racial question, far from being the determining factor in the development of Haitian society, is merely the mystifying form which, in the consciousness of two aristocratic rivals, serves to hide

real interests and momentums from the class struggle.

NONETHELESS this racial question is a very important social reality in the history of Haiti. We know that Marx, by way of denying that spiritual dogmas had a decisive role in the historic process of determined societies, nevertheless believed that as social realities they could affect the general course of history . . . Since 1946, the Haitian society has been the prey of general crisis, fundamentally due to the economic domination of the United States over the country, with the color question once again occupying the foremost ideologic and political place, but only in order to cover up the real content of the class struggle. Black middle-classes like Duvalier, who since 1946 has been allied to the black landlords and the mulatto "compradores", control political power, demagogically helping themselves to big notions of "negritude" and pretending to the black masses that it's they who are in power and that the "Duvalierist revolution" is a sparkling victory for negritude.

The awful Duvalier dictatorship has made the Haitians change the image that they've had of themselves . . . In their eyes, Haiti has stopped being congealed into the mythic figure that has been patiently printed in the consciousness of every Haitian since schooldays: Haiti, first black republic of modern times, mythic fatherland of the black man, cradle and paradise of negritude! Haitians have discovered through unheard-of sufferings that, in a semi-colonial system, the power that should be spread among black, white, mulatto or Indian hands, remains invariably an instrument for ferocious dehumanization, in terms of man and his social and cultural setting . . . Haitians behold blacks and mulattoes, tyrants, criminals without shame, obscurantists, Nazis, tonton-macoutes, because in fact they are without any individuating essence, they're as middleclass as the rest and at the moment of terrorist dictatorship in the capital, they are as capable of crimes as horrible as those

Hitler committed in yesterday's concentration camps or those the yankees of the Pentagon perpetrate today in the two Vietnams.

NATURALLY the tyranny of Duvalier offers a monstrous caricature of negritude, and it's not necessary to conclude . . . that such a twisted rationale is fatally open to an enterprise involving the annihilation of the human condition. Socialism is a doctrine of the liberation of man, but national-socialism was an instrument for his extermination . . . Today the black bourgeoisie, who possess neo-colonialist privileges of intrigues and violence in Africa and America, have prematurely seized upon the concept of negritude as an ideologic weapon because they

(cont'd)

June 1974

justly know that . . . this concept has powerfully expressed the double character of alienation among oppressed blacks. So this concept, for a given moment in the story of decolonization, became the affective reply of the black man, exploited and humiliated and facing the global contempt of the white colonist . . .

Thus negritude, in the best sense of the word, was the cultural operation by which the black intellectuals of Africa and the two Americas recognized the validity and originality of Negro-African cultures, the aesthetic value of the black race, and the capacity for respective peoples to exercise the right to historical initiatives that colonization had completely suppressed. Negritude, in its most authentic sense, was at the outset (in the poetry of Cesaire, for example) the influence upon consciousness of the fact that the proletarian black is doubly alienated; alienated on the one hand (like the proletarian white) by being endowed with a workpower that is sold on the capitalist market; and alienated on the other hand by having a black pigmentation, alienated, that is, in his epidermical singularity. Negritude was the consciousness of this double alienation and of the historical necessity to go beyond it, by means of a revolutionary praxis.

WE MUST not forget, with respect to racist dogma, that in the eyes of a great majority of Whites, the permanent crime of the black man (besides his proletarian state) is that of his light-color. This odious mystification at an ideologic level continues to be a weapon one runs into in the United States, in South Africa, in Rhodesia, used against Blacks. The epidermical singularity of the black or scorned man, instead of being taken for what it is, that is, one of the objective accidents that the history of humanity teems with, becomes a malefic essence, the sign of an absolute evil of the black social being in the consciousness of all the slavers of the world — the mark and stigmata of an unremissable inferiority. We've given a metaphysical and aesthetic significance to the color black as we have to the color white . . .

Negritude, in literature, in art as in ethnology and history was from its inception a form of authentic revolt opposed to the contemptible manifestations of racist dogma in the world. It was colonization which through gun, gunshot, and blood had opened the bleeding white-black contradiction in the very wombs of universal history, in order to conceal and thereby justify the goings-on of capitalist exploitation. Negritude posed the necessity for going beyond that contradiction, not through a new mythic operation, but by way of a revolutionary praxis that was collective. Unfortunately, more often than not, the concept of negritude has been utilized as a myth which serves to conceal the presence of black bourgeoisie on the scene . . . and as any class which oppresses another class, it has need of an ideologic mystification to cover up the real nature of its established connections within the society.

TODAY, with mystificators both black and white, negritude implies the absurd idea that the Black is endowed with a particular "human nature", endowed with an essence that might only belong to him, and in that respect, he is called upon, according to a publicist like Janheluz Jahn, to lend to Europe and the West I don't know what sort of "supplemental soul-life", which occidental civilization is in need of. For the president of Senegal, the poet Leopold Sedar Senghor, "emotion is black and reason Greek."

In such a way all class contradictions are drowned in abstraction, and the black bourgeoisie of Africa and America can securely and with the blessing of neo-colonialism freely exploit the black workers in the name of a spiritual commune . . . According to this elementary and insolent logic, negritude as thus understood, far from articulating a revolutionary enterprise of total disalienation and decolonization of Africa and the two black Americas, merely arrives at covering up the fact that it is one of the columns holding up the cunning, snares and perfidious actions of neo-colonialism. Separated from the historical context of revolution across the board of the Third World, arbitrarily separated from the immediate exigencies of the global, tricontinental struggle of under-developed peoples against imperialism and neo-colonialism, negritude defines an unacceptable "black zionism" with the help of which we would here like to dismiss black peoples from the duty of making revolution.

JULY, 1974

Playing politics with nuclear fuel**NIXON-KISSINGER JOURNEY
TO SAVE 'THE PRESIDENCY'**By Raya Dunayevskaya, National Chairwoman
News & Letters Committees

Nixon's Middle East trip that was billed as a "journey for peace", and was patently political, was climaxed by the introduction of nuclear fuel into that volatile tinderbox. This Nixon-type of "even-handedness" at the very moment when India proved how "peaceful" nuclear reactors can be used to make atomic bombs is nothing short of sheer madness, that of retrogressive capitalism out for single world domination.

That Russia, for the moment, continues with yet another summit with Nixon cannot divert from the fact that that nuclear giant is out for the same type of "hegemony." It only proves that both nuclear titans are in such abysmal crises at home that they have no place to turn but "outwards."

For that matter, Nixon's start of his Middle East journey began in Austria—not exactly the most direct path between the United States and the Arab lands. The claim that the Austrian stopover was to acclimatize Nixon to the change in time zones was belied by the fact that Kissinger was off to Germany to meet with its foreign minister, the minute they landed.

FIRST FOCUS: EUROPE

Furthermore, this was preceded by the feelers put out to France and Germany just as soon as Helmut Schmidt came to the helm in Germany and Giscard in France. On June 9, Flora Lewis, who heads the Paris bureau of the New York Times, reported that "neither government planned to take the initiative and issue an invitation" to President Nixon.

The present cooled relations are due not alone to Kissinger's arrogance in having unilaterally declared 1973 "the year of Europe." While that was his biggest flop, and Nixon's pressing need for "foreign victories" to divert from his crimes at home are all too obvious, Europe's anger is due to its own disarray. Ever since the Arab-Israeli war and consequent oil crisis undermined the whole world economy, Europe has played a sorry role. The capitulation to the Arab demand for both quadruple oil prices and siding not only against Israel but against its NATO "leader," U.S.A., dismantled the very concept of the "European Union." The proof of its non-being was that each country worked only for itself, not for any non-existing "European Union." By then, the only land that declared Europe to be "the main focus" was China. So while all the cameras were to be clicking on the Nile, Kissinger wanted West Europe to consider whether it wouldn't really want "to know."

The compulsion for "the European connection" comes from the global needs of both the U.S. and Russia, China's new role, and the cloud over the whole of West Europe that so easily went to pieces in October, 1973.

The expression, "the main focus," to explain the key role of Europe in global politics, specifically that between Russia and China, is that of Teng Hsiao-ping. He used it in welcoming Heath, who had lost the elections in England but nevertheless was treated in Peking as if he were still not only the "head" of England but "spoke for Europe" — a Europe which understood "the threat of Russia."

CHINA'S NEW VIEW OF EUROPE

The world did not stand still while Kissinger took out a whole month to shuttle between Syria and Israel. Germany and France had moved further to the right. China was busy not only with its mini-Cultural Revolution at home, but with acting out abroad what she meant by a "new division" of the world.

Suddenly, West European capitalism was christened as "second world," proper ally for "Third World," which, so far as China is concerned, means principally China, without which the Third World isn't. China has also been busy taking full advantage of the spy scandal that toppled Willy Brandt. Since it proves that Russia keeps having "sleepers" like Guillaume in Brandt's

entourage for top level missions, China is acting as if she (along with other capitalists, private and state), doesn't do the same. China is trying out how to use that fact to establish a special role for herself.

In the face of all this, Nixon is working hard to see that nothing shall stand in the way of his next spectacular to Russia. Before departing anew, Kissinger, at his last Washington press conference, hinted that the Middle East trip is but the first step in Nixon's "journey to peace." It would "possibly" be followed by a new nuclear strategic arms limitation that Nixon would get in Moscow.

Along with that carrot as "real" reason for the further spectaculars that will bring "generations of peace," came the Salzburg surprise: Kissinger's special press conference, in which he threatened to resign if the campaign to besmirch his "honor" regarding wiretapping isn't stopped at once. The letter was addressed to Senator Fulbright as head of the Foreign Relations Committee. Kissinger hardly finished reading the statement in Salzburg than the Committee met in Washington and unanimously concluded him to be an honorable man who must not "even consider resigning" (Humphrey's phrase). Other voices were not that quickly silenced. In any case, whether this planned surprise was Nixon setting Kissinger up for the kill, or Kissinger trying to separate himself from Watergate so that, no matter what the outcome back home, he will be asked to remain at his post, the point is the American people are being played with.

SECOND FOCUS: THE MIDDLE EAST

The staged outpouring of the Egyptian people to welcome Nixon tells a great deal about how badly Sadat wished not only to cut relations with Russia and be once again "with the West," especially the U.S. It was also for the purpose of turning away from Nasser's "socialism" and charisma. That it tells very little of how the masses feel could be seen from the simple fact that even on so controlled a state occasion, signs also told Nixon that Egypt is with the Palestinian refugees.

It is true that Watergate doesn't mean much to Egypt. The Suez Canal means everything, "the gateway to Europe as well as Africa and even globally." What is important is not only the clearing of the Canal but its deepening to allow super tankers through—a way to industrialization. Sadat succeeded where Nasser couldn't —getting Saudi Arabia to use oil as a political weapon. Not that Saudi Arabia did it for Egypt rather than itself.

(cont.)

6925

This is obvious enough from both the crisis in the whole world economy that withholding of oil brought about and getting the U.S. "to take responsibility" for economic and military, especially military, development.

Moreover, it is not only as against Russia that Saudi Arabia prefers the U.S. The U.S. is preferred also as against West Germany, whose technology is as highly developed, who capitulated easily during the Arab-Israeli war, and who is most anxious to provide "a new philosophy" about the struggle for the "world product," as if that, rather than world production, defines one's place in the world. In any case, King Faisal hasn't given up "winning over" Nixon, and U.S. oil monopolists.

Saudi Arabia, rather than even Israel, is the outpost of western imperialism in the Middle East. This does not mean that Israel isn't now an outpost of U.S. imperialism. But it wasn't so at its birth which unfolded as a struggle against British imperialism. Moreover, many who participated in the struggle were not Zionists, but revolutionary Jewish socialists who were not accepted by any so-called democracy, especially the United States, and were thus forced to make the exodus to

Palestine. All Arab rulers, without any exception whatever then, were feudal oligarchs—so much so, in fact, that Stalin's Russia, not the U.S., was the first to cast its vote for the creation of that new state of Israel. The retrogression of Israel into a state-capitalist society since then is another story. Presently, Arab rulers' ambitions, as Israel's, need to subordinate themselves to the global rivalry between Russia and the U.S. for single world domination.

It is this nuclear rivalry that was Kissinger's trump card during the Arab-Israeli war when he was trying to convince the Arab ruling classes that not Israel but

Russia was the "main enemy." For that enemy was a nuclear power that could not be that easily "contained." It didn't work during the war itself because the oil kingdoms hankered for the quadrupling of oil prices as well as "even-handedness" on the part of the U.S. But now its hatred for Israel is taking second place to "friendship" for the U.S. The Nixon Administration, in turn, is as anxious to be "even-handed" so long as Russia is still ready to bide her time before unleashing itself for a direct confrontation with the U.S. Behemoth.

Of course, the trip has been undertaken to save "the presidency," Nixon's. But patently, narrowly political as this trip is, this is not the whole.

The whole is the mighty imperialistic nuclear power that the U.S. wants uncontested by any other power. And that is true not just for Nixon; it is true for any capitalist party in power, Republican or Democratic.

PERPETUAL MOBILE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

Let's take a look at the Central Treaty Organization that recently met in Washington, D.C. That brain-child of John Foster Dulles used to be called the Baghdad Pact. Dulles' pactomania era supposedly suffered its death blow when Iraq had its national revolution in the 1950s. In truth, without its alleged homeland in Iraq, that Washington-rooted imperial power outpost simply

re-named itself Central Treaty Organization. Regular as clockwork in this, its 21st year, the foreign ministers of Great Britain, Iran, Turkey, Pakistan (the U.S. is supposedly just an onlooker) all assembled in Washington. Though the "indispensable" Kissinger was away in the Middle East, those Cold-War-anti-Soviet satellites made it clear that they were ready to heat up the Cold War—and not just against Russia but their own masses—by

once again inserting in the final communique the Iran talk of the need to combat the "continuing subversive threat against the region." By "region" they mean, of course, the exploitative class power. The added joke is that Pakistan, which has certainly moved very far away from its original reason for being a member of this "Northern tier" anti-Communist alliance, was present (with Mao's unspoken consent). So was Great Britain's Labor Party Foreign Secretary, James Callaghan.

This perpetual mobile of U.S. world imperialism, even when only the stand-in satellites are playing out the roles, is what gives Nixon-Kissinger's journey to save "the Presidency" a more ominous and total role than just an escape from Watergate and impeachment.

For that matter, clean Great Britain is playing the same imperialistic game with the Common Market. Supposedly, with the "victory" of Wilson over Heath, it is "renegotiating" with that Customs Union pretending to be a way to a "European Union," as if that were one nation, united at that. Great Britain will remain part of the Common Market and for the same protective trade reasons other members practice against any and all not in it. And it, too, wants not a political union, but a mere customs conglomerate.

DETENTE WITH RUSSIA

Let's take a second look at detente with Russia. It is because Russia's playing at detente with the U.S. is getting an ever-warmer reception from Nixon the deeper in trouble he is at home, which has sent many shivers down the West European backs. It fears it is witnessing a rebirth of Yalta where the destiny of Europe, East and West, was decided without its presence by the two powers who remained standing on their feet at the end of the holocaust. The only one ready to sing their praise is China, and that is only to use them as possible fodder for Russia which it holds to be Enemy No. 1 and which it does not wish unleashed for an attack on China.

Messrs. Schmidt and Giscard entertain no illusions on that score. And they know also that that is exactly why Russia wishes detente and not only with the U.S., but in their lands. Russia is anxious for East-West European summitry. The 35 nations that were supposed to draft a declaration ratifying the territorial changes resulting from World War II victories is, says "the West," "absolutely out." The U.S. is ready to play that game with Russia. But France and Germany are not. Total deadlock has resulted; they see no July summit in Helsinki.

Whether or not Nixon will succeed in getting himself invited to West Europe on the way to or from Russia, he will have his Russian detente and on the way to it meet with NATO! And he will have his CENTO. (And why has no one paid attention to that leftover of Dulles' pactomania era?)

Moreover, Nixon is making sure that not only will he have a "declaration of principles" that will come out of the NATO Ottawa meeting, June 18-19, but he will be in West Europe, with or without direct invitation from Europe, as Europe. He has already announced that he will address NATO in Brussels on the way to Russia. That is all part of the game of "detente" played the imperialist way.

Thus, with or without any East-West Europe summitry; with or without its bowing to the Kissinger demands for "consultations" before the separate West European nations vote as a unit, Nixon-Kissinger are assuring themselves a cover-up of the malaise abroad—the Palestine question in the Middle East, the international monetary crisis, the quadrupling of oil prices that is undermining the world economy, Europe and

July 1974

(over)

6926

Japan which is suddenly likewise being included in "the West" (1), the going to pieces of Europe, and the Sino-Sovjet conflict that is the real reason of the new flirtations with the U.S.

All that can be done. What cannot be done is a coverup of the crises at home, economic and political, racial and class, Watergate and other high crimes. And it's back home Nixon must return.

HOME IS WHERE THE "ENEMY" IS

The crime-laden Nixon Administration didn't begin at Watergate. It began the day Nixon took office on a "law and order" platform which not only his lawless Attorney General Mitchell carried out against the mass anti-Vietnam War movement, youth especially, Blacks in particular, anti-labor in general. No, it began equally with "Mr. Clean" Henry Kissinger, who, as head of National Security, ordered J. Edgar Hoover (who didn't require much urging) to illegally tap the phones of his own colleagues and those journalists, especially the New York Times, which had revealed a secret order about the bombing of Cambodia with which we were not at war.

So secret were those 1969 bombing missions that not many even among the Pentagon brass knew about their full extent—until 1973. Yet Mr. Clean, in Salzburg, dared demand the "revelation" of newspaper sources. Shades of that cheap crook that occupied the post of Vice-President and first unleashed the campaign against freedom of the press.

So it is neither dirty-word Nixon nor anti-freedom-of-the-press-Agnew; neither clean Kissinger nor the tortoise-moving impeachment committee who can be depended upon for any full steam ahead against Nixon. For that matter, look at the New York Times and its "men of integrity" who criticize Nixon. James Reston is busy defending us against "Cassandras" who would speak as if only inflation, Watergate, Vietnam and generally "a greedy and declining civilization" were characteristic of USA, 1974. In fact, says our pundit, the fact that everything is "under discussion" proves "we are coming into an age of philosophy . . ." (New York Times, 6/9/74)

So we are, but this "age of philosophy" is inseparable from the age of revolution. Which is why it cannot possibly come from those busy telling us the U.S.

is not really corrupt, racist, imperialistic. The passion for philosophy comes from the masses thoroughly fed up with the system, including its intelligentsia that has an excuse for everything from the continuing anti-busing hysteria to the growing unemployment and galloping inflation.

Here is how one top economist, Saul B. Klamon of National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, explains away those wrong predictions about "no recession" coming from computers and their "human" predictions: "How does a forecaster factor into his equations the 'Watergate syndrome'? An impeachment inquiry? International political upheaval? Changing investor expectations? Erratic consumer sentiment? The imposition and lifting of embargoes?"

You can't, but that is not the question. The question is: why should people treat seriously the 1972 prediction of a 3.25 percent rate of inflation when, in fact, it was not only 5.4 percent but that was so for the industrial giants only, while for the consumer the galloping pace is hardly countable? And why treat "the system" with any more credibility when even the sacrosanct Treasury bond issue of \$300 million is set at an 8.5 coupon rate, which is the highest since the Civil War era? And why act as if "philosophy" without revolution can give the answer to so simple a question as equal education when for a full century the Supreme Court looked the other way at "separate but equal" miseducation? And when, finally, it was compelled (both by the continuing revolt at home and the new world crisis of the 1950s) to reverse itself, we have suffered through no less than 20 years of counter-"insurgency"?

No wonder the Blacks have no use whatever, not just for the Nixon Administration, but for the system. No wonder that no less than 200 Blacks (with some whites) jumped ship in Japan, refusing to return to the racist land that dares refer to itself as "the land of the free and the brave." No wonder that, very nearly daily, there are new wildcats in the mines, in auto, and not only in factories and mines, but in the fields, in the hospitals. (see p. 1), in the post office which demands that, "to prove equal to the man," a woman, seven months pregnant, must lift 70 pounds—or be fired!

No, "the age of philosophy" cannot be separated from the age of revolution that is upsurging from below.

—June 17, 1974

July 1974

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

So many anti-Hegellians who consider themselves Marxists have surfaced to attack Philosophy and Revolution that I felt it only proper to give the floor to a German revolutionary Marxist of the Old Left whose individual view objectively sums up the others.

— Raya Dunayevskaya

Dear Raya:

I do not believe in "Hegel Now". I think it can only lead to more confusion. Sure, I am for studying Hegel now as I was in the '20s when "Lenin's Notes" appeared. But not much more than for studying Spinoza, Herder, etc. I am afraid it is, again, a smuggling away from Marx. It is the same, exactly the same, as when the great intellectuals started to go back to the "Young Marx". I enjoy, and will agree with, every word of the "Young Marx", but I do not need the "Young Marx" (he really meant what he said about the "nagging mice") since I have a much better (concrete) one from the year 1852 on.

Engels hit it right when, at Marx's funeral, after summarizing the great theoretical, philosophical and scientific achievements, he said: "For Marx was before all else a revolutionist." You, Raya, are the one who, rightfully, speaks so much about theory and practice—where was Hegel's practice? Hegel ran away. He was first a journalist (practice) and then took refuge in the university, while Marx ("turning Hegel on his feet") started to become a professor, but decided to accept the editorship of the "Rheinische Zeitung".

I do not believe, even without having to see your book, that you know your Hegel better than Lassalle did. Lassalle went to Bismark. Lassalle was not a renegade; it was the Logik of Hegel to go to Bismark. Walking through the streets of East Germany, I saw plenty of Lassallean socialism, and nowhere is Hegel taught as much as at the university in Leipzig. Everywhere at the walls you see the good Hegelian word "people" (Volk), but not once "proletariat".

I AGREE, HEGEL introduced the idea of freedom into philosophy by saying: "The people will learn to feel the dignity of man." Here truly is the genius of Hegel. But "Hegel Now"? When he lived 30 and 40 years after Marat and Dabeuf—and still did not go as far as they? His horror against them is somewhat the same as yours against Mao. What other effect can your Hegelianism have than winning friends for something which is away, and backwards, from the real Marx? (What the real

Why Hegel? Why Now? — a critique

Marx is, you know from his letter to Weydemeyer from 1852, the decisive year, by the way.)

Lenin was right that one should study Hegel to be better able to understand Marx, but one does not need Hegel to understand Marx. Lenin spoke to revolutionaries who fell for Kautsky, etc.—like he, himself, did, before he had studied Hegel. You, however, speak, through the Dell company, to people who at best are on their way to becoming revolutionary. One can be a revolutionary without Hegel!

WHY HEGEL NOW? Why not Feuerbach Now? After all, Feuerbach was just as important as Hegel. Feuerbach, and not Hegel, was the first in the whole history of Philosophy who introduced consciously the idea of "WE" instead of the "I". (For Hegel even "the people" were still "I".)

If you give today's intellectuals only Hegel (or at best Marx via Hegel), they will never understand the proletariat and Marx's and Engel's discovery from the "Holy Family" on. More important than Marxism as a whole is the development of the thoughts of Marx and Engels, and if you wish, the development from Hegel, but from many, many others than Hegel. They learned much, much more from Fourier than from the whole of Hegel. Why go back to Hegel who still, contrary to the French and English thinkers, bothered with theology, no matter what his God really existed? Today's intellectuals will never, and that was Lukac's mistake, understand the proletariat from studying Hegel. The task is not only to understand the dialectic of class struggle and thereby discover our Freedom and Humanism, but the role of the proletariat. That, and that alone, the young people have to be taught, and that one can get only from Marx and Engels and Lenin and Luxemburg and from Trotsky and Mao (I for one can say such things since I never, never agreed with anything typically Trotsky) — and never from Hegel. Any one of the proletarian revolutionaries is worth more than the whole of Hegel.

ISN'T IT TYPICAL that the official intellectuals in the West as well as in the East fall for "Alienation"? Sure, a good word, very Hegelian and Marxian, but there is a very, very good reason why Marx since 1852 did not use this word any more except in connection with labor in the production process. Every liberal you can impress with the slogan "Alienation", but he will still be a liberal. Indeed, the best way to become and feel a liberal is the outcry against "Alienation", because the best way to reduce (not abolish) "Alienation" is to make the fellow "interested"—if the horse could only be in-

terested in the beauty of its harness, it would pull much better. . . .

One can accept every word in Hegel, and still not be a revolutionary. Kautsky, etc., tried to do it with Marx. It did not work. The Parteivorstand had to cut out sentences from Marx and Engels, "explain", and in the end to say openly that Marx and Engels, after all, were humans and made mistakes—or were valid for a certain time only. . . . The Russians still talk Marxism-Leninism (too bad Stalinism was taken out; it will come back), but the introduction of "values" etc. into "socialist economy", as you had shown, clashed too much with Marx's Fetish character of commodities. Don't tell me that Hegel understood the real meaning of Napoleon on the white horse. I do not think he did, but even if he did, the whole of Hegel cannot reach up to the few pages of section 4 in the first chapter of Kapital. Again, what does one need Hegel for? Why today?

Concrete Humanism starts with Marx, with nobody else! Up till Marx it was the great dream! Before Marx it was an abstraction; also for Hegel though he undoubtedly went after the experience of the French Revolution further than all Humanists (Philosophy) before him. . . . Just as Spinoza started Philosophy (as Hegel rightfully said), and thereby started the end of Theology —so the end of Philosophy started with Marx. Why go back?

— P.B.

OCTOBER, 1974

Editorial Article

U.S. instigations increase danger of global minefield

By Raya Dunayevskaya,
Chairwoman News & Letters Committees

President Ford's appointment of Nixon's four-star hatchet man, General Haig, as nothing less than general in command of NATO, is on a par with his continuation of Nixonomic recession, and Kissinger global brinkmanship.

The fact that West Europe's revulsion at being saddled with such a "general" did not stop Ford from making the appointment, means that our Mr. Clean will

not stop playing dangerous games in the global minefield any more than those critical days in August when Nixon's next move was not known, stopped Defense Secretary Schlesinger from toying with a fatal "Seven Days in May" scenario called "overlooking the chain of command."

Paradoxical as it may sound, the corrupt Nixon was made culprit of the Watergate cesspool, that is to say, the patriot-scoundrel was laid on the sacrificial altar of the decadent capitalist system which had brought him to power in its own image.

DISARRAY AND SHUTTLE DIPLOMACY

From the October, 1973 war and its revelation of the disintegration of West Europe under the impact of the Arab use of oil as a "political weapon" when, in fact, it was an economic thunderbolt to the world "order," the global minefield has re-emerged in three other, seemingly unrelated, guises: the downfall of President Nixon, the outbreak of still another war, and world economic recession, all the gold flowing from oil notwithstanding.

The depth of the "West's" many crises has revealed NATO stark naked—it was as impotent when, under the fear of Russian intervention, it was all in one piece in Cyprus as it was when it was all in pieces during the Yom Kippur war.

Now that the abject cynicism of Secretary of State Kissinger and his propensity for global brinkmanship went haywire in Cyprus, will the American Imperial system send this Dr. Strangelove back on still another type of shuttle "diplomacy", if not nuclearly armed, surely able to flex nuclear muscle? Or will he be off hiding—in China? He, with the global scheming mind, wants to warm up relations with China, now that Russia, having begun playing with Turkey, has switched to Greece.

There will be many other switches, be it in Turkey-Greece-Cyprus, or the Middle East, or regarding the "Year of Europe" that wasn't, for the simple truth is the post-WW II world is dead, but no new epoch has arisen once near-revolutions aborted. To probe that we must first of all turn to the most pivotal question of all: the inflation within economic recession as all governments aim for the H-bomb.

RECESSION, INFLATION AND OIL -

Prof. Arthur Burns who chairs the Federal Reserve Board with tight-money fists had to say that "if" unemployment does reach 6 per cent, some public works will have to be initiated. That "if" is the joker. He knows very well that "edging 6 per cent" is the "average," an "average" that never has applied to Black unemployment which is twice the amount of white.

Take two other horror phenomena—aiming at zero growth in order to slow down inflation. That last horror everyone, even the rich, even President Ford, does recognize as "Public Enemy No. 1." However, here, too, the intellectuals manage to exude a greater mess on that subject than even the military-industrial complex, its creators. Thus, the latest, elitist, invented and totally abstruse word is "stagflation." It can hardly be called a precise description of the runaway inflation we're experiencing at the very same time when, far from a booming economy, we trend to zero growth. All "stagflation" (stagnation and inflation) is a precise designation of, is their empty, rootless "intellects."

But even if we deal for the moment only quantitatively and follow their statistics, we cannot possibly forget the poor record of the "shell-shocked economists" whose prediction of unsold stocks was a whopping \$7 billion off.

The 1970s have added something new, far, far away from production. Since, if anyone has a very great deal of cash floating about, it's the oil shekdoms, they have succeeded in inflating the heads of our "shell-shocked" economists with even more figures than they can dream up, with or without computers.

The International Institute for Strategic Studies in London has estimated that within six short years, the Arab kingdoms, shekdoms, emirates, plus the Shah of Iran, will control no less than 70 per cent of the world's total monetary reserve. Think of it. By 1980, the oil-producing countries will have liquid surplus of a more fantastic sum than Midas could evoke — \$400 billion.

NUCLEARLY-ARMED STRUGGLES

The Shah, the kings and the sheiks then proceed to "instigate" delusions about such gigantic industrialization and irrigation of their backward lands, that they dwarf God's parting of the Red Sea for Moses! This doesn't stop either our intellectual "leaders" or the "Intellectual" Shah of Iran from imagining global roles. After all, says the Shah, his country has "an intellectual infrastructure" and is freed of all financial worries.

The truth is simpler: the Middle East countries of kingdoms, shekdoms and emirates thus far have very little more than sand and oil, oil, oil, while the techno-

(cont'd)

6929

logically advanced lands have the coal mines, the steel mills, the auto factories, the petrochemical industries, not to forget the military might and enough nuclear bombs to kill the world's population over and over and over again. Nixon hadn't stopped short of introducing the possibility of nuclear fuel into that volatile imbroglio.

Overhanging all, then, is the nuclearly-armed struggle for world power — and all this intensifies as the exploitation of the people in each country brings untold misery — and creative unrest.

Clearly, in our nuclear world not even the fetish of liquidity can long hold back what every country is really for — a stake in the H-bomb. For a single foothold in that, the poor countries, "pacific" or otherwise, are entering the fray to any extent they can, always at the expense of their teeming, hungry, famished millions. Nixon held out that fatal branch — nuclear fuel — after India showed it could come up with a "little" H-bomb. Are we supposed to believe that the H-bomb will provide food for the 175 million Indians who vegetate below the poverty line of \$30 a year?

PRODUCTION ALONE COUNTS

What all these rulers want to forget is that there is one thing and one thing only that matters and that is production. And in that one thing, the only relationship that counts and defines the whole system is the relationship of constant capital/dead labor to variable capital/living labor. Labor alone produces all value and surplus value (unpaid hours of labor).

The German ruler, Schmidt, who knows better, tried, instead, to say that the world struggle is for the product — and that product of course was oil — rather than production — of oil or anything else. One thing, however, he could not escape through trickery. Therefore, in saying it is a world struggle for the product, what he threatened those who wouldn't listen to his solution was that, otherwise, they will have to contend with the emerging social storm.

When all is said and done, that is correct, and it is it in a nutshell. The laborers from whom all production of values is extracted, with as many hours of it unpaid as possible, aren't just going to sit quietly by and let themselves be exploited. Whether the profits are liquid or otherwise matters little to labor; what they hunger for and will revolt against will produce a mighty "social storm," a revolution.

What, then, is the truth of inflation? Of course, the quadrupling of oil prices has exacerbated the unflagging inflation to so intense a degree that it's easy to see only that its root cause. But long before that scandalous conspiracy between sheiks and American oil monopolists, there was the undeclared Vietnam War in which U.S. imperialism sunk national wealth of no less than \$25-30 billion annually.

Production of armaments isn't production, much less expanded reproduction. All it produces is death and destruction — and inflation. If the World War II holocaust had hidden the Depression — that natural, inevitable consequence of capitalism — it was only for the time of heated-up production — war, destruction, death! And how soon after that holocaust did the Korean War break out? All capitalism ever does is move from Depressions to Wars and back again. Such is the nature of the capitalist Behemoth.

One hundred years ago Marx put it succinctly enough. The only thing the workers "own" is the national debt. And that keeps ever-growing — we have already mortgaged not only our lives but those of our children and grandchildren.

SOCIAL STORMS

The fears that have been enveloping capitalism, ever since the near-revolutions of 1968 nearly toppled it, were

resawakened when the Arabs in 1973 began to use that all-crucial lubricant, oil, as a political weapon, not because they thought the Arabs almighty, but because of fear of the social storms that an economic crisis would evoke.

The same intensity of fear reappeared in spring of 1974 when General Spinoza came to power: again, not because of fear of Spinoza, but because "advanced" capitalism knew that (1) Spinoza was reacting to the African Revolutions that were, indeed, undermining Portugal's colonialism, and world neo-colonialism that is bringing it famine. That will be an unquenchable fire that will bring forth the second social revolution. And (2) they know that Spinoza's "democratization" is by no means the end, but only the beginning of revolutionary developments he himself truly does not really understand.

In our age of state-capitalism, so very much of the "subjectivity" of the masses — their philosophic-political maturity — is in objectivity itself. It is impossible to talk of the objective situation without being conscious of the revolutionary opposition forces to capitalism and its ideologists, for the masses themselves seek to go beyond spontaneity. They are on the threshold of the unity of theory and practice.

This is what caused the reversal of the staid Economist of London to McCarthy-like hysteria. "The Red Wolf Waiting to Devour Southern Europe," is a desperate cry for "the West" to do some "long range thinking," for thus far, it writes, "if there is any organized, long-range thinking about ideological expansion being done in Europe today, it's still in Moscow that it's happening."

But, in fact, it isn't Russia half as much as their own rebellious masses that is the "danger." Helmut Schmidt had preceded the Economist in calling it by its right name, "social storms." The rulers are all deathly afraid of the passion for philosophy that is inseparable from revolution.

They hope to keep those two separated, first by attributing "ideology" to Russia, and secondly, by calling "ideological revelation" "spurious." But the philosophical-political maturity of the age and the mass passion for philosophy and revolution can by no means be passed off as any sort of conspiracy made "in Moscow" — or Peking.

SUPER-POWERS OUT FOR WORLD MASTERY

Should this belated McCarthyism (just as fascism, it is sure to reappear in new forms so long as capitalism exists), make you embrace either Russia or China because they had had revolutions before undergoing transformation into opposite, state capitalism, remember they, too, are in the forefront of this global struggle for power. Indeed, it is this struggle of the super-powers for single world mastery that defines precisely the mess the world is in, and will bring it down. It is this, just this, triangular world out for single world mastery — U. S., Russia, China — which suits the Chinese expression: "Great disorder under heaven."

A good example of this "great disorder under heaven" is what Teng came to tell the UN about "great reversals." The first was that "there was no longer a socialist world"; the post WW II has ended that. The

(cont'd)

Oct 1974

second was even more shocking. Suddenly, West Europe and all those technologically advanced countries that were always considered capitalist were now merely called "Second World," "middle countries" with whom the Third World could collaborate.

Finally, the enemy, the super-powers, those designated as out for "hegemony," single world power, were the nuclear titans—Russia and the U.S. Here comes the greatest shocker—it turns out that, though both are super-powers, one (Russia) is "especially vicious," Enemy No. 1. There is no limit to the gall of this super-revolutionary who had rolled out the red carpet for Nixon, told West Europe to remain in NATO as the needed counterweight to Russia, flaunted the possibility of a Bonn-Paris axis—anything, anything at all against Russia.

Moreover, Teng did not just limit his "proof" of Russia as Enemy No. 1 to such obviously counter-revolutionary deeds as the invasion of Czechoslovakia but extended it—and in the very same sentence!—to the creation of the national revolution of the East Bengalis, which he merely refers to as "the dismemberment of Pakistan," which "dismemberment" was "instigated by Russia." And all that was said in the Assembly in which he alone vetoed the application of Bangladesh for membership.

Western capitalism's fetish of liquidity has its counterpart in China's fetishism of "ideology," which Marx had analyzed as "false consciousness," that of bourgeois intellectuals, and to which he counterposed "a new Humanism," the dialectics of liberation.

MAO'S REDUCTIONISM

The latest such "momentous development" (actually, it was stated in 1963 on rural work, but not so designated until a decade later) is blown up as something momentous, a new development of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought. It is this: "Matter can be transformed into consciousness and consciousness into matter."

This bourgeois, philosophical idealism, surpassing the idealism of Hegel himself, was said, and criticized by their leading philosopher, Yang Hsien-chen, and forgotten. Suddenly, what was said to get the rural workers to work harder and harder becomes, a decade later, "an irresistible historical trend today for the people of the whole world, and many medium-sized and small coun-

tries to unite and oppose hegemony of two superpowers," never forgetting, however, that one of those two is "especially vicious" and "has become an international merchant of death." (Excerpts printed in the New York Times, 4-12-74.)

Mao's reductionism of the creative Subject as maker of history to sheer voluntarism imposed on masses by the Chairman is actually a result of what Mao never admitted, but, in fact, everything he says is based on that underlying assumption—his acceptance of state-capitalism as the next stage of humanity's "development."

REVOLUTIONARY FORCES

The opposing revolutionary forces that signify the social storms are on the horizon, strive to be born not only as spontaneity but as Reason. They will not experience release, liberation, until this generation stops burying its head in the sand about so great, so historic a happening as the movement from practice and recognizes it as having initiated a new epoch for mankind.

Whether we look at the U.S. or Europe, Asia or Latin America, the whole Caribbean, the Middle East or Africa, as well as the Black Revolution in America, in the West Indies, throughout the globe indeed, for they are an international people, the pivotal question is this: How many Marxist intellectuals have, so much as looked at this movement from practice?

Outside of ourselves — Marxist - Humanists — none. Yet that which began in 1953 and has persisted for two full decades was a totally new phenomenon, not only because that struggle for freedom emerged right under totalitarianism soon after the death of Stalin, but it was itself a form of theory. And it circled the globe.

What is to be done now that the 1970s are upon us and the Movement does begin to recognize that (1) theory is needed, (2) that "Black is beautiful", though true, is insufficient to engage in the final battle where whitey cannot all be lumped together as if there were no class divisions that would help uproot the system, and (3) that all the revolutionary forces — worker, Black, women's liberation, youth — must seek unity, not for unity's sake, but for establishing new principles, new human relations, new creativity?

The latest mass outburst of Puerto Rican youth in Newark is sounding the tocsin. Ford should listen to it seriously enough to know that the masses have no intention of putting up endlessly with rising unemployment, deepening recession, runaway inflation, and retreats on Black liberation. A new epoch is on the horizon, and the deepest layers are preparing to cross that threshold into a new social order that is of their own making.

* * *
This article was excerpted from the Perspectives Report delivered to the Convention of News & Letters Committees on Aug. 31. Copies of the complete Report are available from News & Letters for 50 cents. See ad, page 5.

Oct. 1974

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

Dear P.B.:

It is sad, indeed, that so abysmal is the theoretic void which has persisted in the revolutionary movement ever since the death of Lenin in 1924 that the moment there is mention of Hegelian dialectics—the ground that made possible Marx's discovery of a whole new continent of thought, Historical Materialism, which, in turn, made necessary a return to that self-movement which Marx had declared to be "the source of all dialectic"—at that moment even an independent Marxist like you hauls out the three old, very old, red herrings: 1.) Hegel's reinstatement of "theology", 2.) Hegel's failure to understand "the real meaning of Napoleon on the white horse", after which comes the clincher, 3.) "where was Hegel's practice?"—as if that ever were the reason Marx continued grappling with the Hegelian dialectic throughout his life as a proletarian revolutionary.

You, however, go about your merry way, violating both philosophy and history, not only by imputing the reason for Lassalle's "going to Bismarck" to Hegel's Logic, but bringing your clincher up to date as well as "personalizing" it by further dragging in me and Mao, writing that Hegel's "horror" at Marat and Babeuf "is somewhat the same as yours against Mao."

NO PLACE FOR PSEUDO POINTS

Were I as interested as you in scoring totally irrelevant, pseudo-points, I could end the discussion right here by simply showing my "horror"—and this one is real and is of today—at your gratuitously supplying revolutionary red coating to that state-capitalist ruler continuing to mouth Marxist phrases while rolling out the red carpet for every leader from Nixon to Arafat after he had turned his Army loose against the Chinese proletariat whom he called "economists" for daring to

—P.B. is the German revolutionary who wrote the critique "Why Hegel? Why Now?" that appeared in N&L, August-September, 1974.

Answer given to 'Why Hegel? Why now?'

ask for better conditions of labor, and against the Sheng Wu-lien^{oo}, the youth rebels who took him at his word that "it was right to rebel" and worked to develop communes in the manner of the Paris Commune, the form of workers' rule that Marx recognized as the "dictatorship of the proletariat".

It is high time, instead, seriously to get down to working out the inner connection between Marx's theory of revolution and Hegelian dialectics.

It is high time, instead of counterposing endlessly Feuerbach's materialism as "the superior" of Hegel's idealism, that we understood fully why Marx, despite the fact that Feuerbach helped the Young Hegelians (Marx included) "complete" the break with Hegel's idealism, credited Hegel, not Feuerbach, with developing "the active side" of self-developing "Subject":

"The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism (that of Feuerbach included) is that the thing, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the object . . . not subjectively. Hence, in contradistinction to materialism, the active side was developed abstractly by idealism . . ."

Of course, neither Feuerbach's materialism, nor Hegelian idealism, understood proletarian praxis, "revolutionary", "practical-critical activity." That was Marx's

—^{oo}Sheng Wu-lien is the acronym for the 20 organizations comprising the Hunan Provincial Proletarian Revolutionary Great Alliance Committee which issued their Manifesto "Whither China?" asking that the "Cultural Revolution" not remain "a revolution of dismissing officials, nor a movement of dragging out people, nor purely cultural revolution, but a revolution in which one class overthrows another." Calling the Maoist leadership "the 'Red' capitalist class", the manifesto concluded "Let the new bureaucratic bourgeoisie tremble before the true socialist revolution that shakes the world! What the proletariat can lose in this revolution is only their chains, what they gain will be the whole world." (See the manifesto quoted in Chapter 5 "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung" in *Philosophy and Revolution*, pages 176 to 182).

and only Marx's, original contribution—a whole new continent of thought which not only united idealism and materialism, but spelled out the role of the proletariat as both revolutionary force and as Reason, as living, human, practicing of absolute negativity. Which is why when Marx left Feuerbach, it was for good (a fact, I'm sorry to say, that even Engels didn't understand, much less the post-Marx-Engels generation raised on his Feuerbach).

MARX RETURNS TO HEGEL

But when Marx left Hegel, he constantly returned, declaring that, because Hegelian dialectics was "the speculative expression for the movement of history", its "summation"—2,500 years of it—we can see in its "transcendence" an objective movement. Therefore, when we get to the actual movement of history through very specific class struggles, and see proletarian "Aufheben", we

(cont'd)

see not only abolition of capitalist private property by communism, but "the second negativity": "Only by the transcendence of this mediation . . . does there arise positive humanism beginning from itself."

You're absolutely right when you write: "Concrete Humanism starts with Marx, with nobody else!" But that doesn't explain why Marx himself, after his own discovery and the actual class struggles which marked the true "non-speculatively"-expressed history of mankind's development; after the 1848 revolution followed by his theory of permanent revolution; after the development of all his economic theories of value and surplus-value and collapse of capitalism "reverting", in that genius's magnificent work, the Grundrisse, to such Hegelian language as "absolute movement of becoming" to describe the proletariat's "Aufheben"; and, finally, in the second edition of his greatest theoretical work, Capital, published after the Paris Commune, when the greatest civil war in his life-time showed "freely associated men" finally stripping "fetishism off of commodities", Marx first then made crystal clear that the exploitative capital/labor relationship assumes "the fantastic form" of an exchange relationship between things (commodities) because that is "what it really is" at the point of production—reification of labor. This phenomenon become Notion, however, far from transforming us all into "one-dimensional men", first concretizes "the quest for universality" as the proletariat taking destiny into its own hands, so that the greatest achievement of the Paris Commune, as he tells us in The Civil War in France, is simply, "its own working existence."

HEGEL CRUCIAL TO MARX AND LENIN

I can hear you grinding your teeth in impatience at my repeating such "ABC's" of Marxism. No doubt you believe that your reference to 1852 as "the decisive year" has already (and more cogently and surely more briefly) dealt with the problematic of our age since in that letter to Weydemeyer Marx had developed from class struggle through the dictatorship of the proletariat to a classless society. Why then do you persist in (1) separating philosophy from economics so that even when we agree on a point, such as the still-not-surpassed greatness of Marx's "Fetishism of Commodities", you say it in order "to prove the need to dispense with Hegel? (2) continue further to degrade Hegel to one of many philosophers—"Spinoza, Herder, etc." (I love especially the "etc." which shows just how intellectualistic a revolutionary can become once he begins allowing for "culture!") although you know very well that, whatever other philosophers and utopian socialists and "materialists" Marx "learned from", one and only one—Hegel—he not

only "came from", but said the task of the proletariat was "to realize" his philosophy, i.e., freedom. And (3) claim that the reason for Lenin's studying Hegel, in the midst of the holocaust of World War I, was because he "spoke to revolutionaries who fell for Kautsky, etc.—like he, himself, did before he had studied Hegel."

Now supposing that was true—it wasn't, as he fought those politically, not "philosophically", and for those The Renegade Kautsky sufficed—but supposing it was true, how could that possibly explain how Lenin in his Will summed up a lifetime in the revolutionary movement, leaving as a legacy what to look for to extend the Russian Revolution to a world scale? How could what you say show why Lenin who had initiated the Great Divide within revolutionary Marxism, philosophically as well as in actuality—and, remember, I am not talking of Stalin or Trotsky, or Zinoviev-Kamenev, but of Bukharin who, Lenin says, "is not only a most valuable and major theorist of the Party (Bolshevik, not "Kautsky, etc."—rd); he is also rightly considered the favorite of the whole Party"—draw the considered conclusions:

"But his theoretical views can be classified as fully Marxist only with great reserve, for there is something scholastic about him (he has never made a study of dialectics, and, I think, never fully understood it)."

No, my dear P.B., what you say is far from any truth about the Hegelian dialectic. Where you single out Hegel's Logic as that which is supposed to have led Lassalle to Bismarck, Lenin writes: "It is impossible fully to grasp Marx's Capital, and especially its first chapter; if you have not studied through and understood the whole of Hegel's Logic." Where you make it a matter of "studying" only, and that of Hegel "not much more than for studying Spinoza, Herder, etc." Lenin made it a question of break with Plekhanov who "followed" Spinoza, and above all with himself, as a theoretic preparation for proletarian revolution, breaking with co-Bolsheviks who did not understand either "self-determination of the Idea", or the "self-determination of nations" as "the dialectic of history!" And where you stress "the end of philosophy started with Marx," both Marx and Lenin considered it was first necessary "to realize" it—AND THAT, IT IS TRUE, COULD NOT BE DONE BY HEGEL BUT BY PROLETARIAN REVOLUTIONARIES WHO, HOWEVER, UNDERSTOOD "SELF-DEVELOPING SUBJECT" AND PRACTICED IT.

That's what I am trying to do in carrying out philosophy as action. Having so heatedly rushed to criticize "Why Hegel? Why Now?" (Part I, of Philosophy and Revolution) by just the title, may I now ask you to read the book, especially Part I?

Raya

Nov. 1974

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

(Editor's Note: From the paper on Hegel's "Absolute Idea As New Beginning," which Raya Dunayevskaya delivered to the Hegel Society of America conference at Georgetown University, on Nov. 8 we've excerpted the section on the relationship of the movement from practice to philosophy. It is a critique of philosophers, including those who consider themselves Marxists, specifically Theodor Adorno and his philosophic legacy, *Negative Dialectics* (Seabury Press, New York, \$17.50), in contrast to the Czech philosopher, Karel Kosik's *The Dialectic of the Concrete*.)

HEGEL'S ABSOLUTES never were a series of ascending ivory towers. Revolutionary transformation is immanent in the very form of thought. As we saw from the Absolute Idea chapter, the unifying force was free creative power. By the time we reach the mediated final result, Absolute Mind—the absolute negativity that was the moving force in Logic, in Nature, in Geist where we saw them as concrete stages of human freedom—there no longer is any difference between theory and practice. This is why our age, which has been witness to a movement from practice for two long decades (ever since the death of Stalin lifted the incubus from the heads of the masses in East Europe), can best understand Hegel's Absolutes.

To this writer, Hegel's genius is lodged, precisely, in the fact that his "voyage of discovery" becomes one endless process of discovery for us, and the us includes both Marx's new continent of thought of materialistic dialectics, and Hegel scholars, and the movement from practice that was itself a form of theory once its spontaneously discovered the power of thought along with its physical might.

This writer has followed very closely this movement of revolt ever since June 17, 1953, and saw in it a quest for universality because she had already discerned in the dialectic movement of the three final syllogisms in Absolute Mind a new point of departure in the Idea and in the movement from practice.

THIS MOVEMENT FROM practice hardly had the ear of contemporary Hegelians, "orthodox" or Marxist, as witness the erudite and Left late director of the famous Frankfurt School, Theodor Adorno, whose very reason for being, for thinking, for acting was Dialectics,

DIALECTICS OF LIBERATION

that is to say, for negation of what is. He entitled the summation of his life's thought which he certainly considered his intellectual legacy, *Negative Dialectic*. This however, has little to do with dialectics of negativity, least with concept of Subject, with which Hegel distinguished his philosophy from that of all other philosophers who left the search for truth at Substance only. As "concretized" by Marx for proletarian class, Subject is supposed to have been accepted also by Adorno, but, again, he keeps his distance and originality locked into what he calls *Negative Dialectics*.

From the very start of the Preface of his work, Adorno informs us that the positive in the negative, "the negation of the negation," is the enemy: "This book seeks to free dialectics from such affirmative traits without reducing its determinacy." (p. xix) The "theoretical inadequacies of Hegel and Marx" revolve around what he sees as the all-encompassing evil, the concept, that "subsuming cover," its "autarchy."

NATURALLY ADORNO ALSO keeps his distance from "positivists" and the vulgarisms of the knighted Karl Popper of the infamous "Hegel and fascism" school. Nevertheless, Adorno very nearly out of nowhere intimates some sort of kinship between it and absolute negativity. "Genocide is the absolute integration . . . Auschwitz confirmed the philosopheme of pure identity as death . . . Absolute negativity is in plain sight and has ceased to surprise anyone." (p. 362)

By "nearly out of nowhere" I naturally do not mean Auschwitz wasn't the reality of fascism, nor do I mean only the suddenness and shock of introducing the subject matter in the climax to the book, "Meditations on

Contrast Adorno's accusation of "conceptual fetishism" against Marx's famous "Fetishism of Commodities" as "truly a piece from the heritage of classic German philosophy" (pp. 189-90) to Karel Kosik's analysis of the very same section: "It can be characterized in Hegelian terms as the unity of being and non-being, of distinction and similarity, of identity and non-identity. All further determinations are richer definitions or characterizations of this 'absolute' of capitalist society. The dialectic of interpretation or of exegesis cannot eclipse the central problem: how does science reach the necessary beginning of the exposition . . . The dialectic is not a method of reduction, but the method of spiritual and intellectual reproduction of reality." (Translation in *TELOS* Fall, 1968). See also Ch. 2, "Marx's Historical Materialism" esp. pp. 76-94 in *Philosophy and Revolution*.

Metaphysics". Rather I mean it is "wrong," that is to say totally illogical, non-dialectical, from his own point of view of an adult lifetime devoted to fighting fascist "ideology" as the very opposite of Hegelian dialectics, its very death in Nazi Germany. Perhaps a better word than "wrong" would be Adorno's own swearword: "naive."

I mean that, as late as 1957, in *Aspects of the Hegelian Dialectic*, Adorno was almost defending even subject-object identity: "Subject-object cannot be dismissed as mere extravagance of logical absolutism . . . in seeing through the latter as mere subjectivity, we have already passed beyond the speculative idealism . . . cognition, if it is genuine, and more than simple duplication of the subjective, must be the subject's objectivity." And indeed in *Negative Dialectics* he reiterates the same truth when he writes that, despite the fact that Hegel "delfies" subjectivity, "he accomplishes the opposite as well, as insight into the subject as a self-manifesting objectivity." (p. 350)

WHY, THEN, the vulgar reduction of absolute negativity? Therein is the real tragedy of Adorno (and the Frankfurt School): the inescapable one-dimensionality of thought once one "gives up" subject; once one does not listen to the voices from below — and they certainly were loud and clear and demanding in that decade of the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s; once one returns to the

(correct)

ivory tower and reduces one's (his) purpose to "the purpose of discussing key concepts of philosophic disciplines and centrally intervening in those disciplines . . ." (p. xx). Irresistibly came the next step, the substitution of a permanent critique not merely of "absolute negativity" but of "permanent revolution."

Now, whether the enduring relevance of Hegel has stood the test of time because of the devotion and rigor of analysis of Hegel scholars, or because from below there upsurged a movement for freedom that was followed by new cognition studies, there is no doubt that because Absolute Negativity signifies transformation of reality, the dialectic of contradiction and totality of crises, the dialectic of liberation, Hegel comes to life at critical points of history which Hegel himself characterized as "birth-time of history."

There were Marxist scholars, revolutionary dissidents, who built on new ground. Where a scholar from the West like Maurer was preoccupied with Hegel's concept of where to end, the Czechoslovak philosopher, Karel Kosik, was preoccupied with where to begin anew. Of the East European studies that accompanied the revolts, and revolved around Marx's Humanism, especially Marx's "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic," one of the most rigorous studies was Karel Kosik's *The Dialectic of the Concrete*.

Nor were these serious studies limited to the "East." As Frantz Fanon saw it, the African struggle for freedom was "not a treatise on the universal, but the untidy affirmation of an original idea propounded as an absolute." There is no doubt, of course, that once action supersedes the subjectivity of purpose, the unity of theory and practice is the form of life out of which emerge totally new dimensions. To this writer this is the "proof" that the ending of Science of Logic is the absolute as new beginning, the self-bringing forth of liberty.

Dec 1974

WHEN PHILOSOPHERS LEARN to eschew elitisms, then the unity of theory and practice, of absolute as new beginning won't remain abstract desire, or mere will, but philosophy become action. In his re-examination of Hegel, Professor Ffindlay was right when he stated Hegel's exegeses "can seem arid and false to those who see nothing mysterious and god-like in the facts of human thought." But isn't it equally true that philosophers who stand only in terror before revolution not only do not "comprehend" it, they cannot fully comprehend revolution in thought? And Hegel did revolutionize philosophy.

6 9 3 6
JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1975

Editorial article

Deep U.S. recession and the myriad global crises

by Raya Dunayevskaya,
Chairwoman, News and Letters Committees

The new year has brought the world face to face with outright famine in Asia and Africa, recessions circling the globe, the sixth and deepest of the post-war recessions being right here, in the mightiest and richest of all ruling powers, the U.S.A.

The newly-created Middle East Gold Circle, far from being free of crises, including class struggles that undermine the whole structure, is exactly where war threatens to break out. Moreover, on the horizon hovers not only still another Arab-Israeli war, nor only sawdust Caesars like the Shah of Iran, strutting about with the grand illusion of restoring the old Persian empire, and globally at that. Gunboat diplomacy exudes especially from the real world Goliath, U.S. capitalism, nuclearly armed to overkill.

It would be fatal to reduce these threats to "mere contingency" views for only the worst imaginable of situations—"strangulation of industrialized democracies." A Third World War could only be nuclear, would be truly final, the end of civilization as we've known it. No matter how insane, therefore, talk of "contingencies" sounds, we must coldly and deeply and with utmost urgency examine "contingencies" as capitalistic realities.

Let's look not alone at the intra-imperialistic rivalries, nor, no matter how glittering the gold, at the global posturings of the Middle East Gold Circle, nor at the divisions within the ruling classes within each country. Instead, let's begin where the deepest contradictions are, where everything begins and ends—production.

Capitalism, private and state, never could solve basic contradictions, knowing only how to go from crises to wars and back again.

Unemployment and Political Shenanigans

There are starving masses not only in the poor, technologically underdeveloped lands, beset by natural calamities, but also in the richest, super-industrialized country in the world, U.S.A., and that right after the GNP hit the trillion-dollar mark. All too obviously, GNP is not national wealth. Built-in "stabilizers" like unemployment insurance and Social Security may have convinced the learned economists that a deep recession is not as bad as a depression. But, as witness the dissatisfaction and restlessness in any unemployed line, the Black marches, and the UAW demonstration planned Feb. 5 for Washington, the unemployed will not forever allow the capitalists to let the whole weight of their chaotic, exploitative system fall on their backs.

At this moment, when even the Herbert Hoover mentality of President Ford has had to give way to the reality that not inflation but unemployment is Enemy No. 1, here is where lies the truth: the "average" unemployment is 7.1 percent, which means nearly seven million people out of work. Every industrial city, moreover, knows

how farcical is this average. Detroit, for example, has a 12.4 percent rate of unemployment. This too belies the real depth of recession, since in the "inner city," that is to say, among Blacks, unemployment is at the abysmal depth of depression—30 percent!

This startling truth has hardly penetrated the thick skulls either of the Democrats who hurried to try to upstage the President by revealing their "program" Jan. 13, or the Republican President who upstaged himself by "going public" that same evening.

Finally, on Jan. 15, came the formal State of the Union address to Congress. From the mountain of publicity and months of work, trying to get a "consensus" among his battling experts, came forth a little mouse—a 12 percent rebate on taxes paid in 1974, that awful year in which no doubt everyone has already chalked up at least that much in debts.

The Decrepit State of the Union

The pie in the sky about "putting all our people to work" rests on (1) the extension of a lush investment tax credit of 12 percent for two years to Big Business, and (2) taxes on oil and home heating fuel which is supposed to cede government \$30 billion and will supposedly get fed into expanded production. In fact, it only shows, on the one hand, the total unconcern for the people from whom it will take back in higher prices a great deal more than it "gave" in the tax rebate. The only time the cool Mr. Ford's voice rose to a crescendo was when he ordered Congress not to raise federal expenditures by more than five percent for any social legislation, promising to veto all such enactments.

On the other hand, Ford's program, all too obviously, will neither assure "conservation of energy," nor create jobs. What Ford knew before he spoke, but we didn't learn until the following day, was that production (which includes, of course, the closing down of refineries) in the last quarter of 1974 showed the steepest drop in 30 years. This 8.1 percent drop in production, together with the biggest rise in inflation—12.2 percent—brings us back to the bleak days as World War II ended, 1945.

The depth of the economic crisis, which increased the president's desire to get away from it all without any concern for the American people, sent him back to attacking the Arab Middle East, this time, in "subtle terms," that is to say, neither disclosing his gunboat diplomacy nor specifying it is the Middle East he was talking about. This hardly hid the fact that he was blaming the quadrupled oil prices for nothing short of putting world trade itself and the whole monetary structure "in jeopardy." Further: "At stake is the future of industrialized democracy."

The New Gold Circle

Everyone who needs a gallon of gas (as well as that gunboat diplomat, Henry Kissinger, whose preoccupation is playing the global political power game) is well aware of the new Gold Circle of oil powers. The Arab use of oil as a political weapon to force "everyone" to be pro-Arab and anti-Israel in the October 1973 Arab-Israeli war soon

6936

1975

gave way, however, to creation of a new Gold Circle in global wealth as quadrupled oil prices replaced the oil embargo. At the same time also began the dream that this dramatic shift in wealth would also mean a shift in political power by no means limited to the Arab-Israeli syndrome.

Although this oligopolistic shift in wealth was not rooted in expanded production of oil, much less of industry; although it was not nuclearly armed as were the two superpowers—U.S. and Russia—out for world domination; and although it had nowhere near the population that entitled a China of 800 million souls to try to make it a tri-polar rather than bi-polar world militarily, the game of power politics was unleashed.

Let's take another look at the Shah of Iran, who now has the biggest hovercraft navy in the world, the largest naval base in the Persian Gulf, the most sophisticated missile system in the Third World. Isn't the attraction Syria exercises on the Shah the fact that Russia armed it with SCUDS? Isn't that fact why the Persian emperor has suddenly "become" an Arab, and from the land of the pyramids, on Jan. 11 in a joint communique with Sadat, called for "total" Israeli withdrawal from occupied Arab land and affirmed "the right of the Palestinian people to their homeland and the Arab character of Jerusalem."

At the same time, he remains the best customer of the American merchants of death who have just sold 60 F-5 jet fighters for \$750 million to Saudi Arabia. Iran has purchased \$6 billion worth over the past several years. And this hasn't stopped, now that he's buying so many arms from France and pre-paying with a cool billion. On the contrary, he is busy building the biggest airbase in the Middle East to accommodate an air force that by the end of the 1970s will have more fighter-bombers than any member of NATO except the U. S.

The Gold Circle and National Chauvinism

The Shah by now has moved ahead not only of Israel, Canada, Australia and West Germany by ordering 80 of Grumman's F14 Tomcats at \$20 million each, but assured himself of quicker delivery than the U.S. Navy! This leaves out the hardly inconsequential AH-1J attack helicopter which will soon be acquired, or the \$36 billion

budget for the new Iran year, beginning in March, that allocates a staggering \$10 billion for defense alone. At the same time, all this hardware includes not only training by, but actual employing of, American personnel.

Thus, 1,000 Americans, mostly Vietnam veterans, are conducting the world's largest helicopter school to teach Iranians how to fly their fleet of more than 640 helicopters. (Last year, Iran ordered more than \$3.5 billion worth of planes, helicopters and hardware from the U.S.). All this leaves out the fact that Iran has already purchased French and German nuclear reactors. Now that India has shown how easily national chauvinism tolerates the co-existence of famine alongside nuclear bombs, there is no need to emphasize that what is bought for "peaceful" purposes is made into a nuclear weapon.

The International Institute for Strategic Studies has estimated that by 1980 the oil-producing countries will have a liquid surplus of \$400 billion! Add to this Arab potentates at Rabat raising Arafat to state status, followed by the UN welcome for him, and we can easily get sucked into the global myth of the Gold Circle. Thereby we forget the objective realities of capitalist global power, on the one hand, and the real forces of revolution within each country, on the other hand.

What does need serious examination is the pull this Gold Circle has had in bringing about a division within U.S. capitalism.

The Split Within

The deep division within the industrial-military complex between those who opt for Ford-Kissinger foreign policy in the Middle East, and those who hold we can do business with OPEC, no matter how high the oil prices, has reached a new stage. No longer is this opposition to the Administration policy limited to the American oil barons who always preferred to do business because their profits were so high, their exploitation of the oil resource so total, and their anti-Semitism so deep. And, while, as General Brown's anti-Semitic remarks showed openly enough, anti-Semitism is present in the upper military echelons, too, there is a radical sound among the capitalist opponents of gunboat diplomacy which nevertheless "does not exclude" military intervention if new conditions "strangulate" the industrialized world. (1)

Thus, the editor of Business Week sounded very nearly like Stokely Carmichael's revolutionary anti-Vietnam War slogan "Hell, no, we won't go!" when he

wrote an open letter that he will not send his son "to die for oil."

An "intellectual" campaign with an air of great "objectivity" has been launched. Publicity in the daily press has been given to the main article in the January issue of Foreign Affairs, "How Can the World Afford OPEC Oil?"

The prestigious quarterly lists five authors for the article representing an intellectual community veritably circling the globe, from Iran to West Germany, and from the U.S. to Japan, not to mention "many individuals from other OPEC and OECD countries who were consulted." It turns out to expound the Iranian view, as is natural for the chairman of the Industrial Development Bank of Iran, Khodadad Farmanfarmaian, who is its chief author. Nevertheless, its importance lies in the fact that it is not only the view of OPEC in general and Iran in particular, but also of international capital that wants to do business with the oil blackmailers. Moreover, these are not limited to the types who had held out for "doing business with Hitler" by letting him rule Europe.

The Ford Administration and its intra-capitalist opponents do not disagree on the overriding class necessity to do anything, anything at all, to stop proletarian revolution that they all call assuring "world stability." The disagreement, and the falling apart, is over how to assure that it is the U. S. that will do the ordering about; the assurance that civil wars will be put down; the global dimensions of any single crisis when there are myriad of them as things begin to fall apart when, as President Ford told Congress, the "future" can be assured only if there is created "a new energy stability for the world."

Obviously, Ford-Kissinger still believe in Pax Americana, and think that this is "the American century!"

Pax Americana and Western Europe

Just how the Ford Administration means to assure "a new energy stability in the world" is by no means exhausted by gunboat diplomacy directed alone to the Middle East. From a secret(2) report being prepared for the Administration for summer, we can see what it sees for the rest of the world—"not excluding" military interventions, most probably Latin America and nothing short of "the collapse of Indian democracy."

For reasons best known to itself, the imperial global "hypotheses" of the draft report is called "The Future

(1) See Kissinger's "Exclusive Interview" with Business Week, 1/23/75.

(2) Jack Anderson has gotten hold of a summation, and published it on Jan. 9, 1975.

(cont'd)

Jan 7 - 1975

World Environment." It projects the dollar's re-establishment as "the world's major reserve and trading currency" and toys with changes in global power not only in India, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, nor only with "enemies" like Russia and China, but dares speak of "gradually re-establishing control over Europe . . . until Europe becomes more a peninsula than a power."

What is important in the critical period since the October, 1973, Middle East war, is how, at one and the same time, the allies move further apart and closer together as the crisis in each land brings it face to face with sharp class struggles and a tottering economy.

I do not mean that the French ruling class didn't disclose some Vichy leftovers when they so easily capitulated to the Arab wielders, first of the oil embargo, and then of oligopolistic setting of oil prices. When even so nationalist a Frenchman as Andre Malraux sees in this Europe's "disappearance," the disintegration of Western Europe, especially France, is by no means either just rhetoric or only an American imperial dream. Quite the contrary.

But it is the U.S.A. that is playing the other game as well. In the Martinique meeting with d'Estaing on Jan. 9, in order to get agreement that "oil consumers" (industrialized West) meet before they confront "oil producers" (OPEC), President Ford agreed to let France quadruple its wealth by mere declaration that it was "revaluing" its gold stock of \$4.4 billion and it (France) therefore now is worth \$17 billion.

The "American century" is most threatening to the American people. What these rulers are now foisting on us can be seen in its full dehumanized form from Defense Secretary Schlesinger's projection of the insane contingency of "surviving" a "limited" nuclear war.

As if we needed further proof of how dehumanized capitalism is, an absolutely lunatic scheme of Nazi-dimension genocide is presently being discussed seriously. One lunatic by the name of Forrester, under the euphemism (medically and in the French language) of "triage," has proposed that as the "answer" to famine and population growth. The fantastic and deliberate obfuscation of the fact of genocide by the use of a word meaning "sorting out" tells a great deal about the "inventor."

Back to World Hunger—and the Need for Social Revolution

What Forrester is actually and openly talking about is the deliberate, actual murder of millions who are presently starving and whom "society" does not feed. Who will decide those "fit" to survive? That "inventor" who is for zero population "growth"? The Western globalists? The Persian Shah? The Indian Maharaja, or "Indian Democracy" that allowed the Green Revolution once again to revert to the rich while the poor not only get poorer, but starve to death three full decades after achieving national independence!

The truth is that it is not lack of ability to produce sufficient food. Rather, it is the imperialistic structure of the U.S. which pays some not to produce; the capitalist law of value which allows for no production unless surplus value can be produced for it. This maldistribution of wealth is not only a question of "distribution." Rather, it comes from the very innards of production, surplus value production.

Unfortunately, the "Third World," at the World Food Conference in November in Rome, was so busy concentrating on its opposition to U.S. imperialism's refusal to specify what its "increased" aid would be, that it itself did nothing.

While it is true that it's not only a question of the three or four million tons of food needed today, but the 25-million-ton deficit that will grow to no less than 80 million tons in less than a decade, that hardly excuses trillion-dollar-rich America not increasing its miserly contribution to try to control the world famine.

The tragedy was expressed in precise terms only by the Transnational Institute which wrote: "Hunger is caused by plunder, not by scarcity."⁽³⁾

There is no way to stop such madmen except through social revolution, uprooting the whole system. Therein is the positive, the creative force arising from such disintegration in the system and intra-imperialist, intra-capitalist rivalries, provided revolutionaries do not fall into the trap of "taking sides" like "the lesser evil" or "the other land," and provided the theoretic void gets filled.

The Left — Still the Need for Revolution

The Shah can hardly pass for a revolutionary any more than the multi-national oil cartel can pass for a "trade union" just because the new oil barons claim it is "just that." The Shah's first counter-revolution, engi-

neered for him by the CIA and for that reason successful, was in 1951. Though he had lost the throne because the people had put the Tudeh Party in power and the Prime Minister Mossadegh had nationalized oil, he is now using this same fact to try to restore the old Persian empire.

Since then, since the overthrow of Mossadegh and driving to an underground existence of the Tudeh where they could withstand the torturous, murderous secret police, SAVAK, Iran has become a totalitarian police state. As for the new high oil billions, the income of two-thirds of all people in Teheran—and the countryside is much worse off than the capital—is less than \$200 per person a year.

In face of all these well-known facts, how could the Shah suddenly blossom forth abroad as a "supporter of the people?" Moreover, it is not alone Arab rulers and OPEC countries as well as PLO leaders but the so-called Left of the West that conspires in this image. Nowadays it appears sufficient to be "anti-American-imperialist" and "anti-Zionist" to be considered "Progressive," even "Left," without any question either about international or proletarian solidarity. Quite the contrary. Admirers of this type of "anti-Americanism" go out of their way to repeat the Shah's half-truths as the whole truth.

Thus, the New York Review of Books quotes approvingly the Shah's statement that "22 years of cheap fuel made Europe what it is and Japan what it is," not to mention, of course, U.S.A.⁽⁴⁾

And what has happened to the simple truth that labor produces all wealth? Not just its own wages, not just all the products in the market, but all the profits coming from the unpaid hours of labor? Isn't it still a fact that surplus value is derived from labor, be the rulers private capitalists, feudal kingdoms, or the state-capitalists calling themselves Communists ruling Russia and China?

⁽³⁾ Transnational Institute, 1520 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., whose pamphlet, *World Hunger: Causes and Remedies*, is free.

⁽⁴⁾ New York Review of Books, 1/23/75, which titles Geoffrey Barraclough's review, "The Great World Crisis, I," as *THE WORLD CRASH*.

6938

Jan 7, 1975

(cont'd)

Why is the myth of gold being separated from production? Why is the oligopolistic quadrupling of prices of oil excused on the ground that that is exactly what the U.S. oil monopolists did with pricing? And how can that turn upside down all relations at point of production?

So retrogressive are some on the "Left," so perverted their internationalism which is narrowed to one or the other in the Sino-Soviet sphere, that the only "unifying slogan" is anti-Zionism.

Thus, in one of the demonstrations against Dayan at American University in Washington, D.C., one of the slogans shouted with much fervor was "Zionism, out of Iran." Is Zionism, rather than the Shah, keeping the masses half-starved? Is Zionism, rather than the Shah keeping all dissidents in jail? Is Zionism, rather than the Shah, reviving the spirit of the old Persian empire, extended militarily and geographically?

If American Maoists manage to act dumb, not to know that by Zionism in Iran Mao actually means Russia on its borders, Russia being the common enemy of Mao and the Shah, then the Trotskyists, for whom Russia, "though degenerate," remains a workers' state, cannot play the dumb game. The Trotskyist epigones are too opportunistic, too anxious to be "for" "the new Left's" anti-Zionism to separate themselves from the demonstrators, even when anti-Semitism finds in anti-Zionism a useful cover.

The Maoists and Trotskyists are not, of course, alone in this. Open anti-Semitism like that of the Greek Bishop who precedes every reference to Kissinger as "the German Jewish Secretary of State" is tolerated by the Socialist Andreas Papandreu who, along with Dr. Vasso Lysnrides of Cyprus, go all-out for any actions of the PLO as if indeed only terrorists can rightfully represent the Palestinians and their struggle for freedom and self-determination.

This is not to say that there is anything progressive about Zionism, especially as it is practiced in Israel. Nor is it to deny that, consistently, Israel has confined to second-class citizenship even those Palestinians who accepted Israeli citizenship, much less recognized refugees as Palestinians; their rights to self-determination must be fought for. But to forget the PLO terrorism and massacres at Kiryat Shmona, Ma'alot, Shamir, Noharija, Beit She'an plus the Circassian village of Ribnyez, and then whitewash the highly religious Arafat's sudden calls for a "secular state" as if that were "socialist," is to defile national liberation.

Israel has a right to exist, though it is state-capitalist as is our whole age, which needs to be torn up, root and branch. But this uprooting can only be done by social revolution, and that begins in class struggles within the country, as much of the genuine Left in Israel is doing right now in its opposition to its own rulers, in its class struggles and opposition to the austerity program on their backs.

There has been recognition of just how counter-revolutionary is the claim to "revolutionary Third World" on the part of the "new UN majority, Arab led." Thus the recent action of the UNESCO in excluding Israel from "regional" actions in Paris has brought widespread opposition from committed intellectuals who have fought the fight of Palestinian freedom.

Jean-Paul Sartre (and many others signed the statement) wrote: "If Israel has been placed neither in Asia (as was Australia), nor in Europe (as was Canada), this means she belongs nowhere: namely, Israel doesn't exist" just because the so-called Third World "had decided that Israel does not have a right to exist . . . it's the extermination process perfected by the totalitarian systems of the 20th century." This, it should be added, cannot lead to anything but Hitler's "Final Solution."

Whether or not an Arab-Israeli war breaks out in Spring; whether or not the PLO becomes the only symbol of Palestinian resistance; whether or not a world holocaust continues to threaten not alone in that area, but in the struggle between the super-powers, China included—where the struggles cannot end is within each country, where the masses in action will be the only ones capable of staying the hands of nuclear madmen.

It is here then where the deepest recession eats away at our vitals, where the Black Revolution reminds us every day that it will start anew, where the new forces of revolution—women and youth and unemployed as well as labor and Black—are gliding for the battle with capital, and arming themselves with Reason as well as force—where the struggles will develop.

Let's begin by regaining our heads as well as our class solidarity instead of tailending any state power, be it U.S., Russia or China, much less the Gold Circle suddenly anointed as Third World. And in every activity, be it at the point of production, the unemployment lines, Women's Liberation struggles, or staying the hand of the gunboat diplomacy of Ford-Kissinger, let's not separate the struggles for freedom from the philosophy of liberation. Philosophy and revolution are inseparable if we are not once again to end with aborted spontaneous mass revolts.

Jan - Feb - 1975

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

For the first time in a decade — during which nothing short of the planned eruption of the "Cultural Revolution" and the planned loss of a Chief of State, President Liu Shao-ch'i took place without the National People's Congress participating in any way — the Fourth Congress convened in Peking this January. For the first time since the first draft of the new Constitution was proposed — but had obviously been dropped since Mao's "closest comrade-in-arms," his designated successor, Lin Biao, likewise died unnaturally — the name of Mao nowhere appears in the present Constitution.

For the first time in two decades since this governing body, which is supposed to be the highest organ of state power, first met and adopted a Constitution in 1954, it now "amended" it by reducing its 106 articles to 30. The Constitution's brevity was by no means a mere "technicality" any more than was the abolition of the post of the president. The substitution of Standing Committee for the post of a single president and the compression of the contents of the new Constitution both attest to the totality of the revisions, but in very opposite directions. Let's look into their oppositeness.

On the one hand, we see, for the first time, the open admission of the totalitarian nature of the state. The "Standing Committee" is not only subordinated to "the leadership of the Communist Party," but no doubt of any sort is allowed that the Communist Party is the sole, supreme authority in the government, in the Army, as well as "in all matters of superstructure." (1)

On the other hand, there is the complete coverup of the class nature of the state. Without so much as a single reference being made to the original Constitution, adopted in 1954, which openly declared China to be "state-capitalist" (2), the "amended" Constitution declares China

(1) The official (Hainhua) translation of the Constitution was published, almost complete, in *The New York Times*, 1/20/75.
(2) "In the historical circumstances of China we can carry out the gradual transformation of capitalist industry and com-

to be "a socialist state of the dictatorship of the proletariat . . ."

Were we willing to close our eyes to the forced identity of these two opposites — the dictatorship of the proletariat, a transitional state, and socialism, an achieved class-less society — can such world shaking, historic stages be accomplished by a mere stroke of the pen? Has the reality been so totally transformed?

MAOISM WITHOUT MAO: CHOU EN-LAI

Nothing could be further from the truth. The reality is that, just as Stalinism is flourishing without Stalin in Russia, so is Maoism without Mao's name. And I do not mean only because he is still alive, is still the Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. No, I mean that his "philosophy," "Mao Tse-tung Thought," does, indeed, underpin the whole structure of China.

Whether or not Mao's heirs will, like the heirs of Stalin, run like rats from a sinking ship once Mao dies, nothing fundamental will have changed so long as Mao Tse-tung Thought governs the economic base as well as the political and cultural "superstructure." All we have to do to see this is to listen to the Premier and "moderate" Chou En-lai's Report to the Congress as well as carefully reread that new Constitution.

I'm not referring to such superficialities as Chou peppering his speech with quotations from Mao as well as referring to him by name as "our great leader." No. I'm referring to something a great deal more basic — the three fundamental principles of capitalistic production which appear in the Constitution and govern Chou's report: class struggle, production and ever more production, "and scientific experiment." Anointing Marx's analysis of capitalistic production as "three great revolutionary movements" changes nothing whatever in labor's exploitation at the point of production, much less in the sacrosanct halls of science producing nuclear bombs.

meres through various forms of state capitalism. State-capitalism under the control of a state led by the working class is different in nature from state capitalism under bourgeois rule." (Documents of the First Session of the First National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China. Foreign Language Press, Peking, 1953.)

How new is China's new constitution?

As if the 11 crisis-ridden years had never happened, Chou En-lai delivered his report where he left off in 1964, and it all led to making China, with a new Five Year Plan, into a "powerful, modern" country. The figures he cited were all in percentage terms so that you didn't really know what, physically, was being produced and what will be the reality at the end of the Five Year Plan in 1980. The great successes he spoke of must have jarred the audience, at least the top leaders, with the "Document 21" (3) which spelled out the true conditions of industrial crisis and worker unrest.

Nevertheless, the continuity between Chou's report to the Congress in 1964 and the present is important, not so much because it is "moderate," as against Mao's Great Leap Forward in 1958 and the Cultural Revolution 1966-69, not to mention the mini-Cultural Revolution —

(Continued on Page 7)

(3) "Document 21" has not yet appeared here, but a review of it appears in *Newsweek*, 1/3/75.

6041

"criticize Confucius, criticize Lin" campaign — but because the class nature of China remained the same throughout all of these periods. Thus, though the 1964 report, which tried initiating a new Five Year Plan, was "interrupted" by the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" (which they couldn't contain, once it got going, until 1969), the motive force of the society remained Stalin's perversion of Marx's great principle, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need," into the exploitative principle, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work."

Far from the Cultural Revolution having been a truly social revolution, it was actually Mao Tse-tung Thought disciplining his co-leaders to consider Russia to be "Enemy No. 1." Now that he has trained the "collective leadership" to operate on that basis, the rehabilitation of many in the party headquarters that "had to be smashed" was with Mao's approval. Whether it is the young Wang, whom Mao hailed at the Tenth Chinese Communist Party Congress in 1973, or the old Teng, whom the Cultural Revolution had called a "demon" and "freak" but who is now Chou En-lai's Deputy, China is once again being put on a war footing and Chou is telling the masses that they must do as the Chairman asks: "Work hard," and "Dig trenches deep."

What was exciting and what was new and from below happened outside the Congress. Strikes and work stoppages occurred in various industrial centers in China. The Constitution is trying to face that reality by "granting" the workers the right to strike.

Judging by the very first declarations the "new" and "moderate" leadership has issued officially, it is clear that their interpretation of "continuous revolution" is endless labor discipline, with editorials in Red Flag and People's Daily, shouting that those who do not practice labor discipline are trying "to make use of the slogans of democracy to sabotage the unified leadership of the party and the proletarian dictatorship."

What, then, is Maoism with or without Mao, and with Chou-Teng-Chang as the new triumvirate to execute the new Constitution?

(TO BE CONCLUDED NEXT ISSUE)

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

PART II

The pure Maoism that governs the new Constitution and its very, very old "new" leadership⁽⁴⁾ is Mao's most unMarxist and most original philosophic contribution "On Contradiction," which rested on substituting for class contradictions, the relationship between economic base and political superstructure and so equalizing the two as to make his "superstructure" (i.e., his political line of the moment) every bit as decisive as the production relationship.⁽⁵⁾

Ever since the 10th Communist Party Congress in 1973, new and very important documents, the Wan-sui⁽⁶⁾, have finally become known in the West. These shed new, and in some cases shocking, light on the whole question of the relationship between base and superstructure, which drags in Lenin, along with Stalin, as Russian "comrades" who "underestimate" the peasantry. Since the voluminous writings of Lenin on the peasantry, and the further development of the colonial question after the conquest of power, led Lenin to relate the question of world revolution to the Orient — "If not through Berlin, then perhaps through Peking"—Mao could not possibly, not through the wildest leap of nightmarish imagination, make such an accusation against Lenin. Here is how he tries nevertheless:

In 1955 — after the death of Stalin, but before Khrushchev's deStalinization in February 1956 — Mao embarked on his type of fantastic collectivization and criti-

(4) The top leadership is octogenarian, the majority are in the 70's and the "young" in the triumvirate, Chang, is 62. From the new elections in 1973, the one that was played up as youth, and who appears not to be at the top but in any case is on the Central Committee, Wang, is in the mid-40's.

(5) Stalin only talked about the relations of production but not about the superstructure. Part of Mao's analysis is in Wan-sui, below.

(6) Wan-sui is the abbreviation of Mao Tse-tung ssu-hsiang wan-sui (Long Live Mao Tse-tung's Thought) which appeared in 2 volumes (1967, 230 pp; 1969, 720 pp) for an elite, limited audience in China. Taipei got hold of the books and photo offset them in 1973. At present a lengthy discussion by many China scholars is appearing in The China Quarterly, Jan-Mar, 1974, Dec. 1974, and still going strong.

cized Stalin's final document, Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR.⁽⁷⁾ There he accused Stalin of overestimating technology and giving priority to "things instead of people." Mao says, "What we use to regulate things is the Plan" as if that, just that, wasn't Stalin's god!

Nevertheless he goes on mindlessly, reducing to a single slogan, Lenin's voluminous writings on the peasantry and on the soviets as something that arose spontaneously, as did the Paris Commune, and thus charted a road for Marxists, on the eve of 1917, to realize that a new society means "the population to a man, woman and child" controlling production and the state. That single slogan is Lenin's "Communism equals soviets plus electrification."

Characteristically, what Mao does directly after quoting that sentence out of context is further, deliberate obfuscation by letting the slogan dangle in the air as he continues his argument with Stalin, as if that also covered Lenin, and contrasts to them his "mass line."

What concerns us in 1975 is that Chou, like Mao, spells out "mass line" as workers needing to work hard and harder, while they obey "the battle call" and "battle task" set out by the present Congress to achieve "big and rapid increase in industrial production this year." So it isn't superstructure, after all, that the Chinese "theoretic contingents" are concerned with, as is seen in broadcasts from Huanan which lauded "the great blueprint for building China."⁽⁸⁾

"PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE" AND THE "SECOND WORLD"

Also enshrined in the Constitution is "peaceful co-existence." It is hard to believe that after all the shrill propaganda against Khrushchev on "peaceful co-existence" as a sell-out to capitalism and imperialism, Maoism would so blatantly proclaim the same. For those who think Maoists have an out, since "theirs" is based on the Bandung Conference (which indeed preceded

(7) See my analysis in *Marxism and Freedom*, the chapter on Stalin.

(8) Some of the quotations from the new Chinese leaders appear in an article by Joseph Lohyvel in *The New York Times*, 2/11/75.

Khrushchev's espousal of the slogan in 1956, but was tied directly to the Asian-African Third World), read and read again the new Constitution and Chou's speech and Teng's April speech to the UN last year where he first "created" a "new world" he called the "Second World," which turned out to be nothing short of West European capitalism.

Here is how Chou spelled it out this time: "We support the countries and the people of the Second World in their struggle against super-power control. We support the efforts of the West European countries to get united in the struggle." And since they fight, not capitalism, but only the two super-powers, and two super-powers—USSR and the U.S.—are once again distinguished so that Russia is the worst, there is no doubt whatever that "pure" Maoism and its unique Cultural Revolution's achievement, making Russia "Enemy No. 1," lives in full bloom.

Finally, only one question remains regarding Maoism without Mao. The most fantastic, literally insane of all Mao's brainstormings, was the one regarding the A-bomb, and that was before China got the "know-how" in 1964.

THE BOMB

In 1957 when Mao was in Moscow, he projected to Nehru the idea that the Third World, China especially, had nothing to fear from a nuclear holocaust since that would do away with "imperialism" and the civilization that would rise on its ruins would be "higher." This effectively shut up Nehru.

No one, indeed, dared speak about it, and it remained secret, until first, a British trade union delegation heard of it and was not shocked into secrecy, and then the Sino-Soviet conflict broke into the open, and the Russians never tired of referring to it. No matter what purposes the Russian Communists put this knowledge to, the point is: Mao did say it, Mao did think it, Mao never deviated from that projection. Indeed, this is precisely what accounts for his acceptance of state-capitalism (which he calls "socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat") as the next stage of humanity's "development."

The only thing that is new now is that the documents that became known in 1973, which were meant for the elite of China during the Cultural Revolution, back up this view by quoting Mao as saying: "In Chinese history our population has been destroyed by half, a good many times."

Is that what the "new" leadership likewise sees as what, as Mao put it, "would sweep the world clean of imperialism" after which "we could rebuild again"? And is this what leads the "New Left" in the West to consider Mao the revolutionary who moves "from revolution to revolution to revolution"?

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

Two reasons prompted me, on this year's Spring lecture tour on the East Coast, to talk on the relevance of the relationship of philosophy to political economy today. One was that the New York Union of Radical Political Economists (URPE) invitation stressed the fact that Marxist historians should tackle the problems of the day in the U.S. The other was the re-emerging Maoist Stalinism, especially amongst those specializing in China studies. To the latter subject I will return in a future column. Here is an abbreviated abstract of my talk at the New School for Social Research.

I. Concepts

"The law of motion" that Marx had set out to discern in his massive, rigorous study of the economic laws of capitalism "and its notions" led to two other discoveries. One was that the law of concentration of capital could lead to all capital concentrated in the hands of "a single capitalist . . . or single capitalist society" but change nothing fundamental in the role of labor. Two was the creation of "new passions and new forces" from the absolute opposite of capital accumulation—workers' resistance at the point of production, the class struggles and passion for philosophy of liberation and reconstruction of society on totally new beginnings.

Until the first, classic Revisionism—Bernstein's Evolutionary Socialism—called for the removal of "the dialectic scaffolding" along with the indispensability of revolution, none questioned the integrality of economics and philosophy, philosophy and revolution, theory and practice. Yet, though Rosa Luxemburg attacked Revisionism most profoundly in *Reform or Revolution?*, when she herself turned to analyze a still later stage of capitalist development, imperialism, and she found revolutionaries as well as reformists attacking her concept of "non-capitalist lands" being the reason for the

extension of capitalism's life, she too, suddenly, spoke against "the roccoco" in Marx's style. The truth is none were practicing dialectics, all Marxists merely "took it for granted."

Only when the outbreak of World War I brought about the collapse of the Second International did Lenin finally feel the impulse to return to the origins of Marxism in the Hegelian dialectic. It is only then that Lenin turned to the study of Hegel's *Science of Logic*, not as abstract, bourgeois philosophy, but as "algebra of revolution" that could help the rebirth of revolutionary Marxism.

Until 1917, or, more precisely, 1918-21, it would have appeared that Lenin held the same view of state capitalism as Bukharin, whose book on *Imperialism and the World Economy* he had favorably introduced. Only with the Revolution had "the dialectic" become the center of all his writings and deeds and perspectives for world revolution, so that even his Bolshevik co-leader was characterized as "not fully a Marxist" because "he had never fully grasped the dialectic."

In a word, all the studies of the new stage of capitalism, from Hilferding's *Finance Capital* through Luxemburg's *Accumulation of Capital*, to Bukharin's studies both of world imperialism and the Economics of the Transition Period, were entrapped in the bifurcation of subject and object, economics and philosophy, history and revolution. This was hardly helped by Trotsky—who, alone, was left to fight Stalinism—not facing the reality of the first workers' state in history having been transformed into its opposite, seeing the degeneracy as arising only from the fact that Stalin's Russia was "the policeman" arrogating to himself "distribution." Since then, Marxist historians have either evaded the whole question by speaking of the imprecisions of "advanced capitalism", or used "state capitalism" only against Russia as if it were not a world phenomenon, or as if Russia became that only when Mao so declared it to be—once the Sino-Soviet orbit became the Sino-Soviet conflict.

II. Actualities:

Today's "New Left" hardly helps illuminate today's problems when it forces a discontinuity from the past under the delusion that theory can be picked up "en route". To dig deep into the world reality, including that of the Third World, and, inseparable from that study of "object", to see what is truly new from below, from Subject, from the movement from practice, is the only way the theoretic challenge can be met for our age. What are the continuities and discontinuities in actuality as well as in philosophic concepts, the totality demanding and expressing dialectics of liberation in the age of state-capitalism?

The Great Depression, 1929-1939, had demolished completely private, competitive, "free enterprise" capitalism which went into a wild scramble to save the

(Continued on Page 7)

State-capitalism and the dialectic

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

system through state intervention and thus hoped to keep the proletarian revolution at bay. My study, from original Russian sources, was of the first three Five year plans and economic growth and degradation of labor. This was on a totally different basis than either that of the anarchists who were quick to throw "state-capitalism" at the Russian workers' state from its very birth, or those like Bruno R., who, in the shock at such a transformation into opposite, reverted to what totalitarianism was in feudalism, thus leaving room both for those who departed from Marxism as well as the early Shachtman who, though he saw "bureaucratic collectivism" as an "unforeseen, mongrelized reactionary part", nevertheless claimed it part "of the collectivist epoch of human history."

As distinct from that discontinuity of concepts, I retained the Marxian concepts of history and the basic relationship of labor/capital to study the actuality of Russia and there found the operation of the most basic law of capitalism: the law of value. Stalinism was but the Russian name of the new stage of world capital: state-capitalism.

A new world stage of development did begin in 1946 with the victory of Mao, but it was not of the scope of the Russian Revolution but of the national liberation struggles. In any case, Mao himself originally called his state "state capitalist", telling the Chinese masses not to worry because once they, through the Communist Party, held "the commanding heights", politically controlled the gun, then the state would be a "transitional one" only, leading to a classless society. But in fact anything but that happened. State-capitalism mouthing Marxist phraseology doesn't change the conditions of labor for the masses, or their "superstructure", that is to say, their freedom of thought. As is seen from the current debate in *The Black Scholar*, (See Black/Red column, p. 6) this is no more a question of China than the debate on Russian state-capitalism was a debate of Russia. Rather, it is a question of world revolutionary perspectives, especially of the American Revolution.

The governing point is that it is not "foreign", but involves us, American Marxists. The point is also that we will be entrapped in still another "faction" unless we begin with the new dialectic from practice which the masses established in the past two decades, whether it took the form of a liberation struggle from Communism, Russian Communism, as in East Europe, or from Western imperialism as it was in Africa, or from the Left within China, with the Sheng Wu-lien arising from within the "Cultural Revolution" that called for "a genuine Paris Commune" against "the red capitalist, Chou En-lai," or, finally the Black Revolution in the U.S. that stimulated the Free Speech Movement in academia as well as the totally involved youth in the anti-Vietnam war movement, thus giving rise to a whole new generation of revolutionaries, white as well as black, Women's Liberation as well as wildcats.

**III. Challenges to Marxist Historians:
the Movements from Practice and from Theory**

All history is contemporary history and all truth concrete. What were Hegelian concepts of dialectic were removed from ivory towers of thought and made into a new continent of thought and practice by Marx, who called his philosophy "a new Humanism" that united the ideal and the real, and saw history not as past but as present and as being shaped by living men and women. There are no Marxes or Lenins today but we do have the maturity of the age and that movement from practice that is itself a form of theory. To think that, as American Marxists, we can only talk of class struggle without participating in it, or talk "Left" without mentioning the different tendencies, actually narrows Marxism from its world roots, and allows bourgeois ideology to prevail. This doesn't mean that we will not concentrate on American studies. The very opposite is true both of concepts and of reality. When we attempt to restate Marxism for our age, when we study, in this age, be it the two-way road to revolution of Blacks in America and Blacks in Africa, or Nixon's "New Economic Policy", or the current deep recession, we cannot leave out the concepts of state-capitalism and the dialectic.

The dialectic is what makes us see the opposite in each unit and each unity and keeps us from the trap of one-dimensionality. Which is why Marx considered scientists as well as utopians "abstract materialists", and warned against "a materialism which excludes history and its process."

In this bicentennial year, as against the so-called objective historians, Marxist historians must dig deep both into the present and the past, not merely exposing the lie inherent in the Declaration of Independence which had made an abstraction of freedom, but in opening theoretical avenues for the second American revolution. Only by listening to the masses from below — especially during these past two decades when on all fronts, from Black Revolution to anti-Vietnam war movement, from Third World and East European Revolts to Women's Liberation and Sheng Wu-lien, they far outdistanced theoreticians stuck in "fixed particulars" and one-dimensionality — can Marxist historians bring about a totally new relationship of theory to practice and thereby bring to life what Marx called "the realization of philosophy", that is to say, make freedom a reality.

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

I am turning over my column this issue to a colleague who is a young Women's Liberationist and who has sent me the following letter. —Raya Dunayevskaya

Dear Raya:

"Women's Liberation has reached a new stage, both objectively and subjectively," I wrote after your tour here last month. I meant that not only has women's activity been great (as we can see from the lead article in April News & Letters), but there is also a real passion for philosophy in the air.

There seem to be feminist "study groups" all over, and a new interest in Marx, who was once rejected along with everything not-brand new and exclusively woman.

But what impressed me especially were the new women who came to your lectures here. Their questions were so serious, and their affinity for the ideas of Marxist-Humanism so immediate, I felt that there must be conclusions drawn and new relationships begun.

There were mostly women at the Hunter College lecture on Women's Liberation, of course. They discussed with you everything from the need to involve working class women in writing equal rights legislation, to the relationship between mass movements and individual creativity. But at the other lectures, too, the women were the most eager to talk about ideas for their movement. In Towson, Md., they asked about Juliet Mitchell and Sheila Rowbotham's theories. At the URPE (Union of Radical Political Economists) conference, where you talked on state-capitalism, the questions quickly turned to the vanguard party concept and WL's antipathy to it.

MY QUESTION IS, why haven't more of the women who loved you come to our meetings since? Are they so afraid of organizations that they cannot see the

philosophic necessity of continuing the discussions? History has surely proved that movements cannot stand still in thought: they go to a higher stage or they retrogress. Philosophy is not something to be enjoyed at one meeting a year, but to be lived.

I am afraid women don't join with us because of the incredible elitism they have seen in most Left organizations. Even among women's groups that call themselves "socialist-feminist," Maoism of some kind is the order of the day. The women in one New York group pride themselves on not being in an organization with men, but their thinking is exactly the same as when they were in SDS in 1969. They have not reorganized themselves one bit by becoming "feminists"!

The concept of the backwardness of the masses is so central to such people's thought, that even if they don't call themselves a vanguard party, they consider the mass of women as stupid. How can this not repel women liberationists whose movement for the past 10 years has been based on the self-development of the individual and the struggle to control her own life?

ONE PROBLEM IS the theoretic question being posed as "socialism versus feminism," with horrible un-freedoms given as the "socialism." Some state power or would-be power, whether it's a party or the intellectual-writer, is presumed to embody socialism, and the only "political" discussion is which one. Would you believe, at the URPE conference session on Third World women, a woman said that North Vietnamese women have achieved equality because they do the heaviest manual labor, while Chinese women have not because the men do it and get paid more than women?

Contrast that level of discussion with the fundamental questions raised by the new voices of Women's Liberation: What is the unfettered nature of women? What is human nature? What is "women's work"? What should human labor be? What different kinds of relationships can there be between men and women, women and women, men and men?

The irony is that those "apolitical" women are the

real Marxists, for those were the very questions with which Marx began his analysis of the world. In our WL group the other night we read "Private Property and Communism" from his 1844 Essays, and the new women were amazed at how much he sounds like the best of WL! And they had no trouble fitting his description of "vulgar communism" to Russia or China today, especially where he says:

"We should especially avoid re-establishing society as an abstraction, opposed to the individual. The individual is the social entity."

Our women became furious that Marxism has been used to mean totalitarianism!

MARX NEVER LOST sight of his original, humanist vision of the reconstruction of society. He was always looking for what he called (in *Capital*) "the new forces" (Continued on Page 6)

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

and new passions" that would do it, including the women. We need this methodology so urgently today.

Yet the strangest "Marxist" analyses are being put forth by some women. The wages-for-housework group and those who call office workers "the new working class" (replacing production workers), are going through contortions to fit women into some kind of static "class" analysis that is not Marx's at all.

He was for a social revolution by all oppressed groups that would completely tear up and remake the world. All must participate in the process if individual freedom is to be the end. Now, isn't that exactly what women liberationists are saying when they demand freedom now, knowing it cannot be "given" to them "after the revolution"? In other words, socialism and feminism are not opposites, but are in fact inseparable, if by "socialism" you mean true Marxism.

So — the problem remains, how to get the feminists who are now seriously searching for a philosophy of human liberation, to try to work out Marxism for today with us Marxist-Humanists? To see that it is not a question of liking you as a woman philosopher, but of grasping philosophy? To see that it is not a question of party or elitism, but of philosophy inseparable from activity and organization?

—Molly Jackson

TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

**THE CONCRETIZATION OF MARX'S
NEW CONTINENT OF THOUGHT: 1917**

Once there was a great proletarian revolution, the greatest ever, the most international, having been conceived as but one step toward the world revolution, and the deepest since everything from struggles at the point of production to national liberation movements, and from women's liberation struggles to new forms of literature were to be created anew. And because the 1917 Russian Revolution was so total, not only was the philosophy of revolution inseparable from the actual overturn of the old and creation of the new, but the Black Dimension was recognized as revolutionary, though "a national question." That Black Dimension, moreover, felt so at home as to criticize also the Communists themselves (the American Communists) for their prejudices. Here is how eloquently Claude McKay addressed the Communist International in 1922:

... there is a great element of prejudice among the Socialists and Communists of America. They are not willing to face the Negro question. In associating with the comrades of America, I have found demonstrations of prejudice on the various occasions when the white and black Comrades had to get together; and this is the greatest difficulty that the Communists of America have got to overcome—the fact that they first have got to emancipate themselves from the ideas they entertained towards the Negroes before they can be able to reach the Negroes with any kind of radical propaganda.

In 1918, when the Third International published its Manifesto and included that part referring to the exploited colonies there were several groups of Negro radicals in America that sent this propaganda out among their people. When in 1920 the American government started to investigate and to suppress radical propaganda among the Negroes, the

Instant Marxism and the Black intellectual

small radical Negro groups in America retaliated by publishing the fact that the Socialists stood for the emancipation of the Negroes, and that reformist America could do nothing for them. Then, I think, for the first time in American history, the American Negroes found that Karl Marx had been interested in their emancipation, and had fought valiantly for it.

**THE TRANSFORMATION INTO OPPOSITE:
STALINISM, MAOISM**

In 1929, the Great Depression broke loose in the world. It is also the period when Russia became transformed into its opposite. From the first workers' state in history it developed into a state-capitalist society. Its name was Stalinism and its thought was that false consciousness which reduced Leninism to an administrative formula of how to get the workers to produce ever more and have no voice at all while receiving ever less pay and being forced into the silence and horror of concentration camps.

As against the 1917 proletarian revolution issuing from World War I, the revolutions that issued from World War II were national only. Ideologically they were rooted in Stalinism which passed for "Marxism-Leninism" but in fact were state-capitalist under the shield of "socialism in one country." The "Thought of Mao Tse-tung", grafted on that nationalistic basis, was original in but two aspects: guerilla warfare, and brainwashing which Mao called "rectification." The "new" in that brainwashing was that it was philosophically expressed as "contradiction." The trouble was that the contradiction was violated of its class content. The "super-structure" was placed above it, and made so manipulable as to extinguish all fundamental differences between "primary and secondary contradictions."

What Mao said of Stalin after Stalin's death: Stalin was "not completely a metaphysician; he understood dialectics, but not very much," (1) could also be said of Mao.

(1) Wan-sui, 1967, quoted in "The China Quarterly," March 1975.

The Black intellectuals nowadays think that they, in turn, can rest on this abbreviated Marxism called Maoism. Instant Marxism is no substitute for "the labor, patience, seriousness and suffering of the negative"—so imperative for a philosophy of liberation that hungers to become real.

TODAY'S BLACK INTELLECTUALS

The gap between Black workers and Black intellectuals in this era of sharp economic crises has become so deep that, at first sight, there seems to be no point whatever to go into the debates among self-proclaimed leaders, rootless intellectuals trying overnight "to make" a revolution and a theory. Yet the deeper the economic crisis and the unbounded restlessness among workers, the more necessary it is to see what does get reflected also in the elitist movement.

(Continued on Page 7)

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

The first truth is that, no matter how far removed from any direct relationship to the workers' struggles are Black intellectuals, the Black Dimension is so inherently revolutionary and, at the same time, so forced by capitalism to an intellectual ghetto, that they cannot but reflect some of the alienation produced by capitalism.

Take so Establishment a person as Ralph W. Ellison, who has belatedly come to tout "middle-class values." He was the very writer who produced one of the greatest novels of the 20th century written by anyone, white or Black. That work of genius, *The Invisible Man*, tells of so total a rejection of white society that has made the Black "invisible," that there is no way whatever for that truth—the art-speech of reality—to be covered up by his "sudden" discovery of middle-class values that the Blacks are now being asked to emulate "perfecting our mastery of the cultural and intellectual tools of modern American society," as if that could "transcend the valueless and directionless void in which we now find ourselves." (2)

The second truth is that those intellectuals who do have some roots among workers, like Baraka and Sadouki, and who are looking for some theory, which Baraka calls an "Ideology with three cutting edges— from nationalism to Pan-Africanism to socialism" are attracted to Maoism, not because Mao speaks of remaining Red even if it takes "a thousand or ten thousand years" but because they think that Maoism is a short-cut to a new society. In this they reflect the proletarian impatience to do away with this exploitative, racist, imperialistic, alienating society. They suffer, however, from the preoccupation of all elitists. They all want to be leaders and to order all others to follow. Even some like John Oliver Killens, who do recognize "the problem with instant Marxists is that their Marxism is a misinterpretation of Marx", nevertheless consider the "thrust" must be for leadership. (3)

Among these would-be Marxists there is one, C. L. R. James, who surely has the knowledge of class analysis, racial history and "culture." But he bows out of the whole debate by claiming that "we (James and George Padmore) never quarrelled . . . this quarrelling now I don't understand."

Both statements are untruths, as is the one where he details the working with George Padmore between 1935 and 1939. They add up to an evasion not only of facts but of theory. (4) That can hardly help illuminate the present situation, much less allow us to hear the forces from below who are the only ones that can hew out new ground for the battle of ideas. An end must be put to all the prevarications, evasions and the myriad rewritings of history at the very moment when the passion for philosophy among the masses is so all-pervasive.

It was the Black forces from below that courageously and creatively fought the battles of the '60s and thus gave birth to a whole new generation of revolutionaries, white as well as Black. History shows that these mass forces are the only ones that can save the intellectuals from their rootlessness and thus once and for all put an end to the old and create the new, thereby "realizing" philosophy—that is to say, make freedom a reality.

(2) "When Does a Black Join the Middle Class?" by Ralph W. Ellison, *Los Angeles Times*, 1-23-75.

(3) The quotations from the debate in *The Black Scholar* as well as others by Baraka, Sadouki, Killens, James are from "Black Intellectuals Divided Over Ideological Direction," by Charlayne Hunter, *New York Times*, 4-22-75.

(4) Consult both *Pan-Africanism or Communism?* by George Padmore and *Black Revolutionary: George Padmore's Path From Communism to Pan-Africanism* by James R. Hooker for the history of the relationship of Padmore and C.L.R. James, which hardly extended to 1939 when C.L.R. James had already penned *The World Revolution* and became first a Trotskyist and in 1941 was co-founder with me of the state-capitalist tendency in the U.S. (See *For The Record*, available from *News & Letters* and deposited in the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection of the Wayne State University Labor History Archives, Detroit.) It's hard to gauge from his present writings what his views have developed into since he became a professor.

TWO WORLDS

Counter-revolution and revolution: what can we do?

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

(The following excerpts are from the *Perspectives Thesis* delivered to the National Editorial Board meeting of *News and Letters Committees* on Aug. 30. The full report is available from N&L for 50c.)

Introduction
WHEN PHILOSOPHY AND LIBERATION
GET SEPARATED

So extreme, global, intense is every struggle in the crisis-ridden world we inhabit that, whether it is so elementary a question as secondary school education in Detroit, or so complex a question as the five-way bloody struggle in Portugal, we cannot but focus on the death and life aspects of counter-revolution and revolution.

Thus, 1) 21 years after the U.S. Supreme Court declared that there is no such thing as "separate but equal," a Detroit Federal District Judge named DeMascio has just declared that segregated education is "quality" education! As if that were not retrogressive enough of a step for a white District Judge to make, Detroit's Black Mayor Young has turned so mealy-mouthed that he's barely distinguishable from that white racist.

Thus, 2) in Portugal, where the Socialist Party began courageously enough first in the revolution against fascism, and then against Communist dominance over the proletariat, it is now, in the North, hardly distinguishable from the Catholic hierarchy — and the Maoists . . . with whom they are now functioning. That is not so surprising, because Maoists collaborate with any and all who oppose Russia, be it Social Democrats in Portugal; capitalist class rulers in West Europe that Mao now calls "Second World," as if that could hide their class nature; or with Mobutuism in Zaire and Angola, U.S. imperialism, NATO, the PLO, or the Shah of Iran. They even trade with South Africa. In a word, there is but one condition: being against Russia. That Russia is no doubt

doing the same thing does not make China "revolutionary."

There is, 3), no end to what abysmal depths hypocrisy has sunk during these counter-revolutionary times. Ever-new facets keep appearing. The latest occurred in Bangladesh. Having murdered Sheik Mujib and his entire family, the murderers buried him with "full honors." Or so the new rulers announced. The self-declared president — Ahmed — then dubbed the counter-revolution a revolution, first calling Bangladesh the Islamic Republic of Bangladesh, then denying the theocratic designation but practicing it nevertheless. Government by assassination has replaced politics of double cross.

Or: 4) Not many have exceeded the Shah as empire builder . . . (but) India possesses by far the largest land, sea and air forces of any Indian Ocean littoral power. With the total number of armed forces numbering more than 1.1 million (including border security forces), the Indian Army of 830,000 soldiers is said to be the fifth largest in the world . . .

Part I

Let's see if anything, anything at all has changed this year. The 400 million who were either starving or severely malnourished in the poor-poor Third World and Fourth—Asia, and Africa, and the Middle East—are where they were last year: starving and severely malnourished.

Let's move from the poorest lands to the richest—the USA. It is here we wish to stay, for the class enemy is always at home. It is here where the revolutionary force is also, but we cannot move forward unless we know the counter-revolutionary force we must face, the biggest in the world, the most militaristic, the most nuclearly armed, the mightiest.

We're supposed to be "bottoming out" of the Recession. The brainless head of the brainless Brain Trust, Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve Board, claims that the recovery is so "broad based" that we need not worry overly much of any double-digit inflation. And, of course,

he always has "figures" to prove his point . . .

The latest recession started back in November of 1973 and supposedly "touched bottom" in May 1975. From a peak of 127.5—taking 1967 as 100—industrial production slid to 109.6, i.e. 14.1 percent. But since that doesn't concern the workers, who are doing the work of producing, let's get to the crucial point—unemployment.

(Continued on Page 7)

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

Now that we have supposedly bottomed out, these "spets" don't even bother to claim that unemployment will be reduced more than a mere one percent from the present "average" of 8.4 percent. Even this miserly difference doesn't end the Braintrusts' confusion. It turns out that the Labor Dept. survey of households was supposed to show that there has been a rise from March to July of 1.2 million workers employed. However, businessmen have their own (and naturally, more accurate) way of showing how many are employed—the payroll. And they have shown that there has been no such increase.

The AFL-CIO has not only been releasing quite different figures of unemployment, but also of corporate growth. (NYT 8/22/75). These show: (1) that the 50 biggest banks control more than half of all bank assets and hold controlling stocks in more than 5,200 companies, (2) That the top 119 manufacturing corporations hold more than half of all assets and get more than half of all profits in manufacturing. And (3) that the 500 biggest U.S. corporations hold more than two-thirds of all business income . . .

Not only that. The global reach of these companies is the major cause for the decline of the U.S. trade position and for the loss of jobs, as they are always running away to produce where labor is cheapest, be that in the South USA or South Africa, Europe or Asia . . .

Clearly, whether we examine the home front or the world situation, we have reached an abysmal point of such crisis and retrogression that this exploitative racist, sexist, imperialist, alienating society must be torn up by its roots.

Part II DIALECTICS OF ORGANIZATION: DIALECTICS OF LIBERATION

. . . It took Trotsky his defeat by Stalin in the late 1920s for him to recognize that Lenin alone was indispensable to 1917. He then took lock, stock and barrel the 1902 concept of vanguardism, thereby assuring continuance of the theoretic void left by Lenin's death.

Once we picked up the link in the historic continuum with the theory of state-capitalism in 1941, we were on the way both to reconsideration of the role of labor and new beginnings, but these remained both philosophically and organizationally quite blurred until there was that new great duality in the objective reality of 1953 with its compulsion to see philosophically, in the Absolute Idea itself a movement from practice, and in an actual movement from practice a form of theory itself, both of which demanded organizational expression, the Committee form of organization inseparable from philosophy . . .

To meet the challenge and to meet it under the whip of counter-revolution we have traced it here, whether it is in the relations of U.S.-Russia, or China, alone, or in Sino-Soviet conflict, Bangladesh, Islamic or otherwise, Latin America, or Africa or India. Moreover, that whip of counter-revolution is present not only where it is obvious, but where it resulted in "peace"—the Middle East shuttle . . .

World revolution, too, starts at home. Every word has gotten to mean its opposite, whether we limit ourselves to local matters like "forced busing" and "quality education" or nothing short of "a new world economic order". Heretofore a new world economic order has meant the end of capitalism and its replacement through proletarian revolution, by socialism . . .

Capitalism is in economic crisis for sure, and politically has been in its death throes for all too long, but it is the workers, the Blacks, the women and the youth—all the creative, oppressed, revolutionary forces—who will topple "the tottering structure of neo-capitalism." And because of the totality of the crisis and the nuclear threats that are hanging over the very survival of humanity, it becomes imperative not to rush away from the colossal tasks just because we are so small.

Millions upon millions have the same desire as we for a new social order and new human relations. The vision—philosophy and revolution as a unity—can shake up this mightiest of all capitalistic empires. The first step in that transforming of the counter-revolution into its opposite—actual social revolution—is being set here in activities, manual and mental.

Yes, world revolution starts at home. Anything and everything done here that would indeed shake the U.S. will shake up the world, undermining the old. It may be just one step but it can become the longest of all steps to making freedom a reality.

TWO WORLDS**Youth ID cards vs. youth passion for freedom**

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

Recently I talked to some high school classes and also sat in on an informal conference of high school youth in Detroit who came from schools ranging from the educationally "most favored," like Cass, to the "least favored," like Highland Park. They had been involved in everything from mass walkouts to individual disputes with teachers who supervised the type of articles the youth had dared write. They raised the whole question of desegregated education — which was suddenly being called, not following the law of the land, 21 years too late, but "forced busing" and "reverse discrimination."

Yet, while all adults in the education field of high school youth seemed to discuss nothing but busing, the youth were preoccupied with the latest and hardest manifestation of totalitarianism: ID CARDS.

YOUTH KNOW RACISM IN U.S.

This was not due to any delusions about how much of the very warp and woof of America is racism — from that racist occupying the White House to the lowliest student in South Boston, egged on by the neo-fascist Councilwoman Hicks. On the contrary, some had made the bus trip to South Boston to participate in the struggle against those fighting to establish white supremacy in what, as far back as 150 years ago, was the citadel of Abolitionism. Rather, it was due to the maturity of the 1970s, as against the more famous 1960s when college students thought they were being made aliens in their own society by being computerized. Later, it was not just that they had no personal identity, but were numbers on a card. By the 1970s the high school youth were saying that, as persons, they were not just alienated, but reified, that is to say, made into things, things with pictures on them to identify living persons and tags to specify home and phone and list of courses. They felt just like prisoners, with ID cards as in fascist and totalitarian countries, who are allowed no travel abroad, no travel from country to city, or from job to job — or, like them, from school to school.

They saw little distinction between those high schools

like Highland Park where the teachers cared absolutely nothing about you once they took the roll call, taught you nothing, and gave you a passing mark just so they would not have to face you twice in the same grade, and a school like Cass that was proud of its "high standards" in what they called education, but where students felt teachers often just talked "at" them.

"OBJECTIVITY", ID CARDS, BRAINWASHING

One student from another school related the story of an argument with an administrator because she had been courageous enough to describe a bus trip to South Boston. One would think she had just committed the most "subversive" act against the government if one were to judge by her teacher's outburst. He finally came up with the word, "subjective." The report, according to him, was not "objective."

What she wanted to know was: who was the judge of what was "subjective" and what was "objective" in a description of a demonstration — the participant in it, or the man on high sitting either in Washington, D.C., or in Detroit, Mich.? Wasn't there a division within subjective, between her story and his judgment? And wasn't there as "great a divide" between what, objectively, happened, depending on which side of the police lines you were standing? What is "observing"? What is acting?

The discussion then moved back to ID cards. At first, the reason for the introduction of ID cards was supposed to be for the protection of the students against the "criminal elements" who were preying on the students. To keep "the criminal elements" out of school, you were to have an identity card with you on entering the school. Now, you were to wear them in school and any one at all could take information from it, or memorize it, or whatever.

The point was that there is no privacy left whatever. You are not the one who decides anything; the authorities decide everything. You are made to feel a prisoner because that is what you ARE. Was there any difference between this "democracy" and the police state?

It was at this point that the whole question of brainwashing came up as it related to war situations, espe-

cially in the Korean War which by no accident, preceded the Supreme Court decision finally to recognize that "separate but equal" has been the lie of American education ever since the counter-revolution of the Boerism South against the Civil War and Black Reconstruction. It was at this point also that the question moved to a philosophy of freedom, Marx's Humanism and the adventures of Hegelian dialectics. Because it is necessary to restate it in both the old and new context, here is an excerpt from a lecture I gave several years ago:

(Continued on page 7)

6 9 5 2

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from page 5)

THE EDUCATORS MUST BE EDUCATED

That academic tradition that operates on the assumption that the generation that could understand Hegel's *Phenomenology of Mind* has died, cannot help the youth of our epoch grasp the grandeur of the vision of the most encyclopaedic mind of Europe who wrote:

"Within the short span of man's own life an individual must learn the whole long journey of mankind. This is possible only because the universal mind is operative in every individual mind and is the very substance of it."

It would seem that if you, we, everyone have to learn all of civilization in one's own lifetime, and that be but the preliminary for adding his/her own dimension to future mankind's history, then it would look like we all had to be geniuses. Not so, says Hegel. We have the advantage of living in an age where "what in former days occupied the energies of man of mature mental ability, sinks to the level of information. In this educational progress we can see the history of the world's civilization delineated in faint outline."

And indeed, what schoolboy doesn't know more about geography than Columbus did when he discovered America? What about the law of gravity? You can name thousands more of such examples. Good, so we start on a pretty high level — and the youth particularly have absorbed in them 5,000 years of Western Civilization by just being born today.

It is true that Hegel himself threw a mystical veil over his philosophy by treating it as a closed ontological system, but he also warned against those who become the self-styled "representatives" of a philosophical work who, he said, "are like the dead burying the dead." He put his own faith in the public instead, not alone because of its modesty but because, "it is the nature of truth to force its way to recognition when the time comes."

That the time is NOW is heralded by the fact that we are the ones who live in what I call the age of absolutes — on the threshold of absolute freedom out of the struggle against absolute tyranny.

If the high school students have now reached such a crucial point (and I am sure we have) in their specific fights against ID cards and segregated, racist education, and for freedom not alone in education but in life, then it is we who can both best understand Marx's statement that "the educators must first be educated," and make the idea of freedom a reality. We do, indeed, live in an age which has erased the distinction between theory and practice.

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

(EDITOR'S NOTE: A student who has been searching for a document noted as "missing" in the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection at the Wayne State University Archives, located the article, written in 1944 on "Marxism and the Negro," and wrote: "In light of both the Black Scholar debate between Marxists and Nationalists, and the new depths of racism appearing in the ranks of white labor from Louisville to Boston, I was struck with how much this article written 30 years ago illuminates for us today. Could you reprint it in N&L?" While too long to reprint in full, brief excerpts appear below. The complete article is being added to the collection on deposit at WSU.)

MARX, LENIN, ON NATIONAL QUESTION

Lenin's Theses on the National and Colonial Question, which was adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International was essentially a statement of principles. It singles out two nations as illustrative of the type of national oppression that evokes mass movements of resistance. These nations are Ireland and the Negroes in America . . .

In his very numerous polemics Lenin emphasized that concrete historic situations, not abstract considerations, formed the focal point of theory and action on the National Question. The decisive thing was that "All national oppression calls forth resistance of the broad masses of people." It is insufficient to state that revolutionists would support those movements. It is a question of the development of the national struggles

* The Raya Dunayevskaya Collection consists of 12 volumes dealing with the origin and development of Marxist-Humanism in America from 1941 to 1975 and is available on microfilm for \$30 from the Walter Reuther Library of Labor History Archives of Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

MARXISM AND THE BLACK DIMENSION

along lines of independent mass activity. As Marxists, we would, naturally, prefer—if we could indulge in such abstractions—that these movements would take a turn towards a shedding of what Trotsky calls the national shell and reveal clearly to the participants the social and class content therein contained. But history, as well as the analysis of the economic basis of what Marxists call the national question, has shown that these questions can be resolved and clarified only in the course of the struggle itself . . .

Marx said that as long as the bourgeoisie of one country holds domination over the other, the emancipation of the proletariat in the oppressing country is impossible. In his letter to Siegfried Meyer and Karl Vogt, Marx amplified on this idea thus:

"The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he feels himself a member of the ruling nation and so turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists against Ireland, thus strengthening their domination over himself. He cherishes religious, social and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude is much the same as that of the 'poor whites' to the 'niggers' in the former slave states of the USA . . . It (the antagonism) is the secret of the impotence of the English working class despite their organization."

NATIONAL EGOISM AND NEGRO CULTURE

Some of the American Marxists are obsessed with the idea that, if the Negro be classed as part of the National Question, we will lose sight of the class struggle . . .

To say that labor is to fix it all is to say nothing. Labor has to "fix" all problems. The proletariat is the only cohesive revolutionary class in present-day society and no fundamental transformation of the social order can occur except under its leadership. But meanwhile,

the Negroes are in constant activity and organization (NAACP, Urban League, the Garvey movement) on the basis of the fact that they are a nationally oppressed minority. They work with labor sometimes, and against labor at other times. They cannot be told to wait for the day of the revolution.

The fact that the Negro masses could embrace so utopian a scheme as "Back to Africa"—a utopianism all the more suicidal since their customs, language, and

(Continued on page 7)

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

cultures are American—reveals both how frustrated the Negro feels at ever achieving full democratic rights in America and how desperately repressed he feels as a national minority. And, what is more important, they mean to do something about this with or without the help of revolutionists . . .

PROLETARIANIZATION SOUTH AND NORTH

The Negro has been an integral part of labor in heavy industry since the earliest days of Southern industrialization. He was a militant member of whatever unions took root there. At the height of its power, the IWW claimed one million members, 100,000 of whom were Negroes. The most important of the IWW unions among Negroes were precisely in the prejudice-ridden South, in the lumber industries in Louisiana and Texas and among the longshoremen and dockworkers in Baltimore, Norfolk and Philadelphia. The Brotherhood of Timber Workers in the lumber camps of Louisiana, Texas and Arkansas had 35,000 members in 1910, 50 percent of whom were Negroes . . .

The proletarian Negro is not the cowed plantation hand. He is literate and has been disciplined by the factory. He knows the might of a cohesive group, organized by the very process of production. He is and feels himself a potent factor. He is no small minority to his white brethren in industry . . . Nevertheless, the "boss and black" relationship—that is, the racial relation having its roots in the plantation economy—still pursues him in the city as well as in the field. Segregation, Jim Crowism, social discriminations persist. The contradiction between the potency in the process of production and his seeming impotence outside cannot but find a manner of expression.

The explosive power in the struggle of the Southern Negro proletarian in the Southern metropolis will have significance in repercussions for the contiguous rural Black Belt. It will strike directly at the heart of the Southern economy and Southern politics and upset as well Northern capitalist interests which have so readily accepted the South's segregation pattern in order to coin surplus value from it. But among the millions suffering on the plantations and among the hundreds of thousands who have won themselves a place in industry, the problem before them is and must continue for a long time to be the emancipation from the national oppression which they feel at every turn . . .

URBANIZATION

In the North, too, the proletarianization and trade unionization of the Negro did not raise him to the status of the white proletarian and did not dissolve his struggle for elementary democratic rights into the general class struggle. First, in the trade unions he must fight as a Negro for his place as a worker. Wage differentials, seniority, upgrading have by no means been abolished. Then, outside of the trade union, he is ghettoized.

Both South and North, the Negro has become urbanized as well as proletarianized . . . It is the creation of a comparatively free proletariat and semi-proletariat of these large urban centers in the North which created the possibility for the development of the powerful Negro press . . .

It is precisely in the Northern urban center that the political results inherent in the situation in the South receive their sharpest political expression. Capitalism, in dragging the Negroes from the South, cannot prevent the explosion and revolt of the national oppression which the semi-feudal economic relations in the South not only generate but are able to keep in subjugation. The ghetto-like existence, the social humiliation not only spring historically from the cotton plantation. The cotton plantation exports to the North its workers imbued with the ideology of the South along with the Klan, the Knights of the Camellia, etc. to stimulate, encourage and organize anti-Negro prejudices of the people of the North, fortified among the working class by competition in industry . . .

THAT THE PROLETARIAT will ultimately solve this problem, we have no doubt. The oppression which the bourgeoisie has so mercilessly placed upon the Negro has not only resulted in placing them in strategic industries but will give their developing class consciousness a hostility to the existing society and a determination to destroy it which must be the counterpart to the history of the Negro people in the country.

But for this very reason, declining capitalist society aided by the historic traditions of the country will see in the Negro Question the focal point of attack in order to disrupt the proletariat. Under these conditions, on the one hand you have the question of seniority, closed shop, etc., and on the other hand you will again see the Negro as a nationally oppressed minority inside the union. With unemployment as the basic question facing capitalist society in the post-war period, the opportunity for creating dissension in the ranks of the proletariat will be substantially increased. . . . It is equally clear that the proletariat is also aware of the dangers.

June 18, 1944

Under the whip of the counter-revolution

**Will the
revolution
in
Portugal
advance?**



Thousands marched in 1975
May Day parade in Lisbon,
Portugal.

JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1976

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairwoman, News and Letters Committees

The counter-revolution that has put down the alleged "extreme Left attempt at coup d'etat" in Portugal is unfolding on all fronts, from the imposition of "discipline" on factory workers to the purging of MFA (Armed Forces Movement) and re-establishing a military hierarchy loyal to "it" — the capitalist government. The nationalization of radio stations except episcopacy's Radio Renascença goes hand in hand with trying to drive the peasantry off the occupied lands, and "reorganizing" all "far left" newspapers. So much for the Socialist Party's "struggle for democracy." Indeed, so far to the Right has this alleged "Left Centrist victory" over Communism moved that Socialist Soares and his Major General Antunes themselves fear an outright fascist return. Hence, they are denouncing, not too loudly, "blind anti-Communism."

What they mean is not the establishment of any genuine workers' democracy or releasing of workers' revolutionary energies, but just the inclusion in the government of the Communist Party, which is as practiced as they are in class-collaborationism, and was the first to engage in strike-breaking action against the mass strikes that followed the overthrow of the fascist regime.

And the CP leader, Alvaro Cunhal, promptly acceded to them: "We have to face the new reality."

The Nov. 25 Coup: Before and After

In a word, the Rightist move backward — the Nov. 25 coup — instead of being seen and fought as the whip of the counter-revolution that it is, is being whitewashed by the press as if that was the way to avoid a bloody Chile-type coup. But the only reason they do not dare yet roll history backward that far is because the mass movement is still intact, has not been taken over by any existing parties.

Moreover, the very fact of the spontaneous mass outburst of wildcat strikes, which arose upon the overthrow of the fascist Caetano regime and was not subordinated to any "Party", is the reason the masses are mastering new ideological insights. Thus, the majority first voted for the Socialist Party because they were running away from the Communist Party in revulsion against the latter's strike-breaking activity, but now these same masses are taking a second look at the class character of the SP-type of "democracy": and asking: was its espousal of democracy more than the left covering for NATO, as if Helmut Schmidt's West German type of "socialism" differs fundamentally from the open imperialism of Ford's CIA? They now see it not as any kind of workers' democracy; rather the howling for "sacrifice and hard work" is clearly a defense of the capitalistic system.

New Questions

At the same time, many questions are also being raised about the Left and its "programs" void of a concrete philosophy of liberation. Hadn't all the "Left" acted as if General Spínola had been the real leader of the overthrow of the Caetano regime? Hadn't there been an underestimation of the nascent workers' and peasants' struggles, student revolts, women's movement, though there were many open instances since the mid-1960s of the restlessness in the land? Had any given full credit to the African Revolutions which led the Portuguese soldiers to undermine the fascist imperialistic regime at home?

The truth is that the revolution in Portugal began in Africa, and not only because Portuguese imperialism was losing, but because the African revolutions, theoretically as well as practically, were shaking up the very ones who came to shoot them down. (1)

Moreover, the national liberation struggles weren't just the "accidental" springboards for the Portuguese revolution. Nor was it only the "cell form" of the African guerrillas which the Portuguese army copied when it began organizing its opposition. The revolutionary elements in the MFA were witnessing theoretical developments in the African revolutionary movement that moved beyond nationalism to Marxian socialism, to world relations. The "Left" leaders who rushed to Portugal, declaiming most against "dogmatism," are the most dogmatic about their most empiricist programs—as if each slogan is "the" proof of socialist universalism, and any deviation from any of them a capitulation to the bourgeoisie, a mere "Bonapartist caricature." (2)

To Begin at the Beginning

The truth is — we must begin at the beginning — that even under Spínola's "leadership," the Portuguese revolution did not begin as no more than an ordinary

(1) See especially the African struggles before 1974: *The Struggle for Mozambique*, Penguin Books, 1969, by Eduardo Mondlane, then FRELIMO president, is the most comprehensive by African leaders, and contains the first theoretical section also on Women's Liberation, plus quotations from women leaders. *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amílcar Cabral (PAIGC)*, Monthly Review, 1969. Cabral also wrote the foreword to Basil Davidson's *The Liberation of Guinea* which has the most beautiful pictures, including that of Carmen Pereira, a leading political commissar. As it happens, the current NY Times Magazine section (1-4-75) carries an article, *Suddenly, Angola*, which contains a poem by the third of the leaders of Portuguese Africa, Dr. Neto of the MPLA, whose most recent interview is reported in the Jan. 3, 1976 issue of the *Manchester Guardian*.

(2) The phrase as analysis of MFA appears in Tony Cliff's *Portugal At the Cross Roads*, a special double issue (No. 81-82, Sept. 1975). It is valuable because of 54 in-person reports, and has much material on PRP/BR, though it fails to mention that it is headed by a woman, nor is her name, Isabel do Carmo, mentioned anywhere, though the analysis extends over 48 pages.

coup d'etat. Not only was Spínola not the real leader, but neither was the whole Army. Rather it was the revolutionary sections of the MFA. Thus, whereas at the start the young officers organized on so narrow and reactionary a level as opposing the new conscripts becoming officers, once they organized new cells in the army, both the leniency with which the guerrillas treated them when they were captured, and the education that was being carried on in the national liberation army began changing the nature also of the MFA within the Portuguese Army.

The leaflets of the FRELIMO in Mozambique, the PAIGC in Guine-Bissau, and MPLA in Angola may not match the fraternization leaflets that the Bolsheviks wrote in 1917, but they certainly were an entirely new ground for fighting in Portugal, 1974. In urging the Portuguese soldiers to go home and make their own revolution, the national liberation forces were raising questions, including the role of women, that the "advanced" Portuguese had not even heard of. (3)

Because of its narrow beginnings, the radicalization of the MFA was underestimated by the Old Left, some going so far as to consider it no more than, as noted, "Bonapartist caricature." Others thought that the MFA's 5th Division, which was responsible for propaganda work and called for "cultural dynamization," was but an expression of pure and simplistic Maoism. But, in fact, with all mistakes, this never approached the sheer dementia of Maoism in Portugal, headlining its paper: "Revisionism in power means social-fascism in power." (4)

A deeper look at new beginnings will, of necessity, lead us to the spontaneous mass movement: land seizures by revolutionary sections of the poor peasantry as well as the great proletarian strikes, of which there were no less than 100 the very first month after the overthrow of the fascist regime — the youth as well as Women's Liberation Movement, which has been paid least attention, though it is a pivotal force. (5)

When the SP-CP had, in 1969, organized the Democratic Women's movement, it was strictly limited to economic issues . . . not that "Equal Pay for Equal Work" was ever enforced even in 1974-75. Still, that movement, from above, kept eyes turned away from "feminist" issues, such as right to abortion, or other man/woman relations, though some Portuguese men were backward enough to oppose their wives using contraceptives because it could supposedly make them impotent! Even when women were complaining they were as afraid of their men at home "as of bosses in

(3) *The Struggle for Mozambique*, pp. 147-50.

(4) Maoist slogan, which appeared in the June 6, 1974 issue of *Lutte Populaire* is quoted in Robin Blackburn's *Lisbon: The Fall of Fascism* (*New Left Review*, London, No. 87-8, Sept.-Dec. 1974). It also contains as appendix *The Lisnave Workers' Communique*.

(5) *Portugal: A Blaze of Freedom*, Big Flame Publications, 1632 Bristol Rd., Birmingham 29, England) is both the most objective and comprehensive revolutionary study. It is the only one of the analyses that has a substantial section on the role of women, and its glossary doesn't suffer from the sectarianism of either IS that doesn't mention Trotskyist groups, or the Trotskyist groups, which go on endlessly just on themselves.

the factory." It did not move those "advanced politicians" to change the nature of their organization. The Women's Liberation Movement (MLM) thereupon arose on new ground, ground that didn't separate philosophic foundation from feminism or class struggles.

New Forces of Revolution, Focus: Women, Youth, Peasants

Amílcar Cabral, back in the 1960's when Portuguese economy seemed to experience its greatest "development" with the multi-nationals moving in on Portugal, said that Portugal, as the weakest link in world imperialism, "could not afford neo-colonialism." The only ones who seemed to listen to the African revolutionary were the Portuguese students, whose strikes came to a climax in 1968 and were against conscription as well as for academic freedom.

The more foreign capital began to move into Portugal as a safe haven for profits and low-paid labor, the more contradictions undermined the regime.

Take the question of the 1973 Middle East War with the accompanying Arab quadrupling of oil prices. On the face of it, it seemed to have no relationship to anything happening in Portugal. But, in fact, fascist Portugal, with its monopoly CUF and in collaboration with two Swedish and two Dutch shipyards, had built the great showy Lisnave dry docks because they expected a most profitable tanker business.

The complex at Sines was based on refining and petrochemicals and the expansion of motor vehicle assembly plants. But where a 25 percent increase in tanker business was expected, a 10 percent drop in oil purchases was the consequence of the quadrupled oil prices. The Western economic crisis, which was global, deeply affected Portugal, facing defeat in Africa, and massive unemployment and strikes at home.

The human factor of this equation was not only the suffering. Some new forces of revolution were born. First, no less than one and one-half million (out of a population of 8.5 million) had seen service in Africa where they had been politicized by the national liberation movement. Secondly, the miserable conditions in Portugal sent Portuguese workers also to West Europe. By 1974 no less than 900,000 Portuguese had emigrated to West Europe, with 700,000 in France and 150,000 in West Germany. This move to the big cities abroad for employment was glossed over as if it meant economic development at home. Actually, the great number that left agriculture — there was a drop from 50 percent to 30 percent in agricultural production — meant not industrial development at home, but agricultural collapse. (6)

All these factors brought the women into production — industrial, agricultural — and into unemployment. They were the first to be hit by unemployment which, by 1975, numbered no less than 500,000. The women who established the Women's Liberation Movement (MLM) did not think that all their problems were "solved" by

(Continued on Page 8)

(6) "The Thorns of the Portuguese Revolution" by Kenneth Maxwell in *Foreign Affairs*, Jan. 1976.



Victorious MFA troops in truck are joined by happy civilians following overthrow of fascism in Portugal.

(Continued from Page 5)

the existing parties and unions. Which doesn't mean they didn't actively participate in all of them. It does mean, as was proved all over again at the May 1, 1975, demonstration where they were attacked by the CP and other so-called Left men who did not stop from also attacking their children, that not only was an autonomous movement of women necessary, but the Old Left had to answer today: what happens after the revolution on the most fundamental man/woman relationship.

An MLM leaflet, calling for equal pay for women at the Via Longa brewery and Pao sugar factory, was forced to state: "It is not only the bosses that are exploiting us; it's our own comrades that are refusing equal pay."

Or take the question of agriculture and the most reactionary Catholic hierarchy. Ironically, the entry of foreign capital — U.S., West German, Swedish, Dutch, French — built up not only big industry, like the Lisnave shipyards or the new airport at Farno, but also (in this case West German capital) an irrigation scheme in the Alentejo, which is exactly where the majority of workers were women, where the greatest activities, including the seizure of land, were most militantly fought for by women. Along with the militancy was the demand for a philosophy to fight against the ideological power of the Catholic and fascist tradition which had forced women into submission to God, man, family. They have a long tradition of strikes, arrests, imprisonments. Whether it is in the Alentejo district, where out of 10,000 unemployed, 8,000 were women, or in the cities where, besides industrial struggles, women are very important in health care service, or in ideological struggles, where surely one of the most revolutionary groupings, PRP/BR is headed by a woman — Isobel do Carmo — there is no way to escape the new, the pivotal role of women, the youth both on campus and in the army, or the poor peasants. On Feb. 9, 1975, 30,000 farm workers in Alentejo demanded confiscation of the properties of the owners attempting coups.

Instead of keeping away from "feminist" questions, the Old Left better learn to recognize new forces of revolution and new ways of emergence of those forces. Before the April, 1974 overthrow of the fascist regime, undercurrents of revolt arose among women, from literature to actual class struggles.

Thus, New Portuguese Letters (published here as The Three Marias and by no means "just literature"—though great literature it is) posed questions of human relations far more profoundly than the Old Left had. Their freedom from jail was by no means due only to the overthrow of the Caetano regime, but to the protests by the international women's liberation movement. (7) The symbol the women's movement, in agriculture especially, had chosen was Catarina Enfemia, assassinated by the National Guard during a strike for the eight-hour day.

Women became especially important in 1973 when a labor shortage sent them into textiles and electronics, and directly into the fight against multinationals: Timex, ITT, Plessy, and the garment industry (where Swedish capital owned 15 of the 25 major companies). It is in textiles and electronics and shipyards where the grass roots workers' movement first erupted, and where none questioned the militancy of women workers. But they were asking not only for a fundamental change in labor conditions, but for different relations at home.

Or take agriculture. Women's wages averaged only 50 escudos a day, 50 percent lower than men's. Just as in Lisbon, women workers took over a laundry plant to make it a free service so that "working class women will be liberated from housework," so they were among the most active in the peasant seizures of land and cultivating it on a cooperative basis. The peasants came in their tractors to take part in the Aug. 20 political demonstration to unite with the workingclass tenants and squatters who were occupying houses. At Caixa the peasants occupied the land of the Duke of Lafões and turned that into a cooperative.

(7) When Maria Barrera, one of the authors of New Portuguese Letters (The Three Marias), was in the States, she not only insisted the international women's movement had much to do with freeing her and her co-authors from jail, but insisted: "I believe in feminism because for me it is the hope to change society." Her speech is reproduced in News & Letters, April 1975.

(8) Both PRP/BR's Manifesto and many other documents of the Portuguese Revolution have been reproduced by the People's Transition Service (1735 Allston Way, Berkeley, Cal. 94703) in Portugal: Key Documents of the Revolutionary Process.

Dual Power? CRTSMs? Apartidarism (Non-partyism)?

As the mass strikes showed the very first month after the overthrow of the fascist regime, these were no ordinary strikes and some ended in occupation of factories, the most important being the workers occupying the Lisnave shipyards. But while there is no doubt that one of the great developments was that at the Lisnave shipyard complex, neither it nor the Revolutionary Councils of Workers, Soldiers and Sailors (CRTSMs) were nationwide.

Of all the parties that arose the one that was most indigenous and revolutionary, was the PRP/BR (Revolutionary Party of the Proletariat — Revolutionary Brigades). (8) So characteristic of the revolutionary situation is anti-partyism (apartidarism) that this group, a splitoff from the CP, tried to assign priority, not to the party, but to the spontaneous mass organizations. They called for, and were instrumental in organizing, Revolutionary Councils of Workers, Soldiers and Sailors. The critical question became: were they really developing spontaneously and on a national scale? Was it the type of mass outpouring, and an arming of the working class that one could say these instances of self-activity created actual dual power?

It simply wasn't true that there was such a self-mobilization of the masses that actually challenged the new, but very much still the capitalistic government. Nor was it true that even the most "revolutionary" sections of the MFA equalled the armed people, quintessential for a social revolution. And least of all was it true that the Constituent Assembly was anything approaching such high rhetoric. The vote was just a vote, a mere consultative one at that, that didn't challenge continued army rule. To say, as one (9) of the Trotskyist groups maintained, that the Constituent Assembly was a "step toward a workers' and peasants' government," is utter nonsense, reformist euphoria.

By the time Soares' "democracy" won and Goncalves was thrown out of government, it was the end also of the unholy alliance of SP and Maoists, not to mention the Catholic Church hierarchy which is the true



Women's delegation at FRELIMO Congress.

winner as the counter-revolution unfolds its fascist face. A new united front of all Left groups (FUR included MES, PRP/BR, LUAR, LCI and others) warned, in its Sept. 10 Manifesto, (10) that the reactionary escalation would end in a rightist coup. On Nov. 25 it did.

The first stage of revolution has ended.

Counter-Revolution in Portugal, Against Africa

The revolution in Portugal was born in the African Revolutions. The counter-revolution in Portugal is "coinciding" with the USA-CIA-South African conspiracy to try to recolonize Angola. As against the revolutionary appeal coming from Black Africa as well as Portugal, South African apartheid increased its falsehoods along with its power, trying to make itself "part" of "The West." The one thing that characterized each of these total opposites (but hardly touched the revolutionary left in Europe that remained color blind as white), was its very organism, and not just the pragmatists' superstructure.

Thus, Admiral Bierman, South African Chief of the General Staff, wrote in 1972: "It is imperative that a superpower would be involved in the strategy of the southern hemisphere . . . We must persuade the West that communist penetration into the Southern hemisphere is a direct threat to Western Europe and the rest of the free world." It is this which is now appealing to the Ford-Kissinger-CIA dirty tricksters, and deep organic imperialists.

(9) There are two Trotskyist groups in Portugal, one headed by the majority of the Fourth International Secretariat (Mandel), and one by the SWP (Joe Hansen). See *Intercontinental Press*, Sept. 8 for "In Defense of the Portuguese Revolution" by Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan and Ernest Mandel (24 pp), and the endless one about all the differences between the Fourth International and the SWP (70 pp) in the Oct. 13, 1975, issue of I.P. "For A Correct Political Course in Portugal" by Gerry Foley, Joseph Hansen and George Novack.

(10) *Lutte de Classe* (appears bilingually as *Class Struggle*) No. 31 and 32, Oct., Dec. 1975, takes issue with Tony Cliff's analysis, official Trotskyism and is itself Trotskyist. It doesn't shed new light but it is valuable in reproducing the most chauvinistic Maoist remarks both in France ("France needs a strong army"), and internationally by quoting *L'Humanite Rouge*. See especially 1975 where the Maoists proclaim: "The two super-powers do not play the same role . . . The danger of the expansionism of Soviet social-imperialism is greater . . . from the activities of the 5th columns represented by the various revisionist parties."

While Kissinger's preoccupation, first with South Vietnam and then the Middle East and Russian detente, had, in early 1970's, not bowed to a close relationship to apartheid South Africa, by the time Angola won its freedom, U.S. imperialism was all ears to the siren call of all imperialisms and racism: South African apartheid, which, for more time than we really know, was listened to by "Communist" China for whom nothing takes the place of their own nationalism which considers not the U.S. but Russia Enemy No. 1.

Thus South Africa has won its point, West, East. And now it is not only the Ford-Kissinger-CIA-Moynihan cabal, but the journalists, and not only such as C. L. Sulzberger, but so-called English Liberals such as the actual head of the Liberal Party, Jeremy Thorpe, and the Manchester Guardian. (11)

All are out to brainwash about what type of government is in Portugal, and how Russia supposedly controls the MPLA lock, stock and barrel. Russian detente or otherwise, the cackle is out to teach us the "principles of geopolitics": how Portugal faces the Atlantic at the far western tip of Europe, while her islands are strategically placed astride the shipping lanes between Europe, the Mediterranean and the Americas, not to mention that her "African colonies" had the best port facilities for the Indian and South Atlantic oceans.

It is not that any of this is fooling the masses; it is not even fooling the Senate. But while the Senate and House will soon capitulate, American revolutionaries must not only oppose U.S. imperialism in Portugal and Angola (see "U.S. works with South Africa," p. 12), but the acts of solidarity with the Portuguese Revolution must not be separate from a serious theoretical summation of where the Portuguese Revolution was stopped, and how to try to advance under the whip of the counter-revolution.

Dialectics of Theory

As a first step in that direction, and in the hope that the discussion will dialectically develop, in Portugal most of all, let us begin with one of the points raised in the Draft Program of the Revolutionary Party — Revolutionary Brigades: "It is also the organization capable of making a synthesis between theory and revolutionary practice." (12)

That cannot just be stated. It must be worked out, beginning with the voices and actions that came from below, and questions asked of "what happens after" even as they raised the struggle for workers control of production, CRTSMs, and the ways of self-defense to fight the myriad forms the counter-revolution is imposing, as Portuguese and as part of world capitalism, as it conspires to get back total power.

From the very first proletarian revolution, 1848, Marx had drawn the conclusion "From the first moment of victory, and after it, the distrust of the workers must not be directed anymore against the conquered reactionary party, but against the previous ally, the petty bourgeois democrats, who desire to exploit the common victory only for themselves." (13)

Instead of quoting endlessly what Lenin said on the Party in 1903 — a position he many times revised (14) — why not see how Lenin reorganized his thought when he was first confronted with the betrayal of the German Social Democracy and raised the perspective: Transform the Imperialist War into Civil War, not just as a slogan, but the new philosophic, dialectical question of transformation into opposite. (15) By 1917, "All power to the Soviets" was rooted in the philosophic reorganization and its political expression in State and Revolution: that there can be no new society unless production and the state is run by the population "to a man, woman and child."

To reduce that to a question of the Party, the Party, the Party "to lead," as everyone from the Communists, Maoists, Trotskyists (of all varieties) are doing, is to doom the resurgence of the revolution.

Stop to think as well as to do.

(We will return to the subject in a future issue, after we have heard from Portugal.)

(11) See especially "Black and Red Don't Mix: Can Black and White" by Geoffrey Taylor, Manchester Guardian, 12-14-75

(12) The Sept. 10 Revolutionary United Front Manifesto was included as a separate page in People's Translation Service on Portugal.

(13) Karl Marx's 1850 Address.

(14) For the modification in the party concept, 1903-1923, see Ch. XI on "Forms of Organization: The Relationship of the Spontaneous Self-Organization of the Proletariat to the Vanguard Party" as well as Ch. XII on "What Happens After?" in Marxism and Freedom, pp. 177-209.

(15) Along with Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks (Vol. 38 of Collected Works), see his Critique of Bukharin's Economics of the Transition Period, reproduced as Appendix to that work (Bergman, publisher, NY).

TWO WORLDS Middle East, UN, OAU—and ideological obfuscation

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from the first of a new series of Political-Philosophic Letters by Raya Dunayevskaya (see ad, p. 7). The historic analysis of the Middle East, the UN, and the OAU may appear "dated" now that the OAU has voted to recognize the MPLA as the legitimate government of Angola. In fact, however, it is more relevant than when written because, in the dialectics of liberation, time is decisive. There is a world of difference between voting when the battlefield victories are beyond dispute, and voting when everything is at razor's edge.

January 24, 1976

Dear Friends:

Three fantastic occurrences in three widely separated parts of the world this month exude such abysmal lower depths of ideological obfuscation that they could lay ground only for counter-revolutionary, not for revolutionary, developments. It is imperative, therefore, to look at these events, not merely as passing "immediates," but in an historic-philosophic context.

First, let's look at what followed the passing of that UN Resolution which equated Zionism with racism: 1) the break-up of the OAU meeting in Ethiopia over the question of recognizing the legitimacy of the MPLA government in Angola; and 2) the war in Lebanon which is calling into question the philosophic underpinnings not only of that UN Resolution, but of that whole "thieves' kitchen." This expression of Lenin's for the League of Nations that followed World War I, just as succinctly characterizes the UN that followed World War II and also called itself a "peace" establishment . . .

In the Arab Middle East, the unifying force—anti-Israel—cuts across the myriad contradictions. Thus, as if Lebanon wasn't disintegrating in a fratricidal war between Christian and Moslem, Arafat feels no compunction about shouting, over machine-gun fire, the thousands of dead bodies, and the rubble, that this all is an

Israeli "conspiracy," a war initiated by "international Zionism." . . .

Lebanon, an artificial state which does have Christians and Moslems, can't escape the class divisions, and is at this very moment steeped in civil war. Those Lebanese Moslem Left, who are fighting a genuine revolutionary class struggle against its rulers, Christians mainly but Moslem, too, are being kept in check. The overriding order is never to forget that Israel is the enemy. Lebanon, 1975-76, is in danger of replaying the slaughter in Jordan, 1970-71. Will Syria enter, or the PLA under its control? The PLO allows its adherents anything except a revolutionary class struggle within "the Arab nation" . . .

RATHER THAN CONCERNING ourselves with the UN vote on the Resolution equating Zionism with racism—72 for, 35 against, 32 abstaining—we can get more illumination on whether that Resolution is but the latest form of anti-Semitism or a genuine struggle against racism by turning to the second event that followed the vote—the break-up of the OAU meeting in Ethiopia, January 8.

Heretofore, the one thing that always united all independent African nations and those fighting for independence was the total, the unequivocal opposition to apartheid South Africa. No matter how wide the division between the African countries, and no matter how deep the division within any one country, including even the outright civil war in Nigeria, no African entertained the slightest doubt that, as a continent, Africa will never be fully independent so long as racist South Africa exists . . .

Suddenly, the world was confronted with this spectacle at the OAU meeting in January, 1976:

1) The U.S.-Zaire-South African-supported FNLA and UNITA leaders were seated on the platform.

2) Not one word was spoken against the Africans' new rich "friend," Saudi Arabia, that was funneling money to these puppets.

3) The 20 African nations who had already recognized the MPLA as the legitimate government of Angola could muster only two others to be with them.

4) The OAU adjourned with no decision being taken.

The tragedy isn't so much whether or not a decision on Angola was arrived at but why the shadow of South Africa hanging over the contending forces didn't act as the unifying force it had always been. Clearly, the global struggle for world domination had entered that cockpit, as it had in Portugal . . .

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE to see what one does not want to see. The oil-rich kingdoms can hardly be considered an integral part of the poor Third World, the world that

(Continued on Page 7)

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

has suffered most from the quadrupling of oil prices, which followed the Arab-Israeli war of 1973. If there is any possible affinity of ideas between the oil kingdoms and the independent African nations, that affinity surely lies elsewhere. The ideological disarray is, rather, like the one that's pervading much of the Left who, knowing well the feudal class structure of the Arab theocracies, hungering for a socialist alternative to the capitalistic structure of Israel rather than any relapse to feudalism, much less mistaking Israel and apartheid South Africa as one and the same, nevertheless parrot the UN Resolution on Zionism . . .

It is high time not to take either Arab or Israel's ground for argumentation, or, for that matter, what can best be called "the middle of the road" (which has always been the best place to get run over). It is high time to strike out for totally new ground, the total philosophy of human liberation Marx called "a new Humanism" . . .

When Marx broke with bourgeois society and Left Hegellians, who were arguing "On the Jewish Question" in 1843, he commented on the equating of Judaism not only with religion, but with "bargaining", with "money", that money does, indeed, "degrade all the gods of mankind . . . and converts them into commodities." But if they looked they would, in that case, have to admit that "Judaism has perpetuated itself in Christian society . . . achieved perfection in the Christian world", "in the prevailing world", i.e. capitalism. Therefore, what needs uprooting is the commodity structure of society, without which there can be no "universal human emancipation." Because that principle underlined all Marxist revolutionaries struggling for a classless society, without which there can be no "universal human emancipation" the "Jewish Question" was not dealt with as a separate issue.

During Tsarism, however, when the persecution of the Jews reached the pogrom stage, after the assassination of Alexander II by the Populists, and whether in barbaric Russia, or cultured France, where anti-Semitism reared its ugly head in the Dreyfus case, many Jews began to reject "Western civilization". The pogrom on top of the ghettoization, economic, political and social persecution of the Jews, gave rise to Zionism at the end of the 19th century. As a national movement, revolutionary internationalists rejected it. . . .

Everything totally changed with the Great Depression, and the rise of Nazism, accompanied by such manifestation of anti-Semitism also in the "degenerated workers' state" that Trotsky changed his position on the Jewish Question. The density of today's Trotskyists in not grasping either theoretically or practically what happened shows itself clearest in their positions today which have nothing whatever to do with Trotsky's principled statement, be that on the question of permanent revolution or the Jewish question. Not having the slightest conception of what is the dialectical relationship of the objective to the subjective situation—what is the dialectics of liberation when more than one national movement arises, they simply hide both the fact of the change and the why Trotsky, as the great revolutionary he was, changed his position . . .

WORLD WAR II had totally changed the objective situation. The creation of the state of Israel changed it still further for the Middle East. Two realities, thereupon, were new: the existence of Israel, and with that success, the creation of another national consciousness—the Palestinian people. Their right to self-determination can no more be decided from above, be it via the many Arab kingdoms and emirates, or the PLO claiming sole spokesmanship, much less through a UN command. Let the Palestinian people speak for themselves. Naturally, Zionism in power, like the ideology of all ruling classes, be they Jewish or Moslem, Christian—or the big powers themselves, West and East, is exploitative. Which is why, precisely why, the main enemy is always in one's own country. The Israeli masses will fight that battle. Far from encouraging such action, the UN Resolution equating Zionism with racism, while the PLO representative shouts: Zionism differs "in no way from apartheid in South Africa", cannot but remind one of the Big Lie . . .

For the Left to countenance, nay, to aid in such ideological obfuscation cannot but smooth the way for the counter-revolution. A necessary first step to turn matters around is to clear up our heads so that the history of revolutions, the dialectics of liberation becomes the path for their actualization.

Yours, Raya

The Black dimension in Women's Liberation

APRIL, 1976

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

(Editor's Note: The following excerpts are from speeches given by Raya Dunayevskaya over the past year to audiences ranging from Union W.A.G.E. in San Francisco, to the University Center for Adult Education of WSU/U-M Detroit, Hunter College in New York, De Paul University in Chicago, Cal State in L.A., and George Washington in Washington, D.C. They show the direction that has been taken up in our new pamphlet on Working Women, which is just going to press, and will be highlighted in our special 12-page May issue of N&L.)

We may think we know at least two names from the past—Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman. But do we really know them not only as Black liberationists, but as leaders, as inspirers of the first women's rights convention of white middle class women and ready to break with their Black male leaders, even those as great as Frederick Douglass, when it comes to the struggle for women's liberation after the Civil War? To grasp the Black Dimension is to learn a new language, the language of thought, Black thought. For many, this new language will be difficult because they are hard of hearing. Hard of hearing because they are not used to this type of thought, a language which is both a struggle for freedom and the thought of freedom.

Take the question of the language of activity in the Underground Railroad where Harriet Tubman was one of the greatest conductors. She didn't just escape from the South. She returned 19 times, and she brought out 300 people—and there is more. In a few books you will find her name and they will acknowledge that she was a conductor and a great one. But do they speak of all the creativity that goes into being a conductor of the Underground Railroad, that you become a guerrilla fighter as well as a conductor, that you're a leader of men and women? Just look what it means to know your country, the South, so that you not only bring out Blacks, but are the leader of a battalion of whites.

Or take the language, the creativity, the idea of freedom involved in the very name of Sojourner Truth. The "Ain't I A Woman" speech, great as it was, was by no means the only outspoken and creative talk. Think of the originality in the way she approached the white clergymen heckling her and not allowing her to have her say. She turned to them with the question of whether they believed in Jesus. Consider the self-righteousness with which they replied, and her come-back reply: "Jesus is the son of God and Mary, and man had not a thing to do with it."

WHEN WE MOVE to the period after the Civil War when slavery was abolished we see that even such greats as Frederick Douglass—who had been with the women in their battles before this struggle for the 14th Amendment—now was willing to drop the demand for the inclusion of the vote for the women; and we find that Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman separate from Frederick Douglass. They insist on continuing the struggle for women's liberation.

Listen to the poetry of Sojourner Truth's prose: "I am coming from the land of slavery." This is after the Civil War was won by the North. She turns to her Black people, appealing for continuation of the

struggle for women's vote: "I hate to see my Black man being as bad as the white man." Then turning to the greatest of them, who are stepping aside, she says that it is "short-minded" to stop the struggle at getting the vote only for Black men.

IN THE CONCENTRATION of the struggle of freedom, the Black dimension in women's liberation extended the whole philosophy of human liberation. Now if we jump to the early 20th century we find the same thing. A much under-rated woman in that sphere is Amy Jacque Garvey. She wasn't just the wife of Marcus Garvey. She both edited the women's page in Negro World, and edited Garvey's works after he died, giving to them a great name — "Philosophy and Opinion of Marcus Garvey."

Here she is, speaking in 1925: "A race must be saved, a country must be redeemed. And unless we strengthen the leadership of vacillating Negro men we will remain marking time. We are tired of having Negro men say that a better day is coming while they do nothing to usher in the day. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting in the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we (she is talking about Black women) will brush aside the halting cowardly Negro men, and with prayer on our lips and arms prepared for any fray, we will press on until victory is ours. Mr. Black Man watch your step. Ethiopia's queens will reign again and her Amazons protect her shores and people. Strengthen your shaking knees and move forward or we will displace you."

OR TAKE THE African continent where, again, it was not the educated men, but illiterate women who added a new page to history, when, in 1929, the British imperialists in Eastern Nigeria decided to tax the women. They got so furious they went on spontaneous strike—which was, of course, called a "riot." The great Aba riots. It was not only spontaneous, it was against all the advice of everyone, including the educated males. It was not only against British imperialism, but against their own African chiefs, who had not defended them. Above all, they crossed all tribal lines. And they won, though not until after 40 women were killed and countless others injured.

What happened right here in the U.S. in 1960? It is true it was the wonderful North Carolina youth who sat-in at a restaurant lunch counter and started the magnificent Black Revolution. But the fact is that, five years earlier, one solitary woman, Rosa Parks, a seamstress, refused to give up her seat on a bus, and got arrested, and the incident so aroused the youth that the entire Black population behaved in a different manner than they had ever dreamed of. They decided they would all go to the courthouse; they organized their own transportation and boycotted all the buses; they inspired Rev. King to be with them, and they kept all decisions in their own hands by meeting three times a week. The new stage of Black revolt began there.

RIGHT UP TO OUR own period we find there is a double rhythm in revolution. The overthrow, what is called the first negation, is saying No to what is. But the second negation, the creation of the new, is harder, because you want to have entirely new human relations. In addition to all the great Black women I have mentioned, there is another in the new WL movement, Doris Wright, who raised exactly this question when she said, "I'm not thoroughly convinced that Black Liberation, the way it's being spelled out, will really and truly mean my liberation. I'm not sure that when it comes time 'to put down my gun', that I won't have a broom shoved in my hands, as so many of my Cuban sisters have."

She was not putting the question down as a condition—"I will not make a revolution unless you promise." She was posing the question of what happens after. That is what we have to answer before, in the practice of our own organizations, our own thought and our own activity.

MAY, 1976

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

(Editor's note: The following excerpts are taken from a speech given by Raya Dunayevskaya last month on "Marxism, Culture and Revolution" at California State College in Los Angeles, and sponsored by ACCION, a student group for Chicano studies.)

The fact that Marxist-Humanism, which is what Marx first named his philosophy, as the dialectics of liberation, means both the philosophy and the actuality of it—the actual revolution—the fact that Marx had situated the centerpoint of historical materialism at the base in the economic relations, in the struggles between capital and labor, and seemed to have kicked culture upstairs into the superstructure, gives the impression that he had very little use for it. The truth is very much the opposite, because when fiction is great—and that "when" is very important—there is likely to be a great deal more truth in fiction than in fact.

Whether it's fiction or custom or language or even food—all of the elements of culture on the part of the people bring historic continuity to such a high level that imperialist oppression, even though it doesn't disappear until you actually destroy it, at least can't brainwash you.

This is especially true in relationship to the Latinos and the Chicanos right here in the U.S. Because all was estrangement, the fact that they were so foreign was because they weren't foreign. We had taken their land. And they did not want to give up their language; they did not want to give up their food; they did not want to be naturalized. So all of those have kept up that historic continuity, whether we are talking only in fiction or about the actual lives of people, where the alienation, instead of being estrangement, is the very thing that would be the unifying force for national revolutions, for social revolutions.

The fact that the fiction and the customs and language get unified in a person and are not just floating in air, brings it straight back to the greatest force of Marx's philosophy of liberation—that you, the people, are not just the product of history, but the Subject which will recreate it and remake it.

LOOK AT HOW MARX expressed it in *Capital*: "My view that each special mode of production and the social relations corresponding to it, in short . . . that the mode of production determines the character of the social, political, and intellectual life generally, all this is very true for our own times, in which material interests preponderate, but not for the Middle Ages, in which Catholicism, nor for Athens and Rome, where politics, reigned supreme . . . On the other hand, Don Quixote long ago paid the penalty for wrongly imagining that knight errantry was compatible with all economical forms of society." (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 94).

Marx had always considered Cervantes one of the greatest geniuses that ever lived, but here he is saying that Don Quixote was a product of its time. Its universality is so great because in this fictional form he was able to show what happens to you when you're trying to live as if your age hasn't passed and another age has come on.

WE WANT, THEREFORE, a unity of the culture, the philosophy and the actual revolution. I decided, instead of starting with the revolutions of 1848, to start with 1850 and the counter-revolution of that year because that's what we're all living with today. In 1850, when all the 1848 revolutions had been destroyed, and after the first Mexican-American war, in which the U.S. took over all that part of Mexico from Texas to

Chicano culture, Marxism and revolution

California, all the radicals of the time, especially Lassalle, suddenly began saying: Workers are all backward and need to be educated, then they will vote to send us to Parliament, and we will get them their freedom.

Marx answered them in his Address to the Communist League. He said that we, the revolutionary intellectuals, more so than the workers, have to learn that those who believed that capitalism still had a revolutionary character and that there was a way through parliament, were wrong. The revolution must go on in permanence—not only will we go to the proletarian revolution, but we will also realize that every revolution has a dual rhythm. That the first negation, the destruction of the old, is just that; it is not yet the creation of the new.

NOW SKIP ONE hundred years and we come to 1950. The few revolutionary intellectuals who at least saw that there was a two-way fight between Russia and the U.S. for control of the world, could not see what Marx originally meant by Humanism and what it meant for us then—whether in the alienation of labor and the fight against Automation in the 1950 general strike of miners in West Virginia and Pennsylvania, or in the rethinking of the youth who were said to be only "beat."

Three years later—after the first mass uprising against Russian totalitarianism, the East German workers' revolt—Marx's 1844 essays were suddenly brought out of the archives and onto the historic stage. And once again the revolution, the humanism, the culture, the philosophy were put together. There was no one, whether in Africa fighting against all the European imperialisms, or in China against Chiang Kai-shek, or in Cuba against both Batista and U.S. imperialism, who failed to question—is it only a national revolution, or will we now have new human relations?

EVERYONE KNOWS WHAT Castro is now, but he wasn't a Communist in 1952. The revolution was a spontaneous great revolution that he led without any help from Russian communism. In order to emphasize that he was starting something new in the world, he said in his first speech in 1959: "Standing between the two political and economic ideologies or positions being debated in the world, we are holding our own position. We have named it humanism . . . This, our Cuban revolution, is a humanistic revolution because it does not deprive man of his essence but holds him as its basic aim. Capitalism sacrifices man. The communist state by its totalitarian concept sacrifices the rights of man . . ."

Now in the '50s you had all kinds of tendencies, and for Cuba the question was where do we go from here with American imperialism 90 miles away? Do we have a way, with the rest of Latin America, Africa or Asia to appeal to the masses in other countries or do we have to choose a state power? Of course we know what Castro chose eventually. The point for us to work out is that in each case it isn't that it's a different culture; it isn't that it's a different period, even a historic period; it is whether you want to actually have these new, totally human relations. The question to answer is: who are the forces of revolution and how do you not divide reason from revolution?

WHAT DID MARX do in relation to culture—where he takes up the fetishism of commodities in the very first chapter of *Capital*? What did Marx reveal that was so great and that Sartre didn't understand but we who lived the '60s, and the youth and the proletariat can? The proletariat and the alienated labor that they feel—

6964

6 9 6 5

the fact that they have been made into an appendage of a machine—gives us the greatest force that will overthrow this society. But that isn't the only alienation.

Why couldn't classical political economy, which discovered labor as the source of all value, see the subject of that source? It should have come naturally to that conclusion. It didn't because you, yourself, are a prisoner of the historical moment in which you live.

Marx said: All of this time we were asking ourselves why the product of labor always assumes the form of a commodity and its exchange. But the human beings who have created all these things, why are they "things"? The intellectuals, who make so much of "culture," don't recognize the reification of their own thought. Even when they oppose the ruling thought, they are still reified because they cannot merely oppose. Something new has to be created and you can't do that unless you know what comes from below.

THROUGHOUT THE '60s, in all the freedom movements that had begun, whether here or abroad, theory was looked down upon; the thinking was that it could be picked up "en route." But 1968 didn't make the revolution; it turned out to be a near or an aborted revolution in Paris. In 1970 we had the greatest mass demonstrations, whether in Washington, D.C., or right here in Los Angeles—when 25,000 Mexican-Americans came out. And they shot you down, including Ruben Salazar, because if you're Chicano, you're not supposed to think at all. But what remained after all the demonstrations—even though we were able to stop the Vietnam War, was Nixon—and now Ford.

What does it mean for us today—when we see what comes after an aborted revolution? We have to return to what Marx did under the whip of the counter-revolution; we have to work out the equivalent of the Permanent Revolution for our day.

I would like to conclude with a quote from my special introduction to the Mexican edition of *Marxism and Freedom*, which will be published this year.

"The United States revolutionary intellectual cannot but be desirous of showing the other America than that of U.S. capitalism which has so unmitigated an imperial record in Latin America, whether that be the American-Mexican War of 1846-48 which took away so much of Mexico's land, or the occupation of the Panama Canal Zone which U.S. imperialism to this day dares rule in perpetuity, or the neo-fascist coup in Chile which the Nixon Administration, ever since 1970, did so much to finance, arm and inspire . . .

"Each generation meets the challenge of the times or fades into oblivion. No one can be under the illusion that our epoch marks the type of turning point in history where history fails to turn. On the contrary. Precisely because of the political-philosophic maturity of our age, the movement these past two decades from practice that is itself a form of theory, we can meet this challenge, provided we return to the Humanism of Marxism and the new dialectics of liberation Lenin worked out on the eve of 1917, on the level of the new in our epoch."

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

(Editor's Note: We print below brief excerpts from Raya Dunayevskaya's lectures on "Women as Thinkers and as Revolutionaries", which appear as a special appendix in our newest pamphlet, **WORKING WOMEN FOR FREEDOM**. See ad, p. 6.)

I. MASS CREATIVITY AND THE BLACK DIMENSION

What today we call Women's Liberation as an idea whose time has come, are movements from practice, from below, that have been accumulating through the ages.

Take the so-called Aba "riots" in Eastern Nigeria in 1929, some 30 years before anyone thought seriously of Africa, much less African women, as a new development of world freedom. It was in that inauspicious year that the market women in Eastern Nigeria were suddenly taxed by the occupying British Empire . . . The self-organization of the women established a totally new form of struggle which transcended all tribal divisions—Ibo, Yoruba, Hausa, as well as the smaller tribes. So united, powerful, and violent was the opposition of the women to the edicts, to their own chiefs, as well as to the British imperial rule, that it became impossible to contain the revolt . . .

Has any historian, or even revolutionary, seen that historic act as ground from which a great leap into freedom as well as leadership was achieved in the 1960s? Nor can the neglect be explained only by the fact that the event occurred in far-off Africa, back at the outbreak of the Great Depression.

Take the Women's Rights Convention in this country in 1848, at Seneca Falls, N. Y., a fact often enough recorded by women historians today. All underestimate the Black dimension which inspired the white, middle-class, educated women to strike out on their own . . . Have we asked ourselves, as we proudly repeat Women's

'Women as thinkers and as revolutionaries'

Liberation is an idea whose time has come, such simple questions, as: (1) How does it happen that our very names, "freed from patriarchy," do not measure up to Sojourner Truth's, whose whole philosophy of liberation is included in her name? (2) Have we even today, as we inveigh against "male domination," compared it to Sojourner Truth's separation from Frederick Douglass after the Civil War for being "short-minded" because he did not wish to burden the struggle for passage of the 14th Amendment by demanding also the right of women to the vote? And (3) have today's women theorists built on that movement from below, not only as force, but as Reason? Nor have any analyzed it within the context of that year of revolutions, 1848 . . .

Other than Marx's genius, what was in the air that led to Marx's discovery of a whole new continent of thought? Can we today afford to let the ruling ideology keep us hemmed into American pragmatism? Shouldn't we, as women, at least be aware of the fact that the year Marx first broke with bourgeois society and worked out a philosophy of liberation which he called "a new Humanism" — 1843 — was also the year when a woman, Flora Tristan, proclaimed the need for an international of men and women that would put an end to the division of mental and manual labor? . . .

II. RUSSIA, FEBRUARY 1917; GERMANY, JANUARY 1919; AND ROSA LUXEMBURG

Now let's turn to the 20th century and see, firstly, what we can learn from women as masses in motion, initiating nothing short of the overthrow of that reactionary Russian Tsarism — the dramatic, creative, empire-shaking five-days in February, 1917; and, secondly, let's turn to the 1919 German Revolution, and its greatest theoretician, Rosa Luxemburg . . .

From 1899 when she fought the first appearance of reformism in the Marxist movement; through the 1905 Revolution in which she was both a participant and out of which she drew her famous theory of the Mass Strike; from 1910-13 when she broke with Karl Kautsky — four years in advance of Lenin's designation of Kautsky as

not only opportunist but betrayer of the proletariat — and when she first developed her anti-imperialist struggles and her writings, not only as political militant but carving out her greatest and most original theoretical work, *Accumulation of Capital*; to the 1919 Revolution, she made no division between her theory and her practice . . .

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

Luxemburg was not only involved in lecturing and developing an anti-imperialist struggle over the Morocco crisis which would, in turn, lead to her greatest theoretical work, *Accumulation of Capital*, but she also turned to work on the woman question, which heretofore she had left entirely to Clara Zetkin, who was editing the greatest German women's magazine, *Die Gleichheit*, from 1891 to 1917.

The magazine's circulation rose from 9,500 in 1903 to 112,000 in 1913. Indeed, by the outbreak of the war, the female membership in the German Social Democracy was no less than 170,000. It is clear that, as great a theoretician as Rosa Luxemburg was, and as great an organizer as Clara Zetkin was they were not exceptions to the alleged apathy of German women. On the contrary, it would be more correct to say that there wouldn't have been as massive and important a revolution in Germany were there not that many women involved in the revolution . . .

Has the Women's Liberation Movement nothing to learn from Rosa Luxemburg just because she hasn't written "directly" on the "Woman Question"? Outside the fact that the latter doesn't happen to be true, should not the corpus of her works become the real test of woman as revolutionary and as thinker and as someone who has a great deal to tell us as women's liberationists of today?

III. AN ONGOING REVOLUTION AND TODAY'S WOMEN THEORISTS

We need to examine, if only briefly, today's on-going Portuguese Revolution to see the historic continuity of working class women in motion as shapers of history. As far back as two decades ago, when the totally new movement from below began with the outbreak of the East European revolt against Russian totalitarianism, signaling a new world stage of struggle for freedom from under totalitarianism, and no one was paying attention to the fascist regime in Portugal, there were struggles of workers, of women, of peasants . . .

Women became especially important in 1973 when a labor shortage sent them into textiles and electronics, and directly into the fight against multinationals. It is in textiles and electronics and shipyards where the grass roots workers' movement first erupted, and where none questioned the militancy of women workers. But they were asking not only for a fundamental change in labor conditions, but for different relations at home, as well as raising totally new questions of revolution and new human relations . . .

Working class women have a very special reason for their passionate interest in revolutions, not simply because they're exciting events, but because they show working class women in motion as shapers of history. The dialectical relationship of spontaneity to organization is of the essence to all of us as we face today's crises. It is not only Portugal which is under the whip of counter-revolution that began Nov. 25, 1975. The global struggle for power between capitalist imperialism and state-capitalist societies calling themselves Communist, all nuclearly armed, has put a question mark over the very survival of humanity.

Creativity that can really tear things up at their roots and genuinely start something new, humanly new, can only come from mass creativity. It is only then when it is totally revolutionary, is not hemmed in by the concept and practice of the "Party to lead," and it is only then it can once and for all end aborted and unfinished revolutions.

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1976

Special introduction to Spanish edition of *Marxism and Freedom*

This special introduction gives me great pleasure to write not just because of memories of Mexico, 1937-38, when I was there as Secretary to Leon Trotsky, but because of what that exciting historic period does to illuminate the world today. Thus, President Cardenas had not only granted asylum to Leon Trotsky just when he was being reviled by Stalin in the greatest Frame-up Trials in history, but was, at the same time, challenging U.S. imperialism by being the first to do away with American domination over Mexican oil. Above all in those years towered the Spanish Revolution.

Going still further back in history, Frantz Fanon, in 1961, pointed to the Spanish, in their fight against Napoleon, rediscovering what the American yeomen-millia used in their struggle for freedom from Great Britain. They named the partisans guerrillas. The point was that the continuities and discontinuities in those liberating struggles were inseparable from an underlying philosophy of liberation which Fanon felt indispensable for the African Revolutions reshaping the world.

THE UNITED STATES revolutionary intellectual cannot but be desirous of showing the other America than that of U.S. capitalism which has so unmitigated an imperial record in Latin America—whether that be the American-Mexican War of 1846-48 which took away so much of Mexico's land; or the occupation of the

Panama Canal Zone which U.S. imperialism to this day dares rule "in perpetuity"; or the neo-fascist coup in Chile which the Nixon Administration, ever since 1970, did so much to finance, arm and inspire. The fact that the Interim Report of the U.S. Senate Intelligence Commission has finally revealed the harrowing details of those days and now comes out strongly against assassination does not keep it from showing its own capitalistic class nature by being thoroughly ambivalent on attempts to organize coups against a whole people. The American people can feel nothing but loathing against Ambassador Korry writing to the retiring President Frei against President-elect Allende: "Not a nut or bolt will be allowed to reach Chile under Allende . . . We shall do all within our power to condemn Chile and the Chileans to utmost privation and poverty . . ."

The American people cannot but separate themselves from such dehumanized imperialism, and are, at this very moment, pressuring the ruling class against its continuation. Thereby they display greater solidarity with the Latin American people than with their own government. The solidarity which is most meaningful is expressed by revolutionary intellectuals for whom acts of solidarity are inseparable from a philosophy of liberation.

MEXICO ALSO HAS memories for me after I broke

with Leon Trotsky at the time of the Hitler-Stalin Pact when I could no longer follow him in his espousal of the defense of Russia as a worker's state "though degenerate". I returned to the U.S. to begin the research and development of my theory of Russia as a state-capitalist society and in 1944 had the opportunity to translate and expose (in the *American Economic Review*) Stalin's revision of Marx's law of value. At the end of World War II, I returned to Mexico to meet with Natalia Sedova Trotsky, to whom I read the first draft of what, in a decade, finally became *Marxism and Freedom*, of which this is the eighth edition.

When the first edition was completed in 1957, this work ended with the new pages of freedom signalled by the East European Revolutions against Russian totalitarianism, and the Black Revolution in the U.S. initiated by the Montgomery Bus Boycott. When, in the early 1960s, the Sino-Soviet conflict erupted in the open, I wrote a new Chapter (XVII), "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung." The fig-leaf of Marxist terminology can no longer, I maintained, cover up the nationalistic politics in the Sino-Soviet conflict and we must, instead, ask: Can there be war between two countries calling themselves Communist? What sounded "wild" in 1963 has very nearly become a cliché ever since Mao rolled out the red carpet for Nixon, as Teng is doing for Ford
(Continued on page 6)

Introduction to Spanish Marxism and Freedom

(Continued from page 1)

today (12-1-75), while lecturing him against "detente" with Russia. It would, indeed, be a sad commentary on our age if genuine revolutionaries still persisted in attaching themselves to one or another of the poles of the Sino-Soviet orbit, as if that differed in class nature from U.S. imperialism, instead of striking out on a truly independent road of social revolution.

Revolutions do not arise in the fullness of time for the purpose of establishing The Chairman or a party machine. The Leader Maximus and partilaoist (party monolithism) are there to throttle the revolution, not to release the creativity as well as the energies of the millions. Marxism is either a theory of liberation or it is nothing. In thought and in life, it lays the basis for achieving a new human dimension, without which no new society has viability.

WE LIVE IN a "birth-time of history and a period of transition" such as characterized the age in which Marx lived. Only ours is of truly world-wide scope, and begins with the question: What happens after the revolution that has so often led to a transformation into opposite? A task confronts our age: How can the movement from theory meet the challenge of the movement from practice which seeks a totally new relationship of theory to practice so that it can reconstruct society on new, truly human beginnings? Just as Marx had to fight the "vulgar Communists" of his day who thought all ills of capitalism would be overcome with the abolition of private property, we must not fall into the trap of mistaking Communism's "anti-capitalism", i.e. planned economy, for any other than what it is—the full logical development of capitalism itself into state-capitalism.

The unity of theory and practice that characterized Marx's new continent of thought remains the vision that can assure that there will be no further transformation into opposite such as that which characterized the transformation of Russia from a workers' state into a state-capitalist society, and which presently threatens the Third World. We who were witnesses to the missile crisis in 1962 and saw Cuba caught in the vise of the two super-powers aspiring for world domination know that the fate of the world and the fate of the missiles in Cuba were decided not by Castro, but by Kennedy and Khrushchev. The very survival of civilization demands the uprooting of the old and the creating of a new classless society.

THROUGH ALL the eight editions of Marxism and Freedom there has been no change in either the content or the structure of the work based on the movement from practice to theory and a new society through 200 years of industrial, political, intellectual, historical development—the ages of revolution. It would seem that its timeliness in the 1970's has gained a new urgency because of the merging passion for philosophy from a new generation of revolutionaries within each land, the U.S. included. Whatever the reason the capitalistic UN chose Mexico as the place to celebrate International Women's Year—and be torn apart by it—the fact remains that it is symbolic of both the Third World and the Women's Liberation Movement as Reason as well as force.

The passion for philosophy that has emerged in this decade, as against the 1960's when activism in general and guerrilla war in particular relegated theory to an inconsequential thing that could be picked up "en route", has compelled even a Regis Debray to some second thoughts. Whereas in 1967 Debray rejected theory as if it were no more than "the vice of excessive deliberations" in favor of "military focus" that would decide all, even as the Leader Maximus would be all, he has just now published a critique of his previous concepts which led to such disasters.* Unfortunately, in presently turning to Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks for a dialectic of negativity Debray is attempting quite a feat: "deducing" from the unity of opposites still another form of "military focus". No wonder he once again ends up on a merry-go-round of tactics elevated to strategy.

Debray has learned even less from Lenin than from Salvador Allende who, in analyzing for him the struggle of the Latin American people against U.S. imperialism, said, "The living death of the people cannot continue," concluding that "the liberation of Chilean energies" would "rebuild the nation." Fortunately, Debray's poverty of philosophy has no prowess to invalidate Lenin's concept of the dialectics of liberation, much less to substitute a petty-bourgeois subjectivism for the objective situation of our day that gave birth to a veritable passion of philosophy on the part of the masses. It is they who refuse any longer to separate the actual liberation struggles from the philosophy of liberation which would lay themselves open for still another unfinished revolution.

*Regis Debray, *La Critique des Armes I and II* (1974, Paris) and *Prison Writings* (1973, London)

JUST AS, at the outbreak of World War I, the Second International's betrayal of the proletariat and vitiation of Marxism led Lenin to return to the philosophic origins of Marx in the Hegelian dialectic as his theoretic preparation for proletarian revolution, so the aborted revolution and the disastrous playing with guerrilla warfare in our era must lead us to a total re-evaluation of the relationship of theory to practice. Lenin's return to dialectics laid the foundation for the Great Divide in Marxism (see Chapter X). It is there we must begin.

Each generation meets the challenge of the times or fades into oblivion. No one can be under the illusion that our epoch marks the type of turning point in history where history fails to turn. On the contrary. Precisely because of the political-philosophic maturity of our age, the movement these past two decades from practice that is itself a form of theory, we can meet this challenge, provided we return to the Humanism of Marxism and the new dialectics of liberation Lenin worked out on the eve of 1917, on the level of the new in our epoch. In our age of absolutes, when revolution and counter-revolution are so interlocked, it is not only the intellectuals "in general" who must leave their ivory towers: so, too, must the Marxist theoreticians. Marxism and Freedom is a contribution toward that end.

Raya Dunayevskaya
Detroit, Michigan
December, 1975

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

The death of Mao Tse-tung, and with it, the organized mourning which confined the natural outpouring of grief at the leader's death to the specified times and places, making sure there was no interruption in production, may create the illusion that unity prevails in the Central Committee of the Communist Party, in the Army, in the Peoples' Congress, not to mention "the people of all nationalities." But in fact, this was indeed the year of "troubles under Heaven."

It began with Chou En-lai's death, was immediately followed by the campaign against Teng, who had delivered the eulogy and was evidently Chou's man. The Chinese people had evidently considered it a campaign against Chou himself, as was clear by the tremendous demonstrations in April over the question of wreaths being removed from his grave. This April revolt was preceded by an editorial in March in the Peoples Daily which, in commenting on the first meteorite shower

Death of Mao Tse-tung: the Thought of Mao

which hit Kirin Province in March, suddenly brought out that when an earthquake had occurred in 300 B.C., "some people made use of a meteorite to start the reactionary rumor that 'the land will be divided after the death of the First Emperor.'"

By July, when the most devastating earthquakes hit China, and the three main industrial casualties of the Tangshan earthquake were coal, steel and electricity, plus great damage in China's third largest city, Tientsin, the editorials turned to stories of looting.

No figures were ever given as to how many people died, but it is thought that there are as many as 100,000 dead. Such a natural disaster, for which the Central Committee is certainly not responsible, nevertheless produced a series of slogans like: "Do not become entangled in old grudges among revolutionary masses," "Do not engage in organized fighting teams, and still less in struggle by force," "Increase production".

THE STRUGGLE FOR MAO'S MANTLE

There has been quite a bit of unrest in the country, especially among the most militant of the workers. This

intensified the struggle for power at the top, and it became clearer still when Mao's death did occur on Sept. 9. First, they waited 16 hours before making the announcement, and by then it was clear that the mourning would be confined to designated times and places. Then the funeral list which was published revealed that three important leaders were absent — the Director of the Press Agency, the Minister of Education, and most telling of all, Wan Li, the Minister of Railways. The last strikes were in the railways.

The very appearance of unity of the leadership, of whatever faction, standing together on the specially built platform in Tien An Men Square while Premier Hua Kuo-feng delivered the eulogy to the million gathered there, was belied by the speech itself which, clearly, while proclaiming unity, meant it only for the masses to continue to work and work harder.

Not a single leader of the past, from Chen Tu-hsiu who founded the Communist Party to Teng, was omitted from the most slanderous attacks. Thus: "Under Chairman Mao's leadership, our party defeated the opportunist

(Continued on Page 8)

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 1)

ist lines pursued by Chen Tu-hsiu, Chu Chiu-pai, Li Lisan, Lo Chang-lung, Wang Ming, Chang Kuo-tao, Kao Kang, Jao Shu-shih and Peng Teh-huai and again, during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, triumphed over the counterrevolutionary revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping." (1)

Not a single capitalist is on that list, and hardly a single one from the Long March has been left alive. These are the names of the General Staff of the Chinese Revolution who had disagreed with Mao in the 1920s or since power was gained in 1949 up to this very day, when Hua was still calling for an intensification of the campaign against Teng.

Not to be disregarded is the fact that ex-Defense Secretary Schlesinger was in China, by special invitation from Mao himself, was the first Westerner to visit Chinese nuclear installations, and is more than just symbol of the view that "Russia is Enemy No. 1."

What, then, is the legacy of Mao? Is it only that Mao has been expert in carrying the "civil war" into the Party itself, into the Army, into the Peoples' Congress, and now that none have his authority, they will still continue? Every revolution seems to devour its own children; the Chinese, Mao made sure, in devouring its children, left One and only One untainted.

What does the particular faction now in power mean by the sonorous "Long Live invincible Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought"? Is it a new series of "rectifications" (2), or is it the more material truth that philosopher Mao raised China to a level of superpower, A-bomb included?

None can fill Mao's shoes, but already they have laid the basis, a basis the Western press (3) has swallowed hook, line and sinker, for white-washing the truth of Mao's destruction of all his "closest comrades-in-arms" by saying that Mao's legacy could not be given to any single leader; "all 800 million Chinese are philosophers."

WHAT IS MAO'S LEGACY?

As we have known ever since the days of Stalin, when he unleashed the attack on Trotsky as "egotist" who wanted the mantle of Lenin for himself, while he, humble Stalin, saw the possibility of Lenin's work in a "collective leadership," such collectivity has ever been the path to the Single Man Rule.

The fact that none can fill Mao's shoes, and that collectivity is the only thing possible in the interim period brings us back to the relevant question: what is Mao's legacy? Is winning power on a path very different from that of the Russian Revolution of November, 1917, and the Sinification of Marxism in revolution and in philosophy, a mere variant of Russian Stalinist state-capitalism, or a truly historic, original path to that class-less society

1) Excerpts from Hua's speech were published in the N.Y. Times (9-19-76).

2) One Canadian reporter, Mark Gayn, has written that 1942, the year of the first rectification campaign, was the period when Stalin wanted Mao to attack Japan from a direction which would stop any possible attack on Russia. Mao refused, wanting to husband all his forces for the final victory in China (N.Y. Times, 9-1-76).

3) The N.Y. Times (9-10-76), so laudatorily devoted to Mao, is typical of the Western press which, for its own reasons, wants to cater to Mao's China and therefore writes as if Mao had been the revolutionary who overthrew not just Chiang Kai-shek but the Manchu dynasty. Not a word was said of the 1911 revolution which Sun Yat-sen led and which overthrew that dynasty. Not a word was said about the first great, genuine cultural revolution, May 4, 1919, in which every conceivable tendency emerged, from rejection of the old China, to Marxism, to Western science, to anarchism, as well as the genuine founders of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921—Chen Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao—and Mao was not a founder. The one exception, in the sense of being both objective and at least revealing some of the true history, is the page (p.9) devoted to Mao by Profs. Jerome Ch'en and John Gittings (Manchester Guardian, 9-19-76).

which would, once and for all, put an end to the division between mental and manual labor which has ever been the ground of all class societies?

It was the topic I raised in answer to a criticism of my analysis in "Mao's Last Hurrah" (4) a few days before Mao's death. Here is what I said in my Perspectives Report to the convention of News and Letters Committees on Sept. 4 (see ad, p. 8, col. 1, for full report):

There are some who say: "Yes, you are right when it comes to the U.S.-Russia struggle for hegemonism," that is what the world must struggle against. But look at Mao's revolutionary thought.

"Why, the Chinese Revolution was not only the greatest revolution to emerge out of World War II, and



not only stopped the U.S. in its tracks in Korea; but so much does Mao move from revolution to revolution to revolution that he also initiated the struggle against his own co-leaders and his own Party and his own Army.

"Although these revolutionaries had been with him during the Long March which paved the way for that most original and most massive of revolutions, Mao thinks only of the people, and not in past but present terms. His thought is greater even than Marx and Lenin (and this in a tiny whisper, for my critic doesn't really wish to be heard on this) and Stalin, because it is our age, it is today, it is the future. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution pointed the way for the world."

GLOBAL POWER STRUGGLE MOTIVATES MAO'S PHILOSOPHY

OK, for the sake of argument, and that only, I will, with you, shut out of my mind the global struggle that is not at all limited to U.S.-Russia, but that crucial most massive power on earth—800 million Chinese. I will also delude myself that that massive power, being part of the Third World that is the real focal point of revolution, can obviate the truth that Mao himself is the head of an existing state power that exploits its own masses, as do all rulers. I'm even willing, for a moment, to blind myself to all reality, and listen, listen, listen only to Mao's Thought, that the Cultural Revolution would put an end, once and for all, to all division between mental and manual labor. I will take all Mao's undisciplined verbiage for the only, the total truth.

OK, what is that Thought, that philosophy of pure, unadulterated and continuous "great proletarian cultural revolutions"? It is, first, what it had been from the moment he started his most original path to military power by taking the peasant army Mao led on a different path than the proletarian revolution Chiang Kai-shek had just destroyed, after which Chiang continued his endless extermination campaigns against Mao's army. Philosophically, it had blossomed as On Contradiction.

Now, suppose I were willing to forget that, strictly philosophically, it is a violation both of Marxian class struggle and Hegelian objectivity of knowledge which emerges through contradiction. Suppose further, I allow Mao to convince me that Japan's invasion of China made it correct to reunite with Chiang Kai-shek (after all, nothing succeeds like success and Mao did win power in 1949). Have I not the right to ask: how does it happen that a decade after the 1949 conquest of power—not against a class enemy, but the very masses who made the revolution—the 1937 On Contradiction assumes a new form, *How To Handle Contradictions Among The People*, at which point it is directed against the Left? This time there is no collaborationism.

SPONTANEOUS REVOLUTIONS DESTROYED BY MAO AND KHRUSHCHEV

Hold fast, please, to the fact that originally, i.e., in 1956, the world Communist Parties in Moscow, with China very much in the forefront, "revisionism" was the epithet directed against Hungarian revolutionaries who were fighting Russian state-capitalism and imperialism. This time, Mao was in a most brotherly embrace with the Russians in a counter-revolutionary act; indeed, Mao urged Khrushchev to send those tanks into Hungary to put down the revolt.

Clearly, even philosophically, the "On Practice" which had been inseparable from the concept, "On Con-

4) See *Political-Philosophic Letter #2*, February, 1978.

tradition" in 1937, was not the practice of revolutionaries. Instead, this time, 1958, "How To Handle Contradictions Among The People" was accompanied by the practice of ordering the Chinese masses to toil endless hours in so-called "communes" in something called "The Great Leap Forward" which was so disastrous an act that even Mao had to step back from it a year later.

It is true, you, my critic, have one other original Mao concept—the Second World—and it is not something in the 1950s but in the 1970s. This departure from Marxism is spoken of as if it were the needed bringing-up-to-date of Marxism itself a la Mao's Thought. This Mao Thought of the 1970s was developed after the Cultural Revolution, after Russia had already been declared Enemy No. 1 (5), after not only the removal of Liu (the Party man), but Lin (the Army man), and this though he had been the one who had initiated, carried through, and brought to a climax the Cultural Revolution, for which he was judged to be the "closest comrade-in-arms" of Mao, and named, within the Constitution itself, as the successor to Mao. It was a period when Mao, and Mao alone, had absolute, undisputed, total power.

And what was the apex of the originality which came after all that travail and "continuous revolutions"? It was the concept of the "Second World," that is to say, the industrialized nations, especially West Europe, especially Japan, "and also medium-sized and smaller countries," anywhere in the whole wide world outside of the two superpowers. That exclusive two-fold evil is further made exclusive—Russia was the more dangerous of the two superpowers.

Now, this concept, "Second World," which heretofore everyone, Mao included, considered capitalistic, was suddenly anointed as a possible ally of the Third World, socialist China included.

The rhetoric notwithstanding, Mao's concept of the Second World violates proletarian internationalism, replacing it with the narrowest nationalist "anti-imperialism" with global reach, even as "On Contradiction" vitiated the class struggle and subordinated it to political superstructure. In both historic periods—1937-49 and 1966-76—philosophy was transformed from theoretic preparation for social revolution into military strategy and tactics of reaching power.

For all factions now involved in the power struggle for Mao's mantle, including "radicals," Russia is Enemy No. 1, and for those who argue for equidistance from both U.S. and Russia, military preparedness is the predominant question. It isn't just "preparedness" as something that concerns a war; it is military prowess that has always been the predominant concept.

From the very first start of Mao's now legendary Hunan Report, followed by his Long March to escape the many extermination campaigns of Chiang; through "On Contradiction" and "On Practice" which led to collaboration with Chiang; to the concept of the Second World, the military has been the determining factor. Even among Communist countries, China was the only one that raised the Army, along with the Party, as two focal points for the new power.

As a theoretician of guerrilla warfare; as philosopher of Contradictions who held that no theory existed outside of On Practice, Mao somehow spoke of war as if it were a synonym for revolution, though clearly the On Practice he was talking about was not, was not, the practice of proletarian revolution. What Trotsky wrote of Stalin's theories—"the empiricism of a machine gun"—is even more applicable to Mao, whose empiric methodology is the totally, absolutely opposite of the Hegelian-Marxian Absolute Method, the Dialectic.

The dialectics of liberation will yet take the true measure of the man.

5) This does not exclude the fact that there may very well be, among the ruling elite, waiting for Mao to die, those who, despite a strong opposition to Russia, would rather not have Russia the enemy tower over U.S. imperialism, preferring equidistance from both.

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION*
and *Marxism and Freedom*

(Editor's Note: The May 1976 issue of *Paunch*, a literary magazine, was devoted to "Marx and Critical Thought." Below we print excerpts from Raya Dunayevskaya's sharply critical commentary on the essay by Bill Harrell.)

Marx's Humanism — and that is what Marx named his discovery of a new continent of thought: "a new Humanism" (1)—is either a revolutionary philosophy of liberation or it is nothing at all. Just as a revolutionary philosophy of liberation is not just a "philosophy" (much less Harrell's concept of "sociology"), but a struggle for actuality, the actuality of freedom, so the uprooting of the exploitative system, existing reality, is a great deal more than freedom from economic exploitation, rooted though it is in that necessity. Rather, the process of liberation — "the negation of the negation" — creates what Marx called "new forces, new passions." (2) Having uprooted the exploitative class structure of society, the Subject (the proletariat) has achieved a whole new human dimension. Because "the individual is the social entity," (3) the contradiction between the individual and society is transcended. Even when this was still expressed in the abstract philosophic language of Hegel, instead of Marx's analysis of concrete class struggle and historic revolutions, the dialectics of liberation was unambiguous: "Individualism purified of all that interferes with its Universalism, i.e., freedom." (4)

(1) Let this be identified only with the young Marx of the famous 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, consider also Volume III of *Capital* (p. 954) where he defines freedom as "development of human power, which is its own end, the true realm of freedom."

(2) *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 835 contains paragraph on "new forces and new passions"; and p. 837 "negation of the negation" (Charles H. Kerr edition is used throughout).

(3) Again, let only the 1844 Manuscripts be thought of when identifying individual and social, consider the expression in *The Communist Manifesto*: "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

(4) Hegel, *Philosophy of Mind*, par. 481.

Worker's self-emancipation crucial to Marx

Harrell is right when he says labor is "central to Marxian critical analysis" (my emphasis) — and totally wrong when he speaks of it as "ultimate end" as if that were not Marx's specific description of capitalism, but of "any" society. All that did was permit him to impose on Marx's "ambiguous" conception some sort of kinship with today's state-capitalist societies that call themselves Communist. Though Harrell feels compelled to qualify that allegedly theoretical affinity, holding that the "totalitarian result" "clearly violates its (Marx's) spirit," he never lets go of his perverse definition:

Perhaps the most succinct way in which one could summarize Marxian political economy is: a theory of the development of workers' control as the prerequisite for a society based upon work.

Far from looking toward "a society based upon work" as an "ultimate end," Marx was so appalled by labor that he, at first, called for "the abolition of labor." (5) What convinced him otherwise, that is to say had him concretize the concept, and call, instead, for "the emancipation of labor" was the laborer, his class struggles, his daily resistance at the point of production, where the instrumentality, machinery, dead labor, dominated living labor. The revolt of the laborer against his exploiter, the capitalist, was also directed against the ideology, the false consciousness, which represented him as what he is not.

MARX'S CRITIQUE OF classical political economy's great discovery that labor was the source of all value was that labor was treated only as "source," not as Subject, the "gravedigger" of the system resting on alienated labor. Naturally, workers' control of production would change that mode of labor, but for that to be the absolute opposite of capitalistic reification of labor and its transformation of man into thing, labor has to become self-activity, development not only of production,

but the self-development of man/women, (6) the human dimension. Over 100 years before Hannah Arendt discovered the difference between labor and work, and profoundly misread Marx, and Harrell read Arendt as

(Continued on Page 6)

(6) In the same Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts where Marx wrote, "The secret of the relationship of man to man finds its unambiguous definitive, open, obvious expression in the relationship of man to woman" he attacked not only capitalist private property but also "quite vulgar and unthinking communism."

(5) *The German Ideology*, p. 69.

TWO WORLDS Self-emancipation and Marx

(Continued from Page 5)

an improvement on Marx's concept, Marx had spent a lifetime developing the concept of the duality of labor. It is "about" (7) the only category Marx takes credit for creating . . .

None before Marx had split the category, labor, but it is this, just this, which discloses the perversity of capitalism whose mode of production, with its factory clock, pounds all the many varieties of concrete labor into one abstract mass of "socially-necessary labor-time." (8) Marx, having followed the worker from the market place, where the worker, though "free", had sold himself, or rather his ability to labor, labor power, as a commodity, proceeded to the workshop — the centerpoint of Marx's Capital is the analysis of "The Labor Process and the Process of Producing Surplus-Value." There he traces the laborer as he is turned into an appendage of a machine. This dead labor (labor congealed into the form of machine) dominates living labor, after which "it", as commodity, be he employed or unemployed, gets thrown back into the market. There — and this there is not only the market place but includes the whole of bourgeois culture — "The Fetishism of Commodities" reigns supreme not only over capital/labor, but also over independent intellectuals, including the discoverers of labor as the source of all value. (9) This

(7) The only other category Marx claimed credit for is the split in the category of capital into constant capital and variable capital, but since capital was treated not as a thing but a relationship of production of capitalist to laborer, and since constant capital was but another name for dead labor and variable capital, to living labor which is the only element that underwent a variation in magnitude because, of all the millions of commodities exchanged daily, this class was living and could be and was exploited to produce all surplus values as well as its own exchange-value, wages, they all ended with the split in the category labor, thus: concrete and abstract; labor/labor power; living labor/dead labor; constant/variable capital; fetishism of commodities.

(8) Contrast this concept of time by factory clock and world market as "socially-necessary" with Marx's concept of historic time as "pace of human development." The same totally different world relates to all the criticisms piled on "immiseration" as against Marx's insistence that, be the worker's payment "high or low," capital ("value big with value") "vampire-like" sucks him dry of "free individuality." (See the whole of Part VII, "Accumulation of Capital," and the penultimate chapter, "The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation." [Capital, I.]

(9) In *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Marx explained why it was he considered intellectuals "petty bourgeois" like "shopkeepers", though in "their education and individual position they may be separated from them as widely as heaven from earth. What makes them representatives of the petty bourgeoisie is the fact that in their minds they do not go beyond the limits which the latter do not go beyond in life, that they are consequently driven theoretically to the same tasks and solutions to which material interests and social position practically drive the latter."

is no accident, says Marx, as only "freely associated men" can strip the fetishism from commodities.

Obviously, Harrell thinks he is the exception and can give a more "substantive" view of freedom whose thought, as it moved to materialist "political economy" was "so wrong as to be irrelevant" and became "progressively narrower." To correct that, Harrell empties the specificity of Marxian categories, introducing such total confusion into that most precise expression, "capital accumulation," as to make it both equivalent to bourgeois culture and acceptable to Marx since "bourgeois culture provides the necessary capital accumulation as well as the abstract insight as to the ultimate end of universal freedom." On the way to his conclusion of the know-it-all, be-it-all "sensual needs," Harrell arms himself with what he conceives as support from "Critical Thought" . . .

UNFORTUNATELY, THOUGH HIS sympathy lies in the direction (of the Frankfurt School), Harrell hardly presents a total picture of them, whether in relation to Marx or "as such." First he fails to show the division within. What they were in the 1930's and early 1940's, and what they became in the post-war years hardly makes a unified outlook — not totalitarian, need it be added, but nevertheless motivated by Marxism, independent, and separate from both the German Social Democracy and the Russian "state socialism." Secondly, he acts as if the present "school" — the Habermas "school" — that is altogether removed from both Marxism and the original Critical school, speaks with a like voice . . .

Though he analyzes more of Marcuse's works as against none of Adorno's and little of Horkheimer, the founders of Frankfurt School, the truth is that his preoccupation is Eros and Civilization. Or, more precisely put, sensuality sans history, applicable to "all" cultures, as substitute, not just for Marx's "economics" or "sociology" — or passions, striving to reconstruct exploitative capitalism on humanist beginnings . . .

As for Harrell's dramatic climax, that the incitation of "sensual needs" into "socio-historical categories" would assure the conquest of "unhappy consciousness" — "unhappy consciousness" resolves itself through the discovery of the sensual in the form of its particularity, — I wish him happiness. But let him not forget that the "unhappy consciousness" is only a quite early stage in Hegel's Phenomenology, and in Marx's new continent of thought and in critical thought to the present; there is a long, long road still ahead.

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from a new three-part Political-Philosophic Letter by Raya Dunayevskaya on Post-Mao China. Part I, excerpted below, takes up the two opposing "last wills" of Mao; Part II what is Mao's legacy?; and Part III the global relations. Copies of the complete letter can be obtained for 50c plus 15c postage from News & Letters. See ad p. 7

"In a world beset by myriad crises and irreconcilable contradictions, one, I suppose, should not be surprised at the appearance of such absolute opposites as vultures acting like love-birds over the corpse of Mao Tse-tung, and every country in the world, from the U.S. to Russia, from Chile to Japan, and from South Africa to Albania shouting out a unanimous chorus of glorification.

The hypocrisy of this total outpouring was in no way pierced by the one-day unanimity among Mao's "closest comrades-in-arms"—the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China—as those fighting heirs for Mao's Mantle mounted the platform over Tien An Men Square, where a million had gathered for organized mourning. What did get everyone scurrying was the speed with which victory came to one Hua Kuo-feng over Chiang Ching, Mao's widow and leader of the so-called radicals—in one short month.

THE RAPID VICTORY of Hua Kuo-feng over the major known tendency—Chiang Ching, Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao and Yao Wen-yuan—makes his version of Mao's "Will," if any such exists, the one that pours out of all mass media. It is, however, first necessary to look at what Chiang Ching claimed to be the "Will," not because that is necessarily any truer than Hua's version, but because one of these was circulated while Mao was still alive, whether or not he knew about it. . . . (1)

POST-MAO CHINA: WHAT NOW?

Far from accusing Chiang of "wild ambitions," Mao had allegedly pointed a warning and a way to continue the fight: "Human life is limited . . . In the struggle of the past ten years, I have tried to reach the peak of revolution, but I was not successful. But you could reach the top . . . If you fall, you will plunge into a fathomless abyss. Your body will shatter. Your bones will break . . . It will be necessary to wage partisan warfare once again." The final warning was against "foreigners." Just as the collapse of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang was due to the belief in "foreigners," so she must beware of both the U.S. and Russia—"The bird and the northern star are equally to be distrusted."

Let us for the moment disregard that that seems to fly in the face of the fact that Mao was the one who rolled out the red carpet for Nixon (and that after ridding himself of Lin Piao who evidently opposed that move); that Mao was the one who also invited Schlesinger to China the moment Ford fired him for resisting detente with Russia; and that, in that respect at least, Hua surely carried through Mao's "Will" and now has the U.S. government's promise to sell China the Cyber computer which can easily be used for military purposes.

THE WILL WHICH Hua Kuo-feng refers to as "forged" refers not at all to the "Will" which was circulated back during the summer, at the very time when Teng was removed and Hua was designated as Teng's replacement. Instead, the accusation of forgery against Chiang Ching is based on the fact that she is supposed to have been "arrested while they were forging Mao's will on the transfer of political power. The group of conspirators were surrounded by security forces which, according to another reliable source, were composed of the personal bodyguards of Hua." (2)

Along with these dispatches from London and New York came one from Peking by the *Le Monde* correspondent, Alain Jacob. It quoted the *People's Daily*, *Red Star*, and *Liberation Daily*, all of which published a

common editorial on Oct. 25, to the effect that Mao sent a note to Hua, April 30, in his own handwriting. It read: "It's you who'll be running the show, so my mind's at rest." Further, "it is claimed Mao made certain arrangements to settle this problem," that is to say, the question of the "gang of four."

(Continued on Page 7)

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

WHAT IS A FACT is the disagreement on the Chou-Teng way of carrying out a Five Year Plan, and a long-range 20-year Plan to make China a global economic power. The campaign against Teng was really an attack on Chou En-lai. The Chinese masses evidently had felt all along that Chou En-lai had escaped an unnatural death by dying a natural death. Thus, the April 1976 demonstration was the first spontaneous one since the Cultural Revolution and it was in opposition to the new rulers. Chiang Ching topped that list. But Hua Kuo-feng, as top cop, differed not at all with Chiang in putting down that demonstration. The arrests were followed by the removal of Teng. All, all—Mao himself and Chiang Ching and Hua Kuo-feng—were as one when it came to hitting out against the Chinese masses.

No doubt Chiang had been viewing herself as leadership ever since the Cultural Revolution started and Mao had chosen her to head the Arts. With Chen Po-ta and Chang, she had become overseer of the Cultural Revolution, though all had to work under the slogan: "Learn from the Army."

Whether or not the Army thought Chiang had anything to contribute—and that is very doubtful indeed—surely Mao gave her such illusions. In any case, she thought herself so important and, like Mao, so distrustful of anyone else, that without telling either Mao or the Central Committee, she chose a Western historian, Roxanne Witke, (3) to pour her heart out to. It was the beginning of the end of her, not because the present ruling clique is using it against her and concocting a story of "betrayal of state secrets," but because Mao, judging by all he did to more worthy successors like Liu and Lin, would have resented any Ego parading him or herself as the new type of person to emerge out of China . . .

TANTALIZING IS THE fact that just before the removal of Teng (but when the campaign against him was already in full swing), there was such total concentration against "capitalist roaders" that Mao once again (March 10, 1976) pinpointed the struggle as one within the Communist Party: "A socialist revolution is being conducted without knowing where the bourgeoisie are. They are in the Communist Party."

Now, however, foreign policy is brought into the campaign against "the gang of four": "At the international level, it was planning to jettison the principle of proletarian internationalism and capitulate to imperialism." Whether Hua Kuo-feng and his cohorts meant to include "social imperialism," meaning Russia, was not clear . . .

There has always been no small amount of ambivalence on the question thrown in, most deliberately, throughout Mao's campaign of "Russia is Enemy No. 1." That was so during periods when all of the actual activity and relations seemed to favor the U.S. The fact that they want to have it both ways is pure Big Power pollicking. We must instead see what flows logically from Mao's legacy. The fact that one can interpret the "Will" (no matter which Will one chooses) any way one pleases, testifies to one thing and one thing only, and it is not just a question of what the interpreter says. Rather it is the many gaping lacunae in Mao's heritage.

WHAT IS OF THE essence is not that he has not designated any one, single or collectively, as the "inheritors." It is that he has stripped all—and not only those he physically eliminated—of any actual roots in the Chinese Revolution, or its philosophy. Thus, it is not only those that he had first designated as "closest comrade-in-arms"—first Liu Shao-chi, as Party, then Lin Biao as Army—and then called traitors. It is that all history has been so rewritten that none exists with any historic past. Since the elimination was achieved, not via an open struggle of "two lines" that had equal access, if not to the mass media, at least to the "cadres" of the Party, or the Army, or the State, but via declaring them to be "capitalist roaders," and to have "always" been that, there is no history other than that of Mao and Mao alone.

In a word, there is no history of the Chinese masses except as an abstraction. The history of the Chinese revolution is the Thought of Mao. None who now fight for the mantle have roots in either . . .

- (1) The most complete quotes in English from what Chiang Ching circulated appear in Victor Zorza's "Mao's Last Will and Testament" (Manchester Guardian, 11-7-76).
- (2) The New York Times reports (9-30-76, 10-14-76) are from Hong Kong, the Toronto Globe and Mail does date from Peking, but I found the most thorough of the official press to be the one in the Le Monde section of the Manchester Guardian (10-31-76). See also the article by Merle Goldman (Christian Science Monitor, 10-21-76), and "The Coming Power Struggle" by Tiziano Terzani (Le Repubblica, Rome), excerpted in Atlas Report, November 1976.
- (3) Presently Roxanne Witke, whose "biography" of Chiang Ching, or whatever she will call the book when it is finally published, has been appearing on the "talk shows," stressing how secret all her meetings were.

Editorial article**IS A NEW WORLD RECESSION COMING?**

by Raya Dunayevskaya
National Chairwoman, News & Letters Committees

Even before Jimmy Carter was officially inaugurated President, he managed to violate every major promise he made during the election campaign. From the sharp slap in the face of the Black vote that elected him — his galling proposal that the racist Georgia judge, Griffin Bell, become Attorney General — to the total retreat on the economic front from his rhetorical full employment promise, there was no stopping the reactionary move backward. His own Secretary of Labor appointee, Ray Marshall, said he "would have opted for a much larger package of public works and housing . . ."

The so-called North-South dialogue — the relationship between the developed and undeveloped countries — has also fallen victim to a new form of commodity fetishism. All it has produced are two new illusory phrases — "commodity power" and "commodity stabilization". Whatever illusions on the question of "commodity power" the OPEC countries have given the Third World with their quintupling of oil prices, namely, that any country can decide for itself the price it places on its commodities, the truth is:

First, sisal and cocoa don't have the "power" of that crucial commodity, Oil. Furthermore, in the matter of raw materials, it is not the underdeveloped countries, but U.S. imperialism that would be the greatest profiteer, since it leads in production of vital materials and has the world's greatest agricultural output. Indeed, "the American connection" has long outdistanced all others in capital and military prowess. As against "the French connection" on something as common as crime, it exercises the greatest magnetism for that which is closest to the capitalist's heart—capital investment.

As opposed to the 1950s and early 1960s, when Western Europe attracted Western capitalism with its cheaper labor and U.S. technology, in the 1970s American capital has added a new incentive for world capital: a safe haven for its investments, now that European capital has decided the American proletariat is not as revolutionary as the European workers. As against the oil monopolists who are spending their billions on buying Western technology and military hardware, and whose actual investments in the U.S. are not directed to the capital goods market, West German, French and British capitals. However, so deep is the economic crisis in the U.S. and in the world that such European investment in the U.S. is, likewise, only a palliative.

The decisive failure is that U.S. capital has not expanded its plants and equipment sufficiently; in fact, it is stagnating. Nor is U.S. capital planning to expand, as it complains about the falling rate of profit.

It is here, just here, that Big Business is pressuring the Carter Administration for greater incentives for capital investment rather than the one-shot deal of a tax-cut.

Let us, therefore, turn with sober senses to look at the American economy, and see how worried Big Business and its ideologists are about the so-called "pause" in the alleged economic upturn.

ALIENATED LABOR'S REALITY

Take Lawrence A. Viet, International Economist and Deputy Manager at Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co (not to mention his previous position as economist at the State and Treasury Departments), who openly speaks

of a "premature cyclical downturn"⁽¹⁾ rather than what Ernest Mandel calls "the generalized economic recession coming to an end in 1975."⁽²⁾ Further, Viet points not only to the economic problems, but "the changing attitudes to work itself among the younger generation." Here it can already be seen that serious bourgeois analysts do see that the question of Alienated Labor is not "just theory." It is concrete. It is urgent. It affects the "cyclical downturn." Opposition to alienated labor has long been a fact (and not only among the younger generation), and has intensified since Automation first came onto the historic scene in the U.S. in 1950.

What we are presently experiencing is the worst of the five post-War recessions, along with the slowest post-War recovery which is so globally pervasive that the top bourgeois economists and industrialist fear it is not "sustainable" even at that low level of "recovery." Thus, the Economic Outlook, issued in Paris, Dec. 23 by the Secretariat of the 24-nation body of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, was gloomy even after they disregarded "the depressive influence of falling farm income."⁽³⁾ (which they expected would not repeat itself in 1977), and even after, as spokesmen for top rulers of the world, they were a great deal more worried about higher inflation than high unemployment.

Still, "to correct flagging growth rates" and inject sufficient stimulus, 8 percent economic growth would be needed, and that means \$20 billion! President-elect Carter, however, is projecting only 5 percent economic growth as his goal, and that would slide down to 4.5 percent by mid-year!

Now 5 percent (6 percent, for that matter) is a far cry from the 8 percent growth Carter projected during the campaign, when the high rhetoric also deceptively spoke of "getting the country back to full employment." He is still saying that the present official 7.9 percent unemployment is "unacceptable," but "full employment" has completely dropped out of the rhetoric. The truth is that it is precisely Marx's discernment of capitalism's "law of motion," that ever greater expansion of constant capital as against living labor would bring it to its own collapse, that has been transformed from theory to grim reality. What has become grimmest, and most threatening to capitalism's dominance, is that the army of unemployed has risen to an unconscionable number as a permanent feature of the economy.

The "investment drought" is a great deal more than just "hesitant." What is interesting in the Foreign Affairs current issue's analysis of "The Troubled World Economy" is that it is warning "the West" not to be overly happy with their "petro-recyclers," that is to say, Big

Capital's way of getting those oil billions, from the five-fold increase of prices, back from the Middle East potentates and into its own hands by selling machinery and military hardware, and at highly inflated prices at that.

VITAL LABOR POWER

Even bourgeois economists understand that the centerpiece, the nerve, the muscle as well as the soul of all of capitalist production is labor—the extraction from living labor of all the unpaid hours of labor that is the surplus value, the profits—and that, therefore, neither the market, nor political manipulation by the state, nor control of that crucial commodity at this moment—oil—can go on endlessly without its relationship to the life-and-death commodity: labor power. Foreign Affairs concludes: "cartels don't have infinite lives . . . (and thus) will one day narrow the conditions between prices of energy and cost of production." It costs between 12 cents and 35 cents to extract a barrel of oil; OPEC sells it for \$12 a barrel.

Business Week's special double issue at year's end (Dec. 27, 1976) on "Investment Outlook," tries its best to sound optimistic. It gloats over the 30 percent increase

in net profits in 1976 and expects a further 10-15 percent increase for 1977. But it cannot skip over the following determinants: (1) the low rate of growth; (2) the hardly moveable high rate of unemployment of 7 percent officially, which does not change the truth that this is "average," but among Black youth it is at the fantastic rate of 34.1 percent; (3) the volatile undercurrent of dissatisfaction in the relationship between the underdeveloped countries and the industrialized lands to whom they are indebted at an impossible-to-meet \$60 billion; and (4) the unevenness of growth within the country, which shows that so basic an industry as steel has undergone a 17 percent drop in growth. At the same time, so bleak is the international outlook that Business Week, in summing up the outlook, cannot exclude even depression: "If Washington fails, fears of new world depression will intensify."

The seeming world-wide economic recovery early last year fell flat. The present world-wide slump in steel is more than symptomatic of the fact that there never was a serious recovery. Since steel's market is capital goods, the failure to invest in new plants and equipment signified that not even the 1974 levels of plant and equipment had been reached in the latest "economic upturn."

Evidently, the latest hike in steel prices is not a satisfactory compensation to the steel industry, which keeps complaining about a decline in the rate of profit. Thus, the president of Republic Steel Corp., W. J. De Lancey, complains that the Carter program "does not come to grips with the principal impediment to continued economic progress—a severe lack of investment incentive."⁽⁴⁾ One element in Big Business' criticism is that it points to the deep inner contradiction in capitalism's very mode of production, which is constantly increasing the output for machinery and decreasing the number of employed from whom, alone, it can extract unpaid hours of labor, i.e. profits.

Or take the other "miracle" of the stable Western economy, West Germany. It does have the lowest rate of inflation and it has succeeded in bamboozling organized labor not to demand "extraordinary" wage increases. Nevertheless, actual investments in real, rather than inflated, prices have fallen three years in a row.

STATE AID FAILURE

The new and startling fact, insofar as Big Business is concerned, is that even state help, i.e. state intervention and state planning has not, been capable of inducing the reorganization of capital's basic structure in a way that it was possible when capitalism could save itself from fatal ramifications of the decline in the rate of profit by ever-greater production, technological revolution, and the army of unemployed. Now the army of unemployed has become a permanent feature of the economy and induces fear of revolution in the capitalist's mind.

Moreover, by now its very mode of production makes capitalism invest so much more for machinery and raw materials than for the workers it employs, that its profits decline and capital stagnates. Suddenly, therefore, every nation realizes (even one as rich as the U.S.) that, on a national scale, it is impossible to solve the economic crisis. Nor can it take itself outside of the world economy, with or without plan, with or without state protection.

It is the age of world state-capitalism, and this development has no more solved its deep economic crisis than when full state-capitalism came to a single nation, Russia or China. As for inflation, it is true that the deep recession, which was triggered by those prices after the 1973 Arab-Israeli war, was by no means the only reason for the double-digit inflation, any more than that sickness could be ascribed, as Big Capital wishes to ascribe it, to workers' wages. The overwhelming reality is this: Just as monopoly growth inhibited national economic

growth, so the oil cartel has actually lowered world growth.

The deep recession, in the U.S. and globally, is by no means over, though some who consider themselves Marxists like Mandel think that it has come "to an end in 1975." The false consciousness⁽⁵⁾ that has permeated even economists who are revolutionaries emanates from the fact that capitalism has, in the post-World War II period, come up with ways of keeping the economy going, stopping short of the type of Great Depression, 1929-32 (actually until 1939) that led to World War II. Since this time it would lead to World War III, it is "unthinkable," because it would, of necessity, be a nuclear war that would end civilization as we have known it.

GIVING ACTION DIRECTION

Thus, capitalism's ways of continuing its economic crises within recession level, rather than uncontrollable Depression, is judged to be a "stabilizer," even though it is precisely that type of concept that led to the collapse of the established Marxist (Second) International with the outbreak of the First World War. Where that shocking event had Lenin return to Marx's origins in Hegel, and the dialectic of transformation into opposite, today's Marxists plunge not only into the latest series of economic "facts" sans any dialectical rudder, but also to a violation of the dialectic structure of Marx's Capital itself. That, too, is not "just theory," but that which gives, or could give when not violated, action its direction.

On both counts, neither can a rise in prices go on without any relationship to its real cost, nor can any so-called new economic order be created with such superstructural shenanigans. Just as imperialism in post-WWII could not do for capitalism what it did when monopoly capitalism carved up the underdeveloped world before it won its freedom from imperialism, so state-capitalism cannot save it in the 1970s. The only thing that will create a new social order is the uprooting of this society and all its exploitative relations, whether it has or it has not reached its ultimate in stultification.

By having begun its opposition to the Carter Administration this early, labor and the Blacks have shown they have no intention whatever of letting the whole weight of the present economic crisis fall on their shoulders. From this opposition will flow deepening class struggles and mass revolts.

Jan-Feb '77

- (1) "The Troubled World Economy" by Lawrence A. Viet. (Foreign Affairs, January, 1977.)
- (2) See Ernest Mandel's "A Hesitant, Uneven and Inflationary Upturn": "There can be no doubt the generalized recession of the international capitalist economy came to an end in 1975 . . ." Intercontinental Press, Nov. 29, 1976.
- (3) "World Economic Outlook is Gloomy" (Paris dateline), New York Times, Dec. 23, 1976.
- (4) New York Times, Jan. 16, 1977.
- (5) Bereft of Hegelian-Marxist dialectics, one can hardly escape trying to hem in the analysis of today's crises within the bounds of bourgeois-private and state ideology, and thus inflict structuralism and the latest twist in pragmatism on Marx's greatest original work, Capital. In our day, we have the situation where a new French translation of Capital is introduced by that official Communist philosopher, Louis Althusser, who stooped to pseudo-psychanalysis to express his venom against Marx's Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic as "the prodigious 'abreaction' indispensable to the liquidation of his (Marx's) 'disordered' consciousness." And, for the English world, the beautiful new translation of Capital is burdened with an introduction by the Trotskyist epigone, Ernest Mandel, who spreads himself over some 75 pages of "introduction."

Notes from a diary: Roots, errors, and dialectics

MARCH, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

The concerted way in which the mass media are trying to escape the consequences of the impact on the masses of the eight-day TV showing of *Roots*, has sent me back to the notes from my Diary on an entirely different subject and different historic period — 1943, when Stalin tried to cover up the historic roots, that is, the dialectical processes by which a product of labor assumes the specifically capitalistic value-form of a commodity. Just as the attempt, now, is being made not to make a category of "slavery, reducing it to mere genealogy, so, then, Russian theoreticians, in revising Marx's theory of value, tried reducing the historic Subject (the exploited laborer) to labor as an "element" inherent in all production "throughout history."

SLAVERY AND NEW TIMES

It is not that slavery and wage labor are identical, of course. It is that the two concepts—yesterday's slavery and today's racism, both integral to U.S. capitalism, on the one hand, and private capitalistic wage labor and state-capitalism calling itself Communism, on the other hand—reach a point of such irreconcilable contradiction with their Subjects, that the dialectics of history, under the mass impact of the new times, erases all distinction between past and present, between concept and reality, between objective and subjective, and you desire to uproot the existing society.

To try to blot that out, in Stalin's time, Stalin's theoreticians tried to roll history back to "roots" beyond the pale, when they revised Marx's theory of value and surplus value in answer to the question the Russian students were then asking: what, precisely, was different in a Russian factory in their "socialist land" from that which Marx described in capitalistic England? In the same way, liberal journalists here today, even as the rulers in today's and yesterday's America, in sending the historic roots of slavery beyond the pale, whitewash

the racism still oozing out of every pore of "the American dream." And it isn't of course, only two different concepts that are being buried, but two different real and antagonistic worlds existing in the very same capitalistic America. Genealogy, individual genealogy at that, is a good way, they hope, to keep the racism of the present as deeply buried as the slavery of the past.

JOAN ROBINSON AND LITERARY 'STYLE'

Just as the liberal journalists and historians today are busy explaining away *Roots'* impact on the audience, so my Diary reveals that it wasn't a question that the independent academics in World War II didn't know the reality of Stalin's Russia, but that they nevertheless proceeded to explain away Stalin's startling revision of Marxism and break with the dialectic structure of Marx's *Capital* as the needed antidote to the alleged mysticism of "Hegelian dialectics." I felt this especially sharply in my 1947 discussion with the great British academic economist, Joan Robinson, who had praised the "expose" I had published in the *American Economic Review* (September, 1944 and 1945), but whose affinity of ideas actually lay with the Russian economists on the question that the law of value operated also in a "socialist society." I thereupon called to her attention what I thought was not accidental: that she had left out a pair of parentheses in a quotation from Marx in her *Essay on Marxian Economics*. Specifically, this was a quotation from p.221 of Ch. 10, Vol. III of *Capital*, which in Marx's text reads:

"(Only when production will be under the conscious and prearranged control of society, will society establish a direct relation between the quantity of social labor time employed in the production of definite articles and the quantity of the demand of society for them.)"

By having left out the parentheses, Joan Robinson made Marx's next series of sentences appear as if he were still talking of socialist production, as he continued: "the exchange or sale of commodities at their value is the rational way, the natural law of their equilibrium."

Joan Robinson got very upset as to why I had not brought the error to her attention, as the second printing of her *Essay* was going to press, I said I was sorry, but that it had never occurred to me that it was only a typographical error—it was just too ordinary an error for so serious a thinker to have made unless she literally didn't see, i.e., conceive it. On the other hand, as Hegel put it, "error is a dynamic of truth," and I hoped she would see that it was no simple matter of leaving out a

pair of parentheses, but the oh, so-needed dialectic for reading Marx. Naturally this made her angrier still: Oh you Hegellians! That is exactly what was wrong with Marx. If only he had allowed Engels, who had a good "Anglo-Saxon" style, to write his Capital for him.

UPROOTING, OR FORGETTING?

Error, indeed, does not act as a "dynamic of truth" where dialectics is rejected as the needed methodology, whether that be by bourgeois thinkers or professed Marxists. What is at stake is the recreation, not so much of causal connections between past and present, undiluted by "errors," but of uprooting the existing society. It is the neglect of this, ~~the~~ this, concept of the dialectics of negation which, in fact, is at the root of mistakes when they are serious—and it is only when they are serious that they merit becoming subjects of controversy.

Fairly recently (in the early 1970s rather than the 1940s), an error aroused my ire, again not because it was a matter of "catching" someone making a mistake, but of confronting a mistake which eradicated both a concept and a whole page of history. I was reading Fred Halliday's first translation into English of Karl Korsch's 1923 *Marxism and Philosophy*, and 1930 *Anti-Critique*, and out jumped the reference to the German edition of Marx and Engels' *Letters to Nikolai*.¹¹

For some 20 years, I had borne in silence the vulgar bourgeois scholarship's disregard of Russian history, specifically on the topic of Rosa Luxemburg's scrupulous revolutionary manner of protecting the names of dissidents of the Tsarist regime. In 1913, when she had written her greatest theoretical work, *Accumulation of Capital*, she devoted Ch. XX to Nikolai-on. By the 1920s, when "the West" first started paying attention to her work, "Russians" took for granted that everyone knew that there was no such name; that the hyphen before the "on" signified that the name was not spelled out, but was the ending of any ordinary name; and that, in fact, the name was Danielson, Nikolai Danielson was a great Russian Populist and the first editor and translator into Russian of Marx's *Capital*.

When Oxford University Press, after a lapse of nearly 40 years, finally published Rosa Luxemburg's *Accumulation of Capital* in English translation, I was shocked to find that, despite the fact that the translation is by no less a scholar than Dr. Agnes Schwarzschild; that it had a prefatory note on Rosa herself by none other than Dr. W. Stark; and that it carried a 15-page Introduction by Joan Robinson, who was full of praise for the "dynamic model" of capitalist development by Rosa Luxemburg "neglected by Marxists," nevertheless the name of Ch. XX was Nikolai-on.

With all this accumulation of erudition and high regard for Rosa Luxemburg, a "technical" error of

such vast dimensions as to eliminate nothing short of the autocratic era of Tsarist censorship could only, it seemed to me, be due to the capitalistic class character of the new discoverers of Rosa Luxemburg's work. Unfortunately, it was not limited to the bourgeois scholars.

In 1968, the Monthly Review Press reproduced it "as is." And, in 1970, in an entirely different work published by New Left Books, the German disregard of Russia's theoretical contribution is so total, that even so great an independent Marxist as Karl Korsch refers to "the outstanding introduction by the editor Kurt Mandelbaum to the German edition of Marx and Engels' *Letters to Nikolai*." By then, I did fire off an epistle to Fred Halliday, the editor of Korsch's work, stating that it was one thing for bourgeois academics to make such errors, but for Marxists to do so displays more than forgetfulness of a page of history; it is the dialectics of present history that is the issue. After some delay, I did finally get an acknowledgement from Fred Halliday, to the effect that he had turned my letter over to the publisher. There has been no second edition of Korsch's work, but why could a correction not have appeared in the *New Left Review*?

The "New Left", as the old and new academics, is so bereft of seriousness towards dialectics, be it of roots or errors, be it of history, past and present, that they all end up by tailending some state power. Which is why, "East" or "West," empiricist concepts are so far removed from the dialectics of liberation.

¹¹In a way, Joan Robinson's Preface to the second edition of her *Essay on Marxian Economics* says the same thing when she holds that Marx's "academic analysis can be separated from its unacceptable ideology," and, again, when she talks of Marx's "nineteenth-century metaphysical habits of thought"—her designation for Hegelian dialectics. What came out more sharply in our conversation (and in her commentary on *State-Capitalism and Marxism*), was the direct reference to Hegel and Marx. Her "taking sides" with the Russian theorists on the whole question of the law of value and "socialism"; as well as the dialectical structure of *Capital*, was no more accidental than her "taking sides" with the "communes" in China during the Cultural Revolution. (See her commentary on my first draft of *Marxism and Freedom*, which was called *State-Capitalism and Marxism*, in *The Raya Dunayevskaya Collection*, Vol. III, Section 3, on deposit at the Labor History Library of Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, 48202, and available on microfilm. Also see Joan Robinson's *Cultural Revolution in China*, Penguin, Baltimore, 1969.)

¹²See Karl Korsch, *Marxism and Philosophy* (New Left Books, London), 1970, p. 123, fn. 38.

New Essays: new unity of theory and practice

APRIL, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

Editor's Note: Raya Dunayevskaya is giving her column over this issue to a letter from a colleague concerning her latest pamphlet. See ad, p. 8.

Dear Raya,

I have just finished reading your New Essays for the first time as a totality, and felt that I had to write you this note, because I had been so impressed with Philosophy and Revolution, especially with Chapter One on Hegel, that I didn't think anything could add to it, in its universality and concreteness. But what you have achieved in "Dialectics of Liberation: Absolute Negativity as New Beginning" is so new that for the first time I see what the term "new" you are always using really means.

So limited is the essay to one single chapter of Hegel's Science of Logic — the final one, "Absolute Idea" — so rigorous and textual is it, moving paragraph by paragraph through those final 27 paragraphs of the Logic, that at first sight it would seem that no concrete — or "political" — conclusions could be revealed. But in fact, what I come to understand by the time I reach your conclusion is that the newness is not alone in relation to ourselves as revolutionaries and as Marxists, but even in relation to Hegel himself.

NONE OF THE Hegelians, whether of the "non-political" variety, or those that considered themselves socialists — like Theodor Adorno — have been able to see Absolute Idea, not as pinnacle, not as conclusion, but as the mediation that creates an immediacy. From the very beginning of the essay, your insistence that "the Absolute Idea is a new beginning, a new beginning that is inevitable, precisely because the Absolute Idea is a 'concrete totality' and thus entails differentiation and impulse to transcend," struck me as the new ground on which to work through Absolute Idea — by subjecting it to Hegel's own method.

Such revolutionary excitement is created in following the Idea in self-movement that I feel that anyone reading

this would have to see in the dialectic no separation between Absolute Form, the Method, the Notion, all revolving around the pivot of "universal absolute activity." No longer can it be vulgarly said that Marx "revolutionized" the Hegelian dialectic. Instead, Marx's actualization of the dialectic as "a new Humanism" is seen as the realization of a philosophic method that was already revolutionary — and which drew its revolutionary passion not from speculation, but from 2,500 years of the history of the struggle for freedom — even if "only" as the freedom of the Idea — culminating in the great French Revolution.

The truth is that, even if one wished to call what you have accomplished here a "re-statement" of Hegel, it would be a "re-statement" unlike any that has been created up to this historic moment. While Hegel constantly stressed the necessity of considering things "in and for themselves," generations of those studying his method — academics and Marxists seeking to "apply" the dialectic — have missed the source of that method's explosive energy. Their failure stands out all the more starkly when one considers the clarity with which you express it: "The point is that it is the power of the negative which is the creative element; it is not the synthesis, but the absolute negativity which assures the advance movement."

The height is reached in the last paragraph of the entire Science of Logic, which even Lenin skipped over in his Philosophic Notebooks, saying "further till the end of the page is unimportant." You have proved that what Hegel is stating in that last paragraph is what he will not "know" until he writes the final three syllogisms of Philosophy of Mind (paragraphs 575, 576, 577) in 1830. In doing so, you have brought in both the movement from practice and the movement from theory. In other words, you have shown that Hegel is here anticipating himself.

IS THE ANSWER to why you were able to see this anticipation, where Hegel scholars who had spent their lives could not, the same reason that you are demanding that all attention be paid to the third syllogism (paragraph 577) where "Logic has been replaced, and in its

stead we get, not the sequential, but the consequential Self-Thinking Idea"? In other words, does the dialectical distinction lie in the opposition between Absolute Negativity as Absolute Method and every other method of thought in which substance rules, even when substance is as high as the system itself?

This whole question of Hegel's "anticipating himself" has really set me to thinking, both backward to the

76 9 8 3

process of your coming to such ideas and "forward" to Mao's death and today's headlines on China. The work that I have been doing with your archives has been tremendously revealing of the "labor, patience and suffering of the negative" that revolutionary theory must undergo if it is to meet — and in this case "meet" must also mean "anticipate" — the movement from practice. After working with your 1945-50 philosophic correspondence, I am convinced that the phrase "it is no accident" fails completely to explain your discovery of a movement from practice in your *Letters on Hegel's Absolute Idea* six weeks before the East German masses gave that movement a world reality in their June 17, 1953 revolt against Russian totalitarianism.

THERE IS ANOTHER sense in which I was impressed by the "newness" of your essay. I felt more that it is only because you have penetrated so deeply into philosophy that you have been able to see the biggest headlines as anticipation — not the crystal-ball kind, but as theoretic preparation for each new moment, and for revolution itself. Take the essay which begins the pamphlet: "Post-Mao China: What Now?" It was written one short month after Mao's death, yet has both a scope and a specificity which still escapes the China commentators.

If anything was needed to show philosophy's importance, it is the contrast between your essay and Julius Jacobson's "Notes on Mao's Death" in the current *New Politics*. Jacobson certainly thinks he agrees with you — politically. But in reading his piece, you don't get any idea why Mao had ever achieved the great national revolution he undeniably headed. There is a failure to see either the peasantry as revolutionary force, or the appreciation of philosophy in the depth of the idea of freedom which makes you believe that each person can really be 10,000.

This is exactly what Mao misuses in the Great Leap Forward, and what makes his counter-revolution the worst of all state-capitalisms. Far from national revolution representing for Mao a necessary moment in the path to world revolution, thought and action divide totally when Mao assumes state power. By the time his refusal to back Hanoi as U.S. bombs are raining down on that country exposes him, the Chinese revolution has been transformed into a national state-capitalism fighting for global mastery, whose "proletarian internationalism" turns out to be a new imperialism. If the new beginning with which you face the crisis of our nuclear age is anything less than Absolute Negativity, there is every sort of counter-revolution waiting for you.

THIS IS THE ground of the Trotsky essay as well. Not that Trotsky was ever a counter-revolutionist or retrogressionist. You show him as a great man and a great lifelong revolutionary. Yet Trotsky's "permanent revolution" doesn't end up equalling world revolution. Especially where the peasantry is concerned, self-movement, self-determination fall before the immovable substance of their "incapability of an independent political role, and even less a leading one."

Just two points on your exchange with Mandel printed after the Trotsky essay. His vulgarisms on the peasantry made me laugh, as his position changes three times in as many paragraphs. I am sure there is the closest relation between these attitudes and his disgraceful introduction to the new British edition of Marx's *Capital*. Everyone should read your critique of it. * I also couldn't get over his male chauvinist arrogance. It is really so damning when the Fourth International's supposed "internationalization" of Women's Liberation is exposed by their biggest theoretician's own sexism.

Freedom, Michael Connolly

*Available in "The Raya Dunayevskaya Collection" on deposit at Wayne State University. A guide can be ordered from News & Letters for 35c.

**See Political-Philosophic Letter, "Today's Global Crises and Marx's *Capital*," available from News & Letters for 50¢ (See ad, p. 6).

6983

Tony Cliff degrades Lenin as theoretician

MAY, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

The second volume of Tony Cliff's three-volume study of Lenin, which has just been published, is a most curious compilation. Though subtitled, *All Power To The Soviets*, and although it follows the first volume which already had centered on *Building The Party* (and is so subtitled), it is that same vanguardist theme that permeates Volume II as well. Indeed, the Foreword explains that the reason for the book, when Trotsky's monumental *History of the Russian Revolution* had already covered that period so magnificently, is the latter's "serious defect": "The one thing noticeably missing is the Bolshevik Party: its rank and file, its cadres, its local committees, its Central Committee." (p. ix)

So weighted down is Tony Cliff with the concept of the vanguard party to lead and the "calibre of leadership", that he does not deign so much as to mention the philosophic break Lenin experienced at the shock of the simultaneity of the outbreak of World War I and the collapse of the Second International.

The Chronology does list: "23 August/5 September Lenin arrives in Berne (Switzerland)"—and then proceeds to mention that Lenin presented his thesis on war to a Bolshevik conference. But neither there, nor in the whole 411 pages of text, Notes, and Index, is there a single word that Lenin repaired to the library to study Hegel's *Science of Logic* and that Lenin's "Abstract of Hegel's *Logic*" took from September to Dec. 17, 1914 to complete (1)—after which followed 1915 and more "On Dialectics" and everything from Imperialism to Marxism and the State, the first version of *State and Revolution*.

ON JAN. 5, 1915, Lenin addressed a letter to *Encyclopaedia Granat*, for which he had written the essay, "Karl Marx". He was trying to recall it in order to make "certain corrections in the section on dialectics . . . I have been studying this question of dialectics for the last month and a half and I could add something to

*Tony Cliff, *Lenin*, Vol. II, Pluto Press, London: Distributed in the U.S. by Urizon, \$17.50.

it if there was time . . ." Evidently there was no time—or at least the bourgeois Granat found no time—to allow Lenin to make his corrections, much less to try to figure out what had happened in those six weeks in Lenin's thought. No doubt it was hard to understand why Lenin, in the midst of a world holocaust, was so pre-occupied with dialectics.

Sixty-one years later, a Marxist theoretician like Tony Cliff is still so little concerned with Hegelian dialectics that he fails to see its relevance either to Lenin or Marx—or Imperialism, to which he does devote Chapter 4. That chapter is the perfect proof that empiricists who are bereft of methodology cannot appreciate methodology in others because they so totally deviate from the revolutionary vision. Thus, Tony Cliff informs us that "in terms of the actual description of modern capitalism, Lenin is not original at all, and borrows practically everything from Bukharin." (p. 61) This follows a statement on what Lenin "owed to the people who had studied modern capitalism before—above all Hobson and Hilferding." (2)

That happens to be exactly what bourgeois economists—who have never pretended to be concerned with dialectics as have Marxists (either as philosophy or as revolution)—have always contended. Tony Cliff does them one better by drawing the further conclusion that "the difference between the two books (Bukharin's and Lenin's on Imperialism, rd) is radical—a difference between a theoretical treatise on Imperialism and a political pamphlet on the same subject." (p. 61)

THE GROUND FOR this degradation of Lenin as theoretician is, in fact, laid in Vol. I (p. 256) where Cliff writes: "It was hardly an exaggeration for the Bolshevik historian M. N. Pokrovsky to write, 'You will not find in Lenin a single purely theoretical work; each has a propaganda aspect.'" In Vol. II, Cliff not only leads up to Chapter 4 by telling us (in the chapter on the National Question) that "many of the leading comrades in Russia did not understand why Lenin was so vehement in his opposition to Bukharin" (p. 56 fn), but in the very chapter on Imperialism he skips to Lenin's *Will* (12/23-24/1922) to quote Lenin on Bukharin as the "big-

gest theoretician", without so much as mentioning that a "but" follows: "but his (Bukharin's) theoretical views can only with the very greatest doubt be regarded as fully Marxian, for there is something scholastic in him. (He has never learned, and I think never fully understood, the dialectic.)"

What is this dialectic that made Lenin say—and not just in a polemical way, but in his *Will*—that his Bolshe-

vik co-leader, Bukharin, who had never betrayed, who was always a revolutionary, who was, in fact, "the favorite of the whole party" and a "major theoretician", was "not fully a Marxist" because he had "never fully understood the dialectic". The very work that Tony Cliff considers so theoretically superior to Lenin's popularization was the one that Lenin had first introduced favorably but after grappling with Hegel's dialectic, found so non-dialectical that he undertook his own study.

Secondly, and foremost, Lenin found Bukharin's opposition to self-determination not just bereft of the "dialectic of history", but so total an impediment to working with new national revolutionary forces, such as Irish revolutionaries, that he designated Bukharin's position as nothing short of "imperialist economism".

TONY CLIFF'S SINGULAR empiricism — like all empiricism, bereft of all methodology — is beyond comprehension of Lenin's theory — theory, not just a "popular outline." By leaving out Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks* (3), Cliff not only skips over "philosophy"; but the dialectics of liberation as self-developing Subject, that is to say, the actual masses in revolt. Thus by no accident whatever, the chapter on the "National Question", on which Cliff is supposed to agree with Lenin, not Bukharin, has not a word to say about the Irish Revolution, which was the concrete "topic" under discussion. What was decisive were live revolutionaries. Their appearances on the historic stage had sharpened to a fever pitch all the tendencies fighting Lenin's position.

This was not the Austrian Socialists in the 19th century (where Tony Cliff chooses to begin), nor even Poland, 1912, when the National Question was still debated just as "principle", as "theory", nor the Bund. Though he still keeps away from referring to the Easter Rebellion, Cliff is finally forced to quote Lenin: "The dialectics of history are such that small nations, powerless as an independent factor in the struggle against imperialism, play a part as one of the ferments, one of the bacilli, which help the real anti-imperialist force, the socialist proletariat, to make its appearance on the scene."

But meanwhile they hadn't, 1917 was still to be. And when it did come it was preceded by Lenin's *State and Revolution* that was first begun in those same critical years, 1914-16, when Lenin was grappling with Hegelian dialectics as philosophy, as politics, as economics, as self-developing Subject, "The dialectics proper" — Lenin's phrase — had to be shown as "the living tree of living, fertile, genuine, powerful, omnipotent, objective, absolute human knowledge" because "it is impossible fully to grasp Marx's *Capital*, and especially its first chapter, if you have not studied through and understood the whole of Hegel's *Logic*. Consequently, none of the Marxists for the past half century have understood Marx!"

By eliminating this from his study of Lenin, it is no

wonder that Tony Cliff reaches the climax of his comprehension — I mean non-comprehension — of Lenin by singling out Lenin's "uncanny intuition. In a period of great changes, the number of unknown factors, not only in the enemy camp, but also in our own, is so great that sober analysis alone will not suffice. An unsurpassed ability to detect the mood of the masses was Lenin's most important gift." (p.278)

What then of Cliff's indispensable party to lead? Ah, Cliff brings it all back in the penultimate paragraph: "The crucible of October furnished the supreme test of his (Lenin's) strategy, and of the calibre of his leadership of the party and the class."

(1) When Moscow finally published Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks* in English in 1961, they not only left out Adoratsky's Introduction to the first Russian edition of 1930, but also the Lenin Institute's listing of what books Lenin called for not just in Berne, 1914-16, but in Russia after taking power. It bears repeating Adoratsky: "Despite the fact . . . of the extreme situation and the necessity to give all attention and all energy to practical questions, Lenin continued to interest himself in questions of philosophy. This is evident from his readings . . . On June 24, 1921 he asked for a Russian translation of Hegel's *Logic and Phenomenology of Mind* . . . Lenin not only read but wrote on the question and philosophy. Nine-tenths of the remarks on Bukharin's *Economics of the Transition Period* concern the question of method."

(2) Cliff picks out the quantitative fact of "148 books, 232 articles" that Lenin read and annotated, but says not a single word that while preparing the pamphlet he had read *Phenomenology of Mind*, much less any attempt to dig into the abbreviated "popular outline" to see there such dialectical principles as "transformation into opposite", or the relationship between Hegel's "attitudes to objectivity" and Lenin's analysis of those "other studies" that Lenin "owes" so much to.

(3) In Vol. I, Cliff does have one single reference (p. 291) to "dialectically terse and lively *Philosophic Notebooks*" at the point where he criticizes *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. One would have thought that, even if Cliff had no time for concretizing his terse single statement on the *Notebooks*, his preoccupation with the Party should have led him to see that, Stalinist detractors notwithstanding, Lenin himself had not a word on "partyness of philosophy." Instead, Cliff's point is that it was supposedly only "in the period of reaction after the revolution" that "Marxist philosophy inevitably came to the fore" (Vol. I, p. 289) No wonder he could not see the *Notebooks* as Lenin's philosophic preparation for revolution.

EDITORIAL

JUNE, 1977

Smile but be armed—and think the unthinkable

Carter recreates sedative for nuclear proliferation and economic crises

What was little recorded in the press, which was too busy stirring up the hullabaloo about Carter's "summit success," is the one genuine U.S. imperialist victory Carter could preside over after the phony summit at 10 Downing Street. As soon as that front show was over, he took off for a NATO meeting where the real policy is set: ever greater rearmament, new weaponry ordered and slaughter planned.

There Carter not only called attention to Russia's "essential strategic nuclear equivalence" with the U.S. but stressed Russia's "offensive posture." Thereupon, NATO Secretary General M. A. Luns followed with a description of the ever "bolder" Russian "intrusions abroad" off northern Norway "to the point that a submarine recently entered the Narvik fjord."

There Carter called for the need to create more precision guided missiles and insisted that at no matter what cost, preparations for the new technology of the 1980s must start at once. Thereupon NATO's naval commander in the Atlantic Ocean, Admiral Isaac C. Kidd, was empowered to draw up "contingency plans" for operations beyond the present alliance boundary of the Tropic of Cancer. Whether that was to "protect" oil tankers from the Persian Gulf bound for Europe and the U.S., or for purposes of Western "intrusions abroad," the global aims stick out all too distinctly.

Clearly, Carter's call "to combine, coordinate and concert" all defense programs not only met with unanimity at NATO, but was being implemented before even being pronounced. Thus, General Luns, helping to stir up fear that has ever been the way of rulers to direct the masses to the enemy they choose to name, not only babbled about everything from Russia stationing 100,000 Russian troops in central Europe to its allegedly developing a "death ray" to immobilize all U.S. missiles.

**CARTER A SUCCESS AT NATO:
SCHMIDT THE VICTOR AT SUMMIT**

Carter is hardly waiting for "proof" of that, or his own new weaponry of the 1980s, but at once called for the relocation of ground forces in West Germany, which remains the key point of the international situation for all war mongers, be it for "conventional" wars or a nuclear world holocaust: World War III. Instead of American, Dutch and Belgian troops, as presently, being based well west of potential battle area, they are to move closer to the frontier between West and East Germany.

Finally, what completed his total success at NATO, with those he commanded, was that, far from asking West Europe to "bear its share of the cost" as pre-summitry propaganda had it, Carter assured one and all that the U.S. would "continue" the support and reinforcement of the U.S. "presence" there, including, above all, its nuclear umbrella.

This didn't mean that the West European rulers (or Japan for that matter) would rely on that nuclear umbrella alone, much less be ordered about by the U.S. Quite the contrary. West Germany's Helmut Schmidt, at one and the same time, not only announced that he was going through with the \$4-\$8 billion nuclear reactor deal with Brazil, but that Germany itself would spend \$2.7 billion for nuclear "research." Supposedly this was for peaceful purposes, as part of alternative energy sources not dependent on oil, but in fact, it frees Germany from total reliance on the U.S. nuclear umbrella.

After hitting out at Carter before the conference, and continuing with his own brand of hypocrisy, Schmidt said that, of course, he "understands" Carter's aim to see that there is no access to fuel-process technology that could lead to atomic arms manufacture by "evil-minded countries that evade international control." But, of course, neither that ex-Nazi nor the militaristic regimes in Latin America he is selling nuclear reactors to are "evil-minded!"

It isn't that Carter was "taken in" by such statements. The real reason the summitry of the seven nations at 10 Downing Street May 7-8 decided not to touch that divisive issue is the totality of the economic crisis which they have no way of getting out of as it is, much less if they dared stop the export of nuclear reactors. No less than 100,000 West German jobs now depend, directly and indirectly, on the construction of these nuclear power stations. This is equal to the number involved in the national aerospace industrial complex. In a word, what employment there is heavily dependent on militarization, including atomic.

The economic turbulence that lies ahead, as well as that which undermines it now; the undercurrent of revolt that led to such near total revolutions as the Portuguese; the Russian nuclear buildup which will hardly stop anymore than the U.S., even if there is a SALT deal, is what also relates to Helmut Schmidt's inflated victory at 10 Downing Street. Politically, too, he was "in advance" of his co-capitalistic rulers abroad, i.e., seeing how to shore up NATO's soft underbelly in Portugal. He was first to send in money and "political line" to the present "Socialist" Prime Minister Soares, and thus to assure military bases to NATO.

The 1,600 journalists, TV cameramen and other mass media pundits that swarmed to London for the conference, followed the star—President Carter—around wherever he went, but hardly asked Carter any embarrassing questions. About the only question that did

point to reality—how does the conference expect to succeed when neither the 1975 Rambouillet nor the 1976 Puerto Rico conference achieved any resolution to the economic crises?—was allowed to float away with a Carter smile. When you know that a "world at peace" spends no less than \$250 billion for the military, what can be said of its "economic base"?

**NATIONALISMS, INCLUDING
EURO-COMMUNISM**

Even such permanent arms economy, which has kept capitalism from total collapse, is only delaying the day of reckoning. It has not halted the permanent unemployed army, or the ever-rising inflation, much less the undercurrent of revolt which is constantly bursting out into the open, and presently destabilizing the Establishment in Western Europe and in Japan. It is this which has had Carter constantly backing off on every point he had announced before the summit, from trying to control nuclear proliferation to the pretense of upholding "human rights."

Yet, though Carter easily enough gave up having any such statements included in the official communiqué; and though he kept up the pretense that he is not worried about Euro-Communism—each country has a

6 9 87 7

right to have a government of its choice, he said with a smile—he in fact was busy, at one and the same time, both beefing up military bases in Spain and Portugal, and encouraging d'Estaing to align with his far right to make sure that the French SP-CP coalition does not come to power.

The truth is that, for the so-called common goals of trying to maintain economic growth, lower inflation, and do something to stop the constantly expanding unemployed army, time is running out for capitalism, private as well as state. The overriding fact of capitalism, world capitalism, is stagnation. Stagnation of economic growth, Stagnation of employment, Stagnation of politics. As d'Estaing had to admit: "The problem of unemployment and especially unemployment among the youth, is the basic challenge to our whole economic system."

The 24 country Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development study conceded that, even if there is some immediate economic upturn, there is no way to avoid "the longer term imbalance between the growing demand for employment and the absorptive capacity of the economy." Once again the word is stagnation, decay, a system that has long outlived its usefulness.

To help West Europe look whole when in fact it is going to pieces, Carter "gave in", first to West Germany, then to France, and also tolerated Italy. The crises are just too many, even if one disregards what happened directly after that summitry which included meeting also with Assad and talking of "peace in the Middle East," only to be confronted with Israel moving to the far right in its election and another Arab-Israeli war looming ahead. The festering conflict between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus likewise refuses to go away.

And should it be possible to put all those conflicts, plus the stalled Tokyo round of the trade talks, on the back burner, there is still the overriding fear of Euro-Communism coming to power: both in Italy and France, France especially. With that in mind they are all exaggerating just how close to power is the SP-CP alliance in France. The virulent new nationalisms—whether of the standard chauvinistic private enterprise variety; or Communist nationalism, planned state-capitalism; or the latest hybrid, Maltese—"progressive"—cannot stand on their own feet.

Each is being helped by Big Capital—East, West, Gold Circle Middle East—and in the case of Malta, helped by both China and Libya. And in the not too far distance is the latest flareup of the Sino-Soviet conflict, very sharply tied to the myriad crises not just in "the West" or the "East"; but between the two nuclear titans—U.S. and Russia—vying for single world domination. To that end it is necessary to lull the people and make it palatable to think the unthinkable—nuclear holocaust!

Let's take a closer look at the newest heating up of the Sino-Soviet conflict to see just how it is, in fact, directed westward.

SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT, "THEORIES" AND PRACTICES

Accusing China of wanting to return "to the time not only of cold war, but of a shooting war as well", Pravda, on May 14, spread itself over two pages to give its version of the latest flare-up in the Sino-Soviet conflict: "China is today the only country in the world whose official circles advocate publicly and without any camouflage a new world slaughter."

The Russian rulers turned to the real target: the rumor that the U.S. may sell arms to China: "The leaders of the military-industrial complexes of the U.S., West Germany, Japan and some other capitalist countries are actively discussing the possibility of supplying China with arms and military equipment." Likening this to the "appeasement" which brought on World War II, the implication became unmistakable: if the West "dares" to do any such thing, Russia will not sit idly by. Indeed, the on-again off-again, hot/cold negotiations on SALT are a great deal more related to whether or not China is succeeding in arranging deals with the West, than to the "displeasure" with Carter's rhetoric on "human rights."

The one thing that distinguishes the "pragmatic West" from the supposedly "dogmatic East" is that the latter does try to theorize about its pragmatic imperialist thrusts. April has been a month of such balance sheets since April 22, the birth of Lenin, had been used by China, in 1960, to announce the public opening of the Sino-Soviet conflict. In 1977 it was used by Russia to declare its new scowling at Euro-Communism as theoreticians from 75 CPs met in Czechoslovakia under auspices of World Marxist Review.

The month of April was taken up with preparing "theoretic" ground, at one and the same time, for fighting post-Mao China leadership and scowling at Euro-Communism which they had previously very nearly "approved."

Now there was an attack on "nationalist deviations" from needed "international solidarity." Most significant of all was the fact that this theory was by no means limited to the theoretical journal. Quite the contrary. The practices which are as imperialist as any in the pragmatic West, get "theorized"—and at once militarized. And thus it was that the scowling at Euro-Communism (with its own "internationalism" made as chauvinistically clear as possible), and the attack on China, that replied in kind, was reiterated in the Armed Forces daily, Red Star.

BACK HOME

As if Russian sabre-rattling wasn't disturbing enough, U.S. imperialism did some of its own—and not only regarding U.S. "defense," but spilling over onto the energy front. To the rescue, giving the West its "labor" coloration, came Tony Benn, Britain's Minister of Energy. In defense of Carter's energy proposals, as if they weren't all directed against the masses and for the military, that Minister said: "President Carter's new energy proposals confront the massed alliance of the world nuclear lobby."

Mr. Benn followed this up by denying that the way energy proposals were directed was to the right. He insisted that this was not a question of Left-Right, or Labor-Capital, but supposedly "democracy" vs. "technology" and, while the Labor Party Minister was all for "democracy," nevertheless: "Can you put the genie back into the bottle, or the plutonium back into the uranium? Carter's decision to re-examine the whole problem is good."

The "re-examination," unfortunately, is not for purposes of seeing what to do either about unemployment or inflation or the North-South dialogue, but only to excuse the continued proliferation of atomic energy by both West Germany and France, by both the U.S. and Japan, by Britain and the Middle East, by both South Africa and other chauvinistic narrow nationalisms that are at this very moment thinking the unthinkable. The only thing that will stop this mad scramble for single world domination, is the mass resistance and undercurrent of revolts that once and for all can put an end to the exploitative, class-dominated, racist, sexist society that dares call itself "civilization."

—Raya Dunayevskaya
Chairwoman, National Editorial Board

Chiang Ch'ing, Hua Kuo-feng in post-Mao China

JULY, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

The first of the four tasks the new Communist Party Chairman, Hua Kuo-feng, set for China for 1977 was "to deepen the great mass movement to expose and criticize 'the gang of four.' This is the central task." (1) In its prefatory note to the speech, Peking Review stressed that "1977 will be a year in which we shall smash 'the gang of four' completely."

SMASH, SMASH, SMASH

It is not that Hua's speech to that point needed any further emphasis, as he devoted no less than eight of the 14-page speech at the Second National Conference on "Learning from Tachai on Agriculture" to that one point. Furthermore, point two, "to strengthen Party building," likewise turned out to be a villification of the four former leaders—Wang Hung-wen, Yao Wen-yuan, Chang Chun-chiao, and Chiang Ch'ing who is alleged to have been the ringleader who had taken advantage of being Mao's wife to mislead 800 million Chinese, in these many years.

Here is how he wound up the whole of the speech and thus the two remaining tasks — "to learn from Tachai" to strive "to push the national economy forward," and finally "to study conscientiously and well the works by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and Chairman Mao's works": "Immediately after smashing the 'gang of four,' the Central Committee adopted a decision on the publication of the Selected Works of Mao." Hua then singled out from the new Volume V — actually writings from 1949 to 1957 — "Chairman Mao's brilliant

(1) Peking Review, January 1, 1977. It is also reproduced in China Quarterly, March, 1977. Evidently this conference on "Learning from Tachai in Agriculture" was followed by another "Learning from Tachai in Industry", and there Hua projected no less than "10 more oilfields to be built." Manchester Guardian, 3/22/77, "Brave New Targets of Hua" by John Gittings.

work, On the Ten Major Relationships (2) which is "to guide all" in the fight against Russian revisionism and "the smashing of the gang of four."

The way Hua edited that volume, especially that "brilliant" article, is a tale unto itself, to which we will return later to see if there is any connection whatever between Chiang Ch'ing and this article which supposedly will aid us in "smashing the gang of four." Here, instead, it is necessary to start "at the beginning" — 1962 — the year that Chiang Ch'ing singled out as so crucial that she very nearly dated the "Cultural Revolution" at that time, adding only as an afterthought, that, "of course, the real" beginning was the summer of 1966, since that is when "the masses" began the Cultural Revolution.

Now, what was so crucial about 1962? I don't mean its significance insofar as the annals of Chinese Communist history, which record 1962 as the Socialist Education Campaign. I mean its significance for Chiang who felt very much discriminated against and underestimated in her own right rather than just the wife of Mao.

CHIANG CH'ING AND THE TALE SHE TOLD^o

It is true that when she begins her story—"Let me dissect myself before you"—Chiang starts with her childhood and details all her suffering. The "true story" is also that she was a revolutionary long before she came to Yenan, and married Mao. And once she became the dominant force in the arts during the Cultural Revolution, she wrought vengeance on those Communist leaders who hadn't given her her due in the 1930s.

But what predominated all her actions and ambitions was to be a leader in Mao's eyes, and in 1962, for the very first time, Mao permitted her to draft a policy statement on the arts known as May 16th Circular (p. 304). This, then, becomes the year her self-development

(2) China Quarterly, March, 1977, carries both On the Ten Major Relationships, as edited by Hua and thus now the official version of the Mao Tse-tung speech of April 25, 1956, and a comparison of it and other versions by Stuart R. Schram. "Comrade Chiang Ch'ing" by Roxane Witke, Boston, Little, Brown and Co., \$15. Pagination below is to this volume.

reaches the high point from which what Mao was later to call her "wild ambitions" took off. So much so that, much as she knows and believes Russia is the enemy, the Sino-Soviet conflict which predominated those very years—1960-1964—plays a subordinate part to her never-ending preparations for what would, four years later, become her zenith: "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution."

Unfortunately, that is true not only for Chiang but for her professor-biographer who had five years to research something she certainly knew before she ever started, and yet we get not one whiff of the serious theoretical debates of the Sino-Soviet conflict when Mao first began to challenge Russia, not just for Sinification of Marxism, but for world leadership. Yet it is this, this precisely, which preceded the Cultural Revolution, was its leitmotif, and without which it is impossible to understand the changing global relations that, at one and the same time, made it possible for Chiang to exercise influence as Mao's health was failing, and, while he was still alive, led to the beginning of the end of Chiang's reign.

MALE CHAUVINISM

Instead, we get a sort of Chinese version of Roxane Witke on male chauvinism. Male chauvinism surely is rife in China and Chiang suffered from it at various times, even as all suffered from Chiang's philistinism. Shouldn't the author have been more perceptive as to the reasons why Chiang herself did not attribute what she considered her overly-long march to power to male chauvinism? What point was there to interpreting Chiang's competitiveness with Mao as "teaching the Chairman not only to love her as a woman, but also to respect her as a political figure not to be monopolized by any one man" (p. 449)? And what, exactly, does the phrase, "not to be monopolized by any one man" mean at a time when the author does make clear that the measure Chiang thought she was creating was nothing short of "eventually changing the nation's life"?

A more objective and sharper picture of some of Chiang's history emerges from two photographs (among the series following p. 220) than from the lengthy, distorted story of a distorted life. Both are from the decisive years of the War of Liberation, 1947-1949, after Chiang Kai-shek bombed Yenan to smithereens, and Mao began the final march to power. One shows Chiang as a young soldier following Mao in that march; (She was also a "political instructor" to the People's Liberation Army.) The other is a picture of Chiang as clearly more, than secretary to Mao, although Mao himself was later to denigrate the role of secretary.(3) It was a most productive period in Mao's life as he both fought and theorized on a guerrilla war and the perspective he saw for the new society he meant to build and called "New Democracy."

(3) The Wan-an documents report a speech by Mao in March, 1964, which says: "On the Current Situation and Our Tasks was spoken by me in 1947. Some one transcribed it and it was revised by me. At that time I had contracted a disease whereby I could not write . . . But if you never take the initiative and rely on a secretary, it is just like having a secretary assume your responsibility for leadership work." (Miscellany of Mao Tse-tung Thought, II, p. 338). This is the speech Chiang was so proud of taking down "word for word."

When one considers that it was after those two decisive years, followed also by what is called "incognito" work in land reform and marriage reform, that, as her health failed completely and she was shuffled between hospitals in Peking and Moscow, she was stripped in 1951 of all her posts, one must conclude that there is a greater tale against Mao as male chauvinist than ever there was against Chou Yang in the 1930s upon whom Chiang wreaked her vengeance.

Again, it was not a bourgeois feminist but a great revolutionary writer and feminist—Ting Ling—who dared challenge Mao directly both in Yenan and in the 1950s, and who summed up the fate of those leaders' wives in a single phrase, "Noras who came home." (4)

(To be concluded next issue)

(4) Ibsen's Doll's House enjoyed popularity in Japan, and the heroine Nora who slammed the door on housewifery was used by Ting Ling in her piece on International Women's Day, "Thoughts on March Eighth"; where she saw wives of leaders as cruelly taken advantage of as they became "Noras who return home." The best pamphlet on Ting Ling, Purged Feminist was issued in Japan (Femintern Press, Box 5426, Tokyo). When American feminists who themselves suffer from Maoism issue anything by her, as one feminist journal published in Chicago (Signs, Autumn 1976 issue) did, the "explanatory" note is disgusting as they try to conclude that, though right, Ting Ling was nevertheless evidently wrong, or untimely, or whatever.

Part II

(Continued from last issue)

Chiang Ch'ing rode the crest of the so-called Cultural Revolution, as autocrat over the arts, directly into the very core of Party-Army-State power—membership into the Politburo. By the time of Lin Piao's downfall and Mao's complete reversal of Sino-American relations when he rolled out the red carpet for Nixon in 1972, Chiang took advantage of the presence in China of the host of U.S. journalists, scholars, and what not, to seek out one Sinologist, Roxane Witke. Professor Witke had been commissioned to report on "Chinese female masses", and Chiang asked her to record her solo flight to the echelons of power. The fact that Ms. Witke held that Chiang had "inspired" (5) the "Cultural Revolution," held leadership in her own right in a "very patriarchal society", surely did earn Chiang a sympathetic ear.

Unfortunately, the wheels of bourgeois research and publishing grind very slowly. By the time—five years!—the "weeklong interview" was expanded to a 550-page book on what Professor Witke fancies is "a history of the revolution largely from Comrade Chiang Ch'ing's point of view" (p. 14), Chiang Ch'ing had been arrested, vilified as a "traitor", not to mention a "maggot". When the "Cultural Revolution" first unfolded in mid-1966 and catapulted Chiang front center stage, she seemed to have no historic past. Whether it was to right the record, or to invent an unwarranted high niche in Chinese history, the truth is that the height of power was, indeed, the beginning of the end for Chiang.

The first flurry of mild anti-Chiang posters appeared in 1973-74, when Mao was still alive and when rumors first surfaced about the biography she was recording via a bourgeois writer. Whether or not Mao inspired those first attacks, Hua now claims that Mao saw through her "wild ambitions" and warned her against her "faction of four" in 1974.

A new period had begun at the 10th Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, when the undercurrent of revolt in the military following the downfall of Lin Piao compelled the rehabilitation of many of the former

(5) For a more comprehensive view of the "Cultural Revolution" see both the chapter on Mao Tse-tung Thought in Philosophy and Revolution, and my essay, "Post-Mao China: What Now?" in New Essays. For a view of China's foreign policy, some ten chapters devoted to that are well worth reading in The Chinese Party in Power, 1949-1976 by Jacques Guillermax.

Communist Party leaders who had been removed from their posts during the Cultural Revolution. Where Mao did it reluctantly, Chou hailed it as a sort of "savior" for the development of the national economy. Indeed, he raised Mao's main "enemy", Teng Hsiao-ping, to Deputy Prime Minister. Mao could not have been all that hostile to Chiang in 1973-74. And 1975 proved it.

What was at stake was something greater than Chiang. It was a possible global realignment. First, Mao absented himself from the Fourth National People's Congress, which drew up a whole new Constitution as well as both a Five and a Twenty Year Plan for the development of the national economy. Mao did not attend that Congress. Instead, he was meeting with every reactionary world leader, from Franz Josef Strauss of West Germany to the disgraced ex-President Nixon, not to mention taking any side, any side whatever, including apartheid South Africa's role in Angola, so long as Russia was recognized as "Enemy No. 1".

The year 1975 had revealed great unrest in China. There were many strikes and bank robberies. At the same time Russia was winning victories in Africa, especially in Angola, but also in Europe. China felt "surrounded." The climax came in the first spontaneous, genuine mass demonstration at the grave of Chou En-lai in April 1976. Instead of facing the reality that it was a spontaneous outburst against the regime — the ruling "radicals" controlling the mass media—Mao Tse-tung moved, this time with the great aid of Chiang, to remove Teng. Hua was to replace him. That was Mao's last hurrah. It was not exactly an anointment of Hua as Chairman, but that top cop knew how to take the "interim" position, and so organize the Party bureaucrats, the military and state bureaucracy behind him, as to need no more than a month after Mao's death to displace in toto all those who had control of mass media and may have opted for total power.

His preemptive coup succeeded so well that there is no doubt whatever that, whether or not Mao meant to cut Chiang's "wild ambitions" as far back as 1974, Hua surely had it all planned long before Mao died. Why then is he still so preoccupied, in 1977, to totally smash "the gang of four"? Well, it isn't the "four". It is the Chinese masses who are asked to produce more and ever more as China rushes to "overtake" the U.S. by the end of the century. It is Hua's "interpretation" of Mao's "Ten Great Relationships."

HUA EDITS MAO AND DISCIPLINES WORKERS

Editing may not have as sinister a connotation as DeMaoisation, but then DeStalinisation likewise did not mean any genuine uprooting of Stalinism, that is to say, state-capitalism, just some of its "excesses." The same is true in post-Mao China as the wheels are rolled back

to the mid-1950s before the Great Leap Forward, when Stalin's mistakes were judged to be only "30 percent" while his achievements were rated as "70 percent." While the doors to any Sino-Soviet entente are definitely kept closed, and the doors to the "West" kept open, what predominates over all foreign affairs is what happens at home—building up the economy, especially industrialization, especially militarization in modern weaponry, and above all, getting the workers to produce more, with, perhaps, a little incentive in differential in wages added (6).

With this in mind, Vol. V of Mao's Selected Works has been published and everywhere the study goes forward of Mao's text, "On Ten Great Relationships" as edited by Hua. Thus, where Mao spoke abstractly of "mistakes of some socialist countries," Hua leaves no doubt that China has "done better than the Soviet Union and a number of the East European countries." Thus, of the ten dichotomies—between industry and agriculture; between economics and defense; between central and local authorities; between Revolution and counter-revolution, etc.—there is no doubt that what has replaced all is that economics is in command . . .

It all spells out state-capitalism entrenched and looking for a global role. It isn't that Chiang Ch'ing had fundamentally any different perspective, but she surely had greater belief in "superstructure." It is this fetish that sealed her fate . . .

One famous Sinologist, Simon Leys, attributes part of the emptiness of Comrade Chiang Ch'ing to the author's being "somewhat blinded by her feminist bias." (7) In truth, however, it isn't Ms. Witke's "feminist bias"; it is her petty-bourgeois kitsch that kept her from penetrating what was actually happening among the masses, women included. Thus, as part of her 1972 assignment, she interviewed women other than Chiang Ch'ing, but, again, it was the pseudo-leaders, rather than the masses, as was the case with her report, "Wu Kuei-hsien: Labour Heroine to Vice-Premier." (8) Here she becomes so great an apologist for Mao's China that she designates the case of that Chinese Stakhanovite thusly: "In today's China she represents women in total control."

And how did that display itself? Well, she quotes Wu Kuei-hsien as saying that she prefers to remain with her First National Textile Mill of Hsienyang rather than go to the center of power because of the work she puts in. Thus, "I have one child born last year. That kept me away from work only one month; I did not need the usual 58-day leave . . ." (9)

That, dear reader, is not the product either of Ms. Witke's "feminist bias," or Chiang Ch'ing's "wild ambitions." Rather, it is the product most directly of Mao's retrogressionism which, sans its poetry, is now practiced in full by Hua Kuo-feng in post-Mao China.

(6) See "A Great Leap Backward" by Fox Butterfield, N.Y.T. magazine, 6/19/77.

(7) See "China's Fallen Empress" by Simon Leys in New Republic, 6-25-77.

(8) China Quarterly, 12-75, "Report from China," pp. 730-740.

(9) As against Ms. Witke's apology, see my Hong Kong interview with Jade (printed in News & Letters, June-July, 1968), and Jade's report of the achievements and retrogressions since the Chinese Revolution (included in Notes on Women's Liberation, available from News & Letters for \$1).

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1977

Chiang Ch'ing in post-Mao China

This Two Worlds Article is reproduced in full in **SEXISM, POLITICS AND REVOLUTION IN MAO'S CHINA**, just off the press. See full ad, page 1.

WORLD PERSPECTIVES — 1977-1978

OCTOBER, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Below are brief excerpts from Raya Dunayevskaya's Perspectives Report at the National Editorial Board Meeting of News and Letters Committees, convened over Labor Day weekend. The full report can be ordered from News & Letters for 50¢ plus postage. See *id.*, page 7, for the complete table of contents.)

NO SPOT ON the globe is free from getting sucked into the world market and its power politics. The latest little country, that literally has no wealth at all, over which imperialism could fight is Djibouti. Nevertheless, its achievement of independence disclosed not only the neighboring powers looking hungrily at it, but the Big Powers as well. Because it is a port, and thus a key to the Red Sea, one of the powers looking hungrily at it now, Ethiopia, has one of the two superpowers, Russia, on its side.

Poor Ethiopia. There is hardly any other country that is falling apart quite like it. Besides Eritrea fighting for its independence and Somalia claiming a good part of Ethiopia for its "Greater Somalia," there are no less than five resistance movements within the country fighting the military regime. Here is (was) the second largest country on the African continent, with a fertile soil that used to be the envy of Africa, and the one and only country in Black Africa that was independent when the rest were colonies . . .

Yet with the 1960s initiating Black Revolution throughout Africa, the one that was not successful was in "independent" Ethiopia. And now the very military regime that overthrew Haile Selassie and has the opportunist affront to call itself "Marxist" is the very one to carry on old imperialist adventures against Eritrea and Somalia, as well as counter-revolutions against the resistance movements of the Ethiopian masses. As it is

disintegrating from all these battles within and without, in comes Russia (and of course Cuban "advisors") despite the fact of Russia's critical previous alliance with Somalia, where it already has naval and air base facilities at Berbera which are vital to the Indian Ocean's strategic balance.

THE MIDDLE EAST has been and remains the main immediate point of crisis. But Russia has now lost out in Egypt, and despite holding on tightly to the PLO and Syria, it is not overly secure in the Middle East; is very much shaken up also in India; therefore any entrance to the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea is crucial to it. As if it wasn't bad enough for a country calling itself Communist to participate in these myriad capitalistic-imperialistic double-crosses, we also have the situation that while it's certainly in the forefront in its anti-Zionist, anti-Israel anti-Semitism, it is finding itself aiding Ethiopia as is Israel.

One thing that happens not to have gotten much attention is that the Red Sea, which Saudi Arabia wants to make into an "Arab lake" while Ethiopia used to sound more revolutionary in its insistence that the Red Sea was in African "territory" and in any case was a world waterway, is that the Red Sea is also the outlet to the Port of Elat. Saudi Arabia is offering some very fancy gold to Djibouti to close its port to Ethiopia.

Now — as if all these points of crisis were not enough of a crazy quilt pattern of little power alliances, Big Power alliances, in the volatile Horn of Africa — enter China which is asking the U.S. to make sure to stop Russia's power play in Africa, all the while having both West and East, North and South, believe it is Taiwan that is the issue!

No, it is by no means a question of who of the powers is the "wiser" and who is making the "fatal" mistake in the Horn, or even whether there will be room for oil tankers to travel through the Red Sea to the West, but who will finally get single global control in this state-capitalistic age.

OUTSIDE OF THE theory of protracted guerrilla war, Mao's most original theoretical-practical-philosophic-revolutionary contribution is the primacy of superstructure over economic base, ideology over the relations at the point of production which he vilified as "economism," with culture itself being ordered to shed its life and turn "proletarian."

Mao "died" at the moment he "signed" Lin Biao's

4 6 9 9 2

death warrant, and rolled out the red carpet for Nixon. It is from that moment that the question of a triangular world, a possible alignment with U.S. imperialism, was placed on the historic agenda . . . China can challenge the bi-polar world not simply because it has 600 million people, but because it also has the H-bomb and can become an important industrial power. Which is why it was "necessary" for Mao to die, and with him, the illusions of the Little Red Book.

It may still happen that it will be the Middle East, now that Likud's reactionary victory has brought Menachem Begin to power and thus further heated up that volatile region, that will be the first to detonate war. But what will call into question humanity's very survival is the tri-polar struggle for single world domination. Which is why what is happening in China remains so pivotal.

BECAUSE THE CRISIS is so total and revolt so continuous, it no sooner stops in one place, be it China or Paris, May 1968, or Portugal, 1975 -- when it arises in Soweto. This year it is not only South Africa but what seems to have no direct connection with it -- the Blackout in New York -- which disclosed the true intercontinental character of the Black Dimension. Which is why so simple a matter as an accidental Blackout in New York acted as expose of the Achilles heel of American capitalism, its racism -- the imperial carrier of poverty to the Blacks in America as in Africa.

It is by no accident that what we plan for next year on the Black struggles in the U.S., in Africa, in Latin America, especially the Caribbean, is seen in the very title of our projected pamphlet: *Frantz Fanon, Soweto, and American Black Thought*, for we cannot forget that Frantz Fanon was neither African nor American, but West Indian . . .

It is because there is a totality of mind, body, and heart in the spontaneous movement of masses from force to Reason, that, from the start of the American enslavement of the Blacks, the triangular trade of slaves, molasses and sugar from Africa, to Latin America, to the U.S., became the triangular exchange of aspirations for freedom on every subject from nationalism to culture to new human relations . . . At this moment, nothing short of the totality of transformation of all human relations can act as banner. It is to that end that our Black Thought pamphlet aims.

BUT THIS IS NOT the place to spell out the concrete activities, especially the expansion of *News & Letters*. What you see before you in the bound volume of *N&L* for seven long years gives you one view of the world none other gives you. The point is now to become not just a reader as we expand but writers-editors yourselves. Let your voices be heard, and your thoughts and your labors. Again, just as you will get an Organization Report, you will have a *N&L* report, and Youth and Women's Liberation will follow.

I am mentioning them in passing only to stress that the politicalization begun with the *Political-Philosophic Letters* will first now be extended in the way in which we function in the Movement, in other organizations, and in our organizational - philosophic - political - membership growth as the warp and woof of philosophy in action -- and action as the remaking of the world, beginning with preparations for the American Revolution, not because we are under the illusion that we are now in a pre-revolutionary situation but because we know that the totality of the capitalist crisis is such that for them time is running out. For us it has just begun.

Gramsci's 'philosophy of praxis'

NOVEMBER, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION*
and *Marxism and Freedom*

"The philosophy of PRAXIS is consciousness full of contradictions in which the philosopher himself, understood both individually and as an entire social group, not merely grasps the contradictions, but posits himself as an element of the contradictions and elevates this element to a principle of knowledge and therefore of action."—A. Gramsci, "Problems of Marxism" in PRISON NOTEBOOKS

Fifty-one years ago this month, on Nov. 8, 1926, Antonio Gramsci, revolutionary leader of the Turin Factory Councils, a founder of the Communist Party of Italy, a Marxist theoretician-activist, was arrested by Mussolini's police. When, after nearly a year of incarceration, Gramsci was brought to face fascist courts, the Prosecutor, demanding condemnation of Gramsci, mouthed Mussolini's injunction: "We must prevent this brain from functioning for 20 years!"

It meant a life sentence for the frail revolutionary. Indeed, he died before the 20-year sentence had expired. But fascism could not stop the brain from functioning. The 11 years of brutal fascist imprisonment had produced profound philosophic-political writings that retain relevance for our day. Naturally that was not the lived revolutionary life any Marxist would have wished, much less one who had experienced the Biennio Rosso (the Two Red Years, 1918-1920) of the General Strike, the Factory Councils, the near-revolution that turned into the failed revolution. But it was the period that laid the ground for working out anew the integrality of philosophy and revolution as Gramsci thought through the experiences of the Biennio Rosso as well as its philosophy, history as well as triangular relationship of class, factory councils, party. That is to say, spontaneity

and organization, to Gramsci, could no more be narrowed to an elitist party ordering the masses around than spontaneous actions could be squeezed dry of the creative thought that produced the action of masses in motion.

FACTORY COUNCILS IN ITALY

Rather than either only a vanguard party to lead, or philosophy sans revolution, what had to be worked out was the inseparability of philosophy and revolution. So solidly grounded in philosophy was Gramsci's concept of the Russian Revolution and the soviets which brought the Bolsheviks to power that he hailed them as opening a "new stage of humanity." And when he wrote of the Factory Councils in Italy as "the model of the proletarian state," he knew that, far from arising from his head, it was the Fiat factory workers who had spontaneously formed them during the summer of 1919; that universalism and the anti-state would concretize State and Revolution: "The Russian Revolution is the triumph of freedom: its organization is based on spontaneity, not on the dictates of a 'hero' . . ." (1)

Consider, then, the irony that among Gramsci's detractors are not only state-capitalists in power calling themselves Communists, as in Russia, or those who hunger for state power in the existing parliamentary bourgeois states (with or without a King, be it Spain or Italy or France) who are busy attempting to make that great revolutionary Gramsci sound like a Euro-communist class-collaborationist (2). No, the detractors also include those who fight Eurocommunism and try to restore Gramsci as the revolutionary he was, like the Trotskyists (all varieties), as well as some from the New Left. The latter try to intellectualize Gramsci as if he, as philosopher who had a certain concept of the function of intellectuals, could possibly have assigned a revolutionary role to intellectuals who kept themselves apart from the proletariat, from masses in motion. It all

(1) Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from Political Writings (1910-1920)* edited by Quintin Hoare, translated by John Mathews, London, 1977, p. 54.

(2) This is especially ludicrous in view of Gramsci's singling out for criticism class collaborationism as well as the then existing Socialist Party. See *Selections from the Political Writings, 1910-1920*, London, 1977, p. 43: "The political decadence which class collaboration brings is due to the spasmodic expansion of a bourgeois party which is not satisfied with merely clinging to the state, but also makes use of the party which is antagonistic to the state . . ."

adds up to fear, on the one hand of philosophy and on the other of proletarian revolution, thus reducing the proletariat to robot. It therefore is essential, though in very abbreviated form, to restore the wholeness of Gramsci's "philosophy of praxis." Indeed, the very phrase itself shows how inseparable are thought from action, theory from practice, philosophy from revolution.

By no stretch of the imagination can one excuse moving away from the central core of Gramsci-ism—"philosophy of praxis"—on the ground that since the fascist prison guards were looking over his shoulder, and since many a time when Gramsci would have used the word, revolution, he had to use the phrase "philosophy of praxis," both for Marx and for revolution, as if that were not his own world view. (3)

Quite the contrary. First and foremost, the substance of his Prison Notebooks is directly on philosophy. Far from adhering to a "Crocean idealist" analysis of Hegel, his most profound and violent attack is precisely on that type of "historicism": "This (Croce's — rd) historiography is a degenerated and mutilated Hegelianism because his fundamental concern is the panicky fear of Jacobin movements of every active intervention of the great popular masses as historically progressive factors." (4)

SPONTANEITY

To Gramsci, "history" was always masses in motion shaping history. So much so, that it is not only the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois interpretations he attacked, but also Marxists, from Plekhanov to Bukharin, because their mechanical and scientific views had no conception of what Lenin called "the dialectic proper," whose central Marxian core was the proletariat as Subject transforming history. So solidly grounded in Hegelian-Marxian philosophy was Gramsci all his adult life, that his "purely" journalistic writings before he became a leader of the Communist Party of Italy — the early Gramsci of the Biennio Rosso period — were

permeated with the dialectic of thought as well as of liberation. That is first and foremost and is not at all something forced upon him by prison life which kept him from activism. In truth, the few Times Gramsci created ways to send out uncensored messages, or was able to talk in person to visitors, there never was any separation between philosophy and revolution.

Indeed, this is what gave birth to such designations as "insurrectionist" and "spontaneist" in addition to attempting a forced identity between Gramsci's concept of "Council Communism" and the anarcho-syndicalist concept. It is this which led the Stalinist-Communist leader, Togliatti, not to publish Gramsci's Prison Notebooks for ten long years, and then to truncate them in the post-war years as the Communists became part of the bourgeois government and capitulated to the Catholic Church monopoly of education. Now that the writings are being published as written, it has no more stopped the present-day Communists from perverting this revolutionary's "philosophy of praxis" than did the truncated version which had likewise fooled no-one. Eurocommunist reformism just reflects the hunger Communists have for state power, displayed abroad as in Russia when it was transformed from the early workers' state into its present opposite, a state-capitalist society.

What is of the essence for our age, which has witnessed more aborted revolutions than any, is Gramsci's revolutionary legacy which so integrated philosophy as to create ground for working out a new, urgent need for integrality of philosophy and revolution for our age. For this it is necessary to turn to the most fundamental of all of Gramsci's views — what he called "absolute historicism," "absolute humanism."

ABSOLUTE 'HISTORICISM', ABSOLUTE HUMANISM

Nothing so scares economists, even when they are Marxists, as the word "absolute," as if it really could mean only God or something equally mystical they attribute to Hegel. Because of this, even when they wish to restore to Gramsci his revolutionary stature, the greatest part of the time is spent endlessly revealing the Stalinist distortions, while they themselves so drain philosophy out of Marxian economic categories as to turn Marx himself into an "economist." In a word, what bothers them most in Gramsci is "lack" of economics. (5) It must have been just such vulgar materialism

that Gramsci had in mind when he wrote:

"It has been forgotten that in the case of a very common expression (historical materialism) one should put the accent on the first term — 'historical' — and not on the second which is of metaphysical origin. The philosophy of praxis is absolute 'historicism,' the absolute humanism of history. It is along this line that one must trace the thread of the new conception of the world." (6)

Gramsci hit out not only against Croce but also against Bukharin who kept stressing "objectivity," "science": "Objective always means humanly objective, what may correspond exactly to 'historically subjective', in other words, objective would mean 'universally subjective'... the Hegelian 'Idea' is resolved into the structure as much as into the superstructure and the whole method of conceiving philosophy has been 'historicised'..." (7)

On this, the fifty-first year since the arrest of Gramsci, with which the fascists thought they would "prevent this brain from functioning", let us return to the study of Gramsci's own writings, not just as "legacy" and not uncritically but as ground to build anew, both as integrality of philosophy and revolution, and to work out so new a relationship of theory to practice that the triangular relationship of class, spontaneity, organization can first come alive in a successful revolution.

(3) The French edition of the truncated version of Gramsci's writings is profoundly criticised by Attilio Baldan in "Gramsci as Historian of the 1930s". He gives both a more comprehensive view, though abbreviated, of the whole literature, as well as a critique of the French structuralist misinterpretation. It appears in Telos, Spring 1977, which includes other articles as well as reviews of the available translations in English.

(4) Selections from the Prison Notebooks, London, N.Y., 1971, pp. 404-5.

(5) See Chris Harman's two-part spread in International Socialism (#99), which, though it tells much that is available against Eurocommunist distortions, ends with

an economist summation which totally disregards Gramsci's philosophic totality: "Although he provides a correct abstract account of the relation between economics and politics, Gramsci is alone among the great Marxists in not integrating a concrete economic dimension into his political writings. This is an arbitrariness..." To be that distant from Gramsci's working out the concept of totality is to be deserving of all Gramsci wrote against Bukharin's economist disregard of "the dialectic proper". See my analysis of other IS disdain for philosophy: "Tony Cliff reduces Lenin as Theoretician to an 'Uncanny Intuition'" in the forthcoming News & Letters Joint British-U.S. publication, Marx's CAPITAL, Today's Epigones, and the Global Crisis, off the press, Jan. 1978.

(6) Prison Notebooks, p. 403.

(7) Part of the Prison Notebooks were incorporated in The Modern Prince and Other writings, London, N.Y., 1957. It is from there that I quote here pp. 106-107. It is the central article for our purposes, which Gramsci called "Critical Notes on an Attempt at a Popular Presentation of Marxism by Bukharin," pp. 90-117.

IWY: where to now?

WOMAN AS REASON

Nearly 20,000 women converged on Houston, Texas for the IWY Conference Nov. 18-21. Since delegates to the government-sponsored-and-funded affair numbered only 2,000, it is clear that the activist observers, who had to pay their own way, felt that just being there could help transform the meeting into an event that would change the face of the United States on the question of women's liberation. They were right. They created a momentum far beyond the "National Plan of Action" devised by the appointed commissioners.

Despite the fact that the well-organized and efficiently-run conference had worked to have all 26 Resolutions of the Plan voted as presented, the disabled, then the minority, and then the older women wrote entirely new ones for themselves that gave far more concreteness to women's rights than the abstract cornerstone of the entire convention: the ERA.

STYLE, SUBSTANCE AND SWEEP

It was the Substitute Resolution on Minority Women that was the highlight of the conference in everything from style to substance to comprehensiveness. Five women presented it. The Black woman who rushed to the mike to offer the substitute yielded to the Asian woman, who spoke and then yielded to the Hispanic woman, who spoke and yielded to the Native American, who spoke and yielded to Coretta King, who completed it. The Native American spoke of their children who are taken away; the Hispanic of the deportation struggles and the question of bi-lingual studies; the Asian woman of sweatshop working conditions; and Coretta

King of their demand for firm government support for affirmative action. No wonder she ended, not on how much was achieved these past 10 years, but by declaring that "We still have a long way to go."

Because these new substitute resolutions that were passed so overwhelmingly were so concrete, it was clear that it was not what was done there at the conference that was the most important, but what remains to be done afterward. That task was recognized as the one to be done by themselves, not left to those "above". It was the recognition of Self as social being, Women Liberationists in action.

The euphoria created by the massive attendance, the fact that the delegates were so well organized that the feared direct confrontation with the ilk of the KKK did not happen, and the need for and achievement of unity on the question of the ERA, did create altogether too much enthusiasm for the "leaders", so that a person like Rosalynn Carter, who came as "personal emissary" of the President, was never challenged on his backward move refusing federal funds for the poor needing abortion.

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION'S WHIP

The anti-Women Liberationists held their own counter-meeting of some 10,000 men and women, from around Texas and Utah mainly—especially male-dominated in its counter-revolutionary philosophy of unfreedom, as represented by the KKK, Birchers, Conservative Union, as well as the most rightwing members of the Catholic

and Mormon Churches. But the presence of the counter-revolution was felt within the IWY hall, too. What male chauvinist thought that a whistle was needed to try to keep the rightwing women delegates in line to vote against every and all resolutions?

Unfortunately, the majority delegates — mainly white, middle-class, career women, aiming for political jobs and running for electoral office—were so anxious that all behave as "ladies", that they would not entertain a motion to expel the Mississippi delegation, though it included KKKers. Actions like that not only held back the confrontation of ideas, but permitted the delusion that the counter-revolution was not a threat. None bothered to mention that police cars with KKK insignia patrolled the streets surrounding the conference and struck terror among lesbians, nor that the other "rally" referred to the IWY as "International Witches' Year".

On the other hand, it was the threat of the counter-revolution that did mobilize the conference, and brought a leader like Betty Friedan, who had feared touching the lesbian question, to change her mind and urge adoption of the motion not only for "reproductive freedom" (the right to abortion on demand), but also the right of "sexual preference" (lesbianism). Both motions passed overwhelmingly.

When one of the reactionary woman said that the conference was dominated by "lesbian abortionists", one feminist writer, Lucy Komisar, smiled, "Well, they can't be both, can they?" The significance of this incident isn't the "sense of humor" the *New York Times* reporter emphasized, but the seriousness of the activists; the range of ages—literally from 16 to 80; the connection with history's path, not because the Smithsonian Institute let them use the gavel Susan B. Anthony had used in 1896, but because her niece-namesake, 61, was there—and because the young women who had never heard of either one were the ones who were carrying the struggle far beyond what it was at the end of the 19th century.

That is what brings us to the question of the left and the ideological battles that, unfortunately, didn't take place.

WOMAN AS REASON AND REVOLUTIONARY

At the 1975 IWY international conference in Mexico City, many of the delegates were wives of state rulers, parroting the political line of their respective husband-rulers, whether that be Mrs. Sadat or Mrs. Rabin. Unlike them, these middle-class white women were moved by the controversial questions and by the minority and other women to neither stick only to their own 28 Resolutions, nor be so totally elitist as not to hear some of those voices from below. They knew these voices had no intention of remaining silent once the conference was adjourned and legislation tries to take over and stall and stall and stall.

The sad part, then, was that the left itself would try either to limit itself to single issues like ERA or right to abortion or action against deportation; or to think of themselves as "grass roots" rather than recognizing the actual grass roots whose concreteness was the ground for a battle of ideas.

Women's Liberation-News & Letters Committee did raise the question of Woman as Reason. The manner in which Iranian women showed their interest in Marxism and Freedom, and Black women their interest in a pamphlet like *Sexism, Politics and Revolution* in Mao's China, saying, "Sexism is everywhere," showed the universality and interconnectedness of rights with revolution.

The counter-revolution, with their slanders against the very subject of the conference, did change the question from any single issue to the totality of revolution. That unfolds an entirely new banner: Woman as Reason and as Revolutionary. Nothing short of it will help uproot this exploitative, sexist, racist society.

Dec. 1977

State-plan fetishism and George Novack's philosophy

DECEMBER, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

The Trotskyite silence on the direct Stalinist revision of Marx's Capital remains unbroken ever since it was first promulgated by the Stalinist theoreticians in 1943-4. Which doesn't stop Trotskyite theoreticians in the 1970s from arrogantly usurping dual roles. As a Marxist political economist, Ernest Mandel dares to introduce the newest English translation of Marx's greatest work, not just by keeping silent on those revisions, but by actually glorifying their codification as a "genuine rebirth of Marxism." (1) As a Marxist philosopher, George Novack pontificates on dialectics as if that was hardly more than "the logic of motion, not of rest." (2)

That simplism would hardly merit a polemic were it not for the fact that the politics of George Novack's philosophy, as of Mandel's economics, adds up to one more whitewash of the Russian theory and practice of state-capitalism. What unites Mandel and Novack, and their philosophy and economics, is, of course, the fetishism of the plan. Listen to Novack, in the midst of his expose of Lucio Colletti's "return" to Kantianism, explaining the Marxian concept of fetishism: "It (the fetishism of commodities) flows from the anarchic decentralized, unplanned character of the capitalist economy." (p. 1237)

MARX, OF COURSE, said the exact opposite. First, he warned against following "the manner copied by Proudhon from bourgeois economics, which looks upon this matter as though a society with a capitalist mode of production would lose its specific historical and economic characteristics by being taken as a unity. Not at all. We have in that case to deal with the aggregate capitalist." (3) Above all, Marx never wearied of speaking against the "despotic plan of capital," so inherent in the factory production line that he called it "the strictly regulating authority of the social mechanism of the labor process graduated into a complete hierarchy." (4)

On the other hand, listen to how Novack, in 1977, expands his idea of what is needed against what he calls anarchic "unplanned character of capitalist economy": "Whereas the ruling bureaucratic caste and its regime is reactionary, the nationalized and planned economy which is mismanaged, is highly progressive . . ." (p. 1287) And as if that didn't sufficiently hide the class nature of the Russian economy, Novack calls that state-capitalist economy with its forced labor camps "a society of transition from capitalism to socialism!"

WAS THIS REALLY 1977, I thought? Wasn't that exactly what he said way back in 1951, in answer to the document of the state-capitalist tendency (then called Johnson-Forest), entitled State-Capitalism and World

(1) Mandel's phrase appears both in his magnum opus, Marxist Economic Theory, and in his Introduction to the Penguin edition of Marx's Capital. See also my review of his work in News & Letters, May and June-July, 1970, and N&L pamphlet coming off the press in both England and the U.S., Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis.

(2) George Novack, "Back to Kant? The Retreat of Lucio Colletti," in Intercontinental Press (11/14 and 11/21/77) p. 1254; the other pagination refers to these articles.

(3) Marx, Capital, Vol. II, p. 503, Kerr edition.

(4) Ibid, Vol. III, p. 1027.

Revolution? Here, in part, is the reply I handed in then: (5)

"Comrades Warde and Wright stand everything on its head. Where Marx says the property relationship is nothing but a legal expression for the production relationship, they make the productive relationship nothing but an expression of the property form or relationship. Where Marx says that outside the production relationship, property is nothing but a juristic illusion, Comrades Warde and Wright say: 'Production relations of the economy transitional to socialism are contained in collectivized property.'" It sounds like what Novack has just written in the latest issue of Intercontinental Press. He speaks unchangeably, in face of all the objective and subjective developments these past 16 years. All that has changed is the person singled out for criticism — Lucio Colletti, former CPer, present SPPer, always the bourgeois academic. It is always easier to argue with a Social Democrat rather than a revolutionary Marxist.

Indeed, as I wrote in 1951: "Even where Comrades Warde and Wright state a simple Marxist truth, it somehow gets transformed into its opposite. They state, for instance, that the real contradiction is between productive forces and production relations. Absolutely true. But where Marx includes the revolutionary proletariat as the greatest productive force, the productive forces with them are only the simple material means of production. No wonder that the 'quest for universality' is to them 'an ideological, not a material force.' No wonder

(5) My article, "The Revolt of the Workers and the Plan of the Intellectuals (An answer to Comrades W. Warde and J. G. Wright)" is on microfilm in the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection at Wayne State University Labor History Archives, Detroit. Novack wrote then under the name of W. Warde. J. G. Wright, is deceased.

6 9 9 7

that, though they quote from Marx's *Poverty of Philosophy* so often, they failed to grasp its essence: 'But from the moment that all special development ceases, the need for universality, the tendency towards an integral development of the individual begins to make itself felt' (p. 157)."

THIS IS EXACTLY what Novack cannot see --- the proletariat as the creative shaper of history, uprooting capitalism, private and state. As I wrote in 1951: "Comrades Warde and Wright accuse 'Johnson-Forest' of the heinous crime of identifying the capitalist economy with the 'Soviet economy.' They mean the economy of Stalinist Russia, which, since 1943-44, the Stalinist theoreticians themselves have admitted operates according to the law of value." Since that has always, by foe and friend alike, been considered the characteristic law of capitalism, I asked:

"Why the silence on the Stalinist revisions? Comrade Trotsky marked out a clear division between the bureaucracy, which, he said, would not defend state property, on the one hand, and the masses who would defend it, on the other hand . . . Since the death of Trotsky, the Stalinist counter-revolution has come to full theoretical bloom in the revision of Marx's greatest work:

"(1) The Stalinists have affirmed that the law of value was applicable to all societies. Thus they separated what Marx united: the law of value from the law of surplus value which it entailed.

"(2) They ordered that Chapter I of Volume I of *Capital* be omitted from its 'study.' While they have thus vitiated its dialectic structure,

"(3) they have substituted for the law of the decline in the rate of profit as the law of capitalist collapse, the averaging out of the rate of profit as 'the law of capitalism.'

"There is no secret about this wholesale corruption of Marxian political economy . . . What has the Fourth International had to say about all this? Not a word."

THAT WAS WRITTEN June 5, 1951. During the 16 and a half years that have elapsed, not only has the American Trotskyite silence on those Stalinist revisions not been broken, but the European theoretician has, as we showed, glorified the wholesale revision as a "re-birth of Marxism." Both continue tailending Russian theoreticians in economics and philosophy.

"The theoretical axis of Marx's *Capital*," as was stated in 1951, "is the question of plan --- the plan of the capitalist against the freely associated workers. Chapter XIII, in particular, is unmistakable in its dialectical opposition between the despotic plan inherent in capital and the plan of the proletariat in the cooperative labor process. The cooperative form of the labor process unleashed a new productive power. The attempt to control this power within capitalist confines is the basis of the despotic plan of capital. Marx affirms that there can no longer be any doubt about this. The workers' resistance has disclosed that what appeared ideally as plan was in practice the undisputed authority of the capitalist."

As against this, Marx continued to pose the workers' resistance at the point of production, in the cooperative labor process in opposition to the intellectual planners who could not comprehend this new power. We must repeat: future generations will stand in amazement at the equivocal but relentless resistance the Fourth International carries on against this.

Editorial article: War, peace or revolution

Shifting alliances in the Middle East

by Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairwoman, News & Letters Committees

The two months that have elapsed since Sadat's spectacular peace trip to Jerusalem on Nov. 9 saw it all very nearly collapse in Ismailia Dec. 26. There the initiator of a possible new stage for Middle East relations, Sadat, and the guest superhawk, Israeli Prime Minister Begin, far from coming out with a joint statement of agreement, produced an expression of irreconcilable positions, all couched in diplomatic but unmistakable language.⁽¹⁾ Two days later Begin spelled out the euphemisms "Palestinian administrative autonomy" and "self-rule" in language that brought approval from his Knesset.⁽²⁾ All others, however, could not but read those 26 points as but one non-euphemistic imperialistic point: continued military occupation both of the West Bank of Jordan (which Begin persisted in calling Judea and Samaria) and the Egyptian Gaza Strip.

We must now modify the expression, "all others" to read all others "except President Carter." He managed to find "self-rule" under Israeli guns "flexible"! Where upon President Sadat must have burned up the private line to the White House. What he publicly declared "made my job more difficult" must have been concretized more precisely on the private line, sufficiently shaking up Carter's scheduled six-nation nine-day whirlwind tour to make room for one unscheduled stop at Aswan. It is this that became the focal point of the whole, not only the Middle East whole, but globally, from India to France.

Just as the question of Palestine was raised at the very start of the trip in Poland, and just as Helmut Schmidt was found hovering in the shadows in Egypt, (as did King Hussein in Iran and elsewhere), so Saudi Arabia held the reins to world oil while Carter ended the trip beefing up NATO, Jan. 5, 1978—all readying for confrontations world-wide, with very different and unequal weapons, it is true, but the same exploitative class goals. In any case, by the time Carter reached home shores on Jan. 6 he declared Sadat to be "one of the most courageous men in the world," and one definitely in favor of another euphemism — "principles" — under which the irreconcilable positions are allowed to flounder while U.S. imperialism makes the final decision.

Lest we forget Sadat's equally hawk-like past, especially the Yom Kippur war he launched in 1973, Sadat made sure that Begin knew he is no different now. Thus on the very day of the Ismailia statement when both leaders still smiled, Mustafa, editor of Akhbar al-Yom, wrote: "The meetings in Ismailia were not with delegates of the state of Israel, but with Shylock . . . Jewish usurer exacting his pound of flesh."

JOINT U.S.-RUSSIAN STATEMENT AND CARTER'S ZIGZAGS

No, it wasn't courage or any other psychological characteristic that brought both hawks together . . . "for peace," any more than it was the characteristic of being hawk and extreme Rightwinger that enabled Nixon to open this decade with his spectacular visit to China. In all cases, it is the concrete, not the "general," which drives to action. In the case of Nixon it was the Vietnam war that the U.S. was losing, not only on the battlefield,

but at home. In the case of the Middle East now, it is that those concrete home crises in separate lands reached a sudden concurrence, on the part of the hawks, when confronted with the shock of a joint Russian-United States Statement on the Mideast.⁽³⁾ Unbeknownst to either Egypt or Israel, Russia and the U.S. found common ground on the basis of the "unsafe situation in the Middle East" to declare that "the only right and effective way" to achieve a "solution" is to convene a Geneva Peace Conference "not later than December, 1977."

Israel and Egypt were not the only ones surprised by this October 1 joint statement by the two superpowers. More surprised still, but in this case pleasantly, was the PLO's Arafat. Interpreting the statement's reference to "the legitimate rights of the Palestinians" as an independent Palestinian state, Arafat let it be known that this statement could indeed serve as a "foundation" for talking.

After all, this had been preceded by more than six months of zigzagging by President Carter. Ever since March he had moved from stressing "defensible borders" for Israel to publicly endorsing the concept of a "Palestinian homeland" in his Mar. 16 Clinton, Mass. speech. By summer he had let it drift down to the PLO that, if UN Resolution 242 were accepted, a "Palestinian entity could indeed be considered."

And, whereas Vice-President Mondale was, on June 18, sent to San Francisco to soften somewhat the new tilting to the Arab side by saying U.S. had "no plan, no timetable, no map" to try to impose settlement, no doubt was left in any one's mind that there was, indeed, a new tilting to the Arab side. The type of tilting, however, that landed U.S. with Russia in a joint statement was enough not only to get Israel and American Zionists to begin pressuring Carter, but sent fear into "moderate Arabs," who are, after all, preferred by Carter to the PLO.

It is at this point that Sadat decided to act on his own. But not so alone that it didn't meet with the concurrence of Begin. Neither Sadat's spectacular trip nor Begin's concurrence was undertaken too far afield from U.S. imperialism's goal. Now that they know that the U.S. will have no part of little powers setting the timetable for any new outbreak of war, even if that means that the U.S. has to unite with its global enemy, Russia, they, in turn, promptly referred to the United States as if it, not Egypt, had taken the initiative for a new stage of Middle East relations.

No doubt U.S. imperialism's role will be the decisive factor, whether what has begun that is new finds yet another euphemism—"principles"—to arrive at a collective "solution," or whether all comes to nought once again. But the so-called Left hardly helps matters by automatically siding with the "radical" Arabs, no matter whom that includes. Thereby it falls into the trap of all rulers, as if the 30 years from 1948 to 1978 were one unbroken development. The truth is very different, and truth is always concrete.

Everyone, from the rulers — both Israeli and Arab — to the Left, Trotskyists especially (now that Trotsky has been dead 37 years), likes to pontificate about 30 years of endless Middle East wars, as if every one of these was one and the same, with "Zionist imperialism" on the one side, and "Arab revolutions" on the other.

The truth, however, is that the first Arab war against the state of Israel the minute the UN accepted its independence was anything but revolutionary. It is true that the unifying cement of all feudal Arab states was the anti-Israel feature. It is not true that that made the kings and emirs "revolutionaries." Nasser, for example, approvingly quotes in his *Egypt's Liberation, The*

⁽¹⁾The key paragraph of the Ismailia statement, Dec. 26, reads: "The Egyptian and Israeli delegations here discussed the Palestinian problem. The position of Egypt is that on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip a Palestinian state should be established. The position of Israel is that Palestinian Arabs in Judea, Samaria, the West Bank of Jordan and the Gaza Strip should enjoy self-rule."

⁽²⁾The N.Y. Times, 12/29/77 ran the 26 point Begin Plan on p. A8.

6 9 9 9

Philosophy of Revolution, Eruhan Cohen's report of what the Egyptian talked about in the armistice talks: "The subject Gamal Abdel Nasser talked about with me was the struggle of Israel against the English, and how we organized the underground resistance movement against them in Palestine . . ."⁽⁴⁾

And so anti-Semitic a state-capitalist ruler as Stalin was the first (even beating the United States to the draw) to recognize the state of Israel. He did so not because of any pro-Israel sentiments. Rather it was because, until then, so narrow was Arab nationalism that it had collaborated with Nazism while the Jews not only fought the Nazis, but brought a dimension other than oil to the Middle East.

Finally, and most important, there were many revolutionary socialists in Palestine who opposed the creation of an all-Jewish state, hoping and fighting for a binational state free of imperialism. These, too, had to face the reality that the Arabs were as opposed to collaboration with them as with Zionists, and the Arab states were all theocratic.

Put differently, just as Trotsky (who was certainly no Zionist but a revolutionary opponent of it) stressed that the rise of Nazism compelled a new look at the "Jewish Question"⁽⁵⁾, so Marxist revolutionaries in Palestine in 1948 had to confront the new reality of an independent state, and therefore work for revolutionary goals of uprooting the capitalist state within Israel even as Arab revolutionaries had to work within their homelands for a new classless society. Rather than make anti-Israel the unifying cement, social revolution had to become the driving force.

Russia didn't change its mind as to which side it was on until 1955 when Khrushchev concluded his arms deal with Egypt—Nasser's Egypt, that had overthrown King Farouk. Thus came Russia's first breakthrough into the Middle East. Which doesn't mean that Russia

⁽⁴⁾Egypt's Liberation, p. 24. The book is very worth rereading now both because, objectively, you can contrast Egypt in the 1950s and now, and because Sadat is a person bereft of philosophy.

⁽⁵⁾In the last years of his life Trotsky tried facing the reality created by Nazism, on the one hand, and the drive of the Jews to escape its horrors into a homeland. Though, naturally, still opposing the Zionist solution, he did also change his position. Here are some excerpts: "During my youth I rather leaned toward the prognosis that the Jews of different countries would be assimilated and that the Jewish question would thus disappear in a quasi-automatic fashion. This historical development of the last quarter of a century has not confirmed this perspective. Decaying capitalism has everywhere swung over to an exacerbated nationalism, one part of which is anti-Semitism . . . The latest Moscow trial, for example, was staged with the hardly concealed design of presenting internationalists as faithless and lawless Jews who are capable of selling themselves to the German Gestapo." (1/18/37)

"Some would-be 'pundits' have accused me of 'suddenly' raising the 'Jewish question' and of intending to create some kind of ghetto for the Jews. I can only shrug my shoulders . . . The Jewish question has never occupied the center of my attention. But that does not mean that I have the right to be blind to the Jewish problem which exists and demands a solution." The statements have been reprinted in June-July, 1948 issue of Workers International News.

was always on the "revolutionary" side. The very next year it put down the revolution in Hungary, trading off its support also of U.S. imperialism for Eisenhower's silence in the UN on Russia's counter-revolutions in East Europe.

In any case, the 1956 war was a very different matter than the 1948 war. Though triggered by Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal and Dulles' arrogant refusal to help build the Aswan Dam, the point is that Eisenhower's imperial USA had to oppose it to put an end to old-style British-French illusions that they were still global powers. It is true that Israel was all too happy to be used by France and Great Britain who dominated that imperialist eruption. Eisenhower was so incensed that Great Britain and France still fancied themselves imperial powers that he stopped that war and made Israel return to its 1948 borders.

Revolutionary Arab nationalisms did emerge in the 1960s. But there were also very contradictory births, as witness Al Fatah and Ba'ath that had their origins in fascism as much as in revolutionary nationalisms. In any case, the unifying cement for Israeli-Arab wars was not revolution, but simply and purely anti-Israel. And, along with the goal of "driving Israel into the sea" came uncritical alliance with Russia. Which, in turn, convinced U.S. imperialism that it had but "one outpost"—Israel—in the Middle East against its global enemy, Russia. That is no longer true. And though the U.S. leaned heavily toward Israel in the 1967 war, that hasn't been so total ever since 1973.

For the Left to act as if the disparate Arab states are all "one Arab nation" and, even when theocratic, are playing a "revolutionary role" while equating Zionism with South African racism, is no less false than President Carter's declaring for "human rights" when in Poland but keeping mum in Iran. It blinds us to the entry of Saudi Arabian "black gold" in the 1973 war, and more crucial, it blinds us to the tragedy of Lebanon and the PLO, 1975-76. It is on these two historic turning points we must now focus to fully comprehend what is the "new" which is just shuffling of the cards in global alignments and realignments, and that which is the kind of "new" which could have meant the eve of social revolutions.

ENTER SAUDI ARABIA'S BLACK GOLD

The first slight U.S. tilting toward the Arab side in the Yom Kippur war in 1973 had little to do with Egypt's surprise attack which caught arrogant Israel off balance, and gained Egypt a sort of victory. Rather it was Saudi Arabia's use of oil as a political weapon which so shook up the whole industrial world—Japan as well as West Europe and the United States—as to cause it also total ideological disarray. That West Europe could so easily cave in both to the boycotting of Israel and the quadrupling of oil prices had U.S. imperialism likewise go helter-skelter trying to hold on to its illusion of the 20th century as "the American century."

Overwhelming the myriad political crises came the global economic crisis, very nearly plunging the world into a full-scale Depression. It is this deep recession that still underlies the current situation when Saudi Arabia, instead of shaking up the industrial capitalist world, is working hand in hand with U.S. imperialism. Carter's zigzagging was preceded by Henry Kissinger-Nixon's imperial arrogance, first, in threatening the oil kingdoms with invasion, then declaring "the Year of Europe," not to mention raising China to super-power status and thus transforming, by fiat, the bipolar state-

capitalist world into a tri-polar one—rather than the “tri-lateral” one Brzezinski was mapping out for Carter, which holds on to the illusion that the United States-West Europe-Japan was the world.

Plans by rulers, in and out of power, have a way, however, of being totally undermined by elemental social revolutions. The mid-1970s, instead of bending under to the nuclear world, saw revolutions erupt from Portugal to Angola, and directly in the Middle East, specifically Lebanon.

THE REVOLUTION IN LEBANON, AND THE OLD IN THE PLO, 1975-6

This is not the place to go into detail on the situation in Lebanon which sparked a mass revolution, a genuine social revolution against its rulers, Christian and Moslem alike.⁽¹⁾ It is close enough to our times so that we remember that it had been brewing for a long time along class lines, and when it finally erupted, sparked also by the neo-Nazi Christian Right massacre of Palestinians returning from a Rejection Front meeting, the Palestinians worked as one with the Lebanese revolutionaries.

Because of the Palestinian preoccupation with Israel as Enemy No. 1, however, (and the PLO playing political games in the UN to get the Resolution equating Zionism to South African racism passed), the revolution in Lebanon was totally subordinated to anti-Israel.

Soon we were witness to a replay of the 1970-71 slaughter of Palestinians by King Hussein of Jordan on a more gigantic scale, which this time helped also destroy the Lebanese revolution. The extremely contradictory role of the PLO in Lebanon's civil war stretched from being one with the native Lebanese Left against the exploitative capitalistic system to the near-counter-revolutionary role of welcoming Syria's intervention, without in any way revealing the intra-Arab nationalisms between Iraq and Syria. In the jigsaw puzzle of shifting alliances sans class lines and sans any philosophy of liberation, the revolution met defeat.

To have the Left forget all this and once again turn to Israel as the enemy is to doom the new conditions created by Sadat's trip to Jerusalem to a failure that would once again close all doors to new relations in the Middle East.

BEGIN'S NEW UNDERMININGS

Begin has no need of aid from the “Left” to re-create the atmosphere which would make anti-Israel the unifying cement for the whole Arab world, no matter how divided it is at the moment. He has been master of that all his adult life, from his terrorist Irgun days to ideologically not retreating even when Israel became a state. And presently he is doing all in his power to beat a retreat from the one step forward made when he concurred in Sadat's visit. It began with his arrogant behavior in Ismailia. Since his return to Israel not a day has gone by without proof of his retrogressionist nature.

First he spelled out to the Knesset and made public the 26-point so-called peace proposals which must have reminded every school child of Biblical times when Pax Romana ruled Palestine. Then, as if that reaffirmation of continued military occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was not militaristic enough, suddenly bulldozers in the Gaza and the Sinai began digging up

⁽¹⁾ Elsewhere I did go into detail. See Political-Philosophic Letter #1, “The UN Resolution on Zionism—and Ideological Obscuration Also on the Left,” and #6 on “Lebanon: The Test Not Only of the PLO, But the Whole Left.”

ground for new occupying settlements. Thirdly, he found his Irgun-type rhetorical thunder to yell threats, that if Israeli military presence were not accepted in the Gaza, he would walk out of further “negotiations.”

Whether the United States can find yet another euphemism to rein him in need be no concern of revolutionaries. After all, the liberal-sounding line, “the cold war is over,” has been current in the Administration only as a way of declaring that “co-existence” with Russia is no longer to be the overwhelming fact of all global relations. At the same time, there is no reason to think that the other nuclear titan, Russia, will let itself be shunted aside as unceremoniously as Carter did when he easily forgot the joint US-Russian statement in order to embrace Sadat's initiative. Why should any revolutionary be interested in the double crosses and horse-tradings that go on among rulers before they decide to plunge us into yet another war? Even these aspirers for single world power have to hold back since it would be a nuclear war and would put an end to civilization as we have known it. No, what we need to do is go back to Marxist fundamentals: a philosophy of liberation that would give action its direction.

WHERE ARE THE VOICES OF THE MASSES?

First, let us not forget what sent Sadat to Israel. It was not the economic crisis Egypt is in. It was the restlessness of the masses. 1977 has been filled with mass opposition to the exploitative rule, from a general strike, to a veritable mass uprising against the price rises. Sadat had to retreat when not only was the mass anger unmistakable, but it was clear that the Egyptian masses would no longer tolerate, along with their horrible conditions of labor, being saddled with impossible inflation.

In a word, it was fear of social revolution that made him so courageous as to break with the past basis for diversion of the masses from their dissatisfaction with conditions of labor and life to anti-Israel.

Secondly, Begin's concurrence — that single step forward—shows the objective-subjective situation in his land. Ever since he came to power and showed he was as great a reactionary at home as in his imperialist role, there have been strikes, demonstrations, voices of mass opposition to the rightward course. Even the mass outpouring in Israel for Sadat was a great deal more than planned. (See Letter from Israel, p. 10.)

Above all, the Palestinians do wish a homeland, do want, with or without PLO, self-determination. The seeming unity of all the factions in the PLO at Tripoli belies the actual deep division within the PLO. The key to any solution at this moment lies in the hands of the Israeli masses to stop their ruler from closing up the openings that have opened up to them, as to the Arab masses, across all boundary lines, to settle accounts with their masters and begin working out their own destiny. It can begin as early as Jan. 16 when the “Cairo Committee” meets in Jerusalem, and the masses demand that their voices be heard.

Jan. 9, 1978

Rosdolsky's methodology and Lange's revisionism

Jan-Feb 1978

Among non-Stalinist but leadership-conscious Marxists there is hardly a work that has gained the acclaim accorded to *The Making of Marx's 'CAPITAL'* by Roman Rosdolsky. Published in Germany in 1968, it has now been brought out by Pluto Press in an English translation for the fantastic sum of \$35. It is as if the price itself testifies to its importance. If not a "classic", it is, after all, about the only available lengthy, serious commentary on Marx's *Grundrisse*, which has only recently been published in English for the first time.

Roman Rosdolsky, a well-known Marxist theoretician, tells us that ever since 1948, when he obtained one of the rare copies of the *Grundrisse* then available, he has been studying that "Rough Draft" of *Capital* and set himself a two-fold task: (1) to write a commentary, or more precisely, an exposition of the new discovery "mainly in Marx's own words"; and (2) "to make a scientific evaluation of some of the new findings which it contained" (p. xi). The preoccupation with the latter comprises Roman Rosdolsky's original contribution. To it he devotes Parts One and Seven—"Introduction", i.e., mainly the origin and structure of the work; and "Critical Excursus". To these 225 pages should really be added some 35 pages (Part Six, "Conclusion") which summarize what he found in the exposition and commentary of the work.* Since, as he correctly notes, "Of all the problems in Marx's economic theory the most neglected has been that of his method both in general and, specifically, in relation to Hegel", methodology is the underlying motif not only of his "critical excursus", but the reason for writing the whole of the 581 pages.

I wish I could report that a genuine contribution to dialectical methodology had been made by Rosdolsky. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. If there is anything that is totally missing in his massive study it is dialectics. To the extent to which he does make a contribution to the comprehension of the *Grundrisse* (lots of quotations, especially on Money, but no self-movement of the whole) the reader gets neither a view of the historical sweep of Marx's concept of what the totality of his greatest work was to be, nor an understanding of why Marx nevertheless decided to start everything "anew".

THE MISSING DIALECTIC

This is said not to play down the significance of the *Grundrisse*, much less to say that "starting anew" meant Marx discarded the validity of the range of the "Rough Outline" just because, instead of the six books there listed, Marx readied for publication only three, and finished only one. Quite the contrary. While he definitely rejected its shapelessness, comparing it to the formlessness of "sauerkraut and carrots", Marx meant to develop further some of the most brilliant and profound of his writings that could not find their way into the new dialectic structure of *Capital*, Volume I—like "The Pre-

*Contrast this to Ch. 2, Section B, entitled "The 1850's: The *Grundrisse*, Then and Now", pp. 61-76, *Philosophy and Revolution*; also for changes in the structure of *Capital*, see Marx's *CAPITAL* and *Today's Global Crisis*, especially sections entitled "The Relationship of History to Theory", pp. 29-36, and "Appearance and Reality", pp. 77-82.

Capitalist Economic Forms", and "the absolute movement of becoming". We get a whiff of this in a footnote in the totally new "Fetishism of Commodities" when he refers to the Taiping Revolution, as against the quiescent European workers following the 1848 revolutionary defeats, as if China embarked on their revolution "to encourage" the Europeans to revolt.

Rosdolsky on the other hand, who writes 581 pages to expound the *Grundrisse*, has not a word to say about the originality, dialectic, and dimension of the new, totally new, concept of the Orient, China especially, contained in "Pre-Capitalist Economic Forms", though the period he was writing in followed the 1949 Chinese Revolution, which was the compulsion for the European Marxists to publish, first, that very section, and finally the whole of the *Grundrisse*. (The English translation, however, first came out in 1973.)

It was the specific section on the economic forms preceding capitalist production that became most relevant to the new birth of a "Third World." Nor was it only a question of relevance. It was the dialectics of liberation that gave the dialectic of thought a new dimension of revolution. It is the dialectic that is missing from Rosdolsky's methodology. By using it synonymously with methodology he has managed to reduce both to mere presupposition.

THE PRESUPPOSITION

Let's take a second look at Rosdolsky's claimed preoccupation with methodology. It has led him, among other things, to create a special Appendix directly to Part One on Rosa Luxemburg's *Accumulation of Capital* rather than wait for the end of his work where he deals with all debates on Volume II of *Capital*, including, of course, Luxemburg's critique of Marx's theory of accumulation (pages 490-505). What, in the first part, he entitles "Methodological Comments on Rosa Luxemburg's Critique of Marx's Schemes of Reproduction" (pages 63-72) turns out to be a question of Marx's presupposition of a "closed capitalist society."

Luxemburg uses neither the word, dialectic, nor methodology, making it clear that she is arguing against

Marx's "theoretical assumption of a society of capitalists and workers only", and not against the dialectical development flowing from this. It is the assumption that, she claims, is "a bloodless theoretical fiction" as against the reality of "third groups" and capitalism being surrounded by non-capitalist lands. Indeed, she stresses that it is "the spirit of Marxist theory" that demands we "abandon the premise of the first volume."

The issue has been debated for more than a half century. What is new in Rosdolsky is the claim that it was not done methodologically, that her error in grappling with the problems in Volume II of *Capital* was that she "underestimated the so-called 'Hegelian inheritance' in Marx's thought" (p.492). The irony is that what he cites as proof was her criticism, not of Vol. II, but Vol. I. So aroused was she over the attacks on her *Accumulation of Capital* that far from "underestimating Hegelian inheritance", she hit out against Marx's "famed Volume I of *Capital* with its Hegelian Rococo ornamentation" which she now (March 8, 1917) wrote "is quite abhorrent to me." Rosdolsky, however, proceeds on his merry way, exposing "the dialectic content hiding behind Marx's 'Hegelian style'"—as if style were the issue.

In truth, so total is his blindness to dialectic as content as well as form, as self-movement, self-development, self-activity—all internal, with external being the objectification, manifestation, the non-human—that, by the end of his 445 pages of exposition, Rosdolsky succeeds in reducing to absurdity the very meaning of the word, the very specific word that Marx and Marx alone, used so incisively and originally: Reification.

Where Marx used the word to prove the horrors of capitalistic alienation of the laborer, reducing man to thing, Rosdolsky applies it to economic category, entitling the concluding chapter of his exposition, "The Reification of Economic Categories . . ." Where Marx demonstrates that the mystification of economic categories, the fetishism of commodities, all arise from the very "perversity" (Marx's expression) of relation of object to subject, relations between men assuming the "fantastic form of relations between things," Rosdolsky puts mystification of things on a par with "reification of labor".

Marx does the exact opposite, demonstrating that the reason why the perversion of subject to object assumes that form is due to the fact that, in the process of production, that is what production relations "really are": laborers are mere appendages to machines. The reader can now see that my criticism of Rosdolsky sticking so narrowly to the Grundrisse meant, not a way of playing down the importance of Grundrisse, but stressing that, in form, and in content and articulation of economic categories, economic laws of development through contradiction and crises—the "law of motion" of capitalism to its collapse—Marx's final statement is not in Grundrisse, but in Capital.

Rosdolsky, however, is preoccupied with the changes "in general" rather than in the particular, with the number of books rather than the changes within the first volume of Capital, which is, after all, the only one Marx fully prepared for the printer, 1867. After that, he again introduced changes he considered so important that he asked even those who had read it in the original to read the new French edition (1872-75) since it "possesses a scientific value independent of the original."* Rosdolsky, on the other hand, is veritably obsessed with "the movement from the abstract to the concrete" as if the dialectic never gets to the concrete.

It is true Rosdolsky has made some valuable contributions, the most important being that he makes clear that the Humanism of the young Marx, 1844, the relationship of Marx to Hegel of the mature Marx, the Marx of the Grundrisse, 1887-53, and the "scientific" socialism of the Marx of Capital, 1867-83, are all one and the same. It is surely valuable when the one who says this is not a "Hegelian Marxist", but an "economist".

It is also valuable when Rosdolsky demonstrates that, although Marx finished only three books after he outlined six, what seemed to have been left out, like the book on Landed Property, actually was incorporated in the part on Rent in Volume III. And Rosdolsky does indeed make mincemeat of Karl Kautsky's contentions: (1) that the historic sweep of Marx's famous chapter, "Historical Tendency of Accumulation", is but a variation of "Change in the Appearance of the Law of Appropriation"; and (2) that the outline in 1892-63 was already the finished new outline of Capital, 1868, which Rosdolsky correctly shows, would have meant "nothing short of disregarding the Working Day, Simple Cooperation, Division of Labor, etc." (p. 17). But Rosdolsky himself fails to see that the writing of some 75 pages on The Working Day directly into the "abstract" theoretic volume I, while relegating to Vol. IV the contending with all the other "Theories of Surplus Value", meant an

actual break with the very concept of theory, both as dialectics of thought and dialectics of liberation.

Instead, Rosdolsky decided to conclude his "Critical Excursus" with a special chapter in praise of Oscar Lange's Political Economy which, says Rosdolsky, "is to our knowledge the only work in more recent academic Marxist literature which consciously, and in detail, takes up the question of the methodology of Marx's Capital" (p. 552). This would, to say the least, sound peculiar to all except Rosdolsky who is himself deaf to the dialectic. It was Lange who rushed to the defense of the Stalinist break with the dialectic structure of Capital and — integral to that break — the revision of the Marxist analysis of the law of value, when I translated that article

from Pod Znamenem Marxizma (Under the Banner of Marxism) in the American Economic Review of Sept. 1944. The authors had proposed that in the future Russian teaching should not follow the structure of Capital.

In my commentary, I stated that this was but the reflection of "economic reality," that is to say, the state-capitalist, not socialist reality.

In the excuse that, "tempting" as discussions of value would be, it is outside the confines of his study, Roman Rosdolsky has not a word to say of this debate.* I doubt that that is the reason for his silence, and not only because he chose, as the very climax of his work, to end with a discussion of Lange, full of praise of his Political Economy for devoting three chapters to "methodology." No, my doubt is due to the fact that this is not a question of debates, inside or outside of Russia. It is a question of the actual revision of Marx's view that the law of value is the motivating force of capitalism. It is a question of timing — the height of World War II — and the Russian workers could have told Rosdolsky that Stalin was announcing that there was to be no change in the exploitative reality even after the successful end of the war.

As he said, what is actually at stake, whether Roman Rosdolsky was or was not conscious of it, is that tail-ending Stalinist economism is unavoidable when the Subject — freely associated labor — is left as an abstraction. This leads inexorably to the failure to grapple with the dialectic. To understand how this is so we must return to Marx.

Marx wrote 881 pages of the "Rough Draft" of what was to be Capital i.e., the Grundrisse, and only in the very last paragraph he writes "The first category in which bourgeois wealth presents itself is that of the commodity," and then notes that "This section is to be brought forward." To Engels he writes that, now that he wishes to single out some of these chapters and rework them for publication, "before the deluge" — that is, before the economic crisis of 1857-58 runs its course, perhaps even to revolution — he finds that he must first construct a new first chapter as he doesn't have one on Commodity. And this he did for the 1859 publication, Critique of Political Economy. But this too is no sooner published than, once again, Marx is dissatisfied both with "the form of presentation," and structure of the whole six books he outlined.

*Which is less, I might add, than even Lange did in his very last compilation of his writings before his death. It is true he does not mention me, but he does mention his own article in the American Economic Review, and there is no way to read that without knowing the new Stalinist thesis, and his defense of it.

*Elsewhere I go into detail on these changes. See especially "The Paris Commune Illuminates and Deepens the Content of Capital", and "The Breakdown of Capitalism: Crises, Human Freedom and Vol. II of Capital" in Marx's CAPITAL and Today's Global Crisis.

7 4 10 3

By the time — eight years later — Marx had completed his analysis of the economic laws of capitalist production and, as an active revolutionary, was head of the first International Workingmen's Association, Marx had decided to start ab ovo. Nor was it only a matter of a new outline of three instead of six books. Everything was new, and nothing more so than the split in the category of labor into abstract and concrete labor.

Because Marx considered that split in the category of labor his most original contribution, crucial to "all understanding of political economy," he no sooner began Chapter 1, Commodities, with their twofold nature — use-value and exchange-value — than he made it clear that that was not the essence, that he must at once go to the essence—the twofold character of labor itself. By the time he had finished that first chapter there was also a totally new section, the last, entitled "The Fetishism of Commodities." It was clear by then that he had "thrown out" what had previously followed Commodity, and Money — history of the theory of each category, all of which had been relegated to Volume IV of Capital.

The Fetishism of Commodities has since become not only one of the most famous of Marx's writings, but so bothersome to all exploitative state powers, especially those calling themselves "socialist," that evidently they just cannot live with it. What Stalin declared necessary for "the teaching" has since been codified, without any acknowledgment such as they had to make in 1943 when it flew in the face of all previous "teachings" by friend and foe alike. Discarding, or making an abstraction, of the concrete imperative of freely-associated labor taking destiny into its own hands, stripping away the fetishism of commodities, of Plan, of anything and everything non-human, and declaring, with Marx, "Human power is its own end," inexorably leads one to island Stalinism, that is to say, state-capitalist "methodology."

Just as Lange's "methodology" was pragmatic, Stalinist eclectic, so was Rosdolsky's. Despite all talk of dialectic, and relationship of Marx to Hegel, Rosdolsky, by no accident whatever, concluded that one need "no longer bite into the sour apple, study the whole of Hegel's Logic in order to understand Marx's Capital — one can arrive at the same end, directly, by studying the Rough Draft" (p. 570). Too bad that all Rosdolsky arrived at by the end of his study of the "Rough Draft" was the quagmire of Polish neo-Stalinism which Rosdolsky calls "neo-Marxism."

Thus does the dialectic wreak its vengeance on non-Stalinist pragmatists who skip over Marx's admonition that the Hegelian dialectic "is the source of all dialectic" as well as Lenin's conclusion that it is, indeed, impossible to understand Marx's Capital "especially its first chapter, without studying the whole of Hegel's Logic."

Jan-7-1978

7003

Adorno, Kosik, and the movement from practice

MARCH, 1978

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

Negative Dialectics by Theodor Adorno (NY: Seabury Press; 1973)

Dialectics of the Concrete by Karel Kosik (Dordrecht, Holland and Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company; 1976)

The above two works are not only the most serious contributions to the study of dialectics in the past half-century, but path-breaking originals. Adorno's *Negative Dialectics* is the most comprehensive, and is not only one man's life's legacy, but a veritable philosophic testament of the celebrated Frankfurt School's total existence from its founding. That only a few have chosen to review it is only in part due to the difficulty of the text and originality of the concept of negative dialectics, which is so radical a departure from the dialectics of negativity that Adorno opens his work with an attack on "the negation of the negation," that is to say, the positive that flows from a double negation, and declares: "This book seeks to free dialectics from such affirmative traits without reducing its determinacy" (p.xix).

Rather, despite the comprehensiveness of the 416-page volume, the total view of philosophy is written in so aphoristic a style that it looks, if not chaotic, surely not the type of continuity that characterizes a serious work, but more like essay-type analyses of individual topics, with each just a very few pages. At the same time, the relationship of concrete to abstract always comes as a shocker rather than as something emerging out of what Hegel calls "the self-determination of the idea," or as an illumination of an original and abstract idea that is specifically Adorno.

WHEN I FIRST started grappling with the book, keeping in mind the period of its formation — the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s — I was forced to conclude that Adorno was deaf to the objective situation, the movement from practice, especially the revolts in Eastern Europe. The two magnificent decades, since the very first revolt from under totalitarianism — East Germany, June 17, 1953 — had, indeed, undermined regimes as well as opened vast new theoretical vistas. They were historic challenges to all that was both in practice and in theory. Yet, *Negative Dialectics* has little to do with that dialectic of negativity, least of all with the concept of Subject, with which Hegel distinguished his from all other philosophers who left the search for truth at Substance only. As "concretized" by Marx for the proletarian class, Subject is supposed to have been accepted also by Adorno, but, again, he keeps his distance and originality locked into his work.

Naturally Adorno also keeps his distance from "positivists" and the vulgarisms of the knighted Karl Popper of the infamous "Hegel and fascism" school. Nevertheless, Adorno, very nearly out of nowhere, suddenly brings in Auschwitz, seeing some sort of kinship between it and absolute negativity: "Genocide is the absolute integration . . . Auschwitz confirmed the philosopheme of pure identity as death . . . Absolute negativity is in plain sight and has ceased to surprise anyone" (p. 362).

By "nearly out of nowhere" I naturally do not mean Auschwitz wasn't the reality of fascism, nor do I mean only the suddenness and shock of introducing the subject-matter in the climax to the book, "Meditations on Metaphysics." Rather I mean it is "wrong," that is to say, totally illogical, non-dialectical, from his own point of view of an adult lifetime devoted to fighting fascist "ideology" as the very opposite of Hegelian dialectics, its very death in Nazi Germany.

Perhaps a better word than "wrong" would be Adorno's own swearword: "naive." I mean that, as late as 1957, in *Aspects of the Hegelian Dialectic*, he was — almost—defending even subject-object identity: "Subject-object cannot be dismissed as mere extravagance of logical absolutism . . . in seeing through the latter as mere subjectivity, we have already passed beyond the Speculative idealism . . . cognition, if it is genuine, and more than simple duplication of the subjective, must be the subject's objectivity." And, indeed, in *Negative Dialectics* he reiterates the same truth when he writes that, despite the fact that Hegel "deifies" subjectivity, "he accomplishes the opposite as well, an insight into the subject as a self-manifesting objectivity" (p. 350).

Why, then, the vulgar reduction of absolute negativity? Therein is the real tragedy of Adorno (and the Frankfurt School): one-dimensionality of thought once you "give up" Subject, once you do not listen to the voices from below — and they certainly were loud and clear and demanding in that decade of mid-1950 to mid-1960 — once you yourself return to the ivory tower and reduce your purpose: "the purpose of discussing key concepts of philosophic disciplines and centrally intervening in those disciplines . . ." (p.xx). Irresistibly came the next step, the substitution of a permanent critique not alone for absolute negativity, but also for "permanent revolution."

Now, whether the enduring relevance of Hegel has stood the test of time because of the devotion and rigor of analysis of Hegel scholars, or because from below there upsurged a movement for freedom that was followed by new cognition studies, there is no doubt that because Absolute Negativity signifies transformation of reality, the dialectic of contradiction and totality of crises, the dialectic of liberation, that Hegel comes to life at critical points of history which Hegel himself characterized as "birth-time of history." And there were Marxist scholars, revolutionary dissidents, who built on new ground.

IT IS THIS WHICH not only distinguishes Karel Kosik's "optimism" from Adorno's pessimism, but accounts for the fact that his *Dialectics of the Concrete*, though written in as abstract a philosophic form as Adorno's and thus as difficult for the "common reader," sees what historic concrete the dialectic concrete "has in mind." Karel Kosik's work, instead of being shunted aside, is intensely discussed, and not only in Czechoslovakia but internationally. It is the type of philosophic work, it is felt, which has something very important to say. In a very significant way, Karel Kosik's work both anticipated the Prague Spring, 1968, and, at the same

time, was a theoretical departure which said, if defeated, this can become a new jumping off point for the next revolution.

Thus, though abstractly and indirectly articulated, no one doubted that it was an attack on the ruling bureaucracy, even if that were expressed, not in political terms, but a philosophic critique of fetishized existence. In his sharp first chapter's critique on the pseudo-concrete—an important new contribution of Karel Kosik's—he reminds the readers that "man's fetishized praxis . . . is not identical with the revolutionary-critical praxis of mankind" (p. 2).

To try to draw from his use of the generic Man (with a capital "M"), instead of specific worker, the conclusion that Karel Kosik was shunting aside the revolutionary proletariat, in the manner of the so-called "New Left,"* is to fly in the face not only of Kosik's view of the role of the proletariat, but also his praise of philosophy as the "indispensable activity of mankind" (p. 4). Rather than playing up generic Man as opposed to the "classic" revolutionary proletariat, what Kosik is doing is rejecting the reductionist Communist concept of subjectivity, as if it meant nothing but petty bourgeois egoism, and re-establishing subjectivity as, at one and the same time, the ground of Hegelian dialectics and distinctively Marxian dialectics of Subject who shapes his own history.

KOSIK IS MOST explicit in his description of exploitation as resulting from "dead labor ruling over live labor, object ruling over man, product over its producers, the mystified subject over the real subject, the object ruling over the subject. Capitalism is a dynamic system of total reification and alienation, cyclically expanding and reproducing itself through catastrophes in which 'people' act behind masks of officers and agents of this mechanism, i.e. as its own components and elements" (p. 110).

Kosik's greatest contribution is the reintroduction of the dialectic as the revolutionary pivot of Marxism. We see this especially clearly in the crucial third chapter of the work which deals with Marx's *Capital*. Here, too, though Kosik sticks strictly to *Capital* as the concrete greatest work of Marx, with rigorous analysis of both its construction and its development of categories, he manages, though indirectly, to make it an attack on mechanical materialism, i.e., the ruling bureaucratized teaching of *Capital*, as if, once you counterpose social to individual, you have come to Marx's concept of the class struggle, not to mention the philosophy. As Kosik puts it, "Man is walled in in his socialness. Praxis which in Marx's philosophy had made possible both objectivation and objective cognition, and man's openness toward being, turns into social subjectivity and closedness: man is a prisoner of socialness" (p. 106).

*See "Czech Marxism: Karel Kosik" by Paul Piccone, in *Critique*, #8, 1977.

And a few pages later he contrasts to this "socialness" Marx's revolutionary way out: "Capital turns out to be the 'odyssey' of concrete historical praxis which proceeds from the elementary labor product through a series of real formations in which the practical-spiritual activity of people in production is objectified and fixed, to conclude its journey not in the cognition of what it is in itself, but rather in a revolutionary practical action based on this cognition" (p. 111).

NO ONE NEED THINK that, because "Philosophy and Economy" is the most important chapter, Karel Kosik limits himself to either economics or philosophy. Rather, his work is a far-ranging and far-reaching critique on the glorification of science and culture, which he calls the metaphysics of science and culture. The East Europeans will feel a great affinity for Kosik's profound critique of Plekhanov, and they will easily guess that it's not only a critique of Plekhanov but of "socialist realism," Lukacs included. He considers that Plekhanov's work on art "lacks the 'human, sensory activity' which cannot be reduced to 'psyche' or to the 'spirit of the times'" (p. 77), and holds that Plekhanov's method is a "one-sided approach smacking of Enlightenment" (p. 61). In the land of Kafka, the readers will know that reality is as irradiated by a great work of philosophy as by great works of literature and film.

The movement from practice over the past two decades that produced new theoretical departures, was by no means limited to East Europe but covered the world. This was most brilliantly articulated by Frantz Fanon, when he wrote that the Africans' struggles for freedom were "not a treatise on the universal, but the untidy affirmation of an original idea propounded as an absolute."* There is no doubt, of course, that once action supersedes the subjectivity of purpose, the unity of theory and practice is the form of life out of which emerge totally new dimensions; in the 1960s, these heralded women's liberation as well as Black, youth as well as labor.

It is these live forces that made the near-revolutions of the late 1960s. What is needed now is the singling out of the dialectic of Reason in so inseparable a manner from the movement from practice that freedom can be made a reality. It's this type of role for new, revolutionary subjectivity that Marx disclosed: "Not only do the objective conditions change in the act of reproduction, e.g., the village becomes a town, the wilderness a cleared field, etc., but the producers change, too, in that they bring out new qualities in themselves, develop themselves in production, transform themselves, develop new powers and ideas, new modes of intercourse, new needs and new language" (*Grundrisse*).

*Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (NY: Grove Press; 1966), p. 33.

'Battle of Ideas': a syllabus for study

APRIL, 1978

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION*
and *Marxism and Freedom*

(Editor's Note: A series of classes around our new pamphlet, *Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis*, is currently being held in several cities across the country. We print below, for the interest and use of all our readers, excerpts from a special syllabus prepared for these classes by Raya Dunayevskaya.)

Introductory Note: Nothing is more crucial for the actual struggles of liberation than the way one prepares, theoretically, for revolution. Though the single word, dialectics, sums up both aspects and projects the needed self-reorganization in such historic dimensions as Lenin's in his encounter with Hegel's *Science of Logic* at the simultaneous outbreak of World War I and collapse of the Second International, no word is less understood and more degraded. The latest twist is achieved by the crude Roman Rosdolsky. His synonymous use of the word, dialectic, with the word, methodology, is only to reduce both to mere presupposition. And, while he supposedly follows Lenin's warning that, without understanding "the whole of Hegel's *Logic* . . . it is impossible completely to understand Marx's *Capital*," he—by no accident—leaves out the last three words of Lenin's generalization: "especially Chapter 1." Rosdolsky thus arrives at the absurd conclusion, now that he has *Grundrisse* at hand, that "one no longer has to bite into the sour apple (Hegel's *Science of Logic*) . . . One can arrive, at the same end, directly by studying the *Rough Draft*," that is to say, the *Grundrisse*. (*The Making of Marx's Capital*, p. 570.)

Marx decided to put aside the *Grundrisse*, not just because of the economic laws he was tracing through to their culmination in the "law of motion" of capitalism's collapse, but because of the emergence of "new passions and new forces" for the reconstruction of society.

Rosdolsky hardly mentions a single objective event that happened in that decade between *Grundrisse* and *Capital*. One cannot get a whiff of what happened between the first edition (1867) and the second (1872-5) which followed the Paris Commune and which Marx asked the reader to read even if he had already read the first, as it contained new changes (especially in the *Fetishism of Commodities and Accumulation of Capital*) which contained "scientific value independent of the original."

Instead, Rosdolsky so clings to the *Grundrisse* that it is difficult to see why Marx changed the "Rough Draft," why, in a word, *Capital* alone is Marx's final

statement on his new continent of thought—Historical Materialism, Dialectics of Liberation, Dialectic of Thought.

It is no accident whatever that Rosdolsky's ultimate chapter touts the Polish Stalinist, Oskar Lange, who is the very professor who led off the attacks on me in the mid-1940s for my revealing the Russian revision of Marx's analysis of the law of value and the break with the dialectic structure of *Capital*.

This is the breaking point with Marxism for our age. Stalin initiated it in 1943; up to then his transformation of the first workers' state into its opposite, a state-capitalist society, had not dared to lay hands directly on Marx's greatest theoretic work. By the mid-1950s, the totalitarian state-power saw no need to acknowledge that it had ever been "taught" otherwise. Whereupon, suddenly, both Trotskyists and Maoists followed suit. In a word, once labor was not the creative force of a new class-less society, there seemed no place for the "independent" Marxist theoreticians to go, but to tailending Stalinist theoreticians, no matter how "politically" the non-Stalinists criticized "bureaucratism." All the more quintessential is it to trace through how, for Marxist-Humanists, dialectics allowed for no division between history and politics, economics and philosophy, methodology, process and result.

Thus, along with the first (1941) study of the Russian economy, came our first study of the then unknown *Humanist Essays of Marx*; and, along with the crises ending in World War II, came our concentration on dialectics as methodology.

Today, too, we turn, at one and the same time, to the study of Marx's *Capital* and the myriad economic crises, globally.

SIX LECTURES

Note: Clearly, the supplementary readings* cannot be covered fully in a single series of six talks. The exception is for Lecture III, *Then and Now*: when the new (i.e. since publication of *Marxism and Freedom*) *Women Incendiaries* by Edith Thomas, and Chapter 9 of *Philosophy and Revolution*, "New Passions and New Forces", is included directly in the required readings.

I. MARX'S NEW CONTINENT OF THOUGHT AND DIALECTICS TODAY

Harry McShane's Prefaces to the British edition of *Marxism and Freedom*, to the current booklet, and to the Scottish Marxist-Humanist pamphlet, "Two Essays by Raya Dunayevskaya," are to be the framework for analyzing the birth of the state-capitalist tendency, 1941, to today. Along with the state of Marxist-studies today as they impinge on Marx's *Capital*, today's myriad crises show the inseparability of theory and practice.

Supplementary Readings: Lenin, *Philosophic Notebooks*; Dunayevskaya Collection of WSU Labor History Archives: *Marxist-Humanism, Its Origins and Development in U.S.*

II. ENCOUNTER WITH MARX'S CAPITAL

Chapter 7, of *Marxism and Freedom*, "The Humanism and Dialectic of Capital, Vol. I"; and *Marx's Capital*, Vol. I.

Supplementary Readings: Roman Rosdolsky, *The Making of Marx's Capital*, Parts One and Seven; Dunayevskaya, "Marx's Humanism Today" (in *Socialist Humanism*, edited by Erich Fromm).

(Continued on Page 7)

*The extensive supplementary readings suggested are not listed here in full, but can be obtained together with the Complete Syllabus by writing to News & Letters, 1800 E. Jefferson, Det. Mi. 48207.

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

III. THEN AND NOW:

The Objective Situation in Marx's day and Today in the Writing of and Commentary about Capital.

Chapters 5 and 6 of *Marxism and Freedom*: "The Impact of the Civil War in the U.S. on the Structure of Capital" and "The Paris Commune Illuminates and Deepens the Content of Capital."

New Introduction to *Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crises*. Chapter 9 of *Philosophy and Revolution*. Edith Thomas, *The Women Incendiaries*.

IV. A NEAR-CENTURY OF DEBATE AROUND VOL. II OF CAPITAL

Instead of dating the debates around Vol. II with Luxemburg's *Accumulation of Capital*, 1913, we'll here see that, in fact, the first emergence of Reformism appears with publication of Vol. II of Capital itself and the first signs of monopoly capital.

Chapter 8 of *Marxism and Freedom*: "The Logic and Scope of Capital, Volumes II and III," first two sections.

Marx's Capital, Vol. II.

Supplementary Readings: Rosa Luxemburg, *Reform or Revolution?*; *Accumulation of Capital*; *Anti-Critique*; F. Forest (RD) "Revolt of the Workers and the Plan of the Intellectuals, an answer to Warde and Wright," *WSU Archives Library Vol. V, Sec. III (2)*; also *Two Worlds*, N&L Dec. 1977, "State-plan fetishism and George Novack's philosophy".

V. ECONOMIC CRISES AND BREAKDOWN OF CAPITALISM

Chapter 8, Section 3 of *Marxism and Freedom*.

Appendix to new booklet, "Tony Cliff Reduces Lenin's Theory to 'Uncanny Intuition'".

Marx's Capital, Vol. III, Chapters on General Contradiction only.

Marx's Grundrisse.

Supplementary Readings: Tony Cliff, *Lenin, Vol. 2*; Dunayevskaya, *Marxism and Freedom*, Part V: "Problems of our Age of State-Capitalism vs. Freedom";

Philosophy and Revolution, Part III: "Economic Reality and the Dialectics of Liberation".

VI. DIALECTIC METHODOLOGY

A summation of the whole, including Chapter 1 of *Philosophy and Revolution*, "Absolute Negativity as New Beginning," as well as Chapter 7, "The African

Revolution and the Dialectics of Liberation."

Supplementary Readings: Ernest Mandel's Introduction to the new Pelican edition of *Marx's Capital*; Dunayevskaya, "A Restatement of Some Fundamentals of Marxism: Against Carter's Vulgarization" (March 1944; in *WSU Archives Library, Vol I, Sec. III (6)*). (Reprinted especially for this class.);

Karel Kosik, *Dialectic of the Concrete*, Chapter 3; Theodor Adorno, *Negative Dialectics*, especially pp. 405-408, the very last three pages of the book, where he does try to return to the magnificence of dialectics.

This summation of *Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crises*, combines a study of Marx's economic categories, and their deep roots in his Humanism and Dialectics. The pivot is the concreteness of actual, living forces that spell out a social revolution—Labor, Black, Women, Youth . . . It is of the essence to regain the unity of the dialectics of the liberation struggles and of thought. Let us not forget that sexism became the more virulent when Women as Revolutionaries and as Reason began to demand proof of new human relations the day before, not the day after, revolution.

The fact that every tendency in the movement — from Luxemburg to Mandel, from Lukacs to Tony Cliff, and from Rosdolsky to Novack; not to mention all the myriad Maoist splinters — has turned out to tailend Stalin's revision of the content and form, the dialectic structure and vision of "new passions and new forces" of *Marx's Capital*, testifies to the bankruptcy of leadership-conscious Marxism, and makes it imperative to recapture the historic continuity with Marx's Marxism—his new continent of thought, of revolution, of vision of class-less society.

Postscript:

Because I felt that the new English translation of *Marx's Capital* by Ben Fowkes was a great improvement on the heretofore standard edition, I may have given the impression that it is without blemish. The Rosdolsky volume, which uses that translation, including the word "Valorisation" for *Verwertung*, makes it necessary to take exception to that mechanistic word. Not only was it not extant in Marx's day, but I doubt he would have used it had it been. The Hegelian feel in the word realisation to convey "self-expansion of value" is good enough reason for sticking to the old standard translation. I have no idea why Ben Fowkes chose so "price-fixing" a word, but it conveys nothing of *Verwertung*.

Frantz Fanon, Soweto, and American Black Thought

MAY, 1978

by LOU TURNER and JOHN ALAN

*(Ed. Note: Printed in full is the Introduction to our newest pamphlet, followed below by excerpts.)***Introduction by****CHARLES DENBY**
Editor, News & Letters

and

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA
Chairwoman, News & Letters Committees

On this, the 10th anniversary of the 1968 Kerner Commission's admission that "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white — separate and unequal," it is clear that nothing has been done to change the situation that the 1967 uprisings throughout the breadth and length of the land had forced the President's Commission to acknowledge. Today's papers are filled with statistics proving that conditions of life and labor among Blacks have not only not improved . . . they have worsened. Whether you take the 204-page report of the Urban League, the three-day spread of the N.Y. Times, or the single column into which the Chicago Tribune, Detroit Free Press and others have squeezed a whole decade's neglect, the following facts glare out:

- Unemployment is twice what it was 10 years ago.
- Poverty has worsened and so has the death rate.
- And while the Black middle class has grown, so has pauperization among the poor — and not just for those on welfare. Many can't even reach that level of poverty. There are families who, literally, have not been on a job for three generations!

The New York blackout illuminated the fraud in the long-known statistic that the "aver-

age" unemployment among Blacks is twice that of whites. Even the statistic that unemployment among Black youth is fully 30 percent does not tell the whole story. The naked truth is that there are Black ghettos where unemployment among Black youth is fully 80 percent!

WHAT THE PROLIFERATION of statistics failed to show, however, is that the dissatisfaction with the Government and the Blacks' erstwhile leaders—headed by that mouth-piece of U.S. imperialism, the Ambassador to the UN, Andrew Young — does not mean that the Black masses are just despairing. Contrary to the reports in the white press, Black America's actual rejection of white capitalistic-imperialist exploitation, with or without Black lackeys, is, at one and the same time, a time-bomb that is sure to explode, and a time for thinking and readying for action.

Put another way, what seems to be quiescence is not apathy. Rather it is the hewing out of new ways to meet the challenge of the times which would not again allow activity to get so separated from theory (and vice versa), as very nearly to assure aborted revolutions. To succeed, philosophy and revolution must be united. Which is why Black youth are taking a second, deeper look at the writings of a very different type of

MAY, 1978

Ambassador — the Martiniquean Frantz Fanon. Fanon, who had given up his French citizenship to be an actual participant in the Algerian Revolution and theoretician of Third World revolutions, had come as its Ambassador to Ghana in 1960.

But nearly a decade before then, in that other quiescent period—the early 1950s—Fanon had broken with European values, and, in 1952, wrote that original philosophic work, *Black Skin, White Masks*. It became the transition point to new theory, and practice, of revolution. Fanon was the precursor of a whole new generation of revolutionaries.

By the time, in 1961, when Fanon wrote his masterpiece, *The Wretched of the Earth*, it was to be not just his highest point of development, and not only a Manifesto of the Third World, but a Manifesto with global dimensions he called "a new humanism." That its todayness keeps proving itself in reality as well as in theory was shown both at the height of youth revolt in Paris, May 1968, and all over again during the summer of 1976 when Soweto teen-agers, rebelling against being made to learn Afrikaans, the language of the oppressors, were found, instead, to be reading *The Wretched of the Earth*.

Before his savage murder, Steve Biko, that leader of the Black Consciousness movement who made the link to Fanon most direct both on consciousness and on internationalism said: "The Black Consciousness movement does not

want to accept the dilemma of capitalism versus communism. It will opt for a socialist solution that is an authentic expression of black communalism . . . As Fanon put it, 'the consciousness of the self is not the closing of a door to communication . . . National consciousness which is not nationalism is the only thing that will give us an international dimension.'"

IT IS THIS, JUST THIS, type of affinity of ideas of freedom that led American Black youth to identify with African and Caribbean freedom struggles and thinking. Petty-bourgeois intellectuals may not have noticed this working out of a new relationship of theory to practice that is itself a form of theory, since they haven't done the "theorizing." But the American Black identification with Soweto and Biko, with Fanon and Caribbean thought, was precisely that, as Black and white American youth demonstrations against U.S. imperialism's heavy investments in apartheid South Africa showed. Opposition to U.S. imperialism's propping up of Rhodesia while mouthing hollow words regarding "Black majority rule," words as false as Ian Smith's, is another such manifestation. Many are the ways the passion for freedom is articulating itself.

It is this idea of liberation whose time has come, which inspired the Black authors of this pamphlet — John Alan and Lou Turner — to probe their own experiences as well as historic-philosophic developments. One — Lou Turner — came into the Movement just when the civil rights struggles of the 1960s had reached, on the

one hand, a new point of development with "Hell, no, we won't go!" into the Vietnam war, and, on the other hand, got aborted at the very highest point reached in Kent, Ohio, and Jackson, Mississippi, against U.S. imperialism's invasion of Cambodia.

The other — John Alan — who had been in all class struggles as well as Black struggles from the mid-1940s, felt that the very length of his experiences demanded a total re-examination and re-evaluation of the doings he felt had lacked a comprehensive theory, ever-widening the gulf between revolution and philosophy. He also felt keenly the constant underestimation of Black American thought as if the Third World struggles were the whole and had no roots in the Black American experience. The truth was that the two-way road from Africa to America and back, indeed the triangular — African-West Indian-Black American — development of ideas which led to actual liberation movements, had started way back when all capitalism saw was a triangular trade of slaves, rum, molasses.

KARL MARX HAD BEEN the first to graphically and profoundly sum up the beginnings of capitalism:

"The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalized the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production."

And what his new continent of thought—Historical Materialism that he called "a new Humanism" — led Marx to point to as the path of world revolution was the "new forces and new passions" that would not only destroy the old capitalistic society but create the new, class-less social order on truly human foundations. Bound by this vision, the authors of Frantz Fanon, Soweto and American Black Thought wish to trace the triangular development of ideas and actual achievement of liberation, not for history's sake, but as preparation for the American revolution-to-be.

News & Letters, both as paper and as organization, is proud to publish their study and to appeal to the whole Left to rise to the challenge of the times beset by myriad crises, as well as to open new roads of revolution in thought as in fact. When Frantz Fanon declared that the colonial fight for freedom was "not a treatise on the universal, but the untidy affirmation of an original idea propounded as an absolute," he was, in fact, laying the foundation for the Absolute Idea — the unity of theory and practice — not just as a summing up, a totality of past and present, but what we call new beginnings for the future. Revolutionary Black thought, whether it comes from Azania (South Africa), the Caribbean, or the United States, is not end, but prologue to action. We invite all readers to join our authors in working out the imperative task they set for themselves to theoretically prepare for the American revolution-to-be.

*Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 21, p. 823. Kerr edition (p. 915 Penguin edition).

The Latin American revolutions: where to next?

JUNE, 1978

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION*
and *Marxism and Freedom*

EDITOR'S NOTE: We print below excerpts from a new *Political-Philosophic Letter* by Raya Dunayevskaya, written upon her return from her national lecture tour. The full *Letter*, which includes as Appendix her correspondence with Silvio Frondizi around his projected translation of *MARXISM AND FREEDOM*, can be ordered from *NEWS & LETTERS* for 50 cents.

Of the more than two dozen talks I gave on this spring's lecture tour — ranging from "Gramsci's Philosophy of Praxis vs. Eurocommunism" to "Frantz Fanon, Soweto and American Black Thought"; from "Rosa Luxemburg and Today's Women's Liberation Movement," to "Today's Global Crisis, Marx's *CAPITAL* and the Epigones Who Try To Truncate It" — the talk that produced the most probing discussions was the one given at California State University on "The Latin American Unfinished Revolutions: Where to Next?" This was due to the fact that the discussions on it transformed the question, "Where To Next?", from one of "programs and tactics," as was the case heretofore, to one of methodology and a philosophy of revolution.

In the 1960s the discussions around the New Divide — the Cuban Revolution — were nearly totally uncritical both because of the great enthusiasm over its success against both Batista and that goliath 90 miles from its shore, U.S. imperialism, and because of the hope that it would initiate a new age of revolutions on no less than a tri-continental Third World range. But the new question now posed was: How could it be that Cuba — which made its revolution by its own force and its own Reason which Fidel had declared to be "Humanist," — was now so blatantly tailendist to Russia, globally, as to declare Ethiopia a "land going toward socialism" and oppose the Eritrean liberation struggle Fidel had so long championed? . . .

One African called the Cubans "mercenaries," and I strongly objected to the designation, explaining that,

no doubt, if I were Eritrean, I could easily sound as Maoist as those who declare Russia to be "Enemy No. 1," but that choosing the "lesser evil" has always brought to the fore the greater evil, be it U.S. imperialism or Russian. The young man replied that, first, he was not Eritrean, but Ethiopian; and that a genuine social revolution is exactly what the liberation struggles within Ethiopia aimed at, as against Col. Mengistu. But, continued the young man, the truth is always concrete, and, concretely, the Cubans are not revolutionaries but counter-revolutionaries in Ethiopia.

WHERE, IN THE 1960s and early '70s, discussions in the Left centered around "Dependency Theories," today discussion is around the unfinished nature of all Third World revolutions . . . Today, Third Worldism is declared to be sheer "euphoria," as in Gerard Challand's *Revolution in the Third World*. It is by no means a work by some reactionary outsider, but a Left "participant-observer" as he rightly designates himself. It is this that makes Challand's book a serious contribution to the present discussion of what to do now that the revolutions in the Third World have remained unfinished.

He answers unequivocally with what he calls "Guerrilla Inflation: The Foco Theory as a Theory of Failure." He shows that, first, the only peasant and urban guerrillas that had any success were those that were social as well as national struggles, that is to say, class battles. Secondly, he now acknowledges that "the most important weakness is the conceptual" (p. 179) . . . Unfortunately, far from drawing the "conceptual" to a logical conclusion as a total philosophy of liberation, Challand himself reduces it to "social and political terrain," which is hardly more than Trotskyist paraphernalia, though he rejects Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution.

TWO WORLDS

AS FAR BACK AS 1952, Bolivia had a national and social revolution, in which the Trotskyists played a leading role. They have learned little from their popu-

lar frontism, which only paved the way for retrogression. That the failure to face that question assures the repetition of laying the ground for even more tragic failures was seen as recently as 1971, when the new euphoria over Allende's victory led them to issue the call for a "Single Marxist Party of the Masses" through merger of the Socialist, Communist and Trotskyist Parties . . .

Even now, when they blame Fidel for not having been critical enough of Allende's reformism, not to mention totally tail-ending Russian Communism in Africa, the Trotskyists can find nothing sharper to accuse Fidel of than "empiricism on the question of Stalinism." It is not empiricism that is the question. It is the critical determinant — the class nature, the capitalist class nature, of Stalinism, which is, after all, but the Russian name for the world phenomenon of our age: state-capitalism.

And it is the blindness to this reality which assures continued Trotskyist tailending of Communism . . .

THE SPECIFIC TERRAIN of Latin America brought to my mind the development of the Argentinian revolutionary, Silvio Frondizi. On the eve of the first revolts from under Russian totalitarianism — the June, 1953 uprising in East Germany — Frondizi began a new type of digging into the origins of Marx's new continent of thought he called a "new Humanism".

Frondizi wrote: "The recent publication of the *Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* and of *The German Ideology* serves to illuminate many important aspects of dialectical materialism, making urgent and indispensable a new study of theory that would take into account the humanism in them and in *The Holy Family*, *The Jewish Question*, the introduction to the *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, as well as the later economic works that, far from contradicting the philosophical principles affirmed in the early works . . . illuminate and enriches them". . . .

Silvio Frondizi was a serious Marxist, an activist. In a land where the Left confusedly hoped after World War II that Peron might be an effective force against U.S. imperialism, Frondizi had instead, by the 1950s, organized a group to seriously study dialectics and print Marxist studies in Argentina.

BY 1968, THE MOST tragic aspect, globally, of Cuba's moving away from revolution, was Cuba's tail-ending Stalinism in the approval of Russia's counter-revolutionary crushing of Prague Spring, 1968 . . . It wasn't only the Third World countries that remained cold to "socialism with a human face" in 1968. So sure was the revolutionary youth movement in France that they could "make it" (a social revolution) without any digging deep in order to work out a new relationship of theory to practice, maintaining that theory, as Cohn-Bendit had put it, could be picked up "en route," that Czechoslovakia was left bleeding alone . . .

What is new (in the 1970s) are the new groups that are appearing from the Left, who want to see with eyes of today the past two decades that would not separate the Latin American struggles from those in East Europe, or the Black Revolution in the U.S. from the present struggle in South Africa, or new class struggles in West Europe from the so-called "ultra-Lefts" in China, much less allow Women's Liberation to be relegated to "the day after" the revolution. The new is that the struggles must be considered as a totality, and as a totality from which would emerge new beginnings.

May 15, 1978

Reflections on Notes From A Diary, by Raya Dunayevskaya (Freddie Forest)
**Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks and
 the State-Capitalist Tendency**

Editor's Note: We print below brief excerpts from a new essay by Raya Dunayevskaya which takes up in detail the Philosophic Correspondence between herself, C.L.R. James and Grace Lee (Boggs)—35 letters written between Feb. 1949 and Jan. 1951, the critical period marked, on the one hand, by the outbreak of the Korean War, and on the other hand, by the General Strike of West Virginia miners. These letters have just been added to the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection, on deposit with the Labor History Archives-Walter Reuther Library of Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202. They are available on microfilm from that library. The entire essay from which these excerpts were taken is available for 50c from News & Letters, 1900 E. Jefferson, Detroit, MI 48207.

1978 is the 25th anniversary of the first convention of the state-capitalist tendency as an independent organization in the U.S. It was also the last of a united Johnson-Forest Tendency. As I reflect upon that fact today it is not, as previously, in order "to set the record straight" . . . rather, it is that in the process of looking back at 1953, I realized that the beginnings of the division in Johnson-Forest had begun to emerge in 1949-50 with my translation of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks (specifically his Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic).

Both objectively and subjectively, 1953 was a great historic Turning Point. In March came the death of Stalin, and this signalled the lifting of an incubus from the head of the proletariat. In June came the first-ever revolt from under Russian Communist totalitarianism in East Germany, and with it, a new stage of cognition which, with the Hungarian Revolution, had clearly reconnected with what Marx's new continent of thought originally called itself: "a new Humanism." 1953 was also the year the Korean War ended, and it was soon followed by the Bandung Afro-Asian conference which signalled the birth of a Third World, to develop by the

end of the decade with African and Latin American dimensions.

That is precisely the point. Why didn't the united Johnson-Forest Tendency meet the challenge of the times as the decade first opened when, at one and the same time, there was the Miners' General Strike, in which I was actively involved and "happened" also to be translating, for the first time into English, Lenin's, Philosophic Notebooks?

IN 1949, A CORRESPONDENCE began, lasting nearly two years, on my translation of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks. No matter what else was tackled, which I will develop in full later, all of us stressed the fact that it was the Doctrine of the Notion where Lenin made his great breakthrough of the dialectic for his age of imperialism. Building on Lenin's concretization of the principle of transformation into opposite from the Doctrine of the Notion, we would need to go the full length, to the Absolute Idea, to work out the problems of our age.

Yet, once we had to face Trotskyism with political resolutions and present a summation of the whole decade of our work on the theory of state-capitalism — State Capitalism and World Revolution — we, instead, limited ourselves once again to the category of contradiction . . .

The letters began on Feb. 18, 1949, as I sent a covering note for each part of Lenin's Abstract, beginning of course with his notes on the Preface, Introduction, and Doctrine of Being. I called attention to the fact that what James had referred to as central in Lenin—the early recognition of "Leaps" rather than gradualism — had appeared in Measure, that is, at the end of the first book: "You will enjoy the notes on Being, which you practically skipped over, in your hurry to get to Essence. It seemed to me one of the reasons was the necessity to begin with simplest categories, because both in philosophy, economics, politics and what have you, those simple categories 'contain in germ the whole' . . .

On March 12, I concluded the translation, sending Lenin's Notes on the Doctrine of the Notion, which is where Lenin concluded that none could understand Capital who had not studied the whole of the Logic. I evidently was becoming conscious of differences between Lenin's and James's "variations" of the dialectic. The covering note to the last part of Lenin's Philosophic
 (Continued on P. 7)

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1978

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

Neteboks stated: "Let me say at the start that although you have entered into this 'conspiracy' with Lenin, the outstanding difference between the two 'versions' (of the Dialectic) is striking. You will note that Lenin's notes on the Notion are as lengthy as those on the Introduction, and Doctrines of Being and Essence combined . . . although you spent that much time on Notion, and included its practice, the thing you chose most to stop at and say: hic Rhodus, hic salta to was the Law of Contradiction in Essence . . . (but Lenin) chose to single out the section on the Idea."

JAMES FIRST FINALLY, on June 10, 1949, got to acknowledge the translation of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks and my commentaries. He wrote: "You are covering a lot of ground and it is pretty good. But after conversations with G & reading (carefully, this time) your correspondence, I feel that we are still off the point . . ." Clearly, it is not I with whom they disagree as hotly as they did with Lenin. Indeed, they had not the slightest notion of what Lenin was talking about until July 9, when finally Grace did get down to the Doctrine of Notion as Lenin worked it out . . .

She proceeded to analyze the major categories on the Doctrine of the Notion — the Universal, Particular, Individual — showing that the whole structure, as well as each separate part of the Science of Logic, was grounded in them. This was spelled out especially clearly in her letter of September 4, 1949. And, having made a leap in cognition, she became most concrete regarding Lenin, on the one hand, especially as it related to Imperialism, and, on the other hand, as a critique of Bukharin . . .

(She wrote): "Development is the absolute mediation of Universal, particular and singular. Isn't this the Logic of Self-determination when (there is) growing internationalization? Destruction of state machine when bourgeois state has reached highest stage of organization? . . ."

Now, compare this clarity on self-determination with what we wrote in *State-Capitalism and World Revolution* as we skipped over the stage of unfolding national revolutions: "the struggle for national independence since World War II is an illusion and cannot fail to have reactionary consequences."

How can there possibly be such retreats, i.e., how can opposite positions be taken in what was worked out philosophically, when we weren't writing a "Resolution" and when we were? Upon reflection, it appears that, had it been worked out seriously, that is to say, not just abstractly but concretely, that couldn't have happened. But then that is speculation — no one can tell what is going on in another's mind — and I do not appreciate any indulgence in speculation. What I do know, for sure, is that with the outbreak of the Korean War, June, 1950, and the Trotskyists once again tail-ending Stalinism, the Johnson-Forrest Tendency felt it imperative to leave the SWP once and for all.

THE WHOLE OBJECTIVE post-World War II situation, which looked so ripe for revolution in the 1940s, was once again plunged into a new war . . . All the more did it become imperative, I thought, to work out all philosophic ramifications and not allow our analysis of state-capitalism to remain at essence of economics. In any case, I continued to work at philosophy as I began to develop the research I had been doing for years on "Marxism and State-Capitalism," the book that was to become *Marxism and Freedom*. I proposed two new points of departure: (1) Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, and (2) the American proletariat as seen in the Miners' General Strike of 1949-50 . . .

Everything changed in 1953 with Stalin's death in March. Not only was I writing politically on that event, but I decided also to try out the analysis of the 1920-21 Trade Union debate between Lenin and Trotsky, in the context of the 1950s and, again, with the American proletariat's attitude to these events. The Correspondence special was called "Then and Now," and was distributed at factory gates. By May, 1953, I not only returned to the Absolute Idea in Science of Logic and tackled also Absolute Knowledge in Phenomenology of Mind, but also plunged into Absolute Mind in Philosophy of Mind, from which C.L.R. James had said he "got nothing" . . .

Within six weeks of my Letters, an actual proletarian revolt had broken out spontaneously, and inside a state-capitalist land calling itself Communist — East Germany. This June 17, 1953 Revolt, which signalled a new age, was followed by the Beria purge, and once again I returned to "politics," writing the lead for the very first issue of the published Correspondence, October, 1953. McCarthyism was in full swing and it took less than a year for us to be "listed." By then, Johnson was in England, but still "The Leader," and instigating the break-up of the Johnson-Forrest Tendency. What was great about that was that it permitted us to work out those philosophic ramifications so that, instead of just "state-capitalist tendency," we became Marxist-Humanists. The very first mimeographed pamphlet we published was Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, but it took another two years of not finding a publisher, before the Notebooks, along with Marx's Humanist Essays were printed as Appendices to *Marxism and Freedom* . . . from 1976 until today.

Camp David Summit: Peace in Middle East— or extension of U.S. imperialism?

(Because of the urgency of the ramifications of the Camp David summit, we are holding our column this issue and turning our space over to the following analysis by Raya Dunayevskaya.—Peter Mallory and Ron Brokmeyer)

They—Sadat and Begin—were summoned. They came. They saw. They did not conquer. He, the summoner—U.S. imperialism in the person of President Carter—did conquer. But even he did not do it till the 13th day at the "Summit" which convened on Sept. 5 and had the 17th as the deadline.

Whether the deadline was orchestrated from the start, or came about "spontaneously," the more important fact is that, on the one hand, the U.S. had promised to build—at a cost of between \$300 million and \$1 billion—two airfields "for Israel," "to replace" those in the Sinai Israel ceded, with conditions, to Egyptian sovereignty. And, on the other hand, Carter, having become the "full partner" Sadat had called for, could also show the U.S.'s full imperial clout to the global enemy, Russia; he will visit Egypt in 1979. It is the U.S.'s presence in the Middle East that the Camp David Summit was designed to achieve.

BEGIN AND SADAT, SEPARATELY AND TOGETHER

Begin may not have buckled under as totally as Sadat. He certainly made this all too obvious, both in the substance of the written "Agreement," and orally, beginning at the very first appearance, in the midst of addressing the American, indeed, a world TV audience,

by suddenly switching to Hebrew, acting exactly like the mother lapsing into pig-Latin to make sure the children do not understand adult problems.* No doubt that reactionary terrorist of war days has a whole host of other cards up his sleeve to cause the facade of

peace to crumble into dust, or, more precisely the sands of Sinai. But Begin, too, had not only to acknowledge Egyptian sovereignty over Sinai, but pay lip service also to the "legitimate rights of the Palestinians." That he has no such intention, having first reduced the right to self-determination to an allegedly "self-governing unity" under Israeli guns "in enclaves," cannot totally undo what he did give, to which we will get later.

Above all, there will be a direct U.S. threat in the Middle East. These two airfields are being built only "for Israel", but can any one doubt the purpose of Defense Secretary Brown's scheduled visit to the Sinai?

For that matter Sadat didn't completely buckle under either, though what he got, and what he demanded publicly—a homeland for the Palestinians—are total opposites. His dramatic trip to Jerusalem, which aroused so much mass support both in Israel and in Egypt for genuine peace, was, in truth, a gesture for a separate peace. And that not only because Egypt is in such deep economic crisis and there is mass discontent, but because as rulers, both he and Begin understood better than did Carter, the globalist, how totally "ominous" was the Oct. 1, 1977 joint statement of the U.S. and Russia for a return to Geneva to "cool down" the Middle East cauldron.

Let us not forget that the PLO was the only one to greet that joint statement, with Arafat saying he "could live with it." And what, above all, we must keep in mind is that that way to peace so scared the Middle East potentates that Sadat's spectacular journey to Israel followed within a month, and within another month a trip by Begin to Ismailia.

That there also unravelled the beginning of the end of the new orientation—Egypt-Israel as unit—is exactly what must be kept in the front of our minds if we are to understand Camp David and its ramifications today. That is to say, at one and the same time, the Egypt-Israel "unit" can blow up and spur on the U.S.-Russia global conflagration.

*"Peace has come to our people and our land" may have sounded as if it were meant for all—the Middle East and the world—but the fact that it was spoken in Hebrew, and it was in Hebrew the day before at Camp David, and that he told the Israeli press that the Agreement "did not block further Israeli West Bank settlements or military deployment," surely was a coded message for his cohorts in the Likud.

OCTOBER, 1978

PAX AMERICANA

1978, for the Middle East, opened with such vilification on the side of both Egypt and Israel, that, by March, Carter had to tell the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the "diplomatic process has come to a halt." Indeed, it was this stalemate that got the U.S. Senate to approve the sale of combat planes to Saudi Arabia and Egypt as well as to Israel. But even this did not prod Egypt and Israel back to "negotiations," as was clear from the collapse of their foreign ministers meeting, this time in the setting of England. And July 18 was followed, on July 24, by Kamel's recall to Egypt and his announcement that no further negotiations would be held.

It was this total impasse which brought about Vance's trip to both Jerusalem and Cairo with but a single "handwritten invitation" to Camp David, which both promptly accepted as they really had nowhere else to go other than war, and Israel was already in one war—in Lebanon! That, technically, its army was out of southern Lebanon, far from closing that chapter, is the open wound that bleeds "heavenward"; surely none on this earth is paying any attention to fragmented Lebanon that keeps being bled, though the civil war has supposedly ended and "peace returned."

When, on Sept. 18, Carter addressed a joint session of Congress, he let it be known that Lebanon, though not included in the Agreement, had caused "heated discussion". As if that is not still another of the

serious problems not "solved" at the "Summit" "on" the Middle East, Carter also let it be known that France may be involved. Having been the first to carve Lebanon out of Syria at the end of the First World War, France no doubt has great "experience," not to aid the Lebanese or Palestinian people, but to steer imperialist rule in that volatile region. For the present moment, it sheds yet another light on why the convening of the Summit conference was delayed one day: to allow Sadat to stop off in France. So much for no secrets at the Summit!

What was put down on paper and grandiosely called "Framework for Peace"—but which all others just call "Framework"—far from being anything "comprehensive," limited itself to one near-accomplishment in returning the Sinai to Egyptian sovereignty, provided that, within two weeks, the Knesset votes to dismantle the Israeli settlements there; and one questionable promise that, after three months of negotiations during which no Israeli settlements would be built there, the Palestinians would supposedly get "self-governing rule," provided (1) they close their eyes to the massive army—and even reduced in half, as promised, the Israeli occupying army numbers 15,000 "in enclaves"—and (2) they can "elect" that governing body, provided they understand that what they are choosing is Israel and Jordan, not any homeland for themselves.

If even we were willing, for the moment, to forget that this can hardly pass for a "comprehensive Middle East framework when even such "moderate" Arabs as King Hussein and King Khalid are not included, how can we forget who at this very moment is meeting in Damascus? Assad is presiding there over a so-called "steadfastness front"—of Syria, Libya, Algeria, South Yemen and, of course, the PLO—this time united solidly against the U.S.-engineered Egypt-Israel accord for a projected bilateral "peace treaty."

The fact that Syria is, at the same time, trying not to close all doors to U.S. imperialism by agreeing to hear Secretary of State Vance's "briefing" on what happened in Camp David is hardly to be taken as a sign of any siding with "the West."

Assad's Syria is not only still occupying Lebanon, and not only is being threatened by Israel, both directly on the occupied Golan Heights, and indirectly via the neo-fascist "Christian" Army who are surrogates for Israel throughout Lebanon; but also is threatened from within the rejection front by the Ba'ath regime of Iraq, while Syria itself is in deep economic-political crisis. It is true Sadat is not using the language of Arafat, who is under the greatest illusion of all that 1978 is 1948 and Israel's very right to exist is questioned. But Sadat's Egypt is a crucial country in the volatile Middle East which abounds in crises, from the civil war in Iran to the two Yemens, one "representing" Saudi Arabia, the other Russia, to . . .

It is impossible to go into all the crises besetting

the region, and its strategic as well as oil importance for the industrialized world, as the two nuclear Goliaths—U.S. and Russia—fight for mastery over it. If one can call it "new," the one thing new that has been set off by Camp David is such total fragmentation of the very concept of an "Arab nation," that all one can now see is the heavy tilting toward U.S. capitalist-imperialism until it sets the timing for global conflagration!

No answer can come from either the imperialistic or narrow nationalistic double-crosses. Only the masses taking destiny into their own hands can possibly put an end to the capitalist-imperialistic, racist, alienating world headed for the holocaust. One good sign came when 100,000 Israelis marched against Begin, demanding peace. Another sign came from Egypt, where the mass discontent has forced Sadat not to put all the burden of inflation on the backs of the working people.

Each country's rulers must contend with the mass opposition in its land and it is those masses in motion that can nullify Camp David summitry as well as all other contenders who act as "spokesmen" for the Palestinian people, or any other masses struggling for freedom. These masses in motion have not had their last say.

Raya Dunayevskaya
Sept. 20, 1978

7014

TWO WORLDS

OCTOBER, 1978

N&L Convention: philosophy and organization

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: Raya Dunayevskaya is giving over her column this issue to a letter received from a colleague following the News and Letters Convention over Labor Day weekend. Copies of her three discussion articles which are taken up in the letter can be obtained from News & Letters for \$1 the set, postage included.

Dear Raya:

The question of the relationship of philosophy to organization, which you have long posed, became meaningful to me in a very new way during our recent News and Letters Convention. Those brief two and a half days showed a tremendous releasing of revolutionary passion and Reason—of the "revolutionary spirit", to use the expression of the eloquent Black woman worker who spoke so creatively of her desire for a new way of life.

Look at the richness of experience of those who joined News and Letters Committees at the Convention. Almost all are deeply proletarian, with roots in different sections of the working class—in auto and chemical, as Vietnam veterans, in working for the liberation of Black prisoners—all striving, to find a wholeness of expression through Marxist-Humanist philosophy.

CAN IT BE ANY accident that these "lower and deeper" layers of our society not only spoke with us, but joined News and Letters Committees, in the very year of the most explicit introduction of our philosophic origins and development both into our preconvention discussion, and into the Convention itself?

And this year also brought us the Black Intellectual who has been in every facet of the Black movement. He has known Black as revolutionary Subject, but makes a leap to a new comprehension of revolution when he sees Black as revolutionary Subject united with Marx's new continent of thought. His leap is not separate from the highpoints of our theoretic development this year; he came to us not only through our

work on Frantz Fanon, Soweto and American Black Thought, but most precisely through the classes we held on Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis this spring.

The quality of these newest members—of worker and intellectual, of Black women, of Black and white men who have a deep sensitivity to the Women's Liberation Movement—portends a very new period for us, and in trying to understand how we could have this kind of achievement at this particular period, I looked again at the three contributions you had made to the Preconvention Discussion Bulletins.

YOU DISCUSS THERE what is crucial as a world stage in the revolutionary movement, Hegel's Absolute Idea as New Beginning, its origins and development by Marxist-Humanists from 1949 to the period of our current Convention. Indeed, Chapter One of Philosophy and Revolution, "Absolute Negativity as New Beginning" was brought directly into this year's Perspectives Report to the Convention.

Your article "Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks and the State-Capitalist Tendency" takes up the 1949-50 correspondence between yourself, CLR James and Grace Lee Boggs, as you translated into English for the first time Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks. From your article I could grasp how crucial it is, if one is to develop what is new for one's age, to not miss a single link of what has been worked out historically, philosophically, before you. If you don't follow carefully someone else's revolutionary philosophic contribution arising out of their specific historic moment, then you cannot develop the needed revolutionary thought for your era.

James' and Lee's attitude to Lenin's Notebooks was quite different from yours. They were so anxious to get to their own contribution that they skipped over Lenin's contribution and ended up being unable to make a leap in revolutionary thought. They saw Lenin's contribution within Hegel's Doctrine of Essence and not within the doctrine of the Notion. They would do Notion. But in it was they who, because they did not labor through it comprehensively, became stuck

in Essence and could not see Lenin's contribution in Notion as their point of departure.

DIDN'T THEY TAKE Lenin's Notebooks for granted, thus leaving them partly as an abstraction? In contrast, a true comprehension of Lenin's philosophic Great Divide in Marxism could not be separated from seeing the historical and political ramifications of that philosophic leap.

Didn't your grappling with Lenin's break with his own philosophic past impel you to look historically at the dialectics in the structure of Capital, and to study Lenin pre- and post-1914? And wasn't it this methodology, learned from Lenin's philosophic-political journey from 1914 onward, that enabled you to not just stop at the analysis of the objective situation of our period—state-capitalism as a world stage, which all the state-capitalist tendency, including James and Lee had caught—but look further at the philosophic ramifications of the economic reality?

In other words, you saw not alone state-capitalism, but the new human forces of revolution against that—specifically, in '49-'50, the miners who were on general strike against automation at the very time you were translating those Notebooks.

Wasn't it thus the objective situation, the subjectivity of the specific forces of revolution of that period, together with your working through the philosophic labor of the preceding revolutionary generation, which made possible your leap in cognition when you returned to Hegel in 1953, in the chapter on the Absolute Idea in the Doctrine of Notion, seeing in Hegel's Absolute Idea a movement from practice to theory, bringing forth Absolute Idea as New Beginning?

Such a philosophic breakthrough created a whole new vantage point to view the objective world and the subjectivity of forces of revolution. That philosophy is not separate from organization can be seen in the fact that soon enough you broke with James and Lee, and in 1955 News and Letters Committees was founded, with labor, Black, youth and women spelled out in our very Constitution as the forces of the American revolution. At our founding, you were assigned the organizational task of completing Marxism and Freedom.

TWO WORLDS

OCTOBER, 1978

AND ABSOLUTE IDEA as New Beginning doesn't stop: it becomes more concrete and more enriched over a 25-year period. Your second contribution to the Discussion Bulletins, the Letter to Harry McShane, the Scottish Marxist-Humanist, pinpoints the re-concretization of Absolute Idea as New Beginning from Marxism and Freedom to Philosophy and Revolution.

In Marxism and Freedom you had shown Absolute Idea as the unity of theory and practice, with a movement from practice that is so mature in its action and idea that it, itself, has become a form of theory and movement toward a new society.

But if Absolute Idea as New Beginning is the breakthrough in both philosophy and reality for our age, it is so as its own development. Marxism and Freedom was published in 1958. The 1960s certainly showed the truth of a movement from practice being one of tremendous maturity, as with the Black movement in the United States and internationally.

But 1968, while certainly a high point of opposition to the powers-that-be, worldwide, revealed in its incompleteness that Absolute Idea as New Beginning did not stop as a unity of the movement from practice and the movement from theory. New beginnings as forces of revolution could no longer remain only new beginnings; or the movement would abort.

There had to be, as well, a reorganization of thought as a new beginning, a totality of view, a new continent of thought. If this movement of thought was also seen

as a new beginning, then it would mean a pathway whereby the new forces of liberation could become the fullness of revolution.

For when philosophy itself is grasped as a New Beginning by the revolutionary individual, by the masses as integral to their movement toward freedom, when philosophy becomes the very basis of revolutionary organization, then Absolute Idea as New Beginnings is not alone the unity of theory and practice, but becomes the totality of both, as the movement of liberation constantly being renewed. This I believe is what becomes spelled out much more comprehensively in your Philosophy and Revolution, published in 1973.

YOUR THIRD CONTRIBUTION to the Discussion Bulletins, the Dear Sisters Letter of August 1978, traces the process by which you are constantly reconcretizing Absolute Idea as New Beginning, here as the specificity for one of the forces of revolution, Women's Liberation, for the period since the publication of Philosophy and Revolution. In that letter you develop your methodology of thinking about a work which had begun with a title on Women as Force and Reason, to one which encompasses Rosa Luxemburg, Today's Women's Liberation Movement and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

This dialectical movement towards totality as new beginnings is, I believe, the same method which was within our Convention, allowing so many expressions of the leap toward freedom to come forth. The recognition of self within Marxist-Humanist philosophy, felt by all who became members of our organization, flowed from the philosophic ground of Absolute Idea as New Beginning.

IN RETURNING TO OUR Convention I want to conclude on our Executive Session, where you gave a new vantage point for looking at revolutionary leadership in our age. It is not based on the history of party or program of the Marxist movement, the vantage point of the old Marxist organizations and of the so-called Marxist organizations today. In looking at only party and program, they have distorted so much of both, and have totally departed from revolutionary leadership as theoretic preparation for actual revolution as well as for "the day after" victory when bureaucracy emerges all over again to stifle the new creativity from below, fully released.

Our vantage point is the historic mirror of revolutionary philosophy not separate from organization. Otherwise, Lassalleism, the organizer of mass organizations, will taint us as it has tainted all revolutionaries. Lenin included. That was the most shocking point and also the most sobering.

The responsibility in the revolutionary movement becomes so much greater: the working out of the revolutionary philosophic contribution for our age is not only integral to the self-activity of masses as Reason, but cannot be separated from organization, if we are not to fall into the old quagmire of vanguardism. All the more imperative, it seems to me, is the working out of a new form of organization which we began with committees rather than party-form of organization. Don't you think that is what Rudolf Bahro is trying to do though he sits in jail in East Germany?

Eugene Walker
September 8, 1978

The dialectic of today's crises and revolts

by Raya Dunayevskaya
 Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
 and **Marxism and Freedom**

We print below, brief excerpts from the Introduction and Part IV of Raya Dunayevskaya's Perspectives Report, given to the Convention of News and Letters Committees on Sept. 2. The entire Report has been reproduced as a Post-Convention Bulletin, and is available from N&L for 50c plus 25c postage. See full ad, page 6.

INTRODUCTION: Whether the "China card" is in the U.S.'s Hands, or China's Own, It is a False Alternative

First and foremost among the new contradictions that burst forth (during these couple of months between the June 17 Draft Perspectives and the final working out of Perspectives we need to achieve today) was the August 12 signing of the Sino-Japanese Treaty. The Foreign Minister of Japan, Sunao Sonada, followed this up by informing the world that China had informed him that it (China) would formally abrogate the 1950 friendship pact with Russia.

As if anyone could possibly doubt that the Treaty was not just between China and Japan, Hua Kuo-feng repaired at once to Russia's imperial sphere of influence, East Europe, specifically Roumania and Yugoslavia, and then to Russia's antagonistic neighbor, Iran.

What far outweighs this gesture of nose-thumbing was the global dimension of Big Power politicking with the U.S. The latter was, at one and the same time, encouraging Japan to conclude that deal with China, and using China as its card in trying to get from Russia the kind of SALT treaty the U.S. wants.

While the population Goliath, China, on the one hand, and the industrial giant, Japan, on the other, are by no means just U.S. surrogates, (similar to Cuba or East Germany executing Russia's interests in Ethiopia), it is still very clear that Russia is not the only one seeking "hegemony". The state-capitalist age is bi-polar—Russia and the United States—and is titanically-nuclear,

with each fighting for single world mastery. Which doesn't mean that we are already on the precipice, and that others won't try to position themselves in a way to make geopolitics sound "ideological". . . .

THE SHOCKER IS NOT just that state-capitalism calling itself "Communist" indulges in capitalist-imperialist geopoliticking with our lives, exactly as "private" capitalism does. The shocker is not even that "Communist" Russia and "Communist" China consider each other "Enemy No. 1," since that shocker happened as far back as 1960 when the Sino-Soviet conflict came into the open. The new shocker is that not only is "ideology" used to cover up the jockeying for strategic geopolitical positions with the murderer of Lumumba—Mobutu—and the most barbaric of Latin American counter-revolutionaries—Pinchet of Chile—but that Hua Kuo-feng chose to meet the Shah at the very moment when a veritable civil war is in progress in Iran . . .

The Western capitalists are dreaming that China would have to buy, in the next ten years, no less than between \$20-\$30 billion of plant capital. Since Peking has said that it only has \$3 billion in foreign currency reserves, it would have to go in for heavy borrowing. For them, "ideology" has nothing to do with it; they are looking forward to the massive interest, i.e., profits galore. China, on the other hand, is interested in industrialization, hot-house style, with no great concern for the conditions of labor of its workers—exactly as Stalin when he launched the First Five Year Plan, and further intensified it to the breaking point for both workers and peasants with his demand that the Five Year Plan be finished in four years.

As we put it in the Draft Perspectives: "The greatest tragedy of all in this era is that Mao had, in fact, accepted state-capitalism as the next world economic order! Shocking as that sounds when expressed straightforwardly, Mao had it in the back of his mind as early as 1957." In a word, once a revolutionary does not ground himself/herself on new revolutionary beginnings from below, such as the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, and make that new beginning the determinant for a new end, with the goal being **FREEDOM**—retrogression is inescapable.

IV. The Praxis of Philosophy

A new alternative to state-capitalism calling itself Communism—whether in Russian, Chinese, or East European form—has appeared in the very place where the whole movement from practice was born back on

June 17, 1953; East Berlin. It is called *The Alternative—A Contribution to the Critique of Socialism as it Actually Exists*, by Rudolf Bahro. He has just landed in jail for having dared to write a serious study which concludes: "We have the kind of state machine Marx and Engels sought to smash by proletarian revolution, and which was not to be allowed to re-emerge in any form or any pretext."

Nor does Bahro stop there. He also proclaims that not only should the political hierarchy be abolished, but so must "the despotism of the factory . . . Work norms and piece wages should be abolished."

Bahro will have nothing to do with those who think that the Communist bureaucracy's exploitative nature is one only of "degeneration", or a question of "a problem of poor realization." Trotskyites, take note: Bahro writes, "I strongly believe that it is high time for revolutionary Marxists to abandon all theories of 'deformation' . . . We do not want to re-establish old norms, but to create new ones. We are no longer forced to rely on inner-party constellations."

TWO WORLDS

NOVEMBER, 1978

THE NEW BEGINNINGS Bahro is talking about, indeed proving, is to show that the revolutionary alternative didn't just arise today or with him, but "continues to exist unswervingly in Czechoslovakia." It is for no doubt very cogent reasons—he has already lost his freedom, has been jailed—that Bahro seems to prefer to start with Czechoslovakia, 1968, rather than with his own homeland, 1953, which began the entire movement from practice.

It is true that Bahro seems to relate to Eurocommunism, but it is not at all because of what the Eurocommunists are in fact—class collaborationists—but because of Eurocommunism's impact: "The Soviet Union would lose its Western periphery."

Nor could China's previous West European forays, or Hsu's latest trips into East Europe, transform Ceausescu of Rumania or Tito of Yugoslavia (not to mention the Shah of Iran) into revolutionaries who can display what Bahro rightly calls for: "Promethean solidarity."

That needed solidarity can come only from what Marx called "new passions and new forces" for the reconstruction of society on totally new, truly human beginnings . . .

THE VERY FACT THAT this year a revolutionary alternative, as against Mao's false alternative, emerged from East Germany where the movement from practice signalled the birth of a new revolutionary age as well as our very being as an independent tendency that rooted the concept of philosophy and revolution in that movement from practice that was itself a form of theory, needs to make us come face-to-face with our unique and historical contribution which we have tended to underestimate.

What was new that we braved was to disclose how Marx's discovery of a whole continent of thought—Historical Materialism, and what he called "a new Humanism" which united the ideal and the real—didn't just "take off from", but remained rooted in, Hegel.

Just as the fact that Hegel wasn't "conscious" that he laid any such ground for a very different, totally revolutionary generation didn't stop Marx's development, so we stressed the truth that has come out in our age by adding three little words to Hegel's Absolute Negativity: "as new beginning" . . .

No past generation could have done it—nor could the present generation who had not worked out the Absolute "as new beginning" for this age.

Creating theory, a philosophy of revolution, is as hard labor as anything manual. The writing of Philosophy and Revolution . . . manifested the subjective as inseparable from the objective. To execute this next year's task—the book on Rosa Luxemburg, Today's Women's Liberation Movement, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution—we have to understand Chapter 1 of P&R, not merely as a chapter in a book, but as the historic link with Marx and Lenin, that "makes" the totally new—objectively as well as subjectively—concrete . . .

Iran's revolutionary past—and present

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

(The following letter was sent to me by Raya Dunayevskaya, who is away from the office, working on her new book-in-progress, Rosa Luxemburg, Today's Women's Liberation Movement, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. It so totally complements the Lead we had assigned for this issue, on the civil war raging in Iran, that I print it in full, below.—Charles Denby, Editor)

November 13, 1978

Dear CD:

I'm sure there will be coverage of the civil war in Iran in the next issue of N&L, but I thought I'd like to discuss with you some of the past revolutionary developments there so that today's context can be seen in its totality, that is to say, not only as anti-Shah and anti-imperialism but fully revolutionary. For that, we need to return to November, 1917, because it was the ramifications of the Russian Revolution which spread throughout the world and included Iran.

The first thing the early workers' state did was to abrogate the Tsarist imperial treaties, which for Iran meant the end of the old Anglo-Russian division where Iran in the north was Russia's "sphere of influence," and in the southern oil fields it was England's. It is now Iran that stands for oil, but as far back as the turn of the century no less than 200,000 Iranians, many from the province of Gilan, were working in Russia's Caucasian oil fields. The 1905 Russo-Japanese war shook up the whole East and Middle-East, since it was the first time an Asian power won over the Tsar. And just as, within Russia, it produced a revolution, so it led to the establishment of the first Marxist group also in Iran. In any case, by 1917, the revolutionary impact on the Iranian masses, again in the province of Gilan, led to a revolutionary upsurge which, by 1920, actually established a Socialist Republic in Gilan.

Since it was a coalition of Marxists and nationalists which established the Republic, they no sooner de-

clared for land reform and the liberation of women from the veil than there was a breakup of that coalition. By the time the Republic also tried to liberate Iran, it was bloodily put down. And who do you suppose did that in 1921? It was the father of the present Shah, an army officer named Riza Khan, who soon thereafter crowned himself the Shah.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM PERMITTED his rule to continue up to World War II. By then, with U.S. imperialism's connivance, he was forced into exile because "the West" was suspicious of his dealings with the Nazis and wanted to keep the shipping lanes open for military aid to their new ally, Russia. That doesn't mean that they put down the so-called Pahlavi "dynasty". No, they enthroned Riza Khan's son, then only 21. Once again, there was the Anglo-Russian occupation of Iran and the young Shah learned he was but a vassal of U.S. imperialism. Stalin's Russia, however, was not the Russia of Lenin and Trotsky, and had its own illusions about remaining in Iran, demanding, in fact, some oil concessions. At the end of WW II, U.S. imperialism quickly put an end to that illusion and Stalin also learned that U.S. imperialism was the global power.

We know that U.S. imperialism was likewise not without illusions. It dreamed that its military might was sufficient to keep a new revolutionary upsurge from reappearing. The exact opposite was the case. This time, the National Front, strengthened by proletarian and peasant revolts, succeeded, by 1951, in putting Mossadegh in power. With it came the nationalization of the oil industry. By the time these events had developed sufficiently to put fear in the heart of the Shah and make him flee, U.S. imperialism had produced a global Cold War, which brought Eisenhower to the White House, Dulles to the State Department and McCarthyism to the U.S. Within a week of the Shah's fleeing, the CIA engineered a military coup and brought the Shah back to power. The repression started at once; it was not long thereafter that the SAVAK outdid the CIA in brutality.

WE KNOW THAT THE 1960s were a revolutionary

decade throughout the world. But the bourgeois press in this country so played up the Shah's so-called "White Revolution"—a mild land reform—that what did not stand out glaringly was that this came after the Shah massacred a genuinely popular uprising in Tehran itself in 1963. Along with these developments came the billions from oil, the corruption in the palace and in the military, the gobbling up of those billions in arms, and the Shah's new Grand Illusion that he was truly a global power.

What they all try to forget is that the 1970s are not the 1950s, either in Iran or in the U.S. The CIA does not have any such power as it wielded in 1953 in the Iran coup—which, unfortunately, does not mean that they do not have intentions of repeating another counter-revolution in Iran.

The very fact that martial law had to be declared not only in Tehran, but 11 other cities, including Isfahan, also brings up the question of the religious movement. The Shah tries to cover the unyielding revolt of the masses as if it is nothing more than a "mob" urged on by those who wish to turn the clock back. While there is no doubt that some of the Moslem clergy are reactionaries, it is not true that they are setting the direction, that they comprise what the Shah, with his penchant for contradictions, calls "Islamic Marxists." What is true is that when a revolution is genuinely popular, it involves the nation as a whole. And in that confrontation some unsavory characters may be present.

It is the mass movement however that decides the direction, raises the flag of liberation, and shouts, "Down with the Shah" as but one of the many demands for the end of this tyranny, propped by American imperialism. For that matter, some of the most radical women students have started to wear the veil, not because they are rolling the clock backward, but because under the veil can be hidden arms.

FROM THE IMPERIALIST, most reactionary point of view—and that is headed by U.S. imperialism—let us not forget that it is not just the Shah, that is being protected against the mass revolt, but the global interests of the imperialists. And it is not at all excluded that, if the Shah and his military regime cannot totally destroy this movement, the Shah would be removed. Everything from a "constitutional monarchy" to a full military regime, is possible.

What makes it not just possible, but probable, is the fact that the other global power, Russia, is not ready to initiate WW III over Iran. And the supposedly more revolutionary regime, China, though it considers Russia as Enemy Number One, finds more in common with Russia in the sense that, as state capitalists, they are just like the "private" capitalists in their total opposition to one thing and one thing only—and that is an outright proletarian revolutionary regime.

This is the international tragedy—that the Left, even that part of it which does see that Russia and China have separate national interests that outweigh everything else, does not see that it is not only as nations that they do not come to the aid of the revolutionary movement in Iran. Rather, it is that they are opposed to revolution—genuine mass revolutions in their own countries and elsewhere. It is this which unites them against spontaneous revolt; though each, as nation, considers the other, as nation, "Enemy Number One," both are equally opposed to revolution, nationally and internationally.

At this point, however, both of these nations are simply standing aside. American imperialism will do no such thing. Whereas it cannot achieve what it achieved in the Cold War, it has no intention whatever of letting the revolutionaries win. It cannot be underestimated that it put the present Shah on the throne; it killed the national revolution in 1953; it prefers the Shah, whom it has armed to the teeth, above even Saudi Arabia as "the guarantor of the Gulf and the Indian Oceans."

It is not only that Iran's oil (and that is second only to Saudi Arabia's), is crucial to Western imperialism, but that Iran is the passageway for all of the Middle East's oil to the U.S., Europe and Japan. Indeed, its geographic location makes it every bit as crucial to the whole global conflict as its oil—for it is the passageway to the Indian Ocean as well as the Red Sea, the crossroads to the Middle East and also to Africa. Not only, therefore, must we solidarize with the Iranian masses against U.S. imperialism, but we must focus on the fact that U.S. imperialism heads the global counter-revolution. The best way to end that role is to intensify the revolutionary activities right here.

Yours,
Raya

Philosophy and Revolution: critique vs. attack

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

Generally, *News & Letters* reproduces criticisms of any of our writings under the title, "As Others See Us." In the present case, I felt it important to reproduce it in my own column because, as against Howard Parsons' scurrilous attack on *Philosophy and Revolution*, in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* (June, 1975), the sharp criticism of my work by the scholar, George Armstrong Kelly, in his own work, *Hegel's Retreat From Eleusis*, will, I believe, stimulate a serious discussion on the chapter "Why Hegel? Why Now?"

From *Hegel's Retreat From Eleusis*, by George Armstrong Kelly, Princeton University Press, 1978 (pp. 238-242):

An arresting chapter of a new book by the unorthodox revolutionary Marxist Raya Dunayevskaya is entitled "Why Hegel? Why Now?" These questions are broadly answered in the following manner: "No matter what Hegel's own intentions . . . how could he have stopped the ceaseless motion of the dialectic just because his pen reached the end of his *Encyclopaedia of Philosophical Science*?" (p. 6)* This writer, who finds even Mao's "cultural revolution" deficient in the full utilization of Hegel, opts decisively against the interpretation of Hegel that I have been exploring. For the complex lineage of culture, politics and philosophy within the matrix of "absolute Idea," Mme. Dunayevskaya proposes to substitute an unchained dialectic, which she baptizes "Absolute Method", a method that "becomes irresistible . . . because our hunger for theory arises from the totality of the present global crisis."

*Except for footnote 33 we have inserted text pagination references to *Philosophy and Revolution*.

(p.7) To the question I have raised about the contemporaneity of Hegel, she answers with a resounding affirmative: "What makes Hegel a contemporary is what made him so alive to Marx: the cogency of the dialectic of negativity for a period of proletarian revolution, as well as for the 'birth-time' of history in which Hegel lived." (p.7) According to Dunayevskaya, "Hegel moved from 'culture' to 'science', i.e., the unity of history and its philosophic comprehension." (p. 286) It remained, then, only for Marx to demonstrate that action itself, surpassing thought, must be called on to reconstruct society and "realize" philosophy. However, Hegel felt his philosophy to be supremely valid precisely because it preserved and clarified culture in the memory, not because it had supplanted it.³³ Hegel told us not so much what we lack as what we have so tortuously acquired; how it constitutes us, not our latitude in rejecting it or turning it to other purposes. Thus, when our author concludes "that Hegel's tendencies in the summation of the past give us a glimpse of the future, especially when materialistically understood in a Marxist-Humanist, not vulgar economist, manner" (p.287), we recognize the partial aspect of Hegel she is appropriating, and we discern her strategic position in the intramural Marxist debate, but we find her judgment of the links between philosophy, history, politics, and culture alien to Hegel's intent . . .

To quote Dunayevskaya once more: "The (Hegelian) dialectic disclosed that the counter-revolution is within the revolution. It is the greatest challenge man has ever had to face." (p. 287) . . .

(33) Cf. Hegel to Niehammer, 28 Oct., 1808, Briefe, I, p.253: "Every day I am more convinced that theoretical work brings more to pass in the world than practical work. Once the realm of thought is revolutionized reality can scarcely hold out."

MARCH, 1979

TWO WORLDS

Certain strains of Marxism play with it (the Hegelian vision of the spirit's progress and goal in history as facilitated by politics), invert it, or re-compose it in ways that are frequently more profound than other solutions to the riddle of history in our times. If they are more profound, it is because they are more convinced that man has a

meaning and history a destiny. To say that their own contradictions betray them is not to dishonor their effort.

PROFESSOR KELLY, I FEEL SURE, knows that "Absolute Method" is not an expression of mine, but of Hegel's. There is no doubt whatsoever that he is more adept than I with knowing the direct references to that expression, whether that be the two pages (pp. 839-40) on Absolute Method in Miller's translation of *Science of Logic*, or Johnson and Struthers' translation (Vol. II, pp. 481-2). Or for that matter, the reference in the original German to "absolute Methode" (p. 567, 1969 edition). Therefore, he must have meant to say that "an unchained dialectic" is not something that Hegel would have considered his second negativity (which he called Absolute Method) to be. It nevertheless remains a fact that absolute negativity is not something I "baptised" as Absolute Method, but Hegel did; and that Marx's singling out "negativity as the moving and creative principle" was precisely because of his profound com-

prehension not only of economics and politics, but culture and philosophy—and revolution. And it is again at the period of world crisis, this time World War I, that Lenin singles out that section as "not at all bad as a kind of summing up of dialectics" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 231).

Where Professor Kelly stresses Hegel's statement that "Once the realm of thought is revolutionized, reality can scarcely hold out", may I call attention to Hegel's statement on his praise of the Idea because of its relationship to reality, "the pivot on which the impending world revolution turned . . ." (*Philosophy of Right*, p. 10). In a word, what we are disagreeing on is today, and our attitude to philosophy and revolution, when in the contemporary world it becomes philosophy of revolution.

IN CONTRAST TO THAT scholarly discussion, and with full appreciation of the deep difference between a Marxist and an academic scholar, consider the following deceitful as well as obscene attack on my work by Howard Parsons in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, which passed for a review of *Philosophy and Revolution*: "This is philosophical idealism—a real aid and comfort to the counter-revolutionaries sitting on their mounting piles of nuclear bombs."

This is not the only time that that scholarly (sic!) journal created space for a Stalinoid type of professor to pose as "independent". A decade back, when, after a whole century's delay in finding and translating Marx's *Humanist Essays*, these were finally published with serious commentary in the U.S.; another such type of "independent" — this time Maoist-tinged — Prof. Donald Clark Hodges, vulgarized Marx's *Humanist Essays*: "In the manuscripts of 1844, alienation involves a specific economic transaction between the alienor and allenee." (*Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Dec. 1966). Not only had the editor of the journal published this uncritically, but refused to publish my critique, which held that, more intolerable even than Hodges' pontifical about Marx's "alleged (sic!) humanism", was the journal's allowing Prof. Hodges to initiate ideological McCarthyism, creating an amalgam with his claim that every U.S. scholar who, according to him, was engaged in "a salvage operation from Marx's own wastebaskets," thereby creating "a humanistic image congenial to the academic community," was in fact "closely allied to the corresponding economic and political development within the Soviet Union."

What *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* has been doing, by giving free rein to people like Prof. Hodges to attack Marx's Humanism, and now to Howard Parsons to attack *Philosophy and Revolution*, while excluding not only my rebuttal but also that of other scholars who came to the defense of Marx, was to close off any objective discussion. It is for this reason that I repeat what I wrote in my critique on Jan. 22, 1967: "At the risk of being considered 'soft' on the philosophical community, I dare conclude that it would have been far better for freedom of thought, for academia and all others, if Prof. Hodges hadn't become so 'increasingly irritated' at all interpretations of Marx other than his own as to be ready to create instant amalgams!" ("Instant Vulgar Materialism vs. Marx's Humanism", *N&L*, Oct. 1967.)

Chinese invasion of Vietnam: global implications

(Because of the importance of the ramifications of China's invasion of Vietnam, we are holding our column this issue and turning over the space to the following analysis.— Peter Mallory and Ron Brokmeyer.)

by Raya Dunayevskaya

The Chinese Communist Party Chairman Hua Kuo-feng's declaration, on March 15, that China had withdrawn its armed forces from Vietnam may serve its imperial invention of instant history legends as it labels Vietnam "the aggressor." It does little, however, to shed light on why a gigantic land of 900 million wantonly invaded a land of 51 million. The shudder that the world felt at that invasion, February 17, was, after all, not just due to the disparate size of the combatants. The fear rather arose from the possible entry of Russia, leading to a nuclear holocaust. The fear was no empty fear, as it was preceded by Teng Hsiao-ping's visit to the U.S., where he never stopped denouncing Russia's "hegemonistic ambitions" as well as Vietnam's "Southeast Asia ambitions." So much more adroit was Teng at using the U.S. platform (if not the "U.S. card") than U.S. imperialism had so far been using. "the China card," that Russia felt free to accuse China of trying to provoke war between two nuclear giants — U.S. and Russia.

It is necessary to look deeper into China's wanton invasion of Vietnam and warlordistic ravaging of Lang Son. But it cannot be done without examining also the sad state of the Left, which still considers all these state-capitalist lands calling themselves Communist as

if they were indeed "workers' states."

It is one thing to oppose China's invasion. It is quite another thing to be as adept in creating one's own instant history legends, calling Vietnam "vanguard of the world revolution," as the students of Mexico did in their demonstration on March 10.

CREATING INSTANT HISTORY LEGENDS

As if the invasion of India in 1962 had been correct, China referred to that war as proof to the world that the China-Vietnam war would be brief, undertaken only "to teach Vietnam a lesson." Now, outside of the imperial ukase "to teach Vietnam a lesson," there has not, to this moment, been any "uncertainty" about borders, such as was alleged about British imperialism's line drawn between the borders of India and China. To

create today's instant history legend, China found a map ready at hand. It dated back to the Ching dynasty! This does tell a tale of imperialistic ambitions. (We'll return to this later.)

The second instant history legend—about "teaching Vietnam a lesson"—was meant to demonstrate its loyalty to the defense of its satellite—the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia (Kampuchea). Teng failed to explain, however, why, if that were so, hadn't China come to Kampuchea's defense when it was needed; when, both from within Cambodia and with the Vietnamese Army, Pol Pot's barbarous regime was overthrown. Why had China's rhetoric then been just talk? Moreover, why was it followed by further talk that China didn't approve of

"all" Kampuchea's actions? Wasn't this distance between "socialist allies" being laid now in order to create a new berth and new allies for itself?

This more ominous tale does touch on the global built-in conflict with Russia, only it is not because at this moment it fears Russia. Rather, it is because, as a great power itself, it felt quite sure that, just as it had not come to any direct defense of Cambodia, so Russia would not come to any direct defense of Vietnam.

Indeed, the minute a rumor reached the air-waves that China was supposedly bombing Haiphong Harbor just as the Russian ship, Admiral Senyavin, a 16,000 ton Soviet cruiser, was unloading supplies, that instant—and this time it truly was but an instant—official denials came from both China and Russia. After all, Russia has a 4,500 mile-long border with China. There Russia has 44 divisions on alert. It must not be tempted to strike into China's industrial heartland, Manchuria. Russia was not a land to be "taught a lesson" by China. On the contrary. In no respect whatever would China wish to incur the wrath of Russia for any mini-war with Vietnam.

The only truth to be gained from the present Big Power testing is that, whether it is monarchial, feudal Saudi Arabia not coming to the defense of its satellite, North Yemen; or state-capitalisms calling themselves Communists not coming to the defense of their satellites; each country was only testing, testing, testing as if war and death were a game. Like Russia and Nazi Germany in the Spanish Civil War, small wars are but a theatre of testing weapons and armies in preparation for the real global holocaust!

The five ASEAN nations — Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand — naturally relished the sight of two "Communist" countries engaged in outright imperialist war. It also created an opportunity for jabbing at Russia. In a New York Times report, of March 11, the Singapore Straight Times rushed to conclude that the "failure of the Soviet Union to come directly to the aid of Hanoi would be taken as proof that Moscow is nothing but a paper polar bear." All ASEAN combined questioned whether China wasn't, after all, "a paper tiger."

None of them, any more than the Big Powers, will nevertheless offer any challenge to class rulers and militarists like themselves. For that matter, the very first truly historic legend was created with the 1955 Bandung conference announcing a new Afro-Asian world.

FROM BANDUNG THROUGH 1962 SINO-INDIAN WAR TO 1979 CHINA-VIETNAM WAR

The new spirit that arose with the beginnings of decolonization, and especially Mao's victory over the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek regime as well as imperialism, reached global proportions from within the technologically underdeveloped countries when China and India declared a new type of Afro-Asian Third World. Chou En-lai and Nehru worked out a manifesto they called "Five Principles of Co-Existence." Though Marxists knew that, without genuine social revolutions, Bandung would not usher in a new non-exploitative world, none thought Mao's China would harbor ambitions of the Middle Kingdom as the "center of the universe". To the shock of Nehru when he visited his co-host, Chou En-lai, he found that the officially published "Manual of History"⁽¹⁾ showed itself as it was under the Yuan and Ming dynasties when China had conquered Burma, Thailand, the Indochina peninsula, had debarked troops in Indonesia, and not only imprisoned the King of Ceylon, but also imposed an annual tribute from the Moslem world, especially the holy city of Mecca.⁽²⁾

That wasn't all there was to the "model" of the 1662 Sino-Indian war and the map, which had shown a great part of the Soviet Far East as well as the Republic of Outer Mongolia, North and South Korea, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia, Burma, Assam (about 50,000 miles of Indian territory, in fact), Bhutan, Sikkim, Nepal, the island of Sakhalin, as well as some islands in the Philippines, as having been part of China. No, 1978 and the Karakoram Highway⁽³⁾ showed us that that wasn't all there was to the "model." What, then can we expect, in 1979, from the upcoming China-Vietnam negotiations having that 1962 model? Or is it now not just the Yuan and Ming, but also Ching dynasties?

INSIDE CHINA; INSIDE VIETNAM— AND WHERE IS THE LEFT ABROAD?

The only serious challenge against China's invasion


(1)The map included in that "Manual of History," published in Peking in 1954, was reproduced in the New Republic, 4/20/62. See also B. Shiva Rae's article on the subject of "China's Borders" in the National Observer, 7/23/63.

(2)See my analysis of "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung" in the second edition of Marxism and Freedom, especially the section entitled "Can There be War between Russia and China? The Non-Viability of State-Capitalism," pp. 316-326.

(3)The Karakoram Highway, a 500-mile all-weather road over the roof of the world, linking Sinkiang Province with Pakistan, and where the frontiers of no less than five states—Pakistan, Afghanistan, China, India and Russia—meet, was not completed until June, 1978. It was the true reason for the 1962 Sino-Indian War. See "Perspectives 1978-79: The Dialectic of Today's Crises and Today's Revolts," available from News & Letters.

of Vietnam comes neither from other states, nor from the so-called Left outside of China which is all too ready to jump from tail-ending one state-power to tail-ending another. It, too, is busy inventing "new" instant history legends as to what is now the "vanguard of the world revolution." No, the only serious class challenge comes from within China. Whether or not one is to believe Vietnam's claim that there is an actual underground radio station in China which forced the call to end the war, there is no doubt whatever that there is great dissent inside China against the exploitative rulers at home as well as against their "foreign policy." The wall posters testify to that. The strikes are sharper proof of the dissatisfaction with working conditions in China.

The official press finally had to take note of the



Map from "Manual of History" published in Peking, 1954.

undercurrent of revolt. Thus, the People's Daily, March 9, ran an article, "Settle Grudges and Fight in Solidarity." This admitted that "contradictions" were developing in the Party both against conditions of labor, and the war. This was by no means the only article. The foreign press reported also a peasant march on Peking, as well as wall posters, as well as demonstrations . . .

This does not mean that Vietnam is free from pronounced dissatisfaction with their conditions of labor and life. The truth is that neither were the Chinese soldiers at their "fighting best," nor did the Vietnamese, who did defend their land, fight with the same enthusiasm as when they were fighting U.S. imperialism. The results of their victory over imperialism are hardly seen in a better life for the masses, much less participating in the decision-making by the rulers of their land.

And how exactly is the solidarity of the Left abroad expressed?

We repeat: It is one thing to oppose China's in-

April, 1979

vasion. It is quite another to play up Vietnam as "vanguard of the world revolution," as not only the Stalinist Mexican Left, but the Trotskyists everywhere are doing. It is one thing to see, correctly, U.S. imperialism as the most serious threat to world revolution. It is quite another thing to think that it is the only pied piper and that "the Stalinist bureaucrats in Peking are serving as willing accomplices in Carter's charade"; that "in return for economic favors from imperialism, Peking is deliberately lending the prestige of the Chinese Revolution to Washington's anti-Vietnam campaign."⁽⁴⁾

It is one thing to still see China "in a Cultural Revolution" against Russia's monolithism and playing with U.S. imperialism. It is quite another to act as if China's military adventure against Vietnam is some sort of minor deviation which the Chinese will "end and clarify."⁽⁵⁾

Finally, if anyone thinks that Russia was declared Enemy #1 only because it was playing with U.S. imperialism when Khrushchev and Eisenhower created the first "Camp David Spirit," reread Mao's loyal friend, Edgar Snow, who, in *The Other Side of the River*, in that same crucial year of the Sino-Indian War, 1962, was hinting to the U.S., unambiguously, "China's preoccupation with U.S. as the main enemy might veer elsewhere."

The shift in global alliances has been a long time coming. It has nothing whatever to do with any nature of "workers' states," as all are state-capitalist societies. The very opposite is the truth. It is because we are living in a state-capitalist age, where all state powers have only one "lesson to teach": a global imperialistic reach!

There is but one way out, be it in China or the U.S., Russia or Vietnam, and that is a proletarian revolution against "its own" exploitative, racist, sexist rulers. The biggest enemy is always at home. So is its greatest revolutionary force, and those masses not only as force but as reason. There is no other way to create a classless society of human relations.

—March 17, 1979

(4) *Intercontinental Press*, Feb. 10, 1979. As if the quotations above are not fantastic enough, the Trotskyist editor and author, Mary-Alice Waters, assured us — in boldface type — "the danger is not a Chinese invasion of Vietnam, but an imperialist maneuver that Peking is helping to cover up." Too bad that the magazine appeared two days after China's invasion of Vietnam on Feb. 17, 1979.

(5) The most disgusting articles of that gender are penned by a special contributor to the "Op-Ed" page of the NYT — the University of Wisconsin professor "specialist" on China, Edward Friedman, who assured us on 3/11/79, that China's invasion of Vietnam proves that that land of 800 million "is refusing to be pushed around by anyone (little Vietnam — rd), is murderously but clearly manifest in its Indochina invasion." That apologist for post-Mao China tells us that further, we should not forget China's "commitment to proud sovereignty" as well as China's "original and anti-bureaucratic purposes of the post-1949 government (which) are moving forward. This occurs in a new atmosphere of joyous liberation from past terrors."

What revolutionary ground for women's movement?

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

I am turning over my column this issue for excerpts from a presentation given by a colleague, Eugene Walker, on my work "Marx's and Engels' Studies Contrasted: Relationship of Philosophy and Revolution to Women's Liberation", which appeared in the Jan.-Feb. issue of *N&L*. I consider it a serious contribution to an ongoing discussion around the manuscript.

Dunayevskaya is asking today's Women's Liberation Movement to take a journey with her, a journey into the Marxism of Marx. She is asking them to consider the most fundamental of questions—Can the Women's Liberation Movement become subject of revolution in its fullness, as reason as well as force, by comprehending Marx's new continent of thought as ground for its further development.

In taking this journey she is asking us first, to clear the debris of today's would-be Marxist theorists, such as Hal Draper, and women's liberation theorists, who either try to unite Marxism with feminism or to separate Marxism from feminism, but without basing themselves on the Marxism of Marx.

Second, she wants us to see that in part, but only in part, their distortions stem from the fact that many had based themselves on what Engels wrote after Marx's death, his *Origin of the Family*. Since then, it has been claimed that this was Marx's conception as well. But what the *Ethnological Notebooks* of Marx clearly show is that neither in facts, nor most crucially in methodology, does *Origin of the Family* flow from Marx.

Third, she wants us as activists and thinkers, and not only in the Women's Liberation Movement, to come to grips with Marx's philosophy. Indeed, so revolutionary is her point of departure, especially in her contrasting of Marx and Engels precisely on the working out of a philosophy of liberation, that it puts to the test all other interpretations of Marx's thought, and challenges today's independent Marxists to reorganize their thought.

PRIMITIVE COMMUNISM'S DUALITY

Marx, in contrast to Engels, had a very different view of what was primitive communism. He too based himself on Morgan's *Ancient Society* among other works, excerpting it and commenting on it in a manuscript of some 148 pages. But his attitude was neither one with Morgan's, nor more importantly, not one with that of Engels.

In Marx: 1) The social and sexual division of labor were not made synonymous. 2) Though the family was studied and commented upon, it did not become the universal pathway to a class society that Engels tried to make it. And, 3) primitive communism was not uncritically accepted as classless.

In contrast to the division of man/woman, for Marx it was the relation of man/woman which was so deep. So deep that it compelled him time and time again to return to that relationship throughout his life.

The origins of class society, and as Dunayevskaya points out, the transitions to class society were to be found within primitive communism for Marx, and not something which occurred only after. It instead had its dualities—and thus, the origins of class society were not alone in the question of the family. As Dunayevskaya notes: "Then, Marx demonstrates that, long before the dissolution of the primitive commune, there emerged the question of ranks within the egalitarian commune. It was the beginning of a transformation into opposite—gens into caste. That is to say, within the egalitarian communal form arose the elements of its opposite—caste, aristocracy, different material interests. Moreover, these weren't successive stages, but co-extensive with the communal form."

MODES OF PRODUCTION, SUBJECTS OF REVOLUTION

The continuity of Marx's new continent of thought, throughout Marx's life and to our own, lies in his continued return to the necessity of a total uprooting of class society—an uprooting by living human beings whose drive for new human relations, beginning with that most fundamental, woman/man, was most fully expressed as revolutionary subject. The necessity to bring forth the concrete expression of the drive for new relations through revolutionary subject at each historic period, as predecessor to the final uprooting of capitalism, drove Marx to investigate most explicitly the development of capitalism, and as well, to study other modes of production—primitive, Asiatic, ancient classical and medieval. But for any scholar to reverse the process and have Marx investigate modes of production as if that were unconnected to Marx's consciousness of the living subject's constant striving to uproot social relations, beginning with production relations, is to reduce the thought of Marx to a crass determinism. And to reduce a revolutionary transformation of society to an evolutionary one, or to abstract utopianism. It is precisely the interconnectedness of the development of modes of production and the development of subjects of revolution which forms Marx's expression of a "new continent of thought" . . .

Though Engels laid open the ground, he cannot be responsible for the horrid vulgarizations that Draper has put him to. Draper's vulgarizations are no accident. They are at once conneried with his attitude to today's Women's Liberation Movement and to Marx's philosophy of liberation. His attitude to today's Women's Liberation Movement is one of total elitism, one who will "teach" them Marxism because he "knows." It is his complete blindness to what it means to find a new subject of revolution, and what is the role of theory, of revolutionary theoreticians, in helping to give a direction to the newly emerging subjects of revolution, that is at the base of his arrogance.

Not unconnected is his attitude toward Marx, especially Marx on women, which he is consistently ignoring or misinterpreting. Dunayevskaya points out time and time again where Draper failed to take up the crucial points Marx was making with regard to woman and social revolution, and where the points taken up are for purposes of transforming Marx's thought into something quite opposite of what he said. Can it be any accident that the non-Marxist women's liberationist Simone de Beauvoir separates sharply Fourier's concept of the emancipation of women from Marx's, while the "Marxist" Draper drives to make a false amalgam of the two?

Dunayevskaya certainly has criticism of today's Women's Liberation Movement. But so seriously does she take that movement, that far from wanting to "teach it a lesson," what she wishes is for it to understand its own seriousness as subject of revolution, a seriousness that can only be gotten when that movement is willing to come to grips, not with what Draper says, or even Engels, as great as he was, but only with what Marx created—a new continent of thought. Such a new continent of thought is no simple creation, and it is no simple task to grasp it . . .

INTERCOMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE AGES

What drove Marx back to anthropology and thus towards a new look at man/woman relations? One cannot say explicitly . . . But most crucial is what the Paris Commune had illuminated for Marx at the beginning of that decade, the stripping off of the fetishism of commodities only by freely associated labor. It was the

self-activity of the Parisian people, women quite as centrally as men, which had led Marx to add the ultimate section to the first chapter on Commodities, "The Fetishism of Commodities and the Secret Thereof." Marx's interchange as philosopher, as theoretician, was with the revolutionary activity of the working class, a working class of women as well as men.

In these Ethnological Notebooks of 1880-82 the relationship of man/woman comes forth anew. Not because Marx "willed" it, but because so conscious is he of the only real science—history and its process—as continuity and as ever changing, that in his continual digging and digging into its concreteness, seeking its universality, he finds there at each point that most fundamental of relations, man/woman.

So deep is the man/woman relation for Marx that it becomes the measure of society, not as a "replacement" for the class struggle and the necessity to abolish the social division of labor, but as the touchstone for the totality of uprooting that was necessary . . .

What drives Dunayevskaya back to "history and its process"—this history being the birth and development of Marx's philosophy of liberation 1843-1883—is the same as what drove Marx back to study each mode of production: not history, but future, an end to the pre-history of human beings and a beginning of their full-free development . . .

And certainly Draper and other misconstruers of Marx are no ground for our departure, as they fail to see either revolutionary philosophy or subjects of revolution, in history or for today. Instead we have to base ourselves on this intercommunication through the Marxism of Marx and its continuity in Marxist-Humanism of today. That is what will set the stage for the leaps to freedom which are to come.

—Eugene Walker

TWO WORLDS

May, 1979

Russia and China share global nuclear insanity

(Editor's Note: The world's heightened concern over the nuclear madness of U.S. capitalism focuses attention on that of the other powers, Russia and China, as well. We reprint below brief excerpts from two articles by Raya Dunayevskaya written when Russian and Chinese bombs exploded over the world.)

If This Isn't Madness, What Is It?

On October 30 the 50 megaton bomb was exploded. If this isn't madness what is it? . . .

No doubt none of the Russian leaders, least of all Khrushchev, will rush to quote Dr. Pauling who says that a 50 megaton nuclear blast would cause 40,000 babies to be born with physical defects in the next few generations, produce bone cancer and leukemia among persons now alive, and pollute the atmosphere for 6,000 years. Nevertheless the Russian masses will learn the truth. On what scale will they now weigh the 22nd Russian Communist Party program promising utopia in 1980?

The United States' U-2 spy flight put an end to "the spirit of Camp David" while the Congo crisis and the Cuban invasion produced a double-barrelled attack on the UN and the open challenge to the U.S. and its Monroe Doctrine. But all remained short of war even in Laos.

The "comradely relations" in the Communist orbit, on the other hand, have been anything but peaceful. Their co-existence has erupted into open disagreement at Khrushchev's initiative. It is obvious that Chou didn't have foreknowledge of the attack on tiny Albania which is, in fact, an attack on her mighty protector, China. If not only the "revisionists" (Yugoslavia), and the "anti-party" group in Russia, but also the "deviationists" (Albania) and "dogmatists" (China) must be attacked, isn't it clear that the explosion of the bomb is not only to terrorize the outside world, but that part right inside the Communist orbit?

So sure does Khrushchev feel of his home ground that he publishes Chou's criticism. It means also: "You

haven't heard the last of this yet. Wait till I sum up. Until I do, just listen to those nuclear blasts." . . .

If it isn't madness, it is only because we live in the kind of world where the madmen in power are the ones who decide what is rational. . . .

An African from Southern Rhodesia I heard recently, speaking on the image the U.S. is creating of itself in Asia through Mississippi jungle justice against Freedom Riders, said: "You Americans see Communists behind every bush, and when we fight for our freedom, you ask us what we think about the space race with Russia. To us Africans that space race is really for the outer reaches of space—way out. We want freedom right here and right now on this earth."

News & Letters,
Nov. 1961

Mao's Bomb and Khrushchev's Fall

In the short space of 18 hours the world scene has changed so radically that it's very nearly beyond recognition. Or is it? China has exploded its first atomic bomb and, like all other destructive agents from United States imperialism to Russian state-capitalism, from McMillan's Great Britain (now Labor) to De Gaulle France, the claim has been that this flirtation with nuclear holocaust has all been "in the interests of peace." At the same time China's atomic explosion followed so closely upon the heels of Khrushchev's fall from the seat of power that the Sino-Soviet conflict has overshadowed all other probable causes for the sudden shift in power from Khrushchev's exercise of total power to the new "collective leadership" of Leonid I. Brezhnev, as First Secretary of the Communist Party, and Alexei Kosygin as Premier.

What neither the Western experts nor the Communist totalitarians are talking about is the one thing that is truly new in the situation leading up to Khrushchev's removal from power—his sudden decision to try for a new rapprochement with West Germany . . .

The Chinese Communist Party immediately charged

MAY, 1979

Khrushchev with a "sell-out" of East Germany to the West. We must keep this in mind when we read the official announcement from Peking on its atomic explosion allegedly because "The United States is now putting nuclear weapons into the hands of the West German revanchists through the so-called multilateral nuclear force and thereby threatens the security of the German Democratic Republic and the other East European Socialist countries." It is to be doubted that East Europe will feel safe under Peking's "atomic umbrella," but Mao is not one to miss an opportunity to create distrust in Russia's readiness to protect "the socialist countries."

Whatever induced Khrushchev to attempt a new type of relationship with West Germany, it couldn't have been very popular either in Russia or in East Germany or in Poland. Indeed, no policy so quickly unites not only Communists in Europe but Europe as a whole as fear of a rearmed West Germany.

The new power struggle in Russia is, at the same time, a new stage for the struggle for world power, beginning with dominance over the Communist world. While it by no means excludes rapprochement with China, this is quite unlikely at the moment. The point is that, again, all roads lead to Berlin.

The irony of this is that the European Communist parties so value their little independence they have gained by the Sino-Soviet rift not being settled that they are now questioning the method of Khrushchev's removal. Such a skeptical attitude is hardly what Brezhnev counted on as a response to his first major public speech on Oct. 18, in which he promised that the party is striving for the unity of "the Socialist countries on a fully equal footing." What the attitude and the promise do reveal is that the rise of the new ruling clique is only the beginning, not the end, of the divisive forces at work.

News & Letters
Oct. 1974

7079

Iran :

May, 1979

UNFOLDMENT OF, AND CONTRADICTIONS IN, REVOLUTION

I. A Whole Host of Specters Haunting Khomeini's "Islamic Revolution"

Dear Friends,

A whole host of specters are haunting Khomeini's "Islamic Republic" before ever it is officially established. There is the specter of a full social revolution in the very unfoldment of the Iranian Revolution which, after all, witnessed a series of the greatest, most powerful and sustained mass mobilizations for months on end before the three days of insurrection. Clearly, February 9-12 had not only driven the Shah and his stooge, Bakhtiar, from the throne, but the manner in which the workers ended their general strike to return to work without returning their guns, as the Ayatollah had commanded, showed that only Chapter 1 of the Revolution had ended. It put a special emphasis to the complaints of his appointed Prime Minister, Bazargan, about lack of production. As the Deputy Prime Minister, Entezan, put it: "Despite the Ayatollah's commands, none of the major industries in the country are functioning because the workers spend all their time holding political meetings."

As if Workers' Councils, Neighborhood Committees, anjumen, many new forms of spontaneous organization, and youth dominant in all, did not take on the apparition of a dual government, there came, with the celebration of International Women's Day, a mass outpouring of women, bearing the banner, "We made the revolution for freedom, and got unfreedom," which may very well have opened Chapter 2 of the Iranian Revolution . . .

For five straight days the women continued their marches, and not only against Khomeini, but against Prime Minister Bazargan, and on March 10 held a 3-hour sit-in at the Ministry of Justice. Nor did they tolerate the mass media's autocratic choice of what they would photograph, who they would give voice to, whom they would focus on. Instead of letting their protests go unrecorded, the women marched upon the mass media, thus exposing the fact that the censorship there is now almost as total as it was during the Shah's dictatorship.

Nor was the Ayatollah calmed by the fact that the Women's Liberationists produced a schism in the Fedayeen (and to a lesser extent also in the Moujahideen). For, while a good part condemned the actions of the women², others formed a human chain on both sides of the march to protect them from further harassment. That certainly was a great advance over the beginnings of the Portuguese Revolution in 1975 where the Left males attacked women's demonstrations with impunity. 1979 in Iran showed, at one and the same time, that male revolutionaries would not permit attacks on women revolutionaries, and women were striking out on their own as a way of deepening the content of revolution . . .

Under these circumstances of ever new forces of revolution, for male revolutionaries to disregard how total the revolution must be if it is to uproot the exploitative, racist, sexist society, and once again try to subordinate women's struggles as a "mere part of the whole" (as if the whole can be without its parts), is to play into the hands of the reactionaries, be that the "secular" Bazargan government, or the Ayatollah Kho-

meini who is trying to "institutionalize" his Islamic "revolution," that is to say, confine it to where he can steal the fruit of the revolution—freedom—and leave the masses who made it at the bottom as in any and all class societies.

The schisms within the ruling class are not as irreconcilable as between labor and capital. Nor are they only a question of secular vs. theocratic rule. The fact that Khomeini nevertheless tried to keep some distance away from the planned March 5 celebration of the 12th anniversary of Mossadegh, who was the first to nationalize the oil industry and shake up the Shah's throne, throws a glaring light on what he intends to do with his so-called Islamic Revolution. Bazargan, who did sit on the platform, was not recognized as any voice of the 1951-53 revolt and thus was in no position to serve as any bridge between the dissident bourgeois liberal factions. Instead, the person who spoke first was Mossadegh's grandson, Hedayet Matine-Daftari, who criticized Bazargan's attack on the extension of democratic rights. More significant was the voice of the Ayatollah Telegani who had broken with the Islamic Revolutionary Committee in late February, approved, instead, elected, not appointed, workers' committees, thus making sure that the revolution does not stop at its very first step, the overthrow of the Shah.

There is no point in underestimating the power of the Ayatollah Khomeini, who many are now treating as an Imam even if he has not exercised those specters haunting his revolution. That counter-revolution is right within the Revolution. He knew how to hit at the women, mobilizing a few thousand to march with their chadors against the women who were protesting a great deal more than dress.⁴ What the Women's Liberationists learned here was that not all women are sisters. It is, after all, a slander to make it appear as if it were a mere question of women against men. "Sexual politics" is anything but that; the male chauvinism exposed, and that included of the Ayatollah Khomeini, was the limitations of the freedom of humanity, the abrogation of the civil rights—political, social, economic, intellectual, class.

In the latter case—the most worrisome for the Ayatollah—it was the way the workers, in this case the printers, united with the Youth on what seemed most abstract—works on philosophy of revolution, on politics, strategy, on internationalism, to satisfy their thirst for knowledge of all to do with revolution. Thus, in the very midst of revolution when the general strike was at its height, the printers decided to work double shifts so that they could satisfy that thirst. As one eyewitness report describes it: "Bocks are flowing at the people as fast as soldiers' bullets . . . they read everything about revolution. All Marxian books that have been translated into Persian are being reprinted and spread hand to hand and house to house: Capital, Paris Commune, Communist Manifesto, What Is To Be Done?, State and Revolution, Imperialism, Wretched of the Earth, Black Skin, White Masks, Dying Colonialism."⁵ A further account reported a new translation of Marx's 1844 Essay on Alienated Labor and innumerable leaflets.

How idiotic indeed is the bourgeois press that keeps repeating old official (SAVAK?) figures that Marxists number but 2 percent of the population!⁶

May, 1979

II. The Main Enemy Is Always At Home

The workers in revolution need no "vanguard parties" to tell them that the main enemy is at home, that the conflict between labor and capital is irreconcilable, and that native capital has such overwhelming ties with imperialism that, if its life is threatened, the capitalists will certainly ask for imperialism to come to their aid in bringing on the full counter-revolution. But under no circumstances does that mean any slackening of the workers' own self-activity, self-organization, self-development, thus deepening the revolution. Thus, no sooner had Bazargan tried to reassert his full authority by a takeover of the oil industry than some of the workers' leaders at once resigned from the workers' committees in protest. Listen to Mohammad Javad Khatemi's appeal: "To All Oil Workers and Those Who Fight for Freedom":

After 90 days of our heroic strike, during which we have cut off all supplies of oil — the livelihood of the reactionary regime and of its imperialist backers — and by the bloody struggle of the people we have succeeded in overthrowing the Shah . . .

As a representative of the oil workers — the heart of our industry — and as one of the initiators of the strikes in the oil fields . . . I am resigning because I can see that reactionary elements working under the banner of Islam are consciously suppressing the people's freedom and rights . . .

It was you workers who fought and suffered from sackings, imprisonment and the burnings of our homes

and still we did not give up because we all felt a responsibility to the whole of the people of Iran. Myself and other representatives who were responsible for leading your struggle know better than anybody that it was you yourselves that made the victory — not anybody else . . .

We do not accept any dictatorship and will always support those who fight for freedom . . . We must remember and understand the nature of imperialism which still has everything in its hands. We must remember what happened in Portugal, Argentina and especially Chile. Until imperialism is completely smashed such things can happen again.

This type of worker opposition, if it will once again develop a mass base, is the way to stop the attempted counter-revolution, provided that we, as revolutionaries, in turn, do not forget that to speak only of anti-imperialism as if imperialism alone was responsible for the counter-revolution in Chile, in Argentina, or anywhere else for that matter, is a deviation. It is a deviation very welcome to and indeed calculated by the indigenous capitalists. That is to say, native rulers will say anything, anything at all, so long as thereby the class struggle at home can be subordinated to fighting everything "foreign" as Enemy No. 1. What World War II showed us was that, outside of Hitler himself, none were more adept at playing the nationalist game than Peron, and, contrary to Hitler's, he succeeded in so fooling the Left with his "anti-imperialism" that many hailed him as a "revolutionary."

Or look at the Trotskyists this very moment in Iran who, while correctly fighting U.S. imperialism, are so blinded by their position that Russia is still a "workers' state" rather than the other nuclear-armed power reaching for single world domination, that they only lay the ground for "The Vanguard Party" — Tudeh — who are even louder in their declamation against U.S. imperialism, as if it weren't Stalin's Russia that had occupied Iran at the end of World War II as U.S. imperialism and Great Britain helped keep Iran in tow during World War II.

Or look at how Khomeini is using the slogan of anti-imperialism to usher in his bourgeois Islamic republic, to keep Kurdistan within Iran rather than granting the Kurds, and the many other minorities hungering for self-determination, their freedom . . .

As for the Iranian masses, they surely have no need of statistics to attest to their miserable conditions of labor and life. It is the urban poor, 70 percent of whose miserable wages — where they have them — go for rent, who were after all the ones to explode on February 11 in Tabriz. What I am pointing to is that the Iranian Revolution started before the days of insurrection . . .

Of course U.S. imperialism is the most gigantic, militaristic, nuclear-armed Titan in the world. Of course we, as American revolutionaries, must work to see that it never reestablishes itself in Iran or anywhere else. And, of course, we must point to the fact that the rush to the present Middle East treaty was induced precisely by the fear of the consequences of the Iranian Revolution.¹⁰ Nevertheless, we must not permit the indigenous Iranian counter-revolution to hide under the slogan of anti-imperialism, as some in the Left are trying to do by branding not only U.S. imperialism but Kate Millert and, indeed, the whole women's revolutionary movement as if they are "agents of imperialism."¹¹ Nothing could assure the victory of the counter-revolution more than that kind of "anti-imperialism."

Let us, instead, turn to the genuine indigenous roots of a most unique revolution, the very one that is now being so handled about as if the only point involved in it, great though that was for that year, was the Constitution of 1906. The Revolution lasted from 1906 to 1911. We turn to this period not only for nationalism but internationalism, and not only for the past but the present.

III. Two Iranian Revolutions, 1906-11, and Today's

One look at the 1906 Revolution¹² will reveal its two greatest features: that today's Islamic celebrants keep quiet about. One is its inspiration in the Russian Revolution of 1905. Indeed, it was at the height, November-December 1905, that the first general strike broke out in Teheran. While today Iran means oil, in 1905 it was Baku, Russia, that meant oil, and because thousands of Iranian oil workers were in Russia and were inspired by the Russian workers fighting Tsarism, they learned also about a very new form of organization — Soviets. This, then, was what became the form of spontaneous organizations in Iran as well.

The uniqueness in Iran was that what had started

May, 1979

out, indigenously enough, as a secret organization, became Anjumeni, a very nearly dual government — local units organized independently of the Shah and the Majlis by popular elections, defending their independence on the ground that there was too much bureaucratic corruption in the government. By 1907, these anjumeni were by no means limited to Teheran but functioned also in Tabriz, Ezezu, and not only in the towns, but spread to rural areas . . .

It is true—and this uniqueness exists unto today and must under no circumstances be disregarded in coping with the ulemas, mullahs and ayatollahs—that the religious leaders sided with the revolution, or at least its first stages. As against Russia where, though Father Gapon had triggered the opening of the Revolution when his march to the Tsar's Palace was transformed into Bloody Sunday in January, 1905, by the Cossacks firing into the march, the Greek Orthodox Church sided with the Tsar, the religious leaders in Iran went with the Iranian masses both in opposing Russian domination and demanding the Shah grant a Constitution and allow them to establish a Majli (Parliament).

But even here we must see the negative features. For the first chapter, the one so celebrated now, the December 1906 Constitution, limited the Shah's power and produced a Majli. There then followed many spontaneous organizations that worked independently of it. Once the Majli convened, the religious leaders began moving away from any mass struggle. By October 1907, the Amendments the Majli passed restored many powers to the Shah, especially the supreme command of the armed forces so that one could hardly call him just a figurehead . . .

Now, it is the difference between the December 1906 Constitution and the October 1907 Amendments which point not just to the duality in the Shah's leadership in various periods within an ongoing revolution. It points as well to today: the March 30 plebiscite staring us in the face. Khomeini-Bazargan must not succeed just because they will have won so fake an "election." Yet we cannot entertain any illusions. It will be much, much harder for revolutionaries to function. The imminent counter-revolution is being institutionalized . . .

IV. Where To Now?

Each revolution discloses something new and unique and challenging. The new in the Iranian Revolution reveals both new strength and new weakness. Surely the sustained mass mobilizations in so despotic a land, armed to the teeth and primed by Nixon since 1972 to take over the U.S. policeman's beat for the whole Middle East, was nothing short of a miracle, especially when you consider that the Shah extended that Great Illusion to believe he would be pivotal to the final confronta-

tion between the two nuclear Titans: the U.S. and Russia. Moreover, they were so spontaneous that even the Left that always likes to take credit for vanguardism had to admit that not only were they not organized by any party, but they seemed to be organized by "nobody".

Yet it would be wrong to think either that it was only spontaneously that was at work, or that "nobody" organized it. Were it so, Khomeini, for whom one million poured out to welcome back, could not proceed so brazenly and so rapidly to try to saddle the Revolution with what he calls "Islamic Republic" and "Islamic moral code," which we already saw at work not only against the women but against the life style of a whole new generation of revolutionary youth who are the very heart of this revolution.

Nor should we entertain any illusion about the "superiority" of the secular middle-class intellectuals who think that because they see Khomeini as "symbol, not philosopher of revolution", that some "greater intellectual" than he will win in the end. There is but one grain of truth in that pretention, and it concerns, not intellectuals, but theory. There is no doubt that the great weakness of the movement now, and not only in Iran, is the lack of theory, a theory stemming from a philosophy of total liberation such as was and is Marx's Humanism, his whole new continent of thought from the moment he broke from bourgeois society in 1843 until his death, 1883, that is to say, from his Humanist Essays through Capital and the Paris Commune to his Ethnological Notebooks.

It took nothing short of the First World War and the collapse of the established Marxist (Second) International before Lenin recognized that, without philosophy, without the dialectics of liberation in thought as well as in fact, a Marxism reduced to economics was inadequate. In any case, what is most relevant for today, and not only for Iran, is to do away with elitism and such quick slogans as the need for an "April Thesis" to "rearm the party," as if that meant Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution with its built-in underestimation of the revolutionary role of the peasantry.¹⁵

Trotsky's illusion that the April Thesis meant Lenin's "acceptance" of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution notwithstanding, the real relevance of an "April Thesis" for the transition period now in Iran is not the forced identity with that theory that Trotsky built up. Rather, the plain facts of how it came to be is what we hope will help the Iranian comrades work out on the basis of the indigenous and the new, the revolutionary national and international forces of revolution, their path to social revolution, their move from "February" not only to April but to "October."

It was the shock of the simultaneity of the outbreak of World War I and the collapse of the Second International that compelled Lenin to return to Marx's origins in the Hegelian dialectic and see that, without it, Marxism was reduced to vulgar materialism. He refused

MAY, 1979



Jobless Iranian workers demonstrate in Teheran as thousands more protest climbing unemployment and defy fire of Islamic troops. (See "Our Life and Times," p. 12.)

to stop with mere exposure of the betrayal. Rather, with Capital in hand as well as the political thesis of the need to "Turn the Imperialist War into Civil War," Lenin delved into Hegel's Science of Logic. Of all the revolutionary Marxists—Luxemburg, Trotsky, and many, many others—Lenin alone decided that first of all he must reorganize his own method of thinking and doing.

In a word, before the April Thesis was and could have been written, there came, first, Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks (precisely, his Abstract of Hegel's 'Science of Logic'). Then he worked out his theory of Imperialism—his confrontation with the new state of economy—monopoly capitalism on the way to state-monopoly-capitalism, not outside of its relationship to the proletariat but as related to the transformation into opposite of a section of the proletariat that did gain from capitalism's extension into imperialism. Thirdly, and above all, came a real live revolution—the Irish Easter Rebellion, 1916—which gave a new dimension to the "National Question" as self-determination, as "the bacillus" of proletarian revolution.

Finally the determinant emerges for that proletarian revolution—State and Revolution (originally called "Marxism and the State")—and only after that could Lenin "rearm" the Party. Far from that producing any sort of debate about dictatorship of the proletariat, or dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, what resulted—and where we should begin—is "All Power to the Soviets," that is to say, all power in the hands of the masses, their forms of organization, their control of production and the state; their smashing of the bourgeois state, and by working out a new relationship of theory to practice, and the movement from practice to theory, the establishment of new human relations. We have, after all, 62 additional years of experience, have seen Russia and China also become transformed into their opposite, with both vying for U.S. imperialism's alliance! Surely we cannot behave as if nothing had happened in all those decades of maturation, aborted revolutions as well as revolutions transformed into opposite.

There is no way to extend and deepen the revolution if Bazargan is allowed to reduce to a consultative role the function of the committees organized by the workers to run the plants and offices. The fact that the Prime Minister feels impelled to take to the air waves to declaim against what he calls "the dangerous logic of soviets" further exposes his capitalistic tear of the elemental passion for freedom released by the ongoing revolution. Ayatollah Khomeini's stopping the revolutionary tribunals against the Shah's most powerful and vicious henchmen in the SAVAK and in the government has focused on just how rapidly he is turning the clock back, and by no means only at the expense of the women's freedom. Those acts of retrogression are not only dangerous logic. They are acts of outright counter-revolution. Let us extend our solidarity to the embattled revolutionaries—the new generation of revolutionary students as well as workers; Women's Liberationists as well as national minorities fighting for self-determination. Let us extend the activities here to stop the interfering hand of U.S. imperialism hungering for oil and the strategic location for its nuclear global aim.

The struggle continues.

Raya Dunayevskaya
Detroit, Michigan
March 25, 1979

TWO WORLDS

June, 1979

Draper's narrow view of Marx's political theory

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

I am turning my column space this issue over to an important review essay by a colleague, Andy Phillips.
—R.D.

Hal Draper's voluminous* *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution* proclaims his goal to be "a full and definitive statement of Marx's political theory, politics, and practices."¹ While the admitted content is Marx's political theory, Draper, aware of the dirty connotations associated with politics today, felt "compelled" to title his work *Theory of Revolution*. In any case, what Draper alleges to be theory of revolution is in fact his narrow view of Marx's political theory.

In his second volume, *The Politics of Social Classes*, Draper presents "Marx's" views of the politics of the working class and the working class revolution, including trade unionism and the principle of proletarian self-emancipation; the historic roles of the bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeoisie, peasantry, lumpen-proletariat and intellectuals.

ARROGANCE AND HYPOCRISY

Whereas Draper claims to disregard all other Marxists to deal strictly with the Marxism of Marx, he immediately exposes his arrogance and hypocrisy by characterizing Marx's rough draft of *Capital*, the *Grundrisse*, as a "non-book."

"The *Grundrisse*," Draper declares, "is a peculiar non-book," "notebooks kept . . . with no thought of publication," "notes and jottings," "Each sentence . . . a thought that popped into Marx's mind—unreviewed, unrevised, uncriticized, often ungrammatical, and sometimes undecipherable," "often scribbled late at night when Marx was suffering from carbuncles, gastrointestinal illness, headaches and assorted dyspepsias."²

In fact, the *Grundrisse*³ is nothing less than Marx's comprehensive summary of his preceding 15 years of experience and study, comprising an introduction and seven notebooks, and filling over 900 pages. The work, inspired by the economic recession of 1857 and the hope for a revolution, was begun by Marx the last week of

*The volume reviewed, *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution: The Politics of Social Classes*, published by Monthly Review Press, 1978, is the second of an originally projected three-volume work. However, in his foreword to this second volume, author Draper states that the work is being expanded into four volumes.

¹ This quote is from the introduction to the first volume, *State and Bureaucracy*, p. 11, where Draper explains his overall goal.

² *Politics of Social Classes*, p. 3.

³ The title for Marx's *Notebooks, Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie* (Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy) was given by the Moscow Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute for the first German edition.

August '57. Working almost incessantly, he completed it in mid-March '58, except for a few pages added in May. The book, containing 323 analytical categories too numerous to list, is divided into two "chapters." *Money and Capital*, including Marx's analyses of the production process, surplus value and profit, circulation process, surplus labor, surplus capital, original accumulation of capital, theories of surplus value and profit.

Upon reading the *Grundrisse* today and grasping the great insight it gives to the development of Marx's thought and analytical methodology, what is most incredible is that this great work was not published until 1939-41—in Moscow and in a German edition at that, which effectively precluded it from being known during the World War II years.

Indeed, it took nothing less than the Chinese revolution of 1949 to pry this work loose from the dusty archive shelves in Moscow for serious study in the 1950s. Ten more years elapsed before the most discussed chapter, "Forms Which Precede Capitalist Production," was published in English as *PRE-CAPITALIST ECONOMIC FORMATIONS*, and only in 1973 did the first full English edition appear, published by the Pelican Marx Library in London.

Draper's supercilious and arrogant assessment of the *Grundrisse* notwithstanding, Marx specifically refers to his notebooks in the first paragraph of the preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*:

"I examine the system of bourgeois economics in the following order: capital, landed property, wage labor, state and foreign trade, world market. Under the first three headings, I investigate the economic conditions of life of the three great classes into which modern bourgeois society is divided; the interconnection of the three other headings is obvious at a glance. The first section of the first book, which deals with capital, consists of the following chapters: 1. Commodities; 2. Money, or simple circulation; 3. Capital in general. The first two chapters form the contents of the present part. The total material lies before me in the form of monographs . . ."⁴

The monographs Marx refers to are the *Grundrisse*, nothing less than the draft of all four volumes of *Capital*, Marx's greatest work. Actually, the historic sweep of the *Grundrisse* exceeds that of *Capital*, tracing the full development of civilization rather than restricting itself to the precisely logical movement of the capitalist economic system analyzed in *Capital*.

ANTI-HEGELIAN SOUL COMPANION

A popular pastime of some "Marxists" is drawing a sharp line between the "young Hegelian Marx" and the "mature materialistic Marx." Louis Althusser, advocate of "driving this phantom (of Hegel) into the night,"⁵ finds a soul companion in Draper. However, both share considerable embarrassment in the existence of the *Grundrisse*, in which Hegelian philosophic concepts and terminology are so pervasive that any denial of their indispensability to Marx's analyses is patently absurd.

This is not Marx of the 1844 *Philosophic Economic Manuscripts*, a "young" Marx writing totally within the

⁴ Marx-Engels Selected Works, Vol. 1, p. 361.

⁵ *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, Althusser.

June, 1979

framework of classical Hegelian philosophy (never mind that precisely for this reason it is the most devastating critique of Hegel's dehumanized idealism). Here you have the "mature" Marx, the Marx who has discovered the materialistic motive forces compelling the development and motion of capitalist production relations and its super-structured, class-confronting society. This is no Marx merely "tinged" with Hegelianism; this is Marx the conqueror of Hegel's dialectical method, using it to disclose the development of civilization from the first forms of social behavior and relationships.

Where Althusser would rid Marx of Hegel by driving him "into the night," Draper seeks to achieve the same end by trying to reduce the Grundrisse to a dyspeptic carbuncular grunt, as well as discounting Marx's 1844 essays as "pre-Marxist," still tainted with the Hegelianism Draper insists Marx discarded when he elaborated his mature, materialistic theories.

The anti-Hegelian fetishism of Draper and Althusser was totally alien to Marx. Indeed, as he was writing the Grundrisse, the "mature" Marx observed in a letter to Engels on Jan. 14, 1858: "In the method of treatment the fact that by mere accident I have again glanced through Hegel's Logic has been of great service to me." As noted, Marx considered the Grundrisse as the draft of Capital, his most important work; as knowledgeable Marxists have noted, whereas Marx did not leave a Logic, he provided the logic of Capital. And as Marx himself emphasized, "The Hegelian contradiction (is) the

source of all dialectics",⁶ the materialist dialectic included.

Draper calls his work the result of "excavation," digging into the writings of Marx and Engels, relating their thoughts to objective developments. While merit certainly limits what should be fully elaborated, Draper's treatment of the following two issues reveals his own confined perspective.

In his chapter on trade unions, Draper notes that the "New Unionism" in England, comparable to the rise of the CIO in the U.S. in the 1930s, erupted in July 1888 with the factory organization and action of women matchworkers, followed by similar successful activity of gas workers, activity led by Eleanor Marx. Action by these lower and deeper layers of the previously unorganized workers sparked a movement to organize the unorganized which literally transformed the economic and political face of England.

While the importance of these historic developments is self-evident, they are given an added significance by the current impact of the Women's Liberation Movement. But far from detailing the actions of these English working women in the epochal struggle, Draper gives them no more than the barest passing reference on p. 111. Yet it is precisely this type of organizing of the unorganized by Eleanor Marx which concretized the "Marxism of Marx" in one of his last writings, as he called upon revolutionaries to go "lower and deeper into the proletariat," a phrase Lenin first discovered (Aug. 4, 1914) after the collapse of the Second International.

On the other hand, there is Draper's endless preoccupation with Marx and the peasantry. Correctly pointing out that the myth of Marx having no interest in the peasantry is totally unfounded, Draper proceeds for the next 136 pages to confirm Marx's real concern and understanding of the importance of the revolutionary role of the peasantry. One is reminded of the expression: Using a shotgun to kill a flea.

Of many seriously controversial issues, moreover, there is little or absolutely no reference. For example, Draper devotes considerable research and elaboration to Marx's concept of "revolution in permanence." As Draper is well aware, the person pre-eminently linked with the theory of permanent revolution is Leon Trotsky. But in the 48 pages given to the two chapters on permanent revolution, there is not a single reference to Trotsky.

EVADES MARXISTS

Draper's defense that he is disregarding all other Marxists is evasion pure and simple. This facile disclaimer does not prevent Draper from bringing in other "Marxists" when he chooses to do so. In effect, Draper wants to have his cake . . . and eat it too.

For example, where Draper maintains that the largest portion of Marx's and Engels' revolutionary theory derived from their 13-month experiences of the 1848-49 German revolution, he quotes a 1907 statement by Lenin (irrefutably a Marxist) to buttress his contention. Now 1907 was a very good year indeed, the year of the Russian Social Democratic Party Congress made especially rare by the fact that virtually all tendencies in Russian Marxism were represented, and included Lenin, Trotsky, Luxemburg, Martov, Plekhanov, as well as the Bund. Indeed, the central debates at the Congress revolved around precisely the impact of the 1848 revolution on Russian Marxists in the 1905 Revolution, and specifically why an understanding of his philosophy of revolution was necessary to grasp the import of the 1905 Russian revolution as well as forgo practical revolutionary pol-

⁶ Capital, Vol. 1, p. 654n, Kerr edition. Draper's confusing opposition to Hegel precludes any understanding of Marx, be it 1844, 1857 or Capital itself.

JUNE, 1979

icies for the future.⁷

Whereas, in general, Draper's "excavations" into social classes appear to follow Marx's class lines on the development of revolutionary struggle, the significance of the 1881 correspondence between Vera Zasulich and Marx on the Russian question is lost on Draper. Zasulich wrote to Marx, referring to the communal features of the mir, the form of Russian rural land ownership and society, and inquiring whether Russia could go directly from feudalism to communism. Marx drafted four letters in his effort to answer Zasulich. He answered her not only in a letter, but most importantly, in his 1882 introduction to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto. The last sentence of that introduction states: "If the Russian Revolution becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that both complement each other, the present Russian common ownership of land may serve as the starting point for a communist development."⁸

Draper's blind hatred of Hegel's dialectics and disregard of Marx's dialectics of liberation betrays him at every turn, even to the point of attributing to Hegel what is purely Marx. Draper, referring to Marx's opening of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, quotes Hegel to the effect that: history repeats itself . . . the first time as tragedy, the second as farce. What is Hegel's, however, is only that history repeats itself; Marx added the rest.

That the scholar should not know that little bit—the very first sentence of the work that is so pivotal to Draper—proves but one thing: how totally blind anti-Hegelianism can turn an excavator of the "Marxism of Marx."

Throughout, Draper equates Engels to Marx, and often very nearly ranks Engels above Marx. While the contributions and role of Engels in the relationship are surely immense, attempts to equate the two does damaging disservice to both and can only result in disorienting the revolutionary left.⁹

BETRAYS ENGELS, TOO

Moreover, nobody more than Engels understood and appreciated the importance of Hegelian philosophy to Marx's development. The most convincing testimony of this is Engels' treatise on Feuerbach, which is nothing less than a total defense of Marx's insistence that the Hegelian dialectic is the basis of all dialectics. Written in 1888, when Engels was an old man, the work cannot be labeled an aberration of his youth.

Another observation is compelled by Draper's "defense" of Engel as a non-Hegelian, materialistic Engels. Draper, like virtually every Trotskyist in the 1930-40 period, "grew up" on Engels' treatise on Feuerbach, so ignorance cannot be an element here. Draper's effort to divest Engels of his appreciation for Hegel is nothing short of betrayal of Engels as well. The last sentence in Engels' Feuerbach is: "The German working-class movement is the heir of the German classical philosophy."¹⁰

Draper's work is indeed unfinished—but not because only two of the four projected volumes have been published.

⁷ This is not the place to go into the proceedings of the 1907 Congress. The point is that real revolutionary Marxism which pervaded that Congress is bypassed (if ever known) by Draper, and surely would have illuminated the significance of 1848 much more clearly than the single quote from Lenin.

⁸ Marx-Engels Selected Works, Vol. 1, p. 25.
⁹ Rigorous scholarship and research by Raya Dunayevskaya, undertaken for her book-in-progress, *Rosa Luxemburg, Today's Women's Liberation Movement and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*, not only seriously challenges those who would equate Engels to Marx, but in fact discloses profound differences between the two. A chapter of her new book, detailing several important differences, was published as a special supplement to the January-February 1977 issue of *News & Letters*.

¹⁰ Feuerbach, *The Reason of the Socialist Philosophy*, Engels, Frederick; Chicago, Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1903, p. 128.

EDITORIAL

June, 1979

A. Philip Randolph and Black labor's future

The life, the early life, of A. Philip Randolph is what needs to be remembered and what is deliberately forgotten by those who shed crocodile tears over his death and wish to remember only the last years when he had turned against the militancy of the new generation of Black revolutionaries that had been born with the 1960s.

Historically, the genius of A. Philip Randolph, socialist, emerged as World War I ended and the Russian Revolution promised the way to a new, classless world. All that greeted the returning Black soldiers were Ku Klux Klan riots and such barbaric outbursts of lynchings against Blacks moving from the South to the North, that 1919 became known as "Red Summer, 1919." It was a description, not of the extension of the Russian Revolution into the U.S., but of the fantastic number of race riots—no less than 28 in the last months of 1919!

RANDOLPH'S TRUE LEGACY

It was in that period that A. Philip Randolph accomplished three pathbreaking deeds. First was the founding of a magnificent new paper called *The Messenger*. So great was its vision of a very different world from capitalism, and so militant and challenging was his direction for developing a mass movement of Blacks, that no one could stop him—from President Wilson, who called him "the most dangerous man in the U.S.," to the Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities that slandered and persecuted him.

What provoked all the anti-Red and anti-Black hysteria of the Government was the fact that Randolph's *The Messenger* fought not only Big Business but the Government, and not only any specific Administration but the very notion of the United States' sham democracy by printing a cartoon of a Black man being lynched, wrapped in an American flag set on fire.

Nor did he let the labor bureaucracy get away with its type of racism. First he organized the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, and not only won labor victories for them against the railroad magnates but then started fighting within the AFL against its bureaucracy. As late

as 1961, there was a confrontation between him, as the only Black on the Executive Committee, and Meany. So telling was Randolph's criticism, that Meany exploded, "Who the hell appointed you as spokesman for all the Negroes in America."

Although, at the outbreak of World War II, A. Philip Randolph was no longer a socialist, he was still



Cartoon, "The Mob Victim," from July 1919 *Messenger*

an activist, and once again broke new ground, this time as President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, by organizing a March on Washington (MOW). He had planned to mobilize no less than 100,000 Black workers to protest the mass unemployment.

This so frightened President Roosevelt that he issued Executive Order 8802 to bar discrimination in war industry. While this small version of the Fair Employment Practices Act did stop the March, it did not stop Randolph from then transforming his March committee into a committee to end Jim Crow in the Army. (See

The March on Washington Movement's pamphlet, *The War's Greatest Scandal! The Story of Jim Crow in Uniform.*)

This still didn't end his magnificent history-making actions. As against the beginning of the war, when their slogan was "The Yanks are not coming," the American Communists made a 180-degree turn when the Hitler-Stalin Pact collapsed as Germany attacked Russia, and outdid the most rabid reactionary in flag-waving, pretended patriotism. The CP first turned against the MOW, then attacked the Committee against Jim Crowism, calling for "a second front" to be opened by the U.S. everywhere except, of course, in the U.S. for Black freedom, or for the right of workers to strike.

They demanded, instead, that the Negro subordinate his struggles to "the fight against fascism"—in Germany. They called A. Philip Randolph a veritable subversive and his movement too belligerent. The Communist Party's vice-presidential candidate had the gall to say that Randolph's movements helped in "creating confusing and dangerous moods in the ranks of the Negro people and utilizing their justified grievances as a weapon of opposition to the Administration's war program . . ."

THE GROUND FOR TODAY

This, too, did not stop Randolph and he did win the end of Jim Crow in the Army. Nor did he limit his contributions to the economic and social sphere, or to America alone. He was instrumental in helping to establish the two-way road between Africa and America that has been a hallmark of the Black fight for freedom.

To honor A. Philip Randolph is not just a matter of remembrance of things past nor even only of clearing his legacy from the deliberate misinterpretation by those—including the Institute that bears his name and that is headed by Norman Hill—who want the public to know only his last years. Rather, it is to build today and tomorrow on the ground he laid as a pioneer of the organization of Black labor and a pioneer of uniting Black with socialism in the battle of ideas.

Herbert Marcuse, Marxist philosopher

The death of Herbert Marcuse on July 29 marks a sad day on the historic calendar of young revolutionaries as well as old Marxists. How great is the void death has created can be gauged from his mature life span which covered the 1919 German Revolution, the U.S. New Left in the mid-1960s, to the very month of his death in Germany — the country of his birth, the land of both Hegel and Marx — where he was preparing a paper on "The Holocaust" to be delivered both there and in Spain. Marcuse's life-span was by no means one upward spiral. But the fact that the mass media, in their obituaries, choose to dwell on his *One-Dimensional Man*, as if that were the focal point of his life, tells a great deal more about decadent capitalism than it does about Herbert Marcuse.

The truth is that, as a young man completing his military service in Germany, he was active in the revolutionary Soldiers' Council in Berlin. Marx's philosophy of liberation and the revolutionaries, Rosa Luxemburg-Karl Liebknecht, were the real determinants of Marcuse's life. It is true that when the Social Democracy beheaded that 1919 revolution and Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were murdered, Marcuse left political activism for the study of philosophy. It is not true that he wavered in his commitment to Marxism.

In the very period when he wrote his first major work, *Hegel's Ontology and the Foundation of a Theory of History*, which still bore the traces of his teacher,

Heidegger, he penned what remains to this day one of the most profound analyses⁽¹⁾ of Marx's *Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, 1844*, which had just then (1932) been published in Germany. Not only does Marcuse there call Marx's early essays the "philosophical foundation as a theory of revolution," but he adds presciently for our times:

"All attempts to dismiss the philosophic content of Marx's theory or to gloss over it in embarrassment reveal a complete failure to recognize the historical origin of the theory; they set out from an essential separation of philosophy, economics and revolutionary praxis, which is a product of the reification against which Marx fought and which he had already overcome at the beginning of his critique." (p. 10)

JUST AS THE BOURGEOIS press is trying to reduce the historic legacy of Marcuse to the writing of *One-Dimensional Man* (to which I'll return later), so the Stalinists and Maoists did everything to slander Marcuse in the 1960s when, by no means a youth, he nevertheless identified with the New Left in the anti-Vietnam War movement, in the Black revolution, in the student move-

(1) In English this essay, "The Foundation of Historical Materialism," was not published until 1972, when it was included in a collection of his essays, *Studies in Critical Philosophy*. New Left Books, London.

(Continued on Page 7)

Herbert Marcuse, Marxist philosopher

(Continued from Page 1)

ment which rose to a climax in May, 1968, in Paris.

What those state-capitalist practitioners, calling themselves Communists, don't explain is why they chose the mid-1960s to pre-occupy themselves with "exposing Marcuse's role" of working for the U.S. Government two decades earlier, in World War II. What they hide is that while Marcuse, even then, did not compromise with Marxism as theory, they have totally revised Marxism both as theory and in practice. The reason is two-fold: First, by the 1960s, for different reasons, both Russia and China refused to approve any but their own method of opposing U.S. imperialism — that is to say, actually carrying out secret negotiations with it to make sure there would be no successful social revolution in their own lands. Second, Stalinists and Maoists alike hoped to make the "expose" of Marcuse so slanderous that none would want to look at what Marcuse had published in that crucial year of 1941.

That was the year *Reason and Revolution* appeared. In that seminal work, Marcuse established the Humanism of Marxism, and re-established the revolutionary dialectic of Hegel-Marx, for the first time for the American public.⁽²⁾ It is impossible to forget the indebtedness we felt for Marcuse when that breath of fresh air and vision of a truly class-less society was published — and we were actively opposing that imperialist war. It was the year I embarked on the study of the nature of the Russian economy and the role of labor in that state-planned economy, and came upon Marx's Humanist Essays and the famous Frankfurt School. While I deeply disagreed with these German refugees who were under the illusion that one way of fighting Nazism was to work for the U.S. government, I felt a kinship to those opponents of Nazism. One thing that distinguished Herbert Marcuse, a theoretician in that famous Frankfurt School, (officially Institute for Social Research), was that he did not hold himself apart from the people in the country in which he now lived; and his friends were not the rulers, but the revolutionaries.

THUS AT THE HEIGHT of McCarthyism, when the Humanism of Marxism about which I was writing in *Marxism and Freedom* — its American roots as well as its world dimension — was hardly the most popular theory to propound in these United States, Marcuse volunteered, when I sent him the manuscript, to write the Preface to it.⁽³⁾ He also tried to find a publisher for it. Neither in private nor in public did we ever hide the sharp differences that divided us. But that did not keep him from practicing his strong belief in a continuous, open, serious battle of ideas as more than mere bourgeois democracy. As he was to put it in that Preface:

"The Marxian insistence on democracy as the preparatory stage of socialism, far from being a cloak, or 'Aesopian language' pertains to the basic conception and is not minimized by the equally strong insistence on the difference between 'bourgeois' and socialist democracy." (p. 11)

Fairly recently (Nov. 1, 1976), the differences surfaced in a new form as Marcuse had not only moved away from any belief that the proletariat was the revolutionary force, but bestowed that revolutionary role on art. Here is what he wrote would be my attitude: "You will laugh, when you hear I am working on Marxist aesthetics: 'Doesn't he have other worries?' But perhaps

(2) It is true that Marx's Essays themselves were not published in English until I included them as Appendices to *Marxism and Freedom* in 1957. But analysis of them, as well as the attitude to the Hegel-Marx dialectic as revolutionary, set forth in *Reason and Revolution*, sent many students who knew other languages to seek them out.

(3) It was also the period when he had just finished *Eros and Civilization* and, while I had kept my distance on the whole question of trying to combine Freud with Marx, I did turn the book over for review to a Marxist-Humanist physician who held that "It is to the great credit of Marcuse that he clearly and persistently points out the dynamic revolutionary core of Freudian psychoanalysis: that the life instincts... required not compromise but eradication of the present society, not sublimation but confronting the sickness that is disturbing modern life." ("A Doctor Speaks," *News & Letters*, Feb. 2, 1957.)



HERBERT MARCUSE

we will meet again sometime, somewhere, for a good discussion and disagreement."

THE DETERMINING DIVISION between us, of course, came in 1961 with the publication of *One-Dimensional Man*. As against the Marxian concept of labor as the revolutionary force and reason for transforming society, which Marcuse had held not only in his 1932 essay on Marx but also in his 1941 *Reason and Revolution*, and as a departure (or development if you wish) of the 1957 Preface to *Marxism and Freedom*, when Marcuse began questioning the role of the proletariat, he now pronounced nothing short of capitalism's "integration" of the working class in mind as well as body — and even, a la Sartre's analysis of automation, in sexuality. I held, instead, that, far from the proletariat having become one-dimensional, what the intellectual proves when he does not see proletarian revolt, is that his thought is one-dimensional. I sent him my review, and when next we met, what happened discloses how great is the philosophic void that his death brings and how hard it will be to fill that void.

He laughed at my review⁽⁴⁾ and called me a "romantic." Those gentle eyes of his had a way of smiling even when he was theoretically shouting at you—as if he were saying: "It really is good to have one who still believes; for, without revolution, what is there?"

This was the attitude I sensed again as he suddenly engaged me in a discussion of a phrase Marx used in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*: "labor, from a mere means of life, has become the prime necessity of life." When he asked what I thought that meant, it need hardly be stressed that Marcuse knew very well what Marx meant. He wasn't asking for any sort of definition about how different from alienated labor under capitalism would be labor as self-activity and self-development when, with the abolition of "the antithesis between mental and physical labor," the new society could write on its banner: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

No, what he was saying was: since we "cannot know" when labor will become creative as united mental-physical, any more than we can know when the state will "wither away"—and we are surely living in a "repressive monolith," be it the U.S. or Russia—what can we, "a very tiny minority," do? If you think it is more than the Great Refusal — well!

7 0 4 2
August-September, 1979

MARCUSE ALWAYS HAD a strong streak of pessimism in him. I don't mean pessimism in any "psychological" sense — he enjoyed life too much for that. I mean this constant veering between loving utopias and not believing in them; some sort of cloud was always appearing at the very moment when he thought he saw farthest. Ah, there goes that smile in those gentle eyes. Oh, no, he is dead!

One final, personal word. Last year when I saw him in California, where I was on a lecture tour, we of course disagreed again; and again it was on the nearness or distance of revolution. Suddenly he asked me why I didn't stop "running around," (that is, being active), and concentrate instead on finishing the manuscript on Rosa Luxemburg and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

When the news of Marcuse's death came this July 29, just 10 days after his 81st birthday, and I remembered the last discussion, I thought: the 1919 German Revolution and Marx's philosophy of liberation were precisely the points of the birth of Herbert Marcuse as Marxist philosopher. How sad that he is gone! How great that the revolutionary legacy lives on!

Detroit — Raya Dunayevskaya
Aug. 2, 1979

(4) See "Reason and Revolution vs. Conformism and Technology" in *The Activist*, Fall, 1964.

August-September, 1979

TWO WORLDS

A review of 'The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg'

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg, edited and with an Introduction by Stephen Eric Bronner, Westview Press, 5500 Central Ave., Boulder, Colo., 80301. \$18.50, pb \$8.50.

The multi-dimensionality and revolutionary internationalism of Rosa Luxemburg is well set forth in this collection of Rosa Luxemburg Letters in the way in which the very first sentence of Bronner's Introduction leads to Rosa's statement: "I, too, am a land of boundless possibilities." That first section of "Reflections on Rosa Luxemburg" began with "There is always a tradition of liberation that stands in opposition to the heritage that a given society preserves and propagates."

It is this other tradition—revolutionary in the most total sense, that is to say, in its opposition both against capitalism and the reformist deviation within the revolutionary movement—that would have been easier to grasp if the readers had not to confront letters from 1894 to 1919 in one lump sum without a single distinction other than the year's date at the top of each page. It is true that Professor Bronner's substantive Introduction situates Luxemburg in the context of her era. But it is only natural that readers turning to The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg would want to hear her in her own words and sense the direction of her thoughts, actions, development before they have reached the 200th page of those letters.

'HEROISM OF MASSES' VS. OPPORTUNISM OF LEADERS

Because this book needs to be read by ever wider audiences, let me introduce two divisions into these Letters to enable readers at once to meet Rosa Luxemburg—Polish, German, Russian, international revolutionary. The first half of the Letters could be titled: "Heroism of Masses' vs. Opportunism of Leaders";

and the second half: "From Theory and Anti-War Agitation to Prison and Revolution."

It is true she used the expression, "heroism of the masses," to describe the magnificent actions of the Warsaw workers in the first Russian Revolution, 1905, whereas this collection of letters begins in 1894, with a letter of Luxemburg to her colleague and lover, Leo Jogiches, in which she complains that his letters are wholly devoted to the "Cause" and tell her nothing of him personally or of the organizational and factional differences with the Russians. But it is even more true that, from the very start of her break with bourgeois society—when she was only a teenager, yet was already under police surveillance and had to leave Poland for Switzerland, where she met her life-long collaborator Jogiches—"the heroism of the masses" was precisely what won her commitment to the revolutionary movement. She never veered from that for a single moment.

However, whereas that 1894 letter from Paris spoke so personally and very nearly "obediently", all one has to do is read the very next set of letters, as she reached Germany in 1898, to see a quite different Luxemburg. Not only does she take issue with Jogiches' advice, but she reaches such immediate heights theoretically on the most burning question raging in the German Social Democracy—the very first appearance of reformism—that it is her analysis, Reform or Revolution, that is the most comprehensive and profound answer to Bernstein. It becomes a standard for all revolutionaries, and has remained so to this day.

Not only that, Luxemburg's Letters disclose something still more extensive: the vision of a genius anticipating capitalism's development into modern imperialism before the word had been "invented". Listen to Luxemburg telling Jogiches about "Shifts in World Politics" ever since Japan's attack on China, 1895, and Russia's and England's attack on Persia and Afghanistan: "From that, the European antagonisms in Africa have received new impulses; there, too, the struggle is breaking out with new force (Fashoda, Delegon, Madagascar).

It's clear that the dismemberment of Asia and Africa is the final limit beyond which European politics no longer has room to unfold . . . the European powers will have no choice other than throwing themselves on one another, until the period of the final crisis sets in within politics . . ." The letter was dated January 9, 1899! (p. 72)

THEORY, PRISON, REVOLUTION

Naturally, no book review, much less sub-headings, can do justice to the multiplicity of topics and years (1894-1919) covered in The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg; the first subheading made no such claim. It did, I hope, help point a direction, both as to the objective situation and the subjective developments in Luxemburg's life. She no sooner set foot in Germany than she began the fight against reformism. Her "German period" ended long before World War I broke out and revealed the betrayal of the German Social Democracy. Ever since the first Russian Revolution, 1905-06, when Luxemburg was still close to Karl Kautsky, she began to "speak Russian" as she described the "heroism of the masses"; "in all factories, committees, elected by the workers, have arisen 'on their own', which decide on all matters relating to working conditions . . . the organization advances indefatigably. In spite of martial law . . . the work is being carried out just as if political freedom were already a reality." (pp. 114-115) By 1910 she broke completely with Kautsky.

As she generalized her experience into the analysis of General Strike, Trade Unions, the Party, and worked to apply it in Germany, Karl Kautsky's abstract revolutionism and his "theory of attrition" horrified her. She

7041

sensed his opportunism which would lead to betrayals. She called it "the servility of the theoretician" back in 1910. Just as her total break with Kautsky, four full years before the outbreak of war, long before anyone else, Lenin included, sensed any defect in the then most outstanding revolutionary, so her anti-war agitation in 1913 led the Kaiser to cite her "for treason" before there was actual war.

Prof. Bronner has caught the character of Rosa Luxemburg as prisoner beautifully: "It is easy to forget how drab and debilitating prison life can actually be. Rosa Luxemburg's letters serve as a reminder . . . Rosa Luxemburg rebels against the drudgery of prison life . . . She searches for beauty in the cracks of existence, and in response to the boredom of isolation, she watches insects, feeds her plants, and observes the manifold diversity of nature."

That was very far from all she did in that hellhole. Not only did she continue her leadership, theoretical and political, of the anti-imperialist war, and also produce a minor masterpiece of literary criticism of Korolenko (not to mention the constant flow of magnificent "personal" letters, especially to Mathilde Wurm, when she suddenly calls upon Penitencia, the queen of the Amazons). No, she is also involved in strict theory, the phenomenal Anti-Critique, directed against the critics of her greatest* theoretical work, *Accumulation of Capital*: they are, in fact, a single work.

Unfortunately, as her letter to Hans Diefenbach discloses, her rage was directed not alone against those she called "Marx's epigones," who took issue with her critique of Volume II of *Capital*, but even against "the famous first volume of Marx's *Kapital*, with its profuse rococo ornamentation in the Hegelian style." (p. 185)

None of this, however, diverted in any way from what dominated her whole life, in theory or practice, in or out of prison: REVOLUTION. Even in criticism, for example, her praise of the Russian Revolution and the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky "who dared" was unequivocal. Above all, there was the unending preparation for, and finally actual participation in, the German Revolution which finally freed her from prison. Because revolution was her life—or, as she expressed it: "The Revolution is magnificent; all else is bilge"—the then ruling Social Democracy wanted her dead. When the Kaiser hadn't succeeded, the freikorps was incited to brutally murder her and throw her body into the Landwehr Canal.

The *Letters of Rosa Luxemburg* ends with a letter in which she enclosed the first issue of *Rote Fahne*, organ of Spartacus League, transformed into the Communist Party, and calling for all power to the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils. It was dated January 4, 1919. Within 11 days she was dead. But they could not kill her ideas. Her revolutionary legacy lives on; for no other generation does her life's work bear as much relevance as for ours.

*The designation "greatest" means it is Luxemburg's most important theoretical work, not that I agree with it. Elsewhere I have taken issue with it. See my "Analysis of Rosa Luxemburg's *Accumulation of Capital*", included as Appendix to *State-Capitalism and Marx's Humanism*, available from *News & Letters* for 50¢ plus postage.

Two Worlds**ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE 1980s**

The following excerpts are taken from the *Perspectives Thesis* delivered to the National Editorial Board Meeting of News and Letters Committees on Sept. 1 in Detroit. The full report is now available from N&L (see ad, p. 6, for table of contents).

by Ruya Dunayevskaya

National Chairwoman, News and Letters Committees
**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 scapegoat 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" . . .

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 new, 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 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 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 . . .

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 for Rosa Luxemburg, *Today's Women's Liberation Movement and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*, 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" . . .

**II. WITHOUT A PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION:
OIL AND THE PLO GAINING A FOOTHOLD
WITH BLACK LEADERS**

... Oil, oil, oil: the militarized machine is insatiable; they—the rulers—are always preparing it for a

October, 1979

war just around the corner. But what has that to do with the relationship of the PLO and 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 . . .

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 Maoists, 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-Mao 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"?)

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 1872. Unfortunately, it was only for purposes of contrasting the lack of unity in 1972 to the "cohesion" in 1879, 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 8/84/79).

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.

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 R. Hinton who praises Aron's book (NYT 8/24/79), 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?

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 concretizing 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*.

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.)

OCTOBER, 1979

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 uncritically 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 saltus!*"

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.

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?

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 focosism 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.

7045

TWO WORLDS

November, 1979

LEON TROTSKY: A CRITIQUE

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

EDITOR'S NOTE: On this hundredth anniversary of Leon Trotsky's birth, we are printing brief excerpts from a new Political-Philosophic Letter by Raya Dunayevskaya, "The Two Russian Revolutions, and Once Again, on the Theory of Permanent Revolution." The full letter is available from News & Letters for 75¢, postage included. Dear Friends:

The Revolutions of 1905 and 1917 have forever enshrined Trotsky's great historical role. The same two Revolutions, however, tell a very contradictory story about the theory with which Trotsky's name will likewise always be connected as he is the creator of the 20th century version of the theory of the Permanent Revolution. The expression, "contradictory story," is not a reference to the critiques of that theory, mine included.

Recently, in restudying the 1905-07 Revolution as turning point in Rosa Luxemburg's life, the 1907 London Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party (in Russian abbreviated RSDRP; in English, RSDLP) became crucial, not just in regard to her views, but to those of Lenin and Trotsky—and, for that matter, all other tendencies in Russia, as it was that united Congress of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks that, for once, all tendencies attended.

Let's begin at the beginning, with Trotsky's participation in that 1907 Congress which revolved around the 1905 Revolution. Let's remember that this occurs after Trotsky had reached the highest point of activity with the General Strike led by the St. Petersburg Soviet, which he headed. Not only was that a high point of revolution. It became the highest point of Trotsky's theoretical development, as he drew from it what later became known as the theory of Permanent Revolution. Absolutely no one, including Lenin and Luxemburg, matched the leap in cognition which proclaimed that backward Russia, involved in a bourgeois revolution, could be the one not only to have the revolution before the advanced countries, but—in

Absolutist Russia—to reach for socialism "in an unbroken chain." That expression, "unbroken chain," which referred concretely to the 1905 Russian Revolution—and not just the concept of permanent revolution, which Marx had developed in his 1850 Address to the Communist League—was the issue in dispute.

IT IS TROTSKY'S original projection, which was later to become known as the theory of Permanent Revolution but which was not on the agenda of that 1907 Congress because Lenin's proposal to discuss "The Present Moment of Revolution" was defeated by the Mensheviks—with Trotsky's help. Here is what Trotsky said in that dispute:

"What I want is that the Congress, from beginning to end, be political, that it be a gathering of revolutionary representatives of the Party, and not a club, be it of doubtful or even non-doubtful Marxists, bent on general discussions. I need political directives, and not your general philosophical deliberations about the character of the present moment of our revolution . . . Give us a formula for action! That's what I need!"

*From Minutes of the 1907 Fifth Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers Party, in Pyatyi (Leningrad) 5^o "ezd RSDRP, April-May 1907 goda, Protokoly, (Moscow, 1963), p. 49. (My translation.)

When the Congress got down to discussing the one "general", i.e., theoretical, question—the relationship of Social-Democracy (as Marxism was then called) to bourgeois . . . Trotsky did not present a resolution differing from the one the Bolsheviks presented, though he tried to amend that one. Indeed, he reproduced his speech in the 1922 edition of 1905 precisely to show that he opposed the Mensheviks and voted with the Bolsheviks. Yet in the years immediately following the Congress he wrote a whole series of articles attacking the Bolsheviks as well as the Mensheviks. The major one (and the one he was proud enough to reproduce in the 1922 edition of his 1905) was the article entitled "Our Differences" that had been published in Luxemburg's paper in 1909. Here is how it concluded:

" . . . while the anti-revolutionary aspects of Menshevism have already become fully apparent, those of Bolshevism are likely to become a serious threat only in the event of victory." (1905, Vintage Books, 1972, p. 316.)

As if that were not a fantastic enough statement to make in 1909 in "predicting" the future revolution, Trotsky in 1922—that is to say, nearly five years after Lenin had led the greatest revolution in history—perilously footnoted the 1909 statement as follows:

"Note to the present edition. This threat, as we know, never materialized because, under the leadership of Comrade Lenin, the Bolsheviks changed their policy line on this most important matter (not without inner struggle) in the spring of 1917, that is, before the seizure of power. (Author)." (1905, p. 317 fn.) . . .

THE POINT IS, what happened in those intervening 12 years between 1905 and 1917? As we already saw, in 1907 he did not wish to discuss the nature of the present moment of the revolution. In 1909 he published the above cited criticism of Mensheviks and Bolsheviks. In 1910 he followed it up with an article in Neue Zeit,* where the first point Trotsky made was: "Theory cannot replace experience."

As if 1905 meant, not the greatest experience ever—be it for him or the Russian proletariat and peasantry, as well as for the world working class—but only

*"Die Entwicklungstendenzen der russischen Sozialdemokratie" by Leon Trotsky, Neue Zeit Year 28, Vol. 2, Sept. 9, 1910, pp. 866-871.

7 0 4 7

NOVEMBER, 1979

factional disputes between "Economists", Mensheviks and Bolsheviks; as if Russian Marxism arose merely out of fighting a "primitive ideological viewpoint" (i.e., the Narodniks), Trotsky reached the following conclusion regarding those factional disputes between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks: the differences arise out of "the process of adaptation of Marxist intellectuals to the class struggle, i.e. the political immaturity of the Russian proletariat." What such argumentation betrays, I would say, is that it isn't only the "nature" of the peasantry about which Leon Trotsky had a low opinion; it is the proletariat which he considered backward—"politically immature." Trotsky's logic, however, led him to accuse the Bolsheviks, Lenin especially, of "ideological fetishism," "sectarianism," and "intellectual individualism."

Far from returning to his theory of Permanent Revolution, much less to the Luxemburgian view of the advanced nature of the Russian proletariat, Trotsky veered off to psychology, talk against "lack of morality" and "piracy" (a reference to expropriations), not to mention "sexual anarchy."

It all sounds as if somebody was writing a farcical caricature about Trotsky. But unfortunately, it is not a caricature. It is not somebody writing about Trotsky. It is Trotsky's own writing . . .

Those who say that—since that was the period climaxed by the infamous "August Bloc" which Trotsky acknowledged was a "fundamental error", and since he accepted Lenin's characterization of him as "conciliationist"—Trotsky's joining of the Bolshevik Party, like his revolutionary activities in 1917, "eliminated all differences" show they understand nothing of either theory or organization . . .

THE POINT HERE is not so much whether Lenin or Trotsky was right in this or that dispute. Rather, the amazing fact is that Trotsky, the creator of the theory of Permanent Revolution, was practicing not just organizational but theoretical conciliationism—and the

theoretical conciliationism was not only against "others" but against himself. In a word, not a single serious point Trotsky made in 1905 was either developed or related to anything he did in those 12 long years between 1905 and 1917.

How, then, did the question of his theory mature when, finally, in 1917 a proletarian revolution did, indeed, succeed and was led by Lenin and himself? The November, 1917 Revolution remains the highest point of proletarian revolution and is magnificently retold in *The History of the Russian Revolution* . . . What isn't natural is some rewriting of history in the Appendices, especially as it relates to Lenin and the theoretic division between the two on Lenin's slogan, "the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry," which is almost always abbreviated by Trotsky as just "bourgeois-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." To prove how that kept the Bolsheviks from understanding the course of 1917, he shows how hard Lenin had to work "to rearm the Party."

That, in part, is true but the whole truth is that it was not the theory of Permanent Revolution that "rearmed the Party," but Lenin's famous April Thesis. To try to claim that the April Thesis somehow implied Lenin's conversion to Trotsky's theory is to skip entirely Lenin's philosophic-dialectic reorganization which, far from bringing him closer to Trotsky, led to THE most fundamental dispute between them over Lenin's slogans—"Defeat of your own country is the lesser evil"; "Transform the imperialist war into civil war." It was not Leon Trotsky's theory of Permanent Revolution, but the dialectics of revolution that led Lenin both to the April Thesis and to the writing of *STATE AND REVOLUTION*, as well as to putting conquest of power on the agenda of the Bolshevik Party. And it was THEN that Trotsky joined Lenin, not Lenin Trotsky . . .

WHAT STANDS OUT is Trotsky's failure to grasp the totally new theoretical point of departure on the question which Lenin introduced in his Theses on the

National and Colonial Questions at the Second Congress of the Communist International. Trotsky's reference to that thesis is limited to the context of his fight with Stalin—internationalism vs. nationalism—and not the pivotal point of the revolutionary live force of the peasantry, of the national question, and of the perspective that, since world revolution has not come via Berlin, "then perhaps" it can come via Peking. That new point of departure in theory was not grasped, much less developed, by Trotsky.

His attempt, retrospectively, to credit the 1917 Revolution's success to his theory of Permanent Revolution, was not, of course, at the bottom of the Trotsky-Stalin struggle that ensued after the death of Lenin. No. More objective causes are at the root—the new stage of world capitalism, reflected in Stalin's revisionist capitulation to the capitalistic impulse as he moved in the opposite direction of the workers' demands. But, of course, Stalin took advantage of the specific dispute over the additions to the 1922 edition of Trotsky's 1905 as he began his usurpation of the mantle of Lenin . . .

Whether the theory of Permanent Revolution was confirmed or unconfirmed in 1917 is not proven, as we showed before, by the mere repetition of the theory of 1905-06 in 1922. The real point at issue by the time of the writing of *The History of the Russian Revolution* in the early '30s was whether one has a theory to meet the challenge of the new stage of world capitalism—the Great Depression which brought on state-capitalism as a world phenomenon. Although Trotsky by the mid-1930s had fought the Stalin bureaucracy for a solid decade, had written *The Revolution Betrayed*, he denied the transformation of Russia into a state-capitalist society. And he ended up tailing Stalinism, calling for the defense of Russia as a "workers' state, though degenerate" at the very time when the infamous Hitler-Stalin Pact had given the green light to World War II.

Which is why it becomes imperative to see the two revolutions, not weighed down with factional disputes, much less slanted to theoretical conclusions, but with eyes of today turned to future revolutions.

—October 1, 1979

TWO WORLDS

Grave contradictions in the Iranian revolution

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**
(News and Letters Committees has received the following letter from Raya Dunayevskaya, who is away working on her new book-in-progress—Ed.)

Nov. 27, 1979

Dear Friends,

Were it not for the Iranian Revolution that was—and may still resume and deepen, as it is by no means over, despite the counter-revolutionary stage now being carried out by the Imam demagogue, Khomeini, whose insanities are being matched by Carter's saber-rattling—this would be the time for saying one thing and one thing only: "A plague on both your houses."

I. WHERE TO NOW?

Because, however, of the remembrance of the Iranian Revolution as it overthrew the Shah's barbarous regime backed by U.S. imperialism; because of the remembrance of Women's Liberation's refusal to wear the chador, challenging Khomeini's attempt to turn the clock backward and reduce women to a feudalistic state; and because of the continuing rebellion of the Kurds, as well as the Arab oil workers in Khoozestan against Khomeini, along with the other minorities' struggles for self-determination—it is necessary to take a second look at the new form of the occult which is coming out

of Khomeini's Iran and calling all others, and not only U.S. imperialism, "mussed fi ai-Ard" ("the corrupt of the earth"). It is imperative to practice dialectics, rather than to act on first reaction, as if tailending Khomeini's opposition to the U.S. is genuine opposition to American imperialism.

Of course the hatred of the Iranian people for that butcher, the Shah, and their opposition to U.S. imperialism, which had put him into power and kept him there, is not only real and justifiable for Iranians, but was real and justifiable for many Americans who both exposed the truth of the Shah's tortures of the Iranian people and expressed their solidarity with Iranian revolutionaries. Of course the Carter Administration

was well aware of the opposition not only in Iran but in this country to granting any asylum to the Shah, and for a while—a very short while—Carter was forced to resist the pressures of Nixon, Kissinger and David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank to bring the Shah to the U.S. But following the tune of that new Pied Piper, Khomeini, against "infidels" and "satanic domination" is anything but struggling either against U.S. imperialism or showing solidarity with the Iranian Revolution.

ALL ONE HAS to do to see the degeneration of the so-called Revolutionary Council in Iran is to see the new "left-covering" given by the current acting foreign secretary, Bani-Sadr, who is trying to institute an Iranian version of Pol Potism. Listen to the interview Bani-Sadr granted to Eric Rouleau in *Le Monde* (11/10/79): "Teheran is a monstrous parasitic city, which absorbs by itself one-half of the national consumption . . . we will empty it of some of its people by creating in the countryside industrial and agricultural production units."

(1) See my Political-Philosophic Letter, "Iran: Unfulfillment of, and Contradictions in, Revolution," March 25, 1979, published by News & Letters.

Unfortunately, even the more recognizable Left—Trotskyism—far from practicing any revolutionary dialectics, is busy tailending Khomeini's Iran.² The *Intercontinental Press* (IP) of 11-19-79 and 11-26-79 keeps talking of a "New Upsurge in the Iranian Revolution." It even sees anti-U.S. imperialism in Khomeini's phrase "satanic domination" in the arrogant message Khomeini sent to the equally arrogant Pope, telling the latter that the way the "Christian world (can) redeem itself" is by following Islamic Iran's fight against "infidels." It is impossible not to ask whether there isn't a coincidence between this and the one democratic gesture by Khomeini which allowed some of the banned papers to reappear, including *Kadar* (Worker), the paper of the Iranian Socialist Workers Party (IKS). In any case, the very first issue, 11-17-79, of *Kadar* to reappear cited Khomeini's statement to the Pope as proof of "how anti-imperialist" Khomeini was.³ Furthermore, continued IP, the holding of American hostages by the Iranian students (who, not so incidentally, call themselves "Followers of the Imam") "re-emphasizes the people's historic demand for political and economic independence from world imperialism."

In what proletarian revolution, exactly, was the taking of hostages—and not the rulers, but some fairly low Embassy personnel—held to be a revolutionary tactic? Since when has war and revolution been made synonymous? Isn't it about time that Marxist-revolutionaries labeled Khomeini's endless repetition of "we are men of war" "looking forward to martyrdom" for what it is, by citing Marx who wrote that Napoleon, the ultimate counter-revolutionary, "substituted permanent war for permanent revolution"?

IN IRAN TODAY we have a demagogue, openly lying that "U.S. imperialism and its corrupt colony, Israel" were involved in the occupation of the Grand Mosque in Mecca, where no infidel—and all except Muslims are infidels—is even permitted to enter. He kept repeating this brazen lie even after his fellow Muslims, the Saudi Arabian authorities, not only denied any U.S. and/or Israeli involvement, but showed that the sacrilegious act was perpetrated by a fanatical sect of the Muslims whose leader claimed, himself, to be the Messiah. Even then Khomeini proceeded to stress the Big Lie's impact by expressing "great joy" at the fact that the U.S. Embassy in Pakistan had been put to the torch and two Americans killed.

But the Trotskyists continue with their fairly tale Leftism, since they do support the Kurds' struggle for

(2) And if a Trotskyist should dare to say that following Khomeini is like "following" Father Gapon in 1905, they should at least have learned from Trotsky that, far from any Bolshevik or Menshevik or Social Revolutionary or even Liberal following Father Gapon, the truth was that Fr. Gapon himself turned against the Tsar and for the movement after the army fired on their demonstration.

(3) Remembrance, historic remembrance, has a way of repeating itself as if it were an ongoing element in every crisis. Nothing seems more relevant now than Trotsky's analysis of the Big Lie Stalin perpetrated by staging the Infamous Moscow Frame-up Trials, 1936-38, against the "General Staff of the Revolution," including Tukhachevsky, whom Stalin accused of nothing short of dealing with Nazi Germany. The needed revolutionary attitude when such a lie is perpetrated, Trotsky told me, is that it is not enough just not to believe the Big Lie. The fact is, he continued, that the reason the Big Lie is so much more monstrous than the ordinary lie is because its premeditation hides the sinister motivation that would have put everyone on the alert, had they known the truth. What Stalin was accusing Tukhachevsky of, he explained, might very well be what Stalin himself was doing or planning to do. The trial balloon towards that end, which directs hatred towards the accused, calls for a great deal more than just a defense of the wrongly accused. We must be prepared to fight some new "peppery dish" that Stalin is readying—perhaps a deal with Hitler. That was precisely what happened the following year, the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939.

DECEMBER, 1979

TWO WORLDS

Grave contradictions in the Iranian revolution

by Roya D... Author of PHILOS... (News and L... loving letter... working on f...

Dear Fr... W... and... ove... ins... w...

Iran... the... Iran...

Iran but in... Shah, and for... forced to resist... David Rockefeller... the Shah to the U.S... new Pied Piper... "satanic domination" is anything... against U.S. imperialism or showing... the Iranian Revolution.

ALL ONE F... to do to see the degeneration of the so-called Revolutionary Council in Iran is to see the new "left-covering" given by the current acting foreign secretary, Bani-Sadr, who is trying to institute an Iranian version of Pol Potism. Listen to the interview Bani-Sadr granted to Eric Rouleau in Le Monde (11/10/79): "Teheran is a monstrous parasitic city, which absorbs by itself one-half of the national consumption... we will empty it of some of its people by exporting in the countryside industrial and agricultural production units."

(1) See my Political-Philosophic Letter, "Iran: Unfoldment of, and Contradictions in, Revolution," March 25, 1979, published by News & Letters.

the more recognizable Left—... Khomeini's Iran.2 The Inter... 11-26-79 keeps... "Iranian Revolution."... Khomeini's phrase... the latter... "them itself"... "infidels."... a coin... gesture... pa... per... ny... r...

at... Sie... low... de... showed... anatical... himself, to... proceeded to... "great joy" at... "atar, had been... killed!!... with their fairly tale... the Kurds' struggle for...

care to say that following Khomeini... in 1905, they should at least have... not, far from any Bolshevik or Menshevik or... or even Liberal following Father Gapon, the... was that Fr. Gapon himself turned against the Tzar and for the movement after the army fired on their demonstration.

(3) Remembrance, historic remembrance, has a way of repeating itself as if it were an ongoing element in every crisis. Nothing seems more relevant now than Trotsky's analysis of the Big Lie Stalin perpetrated by staging the infamous Moscow "frame-up" trials, 1936-38, against the "General Staff of the Revolution," including Tukhachevsky, whom Stalin accused of nothing short of dealing with Nazi Germany. The needed revolutionary attitude when such a lie is perpetrated, Trotsky told me, is that it is not enough just not to believe the Big Lie. The fact is, he continued, that the reason the Big Lie is so much more monstrous than the ordinary lie is because its premeditation hides the sinister motivation that would have put everyone on the alert, had they known the truth. What Stalin was accusing Tukhachevsky of, he explained, might very well be what Stalin himself was doing or planning to do. The trial balloon towards that end, which directs hatred towards the accused, calls for a great deal more than just a defense of the wrongly accused. We must be prepared to fight some new "peppery diabol" that Stalin is readying — perhaps a deal with Hitler. That was precisely what happened the following year, the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939.

December, 1979

self-determination. However, what they play up is that some Kurds supposedly supported Khomeini, and what they cover up is that none less than the two most important Ayatollahs after Khomeini — Montazeri and Behesti—called the Kurd leaders "agents of Savak, Zionists and corrupt sources." Since it was just at the period when Khomeini was trying to claim that the whole of Iran was for him, he took to the air and said that this statement by the Ayatollahs was a "personal view." But these "persons" are not just any persons. They hold the positions of President and Vice President of the Assembly of the Experts that has just completed the Draft Constitution to be shoved down the throats of the Iranian people on Dec. 2 and 3. Indeed, many believe they undoubtedly were the two who instigated the occupation of the Embassy by the students.⁴

II. KHOMAINI'S BLASPHEMIES

What the media has not shown is that during the demonstrations in front of the U.S. Embassy, there was also a storming of the Ministry of Labor³, in which the mass of unemployed—and there are no less than two million unemployed in Iran now—were demanding jobs. Nor are they reporting the continuing struggles of the Kurds, much less the fact that some Marxists have gone underground to continue a truly revolutionary struggle against Khomeini's usurpation of the fruits of their revolutionary overthrow of the Shah.

Another of the many events unreported in the mass media at the time it happened (and still kept from the regional TV) are the bloody riots Khomeini instigated against the present rulers of the island of Bahrain in August, demanding the establishment of a "pure" Islamic government, the abolition of all "Western ways," especially TV, and the re-establishment of the separation of men and women in all public places. The riots were put down by the current rulers, but so worried are they about Khomeini's influence, his ability to foment rebellions against other Muslims who do not wish to unite "as one" against "the West"—and the East — and whom Khomeini then accuses of "crimes against God," that they have hushed up the August riots.

This is only part of Khomeini's own type of imperialism. Besides the claim to Bahrain, he has retained—despite a challenge by Iraq—the Shah's 1971 occupation of the three islands of Abu Musa and Greater and Lesser Tunb. Those islands are situated near the Straits of Hormuz, through which passes nearly half of the West's oil imports.

FURTHERMORE, Khomeini has lashed out against any Iranian who dares to say that he is for Iran first and for Islam second. He calls that "blasphemy." At the same time, when the PLO suggested that the Persian Gulf be renamed as either the Islamic or the Arabian Gulf, Khomeini rejected the suggestion at once. His insistence that Islam—his interpretation of Islam—must always come first, does not in any way mitigate his disdain for Arabs. Not only was he adamant that the Persian Gulf retain its name, but his opposition to the Arab oil workers and any claim for self-determination, is total. Arafat was quickly brought down to size when he tried to intercede for the American hostages. That doesn't mean that either Arafat or all the Arab state rulers meeting in Tunisia had anything to say for Khomeini—with the exception of Libya, and even their pro-Khomeini stance did not take priorities over selling Oil to the West.

(4) See Christian Science Monitor 11-16-79: "Constitution Gives Clergy Control in Iran" by Geoffrey Godsell.
(3) Christian Science Monitor, 11-21-79.

And in Iran, itself, the so-called Revolutionary Council is itself faction-ridden with pro-Libyan, pro-Syrian, pan-Islamic factions; and though they each bow to Khomeini now, it doesn't mean that would hold if other Muslim countries act out their dissent. At the same time, Hussein of Iraq has no intention whatever of bowing to Khomeini. Indeed, he has already once threatened an invasion and, is at the moment, arming some Kurds to start a revolt within Iran.

III. THE MAILED FIST OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

And what, exactly, is being prepared for the Iranian people once this month of mourning, the Muharram, is over? Well, they are to engage in a referendum to approve the Draft Constitution which the Ayatollahs Montazeri and Behesti have drawn up. Anyone who has any illusions that this Constitution bears any resemblance whatsoever to the one that was inspired by the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907, when the

first Shah was overthrown, or even as the Mullahs amended that Constitution when they brought the Shah back, should take a look at the new institution of the Office of Religious Guardian which has the right to veto over everything and anything passed by the state rulers and is also the supreme commander over the armed forces.

The point is that the Constitution does nothing but try to legitimize Khomeini's usurpation of the victory of the workers who achieved the actual overthrow of the Shah. It cannot solve the crisis in Iran, anymore than staged demonstrations before the U.S. Embassy and the sacrificial use of hostages can stay the hand of U.S. imperialism.

December, 1979

THE GREATEST danger now lies in the momentum gained by Khomeini's demagoguery, which might trigger Apocalypse Now! That is the brink at which the world now stands. Khomeini and Carter may not flinch as they prepare for such a confrontation. But the world must do everything to stay the hands of both rulers.

In the imperative struggle against the savage racism in this country against Iranian students, we must never forget that the underlying racism that has always been shown against the Blacks has actually been directed also against revolutionaries and minorities, though in depth it has been differently expressed racially. What I am saying is that not only must we remember the horror of U.S. concentration camps against Japanese-Americans during World War II, at the very time when no such atrocities were committed against Nazis in this country. The case against each white fascist was treated as an individual case. We must remember that the fact that American revolutionaries have long fought this, have long fought U.S. capitalism-imperialism and its wars, does not mean that we accept, as a revolutionary gesture, the opposition to American capitalism by another capitalist or religious fanatic, any more than we accepted Nazism or Japanese military opposition to American capitalism as anything but an inter-imperialist fight.

Of course the muffled fist of Carter must be stopped, and his is also the hand that can release a nuclear holocaust, which would put an end to civilization as we have known it. Revolutionary opposition against American imperialism can be carried through only if we raise a banner of what we are for. And what we are for is not turning the clock back to some form of occultism.

Anyone who tries to gild a neo-fascist occultism, forgetting that the "masses" that Hitler mobilized were mobilized for counter-revolutionary purposes; anyone who tries to say that Khomeini's constant references to the "disinherited masses" is akin to Mao's "Cultural Revolution," should be made to remember that — though Mao was once a revolutionary, and though Mao did labor under the illusion that making Russia "Enemy No. One" (like Khomeini's making the U.S. "Satan") was the way to fight for world socialism — Mao ended by rolling out the Red Carpet for Nixon.⁶ As we said then, the "revolutionary" Maoist apologists who were willing to forgive Mac every crime on earth and leave a few blanks for those he might create later, were revealing that one and only one organic trait characterizes them all: tail-endism to a state power. This is the exact opposite to what Marx's Marxism is — the struggle for a totally new, classless, social order, based on totally new human relations. Anything short of that spells out betrayal.

Yours,
Raya

(6) See both the chapter on "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung" in my Philosophy and Revolution (D-B, 1973) and "Mao's Last Hurrah," Political-Philosophic Letters, Feb. 27, 1976, published by News & Letters. Since the designation of Russia as "Enemy No. One" is the one Mao legacy the post-Mao leadership is scrupulously following out, see also "Post-Mao China: What Now?" in New Essays (News & Letters, 1977).

Discussion Article:

DECEMBER, 1979

Iran--philosophy and form of organization

With the following excerpts from a contribution written by an Iranian revolutionary activist and thinker, we initiate a new series of discussion articles on the question of form of organization. None represent in any sense an "official viewpoint" of News and Letters Committees; all are intended to help find paths to overcome the separation of philosophy and organization which has again and again proved fatal to revolutions in our time.

—Ed.

by Raha

What is now above all bothering my mind—and has for the past few months—is a form of organization which matches the content of it. The question of organization has long been a matter of controversy, and it is no accident that in Raya Dunayevskaya's "On the Threshold of the 1980s" the same question has been brought up again and again. She emphasizes this matter and defines it as a "burning question of our day . . . the question of form of organization."

I am sure it is no accident that in Iran and in the USA true revolutionaries have once more put this question on the agenda; this above all arises from the same need in both countries, the need to relate "spontaneity and organization."

It is important to note that Marx himself never neglected this question. In fact, he brought it up as early as 1844 when he was writing his Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts. Here he speaks of practice: "In order to supersede the idea of private property communist ideas are sufficient, but genuine communist activity is necessary in order to supersede real private property." It is no accident that right after the matter of practice he brings forth the question of organization. Let's listen to Marx himself: "When communist artisans form associations, teaching and propaganda are their first aim. But their association itself creates a new need—the need for society—and what appeared to be a means has become an end."

MARX SPEAKS OF the necessity of an association, a type of association that does not contradict the "freely associated" society of the future, and is, in fact, itself a model of the future society—a freely associated organization. We can certainly derive a theoretical result from what he defines as an association which itself "becomes an end." That theoretical result is that we should seek a kind of organization which is, at one and the same time, in unity with the philosophy of revolution and with the aim of the proletariat as a class.

So, if we are to abolish hierarchy, our organization (society) should not be based on hierarchy; if we to abolish all the existing authorities, our organization should not be an authoritarian one; in short, a unity of content and form, subjective and objective, must be what we are in search of.

What we witnessed in the case of Iran was the total separation of spontaneity from organization. Creativity of the masses was such that none of the vanguard organizations could keep up with it . . . Of course, we do not count on Maoists, Stalinists and that sort to criticize themselves and try to learn a lesson from history and the existing objective conditions. No, we are instead emphasizing the new forces . . .

Of all the Left organizations in Iran, the Fedayeen are the strongest. They, as well as most of the Left, not only believe in vanguardism but have such a centralized and hierarchic form of organization that it absolutely matches the content. No wonder that their objective aim is to form a vanguard party! They view the absence of a vanguard party as one of the main factors that led the way to the establishment of the present government.

One other factor is that for a long time they were so busy with their belief in guerrilla warfare (voluntarism) that in reality they totally forgot the masses . . .

IN SPEAKING ABOUT the need for an organiza-

tion one can not neglect the deficiencies of the material conditions and blame all the negative aspects of the present ongoing revolution on the lack of a proper organization. Even with a theory of revolution in hand one should not expect a drastic change in the balance of political forces nowadays existing in Iran. For that to take place, theory must be materialized. We should search for ways through which theory can be materialized, ways which turn theory into a fundamental part of the revolution. In doing so, we should derive the practical essence of theory from its relation to the objective conditions . . .

It is no secret that in Iran capitalism was not developed in the womb of the old society, but rather was introduced from outside. Consequently, the historical processes that the European countries went through, the processes which gave rise to the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, did not take place in Iran. If the process of disintegration of the old European societies was a matter of two or three centuries, it was only a matter of two decades in Iran . . .

I must admit that the Iranian working class fully participated in the overthrow of the Shah and if it were not for the decisive role of the proletariat (especially the oil workers) even the overthrow of the Shah couldn't have happened. But we should not forget that it was not the proletariat who started the revolution. Indeed, they came a little too late on the political scene.

December, 1979

7 0 5 2

WHEN THE FIRST general strike of the oil workers took place, their first demand was the release of political prisoners and the second was the lifting of martial law. . . . Are these demands directly socialist demands, or were they mere reflection of the general demands of society? . . .

No one could distinguish workers from shopkeepers when it came to the matter of street demonstrations. And these are the general conditions that cleared the way for Khomeini and his "holy allies".

Marx points out in "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right" that "no class in civil society can play this part (attaining universal domination) unless it can arouse in itself and in the masses a movement of enthusiasm in which it associates and mingles with society at large, identifies itself with it, and is felt and recognized as the general representative of society. . . . It is only in the name of general interest that a particular class can claim general supremacy. . . ."

SO IT IS NOT sufficient to say that Khomeini has come to power as a counter-revolution; we should also explain the how and why. It is not enough to say that Khomeini is an elite; we must also describe the conditions under which elitism can play such an important role. Khomeini's rule is not, as he himself thinks, a gift from God, but has its base in the profane world.

In dealing with this matter, we must ask, what is the objective-subjective condition of the working class? After answering these questions we can come to the theoretical conclusion that in the first chapter of the revolution in Iran, it was not the proletariat who was the leading force and it was not possible for them to come to power and begin the total uprooting of capitalism. Even with a philosophy of revolution in the hands of the intellectuals we would have had a similar result. For "it is not enough that thought should realize itself; reality must also strive towards thought." (Marx)

What I have arrived at, of course, does not mean an end. For what appears to be the end is rather a new beginning. The symptoms of the new beginning became visible, as we were approaching the end of the first chapter of the revolution. That is to say, in the womb of the movement that was nearing the overthrow of the Shah there was to be seen the emergence of another one which seeks not a mere political emancipation, but a complete, human emancipation. And this new beginning started precisely when the workers demanded full control over production, when they formed their councils.

IT IS PRECISELY this objective-subjective achievement right before Khomeini's takeover that set the ground for the next chapter and declared the revolution to be "permanent". Then, right after Khomeini had taken over, we have the revolutionary women pouring into the streets and demanding total liberation for women as well as men. In fact, women's liberationists gave a new meaning to what freedom consists of.

Then we witnessed the struggle of revolution against counter-revolution growing daily. Non-stop workers' strikes, May Day demonstrations, demonstrations of unemployed workers and jobless youth have done a lot to disclose the nature of the new government. And then we have witnessed the class-based struggle of the Kurds for self-determination which was a serious blow to Khomeini's authority.

Out of the actual struggle of women seeking liberation, national minorities seeking self-determination, the proletariat aiming for an end to class domination, has come a totally new concept of revolution. A concept which, although new in Iran, was long before developed by Karl Marx.

7052

January-February, 1980

Dunayevskaya's response to an Iranian revolutionary

We excerpt below a letter from Raya Dunayevskaya written in reply to Raha, an Iranian revolutionary activist and thinker, whose discussion article on "Iran—philosophy and form of organization" appeared in *NEWS & LETTERS*, December, 1979.—Ed.

November 3, 1979

Dear Raha,

You are the first who saw anything about form of organization in Marx's early writings. The opposite is true; the early writings are always quoted as if Marx was both "pre-Marxist" and very nearly dumb on the question of "the Party", so when you quote what Marx said on "communist artisans form associations" and that these "association(s) itself creates a new need—the need for society—and what appeared to be means has become an end," it is clear that you have sensed something that does indeed reconnect with Marx on the question of freely-associated men and women, and that you have every right to conclude "that theoretical result is that we should seek a kind of organization which is, at one and the same time, in unity with philosophy of the revolution and with the aim of the proletariat as a class."

Where I disagree is that you make too quick a leap to the present with the result, much as you want to do the opposite, you are really once again separating philosophy and organization. For example, we, of course, are not only emphasizing "new forces" but Reason, and that is absolutely indispensable. So that you cannot possibly jump to the Fedayeen where every word you say is correct (both against hierarchic form of organization and guerrilla warfare, that unholy combination of vanguardism and voluntarism), and yet it would appear at the end as if it were only because they were separated from the masses instead of it being both that and completely lacking in philosophy.

I think you ask the right question—"how a theory can be materialized"—but then make that materialization only that which relates to objective conditions, as if that meant economics, whereas in fact to Marxist-Humanism, objective conditions are both economics and the masses revolting against that economics. It's very dangerous because that's exactly what has been wrong for the whole Second International and with Trotskyism, that somehow in the process of the economic analysis, the proletariat itself became object. To Marx, however, material did not mean just economics. It meant the whole form of life, so that the need naturally was first and foremost food and shelter, but also all that was

needed, by no means limited to whether you had a spoon to eat with or you were eating with your fingers, but the need for what Marx called "quest for universality."

I disagree that the proletariat were not the first in the Iranian revolution. Of course, the so-called first, whether it's Father Gapon leading masses with icons to the Tsar's palace, or whether it's poets in Iran revealing the horrors of the Shah's prisons, or whether it's the journalist-editor in Nicaragua who was murdered by Somoza, precedes the actual proletarian outburst. But it doesn't become revolution until the proletariat, both in strikes and in demonstrations, that is to say, as masses in motion, appear. When Marx, as you quote, writes that both as a "movement of enthusiasm" and when the proletariat arouses the kind of interest that is an actual universal, that it's possible for "a particular class to claim general supremacy."

I believe that the really important thing is when you say "What appears to be an end is rather a new beginning." It isn't true, however, that that new beginning can be only workers' councils, even when you correctly add to them the new forces like women's liberation, because one of the real deviations in Lukacs was his concentration on totality, but not totality as a new beginning, and that totality also meant more of a summation rather than that Absolute Idea which is both theory and practice, and that as new beginning, I'm sure the Trotskyists would be for workers' control of production, and I'm sure that they would consider the councils "a socialist institution"—and by no means do I wish to play them down, because that definitely is the height of workers' control of production being in their own hands rather than being in a trade union or in a state.

But again, unless they, too, do not separate themselves from philosophy; unless they, too, feel as strongly the need for work on intellectual, as the intellectual feels the strong need for the workers; and unless that "intellectual sediment" (to use a Luxemburgian phrase) has philosophy and organization and revolution and Reason as well as new force, we will once again lose. And, I should add that when Marx writes "revolution is necessary also because it revolutionized the class itself," that's exactly what he meant, the proletariat as Reason as well as force, as objective as well as subjective, as new man/woman.

Yours,
Raya

Reason and revolution vs. conformism and technology

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

Among the many serious responses we received to Raya Dunayevskaya's "In Memoriam: Herbert Marcuse", published in the Aug.-Sept. 1979 N&L, were several suggesting that we reproduce her original review of Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man*, "Reason and Revolution vs. Conformism and Technology", which appeared in the *Activist* (Fall 1964), a journal published by students at Oberlin, Ohio. Excerpts from that review follow.—Ed.

Professor Marcuse's new and highly original book, *One-Dimensional Man*, is not, as the title might suggest, just one more journalistic work on the alienation of modern man. Again, despite its subtitle, "Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society," Professor Marcuse, far from limiting his study to that of ideology, tries to go to the root of positivistic one-dimensional philosophy, in the automated productive process itself. Indeed, in his attempt to restore the great power of "negative thinking," and to center attention on the dialectical development in the objective world, as well as in the field of thought, Marcuse "subverts" conformism both in being and in thought...

A dualism, however, pervades the book's three major parts: "One-Dimensional Society," "One-Dimensional Thought," and "The Chance of the Alternatives." On the one hand, the author is weighted down by full awareness that the transformation of reality cannot be achieved in thought; it must be consummated in practice: "In other words, society would be rational and free to the extent to which it is organized, sustained, and reproduced by an essentially new historical Subject." (p. 252) On the other hand, Professor Marcuse stresses over and over again, the totality of the conditions that "militate against the emergence of a new Subject." (p. 252)

His pessimism is not merely psychological; it is deeply rooted in his concept of "technological rationality," in his attitude that the proletariat has not lived up to its historic task, in his questioning, where not rejecting outright Marx's concept of the proletariat as the "Subject" that would negate "the advanced industrial society." No wonder that Marcuse's studies were developed outside of the range of workers' voices opposing the one-dimensional condition of automated labor.

There is one single exception to this pervasive condition of Professor Marcuse's book: a workers' pamphlet, *Workers Battle Automation* by Charles Denby, who happens at the same time to be the editor of *News & Letters*, to which Marcuse likewise refers in the Introduction.

**One-Dimensional Man* by Herbert Marcuse (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).

In referring, however, to the inhuman labor conditions Denby describes, Professor Marcuse not only stresses that "this form of drudgery is expressive of arrested, partial automation" (p. 25), but he leaves out entirely the central point of the pamphlet, the division between the rank and file and the labor leadership in their attitudes toward Automation...

It is a question of the voices one hears, the sights one sees, the feelings one experiences depending on which side of the production line you stand. In the case of Marcuse, the failure to hear this powerful oppositional voice at the point of production itself, has led to the view that the new forms of control have indeed succeeded in containing workers' revolt, to the point of so transforming the antagonistic structure of modern industrial society that "A comfortable, smooth, reasonable, democratic unfreedom prevails..." (p. 1) without opposition.

TO THIS REVIEWER the brilliance of Marcuse's analysis rests, rather, in the sections dealing with thought, literature, and Beat ways of protest. Listen, for example, to this: "The reign of such a one-dimensional reality does not mean that materialism rules, and that the spiritual, metaphysical and bohemian occupations are petering out. On the contrary, there is a great deal of 'Worship together this week,' 'Why not try God,' Zen, existentialism, and beat ways of life, etc. But such modes of protest and transcendence are no longer contradictory to the status quo and no longer negative. They are rather the ceremonial part of practical behaviorism, its harmless negation, and are quickly digested by the status quo as part of its healthy diet." (p. 14)

Professor Marcuse further demonstrates that the one-dimensional thought which is "systematically promoted by the makers of politics and their purveyors of mass information" is by no means limited to the United States, although that is the main focus of his study. "This totalitarian logic of accomplished facts has its Eastern counterpart," he writes. "There, freedom is the way of life instituted by a communist regime and all other transcending modes of freedom are either capitalistic, or revisionist, or leftist sectarianism..." (p. 14)

MARCUSE PROCEEDS FROM the "One-Dimensional Society," which occupies nearly a half of the book, and which already has analyzed the superstructure as well as the structure of society, directly to "One-Dimensional Thought," which focuses on modern philosophy separately.

We had already been introduced to the emergent pattern of one-dimensional thought and behavior: "The trend may be related to a development in scientific method: operationalism in the physical, behaviorism in the social sciences." (p. 12) Now Marcuse restates his

March, 1980

critique within the process of the development of philosophical thought itself from its origins in the dialectics of Plato to the science of Whitehead and the absurdities of Wittgenstein: "The totalitarian universe of technological rationality is the latest transmutation of the idea of Reason . . . the process by which logic becomes the logic of domination." (p. 123)

As against this, dialectics would reveal the true antagonistic structure of reality and of thought trying to grasp this reality: "If man has learned to see and know what really is, he will act in accordance with truth. Epistemology is in itself ethics and ethics epistemology . . . To the extent to which the experience of an antagonistic world guides the development of the philosophical categories, philosophy moves in a universe which is broken in itself (dechirement ontologique) — two-dimensional. Appearance and reality, untruth and truth (and, as we shall see, unfreedom and freedom) are ontological conditions . . . Philosophy originates in dialectics; its universe of discourse responds to the facts of an antagonistic reality." (p. 125)

Professor Marcuse presumes a goodly amount of knowledge on the part of his readers. But it appears to this reviewer that this part is especially important to the college students daily exposed to (if not brain-washed by) the pragmatist, vulgarly empiric, positivistic, not to mention the success philosophies of the day. As against Wittgenstein's language games, where ordinary language "is really sterilized and anesthetized" (p. 198), and as against "pure" science, science without telos, Marcuse does appeal to the transcendent view, but from first to last, he stresses that his critical theory is "op-

posed to all metaphysics by virtue of the rigorously historical character of the transcendence." (p. xi) The transcendent is not in heaven, but on earth; the historic is transitory, human, actual as against only the potential and inherent.

It is precisely, however, when Marcuse reaches the stage of freedom where he once again questions Marx's concept of the proletariat as the liberating force, and where pessimism once again overcomes his view of "The Chance of the Alternatives" which forms the last part of his work . . .

TWO ELEMENTS — one from theory, and from the objective world—save the critical philosophy that Professor Marcuse expounds. One is that the critical theory refuses to abdicate and leave the field "to an empirical sociology which, freed from all theoretical guidance except a methodological one, succumbs to the fallacies of misplaced concreteness . . ." (p. 254) If even the philosopher should see only the hopeless, Marcuse maintains, he would nevertheless, wish "to remain loyal to those who, without hope, have given and give their life to the Great Refusal." (p. 257)

The other movement of hope is of much greater import since it is both objective and subjective and has the force to undermine the status quo: ". . . underneath the conservative popular basis is the substratum of the outcasts, and outsiders, the exploited and persecuted of other races and other colors, the unemployed and the unemployable . . . their opposition is revolutionary even if their consciousness is not. Their opposition hits the system from without and is therefore not deflected by the system; it is an elementary force which violates the rules of the game and, in doing so, reveals it as a rigged game." (pp. 256-57)

There are those who think that the time for the all-dimensional man passed with the Renaissance. There are others, like this reviewer, who think his time is first coming. And there are the conformists whose total indifference to discussion of anything plural-dimensional is likely to bury One-Dimensional Man without ever getting a serious dialogue around it started in the academic world. I trust the youth will not let this happen. Thereby they will become part of history-in-the-making in the realm of thought.

Editorial Article:

MARCH, 1980

CARTER'S DRIVE TO WAR

by Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairwoman, News and Letters Committees

President Carter's bellicose State of the Union address manifested more than just the instant transformation of a "born-again Christian" into a mail-fisted militarist. So helter-skelter was his rush to plunge the country into Cold War II that the talk of military responses that the war atmosphere created was dominated not just by talk, but by actual landing of the Marines for "exercises" in the oil-rich Gulf region. The Marines, attached to infantry, artillery and armored units, started their round-the-world "exercise" Tuesday, Feb. 12, by flying from Hawaii to the U.S. naval base at Subic Bay in the Philippines. They will number 1,800 by the time they reach the Gulf area in mid-March.

In a word, the President's talk of acquiring bases and facilities, creation of a rapid deployment force, and military ties will stretch all the way from Russia's southern border to Africa as well as the Middle East ports. **U.S. CHRISTENS AFGHANISTAN/PAKISTAN/IRAN ITS "NATIONAL DEFENSE LINE"**

All this war hysteria is based on nothing more substantial than Carter's assumption that Russia's invasion of Afghanistan—which is some 400 miles away from the Persian Gulf and would require invading Pakistan to get there—is equal to Russia's already being in the Gulf region. It is not that anyone outside of Russia and its satellites are condoning Russia's invasion of Afghanistan. It is, rather, that Carter's haste with punitive measures discloses him on the prowl, all

prepared to strike "the enemy," using any excuse to promote his imperial designs.

This has become so obvious that even so conservative a former ambassador to Russia as George F. Kennan wrote: "Never since World War II has there been so far-reaching a militarization of thought and discourse in the capital. An unsuspecting stranger, plunged into its midst, could only conclude that the last hope of peaceful, nonmilitary solutions had been exhausted—that from now on only weapons, however used, could count." (New York Times, Feb. 1, 1980.)

Put another way, the President's pugnacious speech created its own momentum so that he felt uninhibited enough to draw a line in the sand, or above the mountains, without even consulting with the Congress, and to declare it the new "national defense line". Though it is thousands of miles away from the U.S. and surrounded by indigenous governments, their natural resources were declared to be the U.S.'s "vital interests". And, of course, Carter named himself the Big Brother "protector".

1 Russia, which shares a 1,000-mile border with Afghanistan, has always made it its business to have a Friendship Treaty with it. This was true in Tsarist times when their common enemy was Britain which had had two wars with Afghanistan; and it was true in Lenin's day when Afghanistan was the only country in the region to recognize the new Soviet state and Lenin concluded a Friendship Treaty with Afghanistan's anti-British, reform-minded King, Amanullah.



Youth nationwide took to the streets in immediate protest against Carter's proposal for draft registration.

What followed was just as amazing: another instant transformation, this time of that reactionary and bloodthirsty fundamentalist, Pakistan's General Zia, into an ally. This is the general who has been busy secretly building a nuclear device; and who, when exposed, refused to listen to Carter's protestations against nuclear proliferation, and talked of the need for an "Islamic bomb" for defense. This is the general who is so hated a ruler that the Pakistan masses have made his the shakiest regime in the Middle East. Indeed, it was very nearly toppled by the Baluchi people who have carried on a four-year civil war and still actively oppose Zia. This is the man who, just a few short weeks ago, thumbed his nose at the U.S. as he allowed a mob to destroy the American Embassy at Islamabad, where two Marines died. At that point, President Carter felt compelled to cut off both military and economic aid to Pakistan. Suddenly, however, it is this same General Zia, ruler of this same unstable country, who is declared to be the "strongman" for containing Russia, for which purpose Carter is once more propping up that reactionary militaristic regime by arming it to the hilt.

CARTER RENAMES AND EXTENDS NIXON-KISSINGER DOCTRINE

The new, imperially-designated "Carter Doctrine" is a continuation of the infamous Nixon-Kissinger Doctrine, which was just as imperially designated when Kissinger decided to tilt toward Pakistan at the very moment of its bloody suppression of what was to become Bangladesh, just because Kissinger's boss, Nixon, decided to play the China card in the contest with the other nuclear super-power for world domination.

The Carter Administration is doing more than "playing" the China card. Defense Secretary Harold Brown has used his trip to China to announce that the U.S. will now sell China arms. Where even Kissinger-Nixon left it at words, rather than immediately spelling out what their Doctrine meant, concretely, our new super-hawk, President Carter, announced at once that at home, too, politics has been turned into a question of life and death, by announcing the registration of youth for the draft, "when needed."

The answer of the youth throughout the country can be seen in anti-draft demonstrations under the slogan: "No Nukes, No Draft, No War!" (See pp. 1 and 7).

It becomes imperative to examine more closely the long list of concretizations in the undeciated war statement called the State of the Union address. First and foremost is, of course, the christening of the oil-rich Gulf region as the U.S.'s "vital interest," that would not stop short of using military force, for which the draft registration of America's young men and women was required.

Also needed, said the President, was a five percent increase in an already bloated defense budget, which, moreover, left plenty of loopholes for Congress to further increase militarization, not to mention the unleashing of the CIA for covert operations. (See Our Life and Times, p. 8.)

The hypocrisy of pretending that all these 180-degree changes do not change anything in Carter's "desire for peace", that he is still for SALT II, becomes even more ludicrous at a time when he not only is pressuring NATO (France, especially), to follow him in these measures against Russia, but he suddenly is turning to Khomeini, trying to convince him that it's Russia, not the U.S., that is the enemy.

No wonder the Islamic Conference that just concluded did not stop at condemning Russia's invasion of Afghanistan, but also expressed itself in opposition to the U.S. attempt to use that as the excuse for a massive military presence in the region. The Middle East is capable of defending itself, it stressed, making it clear that it will oppose the U.S. using the Middle East as the battle-ground for the super-powers to decide everyone's fate.

Simply stated, it told the U.S.: Big Brother, keep out! That hasn't stopped the U.S., as we have seen, from continuing with its military build-up and expansionism. Already Kenya, Somalia and Oman have promised use of their bases. All aimed at freeing Afghanistan from Russian occupation? One way to pierce through Carter's martial air as well as his hypocrisy is to look into what happened when Afghanistan tried to free itself from its tyrannical ruler, Daud, on April 27, 1978.


AFGHANISTAN'S REVOLUTION DEVOURS ITSELF

The coup which brought the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) to power had popular support. It established the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, confiscated all the royalist lands and holdings, announced land reforms and the abolition of all feudal and pre-feudal relations.² The party had won power in a single day of fighting because there had been great unrest in that poverty-stricken land, directed against Daud, cousin of the king he had overthrown when he himself came to power in a coup in 1973. The unrest came to a boiling point when one of the leaders of the PDPA, Khyber, was murdered.

The funeral had brought out the greatest demonstration ever in Kabul—15,000. It was distinguished by another unheard of event in a country where women are sold into marriage: a good number of women were marching in the funeral procession. Equality of the sexes was one of the first announcements from the new regime, and the PDPA included a woman in its Central Committee, Dr. Anahita Ratebzad. Even the West had to acknowledge that Afghanistan was experiencing a genuine, national revolt. A State Department official said: "We have no evidence of any Soviet involvement in the coup." Which is why Western imperialism did not at once rush into machinations against it.

Pakistan, however, which had become a haven for all reactionaries fleeing the rulers who had confiscated their land-holdings, was at once involved in border skirmishes. A more serious threat to Afghanistan was

China, adept both in ideological battles and actual guerrilla warfare. The Sino-Soviet Conflict had, indeed, found an echo also in Afghanistan. Instead of having its roots among the dominant nationality, the Pashtuns, as did the leaders of the PDPA—Taraki, Amin and Karmal—China tried to get a following among the minorities—Tajiks, Uzbeks, Hasaras, Turkomans, Baluchis. Small as the Maoist group was, they quickly learned to use the word "revisionism" against the



PDPA. China had no intention of confining their struggle to an ideological level, and began not only training guerrillas but cooperating with the most reactionary regime in Pakistan.

Whether or not Dr. Strangelove Kissinger knew of that aspect of the relationship between China and Pakistan long before the successful 1978 coup, there was no doubt whatsoever that his 1973 tilting to Pakistan was China-inspired. In June 1978 China announced the near-completion of the Karakoram Highway, a 500-mile all-weather road over the roof of the world, linking Sinkiang Province with Rawalpindi in Pakistan. The frontiers of no less than five states—Pakistan, Afghanistan, China, India and Russia—converge at this point on the globe. It is this which was the real purpose of the 1962 Sino-Indian war. China always has the sub-continent of India in its view, as India always has China in view.

At the same time—within a short year—the fratricidal factionalism within the PDPA (also referred to as the Khalaq, or Masses, which was the name of its paper) saw the revolution devouring itself.⁴ Land reform lagged behind; women's liberation was hardly begun; disease and poverty were still rampant. And, not too far in the background stood Russia, ready with aid and arms and wanting, above all, not to see a genuine social revolution anywhere.

³ One of those whom the Western media will no doubt play up as if he were a revolutionary—Sayed Ahmad Gailani—is a former landowner and owner of the Peugeot dealership in Kabul and is now head of the Afghanistan Islamic and Nationalist Revolutionary Council.

⁴ See Fred Halliday's "Afghanistan—A Revolution Consumes Itself" in *The Nation*, 11/17/79, and his more substantial study, "Revolution in Afghanistan" in *New Left Review*, Nov.-Dec. 1978. See also "Afghanistan Under the Khalaq" by Louis Dupree—author of the 1973 work *Afghanistan*, considered the standard reference work—in *Problems of Communism*, July-Aug. 1977. Another background report is "Afghanistan: The Imperial Dream" by Firuz Kazemzadeh, in the Feb. 21, 1980 issue of *The New York Review of Books*.

² See "Basic Lines of Revolutionary Duties of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan," broadcast over Radio Afghanistan by Taraki on May 9, 1978 and reproduced as a pamphlet by the Government Printing Press of the DRA.

March, 1980

The very first words from Taraki, as he became President and Prime Minister, shows how gingerly the party was moving on the religious question: "In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate . . ."

Both Taraki and one of the Deputy Ministers, Amin, were more independent than Karmal, the other Deputy Minister, who had totally identified with Russia, even at the period when Russia was class-collaborating with the Daud regime. Thus, when the PDPA gained power, Taraki and Amin managed to send Karmal and other such leaders out as ambassadors to foreign countries.

A totally new stage was reached when Taraki, after attending the so-called Non-Aligned Conference in Havana and becoming Brezhnev's favorite, suggested bringing Karmal back to Afghanistan. That evidently signed his death warrant insofar as Amin was concerned. It was he, after all, who, with the help of dissidents in the Army and Secret Service, where he had many roots, engineered the April 27 coup. He had grand illusions about his own power and his ability to remain independent, and made it clear, even to foreign correspondents, that he had no intentions of becoming a mere puppet of Russia. But Russia was taking no chances on having another Tito to contend with. No sooner had Amin engineered the coup in which Taraki lost his life than the Russians invaded Afghanistan.

MILITARIZATION NOT ONLY OF THE ECONOMY, BUT OF THE MIND

Russia's invasion of Afghanistan lit up the sky for Carter-Brzezinski who thought this was their grand opportunity to worm their way into the good graces of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Carter kept sending messages to Khomeini that Russia, not the U.S., is the main enemy of Islam. Clearly, U.S. imperialism was hoping to get more than a foothold in the Gulf region.

Two years ago—that is, long before Russia's invasion of Afghanistan—the Carter Administration embarked on a "study" of a most unholy series of "options" of what to do should Iran threaten its imperial interests in Oil. It is only now, on Feb. 1, 1980, that the 70-page report has been published, played up by the New York Times on page one under the chilling title: "Study Says Soviet Thrust in Iran Might Require U.S. Atom Arms."

We have here a display of not only how to make the unthinkable thinkable, but how to spell it out as "necessary": (1) publish a "study," though it concerns Iran, when the headlines are shouting Carter's Cold War hysteria over Afghanistan; (2) accompany the article with a map listing most precisely what could become "three key oil-shipping points in the Persian Gulf—Iran's Kharg Island, and Saudi Arabia's Ras Tanura and Juayms," which "would be 'prime targets' for Soviet attack in the event of war in the region"; (3) turn the discussion into the use of "tactical" nuclear weapons.

The essence of all this talk about nuclear weapons is the Pentagon report's galling assertion that "the Iranians will not soon be able to contribute effectively to their own defense"—so of course Big Brother Carter is ready to be Islam's "protector."

As for Russia's invasion, long, long ago, in the last days of Lenin's life, he carried on his battle against Stalin's Russian chauvinism in the matter of the Georgians. He came to the defense of the Georgian Communist, Tseretvadze, who said: "It is true that Marx wanted the union of the proletariat of the whole world, but he never claimed that all the Russians ought to unite at Tiflis." With a single word changed—Kabul instead of Tiflis—we have the exact situation of today, of any day when a workers' state gets transformed into its opposite, as did Russia into a state-capitalist society.

Carter's policy does more than Stalin in putting down national liberation struggles, be it presently in Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, or India. He has spelled this out in a way that does not let anyone get away from his clutches, not only in foreign lands but at home, especially the youth, whom he intends to drag into the Army, and the Blacks, who will continue to bear the main brunt of the recessions and now the ever-expanding militarization of the economy. As Vernon Jordan of the Urban League put it: "We are the boat people without boats."

Carter's drive to war must be stopped before it gets so completely out of hand that a nuclear holocaust is upon us.

5 See "Did Moscow Fear an Afghan Tito?" in New York Times, Sunday, Jan. 13, 1980, by the scholar, Selig Harrison, who had interviewed Amin in May and August, 1978.

6 At his press conference on Feb. 13, Carter waxed so enthusiastic about all the countries he is willing to "protect" that they stretched from Afghanistan to Yugoslavia—should Tito die. The only reporter who brought him back to the reality of the here and now was the Black woman reporter from Washington, D.C., who asked whether the Black Caucus wasn't correct in saying that the Administration's budget for youth employment was "misleading" since only \$3 million of the \$2 billion claimed was actually for employment.

Erich Fromm, Socialist Humanist

The March 18, 1980 press wires carried the sad news of Erich Fromm's death. Although this was but 5 days short of his 80th birthday, and he had been ill for several years, Fromm was both intellectually and emotionally so alert and active that he was at work on a new book. In praising him only as a "famous psychoanalyst," the press, by no accident at all, failed to mention that he was a Socialist Humanist. Moreover, in writing *Marx's Concept of Man* (which succeeded in introducing Marx's Humanist essays to a wide American public), in editing the first international symposium on *Socialist Humanism*, he did so, not as an academician, but as an activist. In inviting me to participate in that dialogue between East and West as well as North and South, he stressed that "it took quite a bit of courage on their (East European) part to write something for this volume, for no matter how diplomatic the language, they were open attacks on the Soviet Union."

Erich Fromm was an original. In attempting to fuse Marx and Freud, it wasn't so much the audaciousness of such a move in the 1920s that needs to be stressed, but the fact that even when he was a most orthodox Freudian, it was social psychology that interested him; his use of psychoanalytic mechanisms were as a sort of mediating concept between the individual and the social. In any case, as he moved away from orthodox Freudianism to elaborate his own version, it was clear that he was breaking not only with Freud but with the famous Frankfurt School and its "Critical Theory," and that, not because he was moving away from Marxism, but coming closer to it. Here is how he put it in his intellectual autobiography:

"I consider Marx, the thinker, as being of much greater depth and scope than Freud . . . But even when all of this is said, it would be naive to ignore Freud's importance . . . his discovery of unconscious processes and of the dynamic nature of character traits is a unique contribution to the science of man which has altered the picture of man for all time to come." (*Beyond the Chains of Illusion: My Encounter with Marx and Freud* by Erich Fromm.)

On Fromm's initiative, (and to my great surprise since I kept far away from any psychoanalysts even when they laid claim to Marxism), I received a congratulatory letter from him on the publication in 1958 of my *Marxism and Freedom*. The period of the 1950s was a most difficult one for Marxists, what with McCarthyism as well as nuclear bomb development permeating the land. Dr. Fromm had helped organize the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy in 1957, but that was not what he wrote to me about. Rather, the subject that then aroused his passionate interest was the restoration of Marxism in its original form of "a new humanism," cleansed of the perversion of Russian and Chinese Communism. So magnificently an objective human being was he that he refused to be deterred either by the fact that I let my hostility to psychoanalysts show by telling him that workers in Detroit shops referred to them as "head shrinks," or even by the fact that I criticized his own essay on "Marx's Concept of Man" as abstract. Here is what he answered me:

"As to your criticism of my essay that it is too abstract and does not discuss the humanism of Marxism concretely, I cannot offer any argument . . . As to the substance of the points you make about the concrete nature of Marx's humanism, I naturally entirely agree with you. Also about what you write of the role of the plant psychoanalyst and Daniel Bell's position."

Our correspondence continued for two decades. It also gave me rare glimpses into the whole subject of the famous Frankfurt School, of which he was, after all, one of its most famous personages, the one who

"In another letter Fromm wrote: "My relations with Commentary are not good. Years ago Mr. Podhoretz rejected something I had written because it contradicted majority opinion of American Jews. I wrote him a sharp letter about his concept of freedom . . ."

influenced them all on the "Integration" of Psychoanalysis into Marxism. The lengthy unabating, sharp debate with Herbert Marcuse in the pages of *Dissent* over 1955 and 1956 was not the main issue. He retained too much regard for Herbert Marcuse's *Reason and Revolution* as the seminal work it was. No, what did arouse his ire most was the duality of Adorno's and Horkheimer's departure from Marxism on the one hand, and the attraction that that held for the "New Left." Here is how he summed it up in a letter to me dated November 25, 1976:

"I get quite a few questions from various people who study the history of the Frankfurt School. It's really a funny story; Horkheimer is now quoted as the creator of the critical theory and people write about the critical theory as if it were a new concept discovered by Horkheimer. As far as I know, the whole thing is a hoax, because Horkheimer was frightened . . . of speaking about Marx's theory. He used general Aesopian language and spoke of critical theory in order not to say Marx's theory. I believe that that is all behind this discovery of critical theory by Horkheimer and Adorno."

Fromm's eyes always were on the future and a new class-less society on truly human foundations. Least known of his multi-dimensional concerns was the relationship of Man/Woman and by no means on just a psychological scale. Rather it was the need for totally new human relations in the Marxian sense: a global vision of the future meant also a look back into the past. Thus, he found Bachofen's studies into matriarchal society very congenial, not because he believed in the existence of matriarchal society, but because it, at least, allowed one a vision of an alternative society to this patriarchal, class, alienating society in which we live. In relating patriarchy to class domination, he had invented the magnificent phrase for it: "patrientric-sequalitive."

Far from remembrance of things past being a question merely of memory, it brings into view the unity of Man/Woman; the human being as a totality, being not just a quantitative measure, but something, dialectically, showing movement, a movement forward. It was what Fromm stressed when, in creating an international forum for his *Socialist Humanism*, he emphasized that Humanism was not just an idea, but a movement against what is, a glimpse into the future. Listen to what he wrote me when he heard I was relating Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's *Philosophy of Revolution*:

"I feel that the male Social Democrats never could understand Rosa Luxemburg, nor could she acquire the influence for which she had the potential because she was a woman; and the men could not become full revolutionaries because they did not emancipate themselves from their male, patriarchal, and hence dominating character structure. After all, the original exploitation is that of women by men and there is no social liberation so long as there is no revolution in the sex war ending in full equality . . . Unfortunately I have known nobody who still knows her personally. What a bad break between the generations."

That letter was written on October 26, 1977. It is now March 19, 1980, and Fromm is dead. And I say, dear Youth, let's not let another "bad break between generations" occur. To prepare for the future one must know the revolutionary past. Getting to know Fromm as a Socialist Humanist is a good way to begin.

—Raya Dunayevskaya

June, 1980

TWO WORLDS

Carter's intrusion, Khomeini's 'Holy War'

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

The following are excerpts from the recent Political-Philosophic Letter by Raya Dunayevskaya, "The Carter/Brzezinski-ordered Imperialist Intrusion into Iran—and What About Khomeini/Bani-Sadr's 'Holy War' against the Left?" The full letter is available from *News & Letters*; see ad, p.8—Ed.

I
BY NO ACCIDENT whatever a real live mad Colonel, the Apocalypse Now type — Green Beret Colonel Beckwith, trained in the decade-long U.S. imperialist war in Vietnam — was chosen to command the "Blue Light" elite corps to descend upon Iran in the dark of the night of April 24 . . . Here was a gory mission that had gone through 30 rehearsals, stretched over a period of nearly six months, involving six C-130 Hercules transport planes, which had proven their technological proficiency in the decade-long bloody Vietnam War, with eight equally proficient Sikorsky RH-53 helicopters, all manned by a volunteer, gung ho military outfit, armed not only with weapons but canisters filled with disabling gas, which, after only three hours in the desert, with no enemy in sight, suddenly falls apart. First, three helicopters malfunction; then, comes the order from the Commander-in-Chief to abandon the mission. It is now 2:15 a.m. of April 25. The fiasco departure becomes a tragedy as the transport plane and helicopter collide and eight American bodies go up in flames. The Green Beret Colonel orders the rest of the crew into a plane without either picking up the bodies, or destroying the secret documents. Five others seriously burned are taken aboard. It is now 4 a.m.

It is impossible to conceive such a total failure unless the reasons behind the order to abort the operation had nothing whatever to do with either the advanced military technology or the lives of the American hostages that were supposed to have been rescued. Two probabilities surely make more logic than the official accounting. One is that the CIA is still cooperating with SAVAK and this actual Fifth Column in Iran got cold feet at the last minute and did not wish to carry through with their mercenary murderous job.

Or, even more likely, the President got cold feet through both the strong opposition he would meet from the American public and the distrust he suddenly felt for the CIA-sponsored Fifth Column . . .

Whether or not President Carter is so Nixon-bent on the retention of his powers in this election year that even the prospect of unleashing World War III cannot stay his hand, it is a fact that the Iranian misadventure can in no way be separated from Carter's

internal drive for war that he had begun long before. The point is that Carter's proposal for reinstating draft-registration for the youth has, indeed, a global imperialist outlook.

It becomes imperative, therefore, that our struggle against Carter's drive for war is at the same time a way to express our solidarity with the Iranian masses in their anti-imperialist struggle. In doing so we must make sure that the struggle for freedom does not get separated from a philosophy of liberation. And therein, precisely, lies the deep contradiction in the Iranian revolution, signified all over again by the Khomeini/Bani-Sadr unleashing of the unholy "Holy War" against the Left.

II

NOTHING WAS MORE ghoulish than the hanging judge Ayatollah Sadegh Khalkhali's display of the burned corpses of the eight American soldiers. Did he intend to put them on trial? . . . What is as disorienting a matter as that calculated display is the statement of the supposed moderate Bani-Sadr and the Imam Khomeini which maligned the Iranian Left as having a connection with Carter's imperialist venture. What Khomeini-Bani-Sadr-Ghotbzadeh-Jehesti-Khalkhali have unleashed is a move against the very forces that were in the forefront of the revolutionary overthrow of the Shah.

Not only is there no connection between the deep unrest in Iran and Carter's intrusion into Iran (and Bani-Sadr knows it), but the ruling clique in Iran has shown an affinity to the rulers in any capitalist country when they took advantage of the desert fiasco to hit out against the Left, against the dissatisfaction over the great mass unemployment, against the national liberation movements, Kurds especially, who have attempted to deepen the Iranian revolution from mere overthrow of the Shah to actual freedom and new human relations. Khomeini and Bani-Sadr know that the opposition to them began with their retrenchment from the goals of the revolution, whether that related to Khomeini's trying to turn the clock back on Women's Liberation, or trying to abolish the shoras of the workers . . .

The great unrest in the country is so inseparable from a great passion for philosophy of liberation that there isn't a single expression — and there are no less than 150 different groups attempting to articulate that passion for freedom, in every form from pamphlets, books, papers, leaflets, to cassettes — that does not at once get grabbed up on the university campuses. It is those bookstalls that so frighten Khomeini and the so-called Revolutionary Council that they order their goons to attack the student youth. Worse than the riots these goons instigated — and there were many injured and some dead — is the state-and-clergy-sponsored edicts for the abolition of political activity. Khomeini is under the illusion that, since the Left does not command sacrosanct mosques such as they used in the struggle against the Shah, the idea of freedom will die . . . What the masses will prove is that they have no intention whatever to let the revolution remain unfinished.

III

THE STRANGEST TOLERATION of all, if not outright "love," is the one that exists between Khomeini and Tudeh. Anyone in the West is so accustomed to the 180 degree turns, hypocrisies and outright alliances of absolute opposites on the part of the Russian Communists ever since the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which gave the green light to World War II, that none in the West were surprised by the declaration of the Secretary General of the Iranian Communist Party, Nurreddin Kianuri, that they are "followers of Imam Khomeini's line."

When interviewed by an editor of *Le Monde*, Eric Rouleau, on the question of supporting terrorism, Kianuri replied: "Of course we condemn terrorism, but no principle can be eternal. From the very beginning we supported the arrest of the so-called diplomats because they were engaged not only in espionage . . . but in counter-revolutionary and subversive activity." As for continuing incarceration of the American hostages, which flew in the face of international law, and which

^oThe Guardian, April 27, 1980 (Le Monde English Section)

June, 1980

Russia also had to condemn, Kianuri let the cat out of the bag by approving the status quo of continuing the retention of the hostages when he said that it "was a good way of preventing the normalization of Iran's relations with the U.S."

It isn't true, however, that either the clerics who were with Mossadegh in the '50s or Mossadegh's secular followers are that tolerant of the Tudeh Party. Tudeh's miserable role in that period has not been forgotten and the invasion of Afghanistan has made some worry over the new "populist" phase of the Communists who did receive 100,000 votes in Teheran alone in the first round of the elections . . .

Khomeini's "anti-imperialism" (which is only anti-America) and toleration of the Tudeh Party, while being totally opposed to genuine Marxists, is seen in the commander of the Revolutionary Guards which have the full support of Khomeini. Their commander, Abu Sharif, spelled out the danger for Iran: "The danger comes from U.S. leftist organizations." He expanded it thus: "There are U.S. leftist organizations which are arming themselves such as the Fedayi Khalq. There are other leftist organizations like the Tudeh Party, which says it recognizes the Islamic Revolution's constitution and Imam Khomeini's line. In this case, it is a legal leftist organization that acts and works on this basis. But the danger comes from the U.S. leftist organizations, which receive funds and weapons from the West and falsely speak about a Russian threat to Iran to justify military relations with the United States." (MERIP REPORTS, March/April 1980)

AS AGAINST KIANURI'S goal — "the breaking off of all remaining ties with the U.S."—and as against

Sharif saying that "the danger comes from U.S. leftist organizations," what becomes imperative is the forging of relations, revolutionary relations, between the masses in the U.S. and in Iran.

To prevent the real danger of a world holocaust, it is necessary to see that the enemy is not so much abroad as at home. It is here where philosophy of revolution becomes as crucial as social revolution itself. Ideas of freedom recognize no national boundaries. It is a fact that our rulers are our enemies and that the Iranian masses are our friends. The world revolution may not be on the agenda at this very moment, but it's that vision of a new world that is the ground for the actual struggle that will prevent nuclear holocaust by creating a new world on totally human foundations.

April 29, 1980

7061

7062

July, 1980

Alioune Diop

We mourn the death, on May 2, of Alioune Diop, whose creative presentation introduced a whole generation of French intellectuals, from Picasso to Sartre, to African life, culture, politics, philosophy. With the founding of *Presence Africaine*, in 1947, he universalized this African presence for the whole world, though it took the Black intellectuals in America more than a decade before they issued an English-language edition of his journal.

While it is true that nothing by an African was looked at with indifference by Diop, it isn't true that the journal was limited to contributions by Africans. Quite the contrary. Its dynamism of ideas reached out to the whole world without ever stopping to look at whether any contribution was considered authoritative by the ruling ideologues. I am proud to say that my essay on Marxist Humanism was published in 1963.

And it certainly isn't true that only "culture" predominated in Diop's life. All one needs to do to see Diop's multi-faceted character is to read his speech to the first Africanist Conference in Boston in October, 1961. Neither the fact that it was on culture nor the fact that it polemicized against another famous African writer, Ezekiel Mphahlele (who had criticized Diop for his continued concentration on Negritude, as if that were as relevant in the 1960s as it had been in the 1930s), diverted Diop from his view of the integrality of revolution and literature.

One of his favorite poets, the great Martiniquan, Aime Cesaire, wrote:

*Those who invented neither gun powder nor the
compass,
Those who never learned to conquer steam or
electricity,
Those who never explored the seas or skies,
But they know the farthest corners of the land
of anguish."*

But Diop's point was that it wasn't only "suffering" that required Black consciousness. The very universalization of culture required de-Westernization and needed to be "cultivated in the cultural genius of the emergent world."

What will soften the blow we all feel at Alioune Diop's death is the rich heritage he left us by creating a two-way road between the Third World and the Western world.

—Raya Dunayevskaya
June 1, 1983

7062

China's 'Gang of four' trial charade and the so-called Cultural Revolution; media and the global crises

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

A good way of making sure that one understands absolutely nothing about what is going on in China, is to read everything that is printed in the newspapers and shown on TV. What has happened? Could it be that the reason why the U.S. media is brain-washing itself, repeating what is dished out in Peking, is that the truth behind the Chinese amalgam of the "Gang of Four" with Lin Biao (Lin Piao) would reveal the connection between the Mao-Lin struggle and Henry Kissinger's presence in 1971 in Peking, plotting Nixon's trip to China? It is a fact that — at the same time that China's policy was completely reversed to transform the nuclear superpower, U.S. imperialism, into Friend Number One — the reactionary China Lobbyist, Richard Nixon, anointed Mao's China as the "new global power."

In a word, nothing short of a shift in global power lies behind the story of the bizarre relationship of the U.S. media and the trials staged in Peking by Deng Xiaoping (Teng Hsiao-ping).

WHY THE AMALGAM OF JIANG AND LIN?

Let's take a look at the simple incommensurability of the dates in the two trials suddenly turned into a single amalgam. First came the 1971 Mao-Lin dispute, which ended in the death, or murder, of Lin. Jiang Qing (Chiang Ching) was in the forefront of the campaign of calumny against Lin that followed. What followed in immediate post-Mao China was that Jiang was arrested by the top cop, Hua Guofeng (Hua Kuo-feng) who helped give the present 1981 ruling clique the appearance of "legitimacy," since he supposedly had Mao's blessing to become Chairman. Where is he now? It was nearly four years between the arrest and the trial of the so-called Gang of Four. And the one who did the arresting is now nowhere around.

Does anyone doubt that it is really Mao Zedong (Mao Tse-tung) who is on trial? Ah, there's the rub. Those in power now, like those who stand accused now — including Mao himself, are the ones who, at one and the same time, both initiated and destroyed the Cultural Revolution.

What remains absent from all reports is any view of the objective world situation, be that in 1966 or in 1971; in 1975 when Mao was still alive or in the immediate post-Mao China, 1976, when Jiang was arrested. If, however, we hold fast to the objective world situation, it will not be too difficult to unravel all the plots and counter-plots which developed during the so-called Cultural Revolution.

They came to a climax, not in any sort of "uninterrupted revolution," but in Mao's counter-revolutionary rolling out of the red carpet for Nixon after Nixon finished the mad bombing of Cambodia. That was followed by Nixon's tilting to Pakistan—which was bloodily attempting to stifle the new-born nation of Bangladesh — in order to get Mao's approval for Kissinger's trip to meet Zhou Enlai (Chou En-lai) and plan for that super spectacle: Nixon's trip to China.

JIANG QING ON THE STAND AND IN ACTION

By the end of the current trial, considerable sympathy was extended to Jiang Qing because she alone, of both the so-called Gang of Four and the military adherents of Lin Biao, displayed some strength of character not only in opposing the accusations against her, but in calling the judges "counter-revolutionaries," whom she challenged to behead her: "Revolution is no crime. To rebel is justified," she shouted. Glaring at the presiding judge, Zeng Hanzhou, she continued: "During the war it was I, the only woman comrade, who followed and accompanied Chairman Mao to the front. At that time, where were all of you hiding?"

To say, as the prosecutor put it, that she was invoking the name of the Great Helmsman only to save her skin — an accusation that *Business Week* (Nov. 24, 1980) repeated — is both to miss the point that it was Mao who did the commanding and Jiang who obeyed unquestioningly, and to try to deprive Jiang of the dignity that a belief in your principles gives you — no matter how wrong those principles may be. It is this which in her two-hour defense also enabled her to be sarcastic of the

1—Actually, the first in the series of arrests following the army's suppression of the Cultural Revolution was that of the genuine Leftist, Chen Boda (Chen Po-ta) who was the head of the whole Cultural Revolution Group. Chen Boda had been Mao's political secretary ever since the mid-1960s in Yenan. Indeed, there is no doubt whatever that many of Mao's speeches were written by Chen — whereupon he was the very first one Mao arrested and started villifying.

January-February, 1981

entire charade that was going on, which featured her, as she put it, as if she were "some kind of devil with three heads. . . . Tell the Monkey King to come and teach me how to grow several more heads, is that it?"²

Unfortunately neither the courage, nor the sarcasm, nor the fact that she certainly didn't plot any assassination of Mao, can in any way clear her of the responsibility for the horrors of that so-called Cultural Revolution. The 20,000-word indictment charged that no less than 727,420 Chinese were mercilessly persecuted, and that 34,272 died. But the only grisly proof of Jiang's "direct crimes" was the constant display of a picture of the bruised corpse of the former Coal Minister, Zhang Linzhi, whom, it was charged, she had ordered to be beaten to death.

What preceded all of this and intensified the differences between Lin and Mao was the question of relations with U.S. imperialism. It wasn't that Lin disagreed

²—The Manchester Guardian, of Jan. 4, 1981, explains that "the reference is to a mythical figure who could grow as many heads as he chose, who would need to help her if the court had its way."

about relations with Russia; he was in the forefront of calling Russia Enemy Number One. But his position was that not only does Russia's "hegemony" have to be challenged, but so does U.S. imperialism's. To the extent that both the U.S. and Russia were held out as the enemies of the masses, Lin was as adamant as Mao against Russia. There was no difference between Lin and Mao either in the initiation of the Cultural Revolution or in suppressing it when it began to have a momentum of its own.

Again Jiang marched to their tune, adding a few vicious persecutions of her own in the arts. Whether she did or did not, by then, sprout some "wild ambitions" of her own³ is not what brought on the crisis in China.

(To Be Concluded Next Issue)

³—The expression is supposed to be Mao's in a letter to Hua Guofeng, whom he allegedly designated as his successor. This period of vilification is briefly reported in Comrade Chang Ch'ing by Roxane Witke. It is a quite superficial work, but since it is the only biography extant, one should read it. See also my critique of it in *Socialist Politics and Revolution*, a News & Letters publication.

China's 'Gang of four' trial charade and the so-called Cultural Revolution; media and the global crises


by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
and **Marxism and Freedom**

Part II

WHAT WAS THE BEGINNING? WHAT WAS THE 'CULTURAL REVOLUTION'?

Let's get back to fundamentals when Mao succeeded in overthrowing the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek, the puppet of U.S. imperialism.

The new China, Mao's China, stood up to the whole imperialist world and won national independence. He did so at the head of a peasant army which asked the workers to continue working. It did maintain its national independence and put the country on its feet. It openly admitted that it was state-capitalism but claimed that the masses need not worry about it, since political power was in the hands of the Communist Party which would protect them. It also won another war — the Korean War. It gained help from Russia and embarked on its own Five Year Plan, restoring both the national economy, which lay in ruins, and peace.



Chinese peasants demonstrate for food and democracy.

There was no doubt that the Chinese were, at first, enthusiastic about the new regime which, though it had openly designated itself as "state capitalist," talked of "a coming socialist society" since "political power was in the hands of the Communist Party." Meanwhile, it remained a "four class" government — and the working class was the one that was poorly paid and housed.

Things changed in the mid-1950s. What shook China was exactly what shook up Russian state-capitalism calling itself "Communist" — the rise of a totally new opposition from below, from the Left, from the masses, who hungered for a true socialist society and were willing to die for it. It came to a climax with the 1956 Hungarian Revolution.

Mao, however, was under the illusion that because he was nowhere as evil as Stalin, he could escape such a development. He declared: "Let 100 flowers bloom; let 100 schools of thought contend." They did just that — for exactly six weeks. Whereupon, Mao took a 180-degree turn and said that any who had illusions that they would create a Hungary in China would soon learn what state power really meant.

In suppressing the voices of revolt at home, Mao began to look not only for a different foreign alignment, but a new world axis — a Third World axis to challenge both the U.S. and Russia. On that there were no serious differences within the Politburo, especially since the Sino-Soviet orbit had been transformed into the Sino-Soviet conflict and Mao had gained the adherence not only of Aduit, who headed the massive Communist Party of Indonesia, but of the actual ruler of that land, Sukarno.

Within and without, 1965 did, however, become the breaking point. First, Mao could no longer claim that China was the "besieged fortress" when U.S. imperialism was raining bombs on Hanoi, not on Peking. Secondly, in place of a Peking-Djakarta axis emerging, what broke out in Indonesia was the most horrifying counter-revolution. The veritable bloodbath — of revolutionary nationalists as well as Communists — put an end to that kind of Third World axis. By that time, not only did some of the Communist Parties which had sided with China in the Sino-Soviet conflict — such as the Korean CP — begin calling for a united front of all Communists, including Russia, for the defense of Vietnam against U.S. imperialism — but so did the majority of Mao's own Politburo.

The one who remained with Mao that year was Lin Biao; he came out with his speech, "Long Live the Victory of the People's War," which propounded that, just as the Chinese Revolution had been victorious by having the peasant army "outflank" the cities, so the Third World could win by outflanking the industrialized world. As was characteristic of Mao when he became a minority, he disappeared.

When he re-emerged, it was with his greatest brain-storm — the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution — which, along with proclaiming the order, "Bombard the Headquarters!", issued the slogans, "Russia is Enemy Number One" and "Learn from the Army!"

Though the so-called Cultural Revolution was no proletarian revolution, the youth who took Mao at his word that "it is right to rebel," took that to mean a right to rebel against the Communist bureaucrats just as against capitalists. Indeed, they called their Communist leaders "capitalist roaders," and the revolt from below soon escaped the confines set by Mao.⁴ It was at that point that the order was given to put down the revolt and Lin led that counter-revolution. There was no doubt by that time that the main axis of power had moved into the Army, Lin's army.

⁴—See the three Sheng-wu-lien documents reproduced in *Peking and the New Left: At Home and Abroad* (published by the Center for Chinese Studies of the University of California, Berkeley, 1969). Consult also *The Revolution is Dead, Long Live the Revolution*, compiled and edited by "The 70's," May 1976. See also the Nov. 1980 issue of *N&L* which contains an essay-article by Bob McGuire which includes the newest information from the opposition group within China, the Li Yizhe.

From the start of the Cultural Revolution, I had asked whether the deification of Mao was really mummification: "The discerning reader cannot help but wonder whether Mao is being deified — or mummified. Is Lin living in the reflected glory of Mao, as the press holds, or is Mao being allowed to live out his remaining years as a deity only because he transferred total authority to Lin, the head of the Army?" (See News & Letters, October, 1966)

THE MAO-LIN DISPUTE


In 1969, the very year when the Ninth Congress declared Lin the "closest-comrade-in-arms" of Mao, the border disputes between Russia and China began on the Ussuri River. The internal differences as to how much power the army takes, and how much the state, were related both to these confrontations in particular, and to foreign events in general. It was almost directly after that very Congress that had specified Lin as Mao's "successor" that the dispute between Mao and Lin began.

It had been clear to Mao — who was no novice either in faction fights or in wars, in maneuvers or in amalgams with super-power imperialists — that there truly was a difference between them, and that Lin stood in the way of his 180-degree turn to relations with U.S. imperialism. It wasn't Lin who began a so-called assassination plot. It was Mao — who began removing Lin from the power he had just granted him.

From the Borgias to Stalin to Mao, there is certainly nothing new in the fact that rulers, as they prepare to remove one of their "colleagues," promptly accuse the one to be removed of the very crimes they are themselves committing. Thus Stalin, at the very time he was sending up test balloons to prepare for his pact with Hitler, accused General Tukhachevsky of just that, and had him executed in the infamous Frame-up Trials — conducting all this secretly—in camera. Thus, it was when Mao began accusing Lin of dealing with "foreign powers," that Mao, Zhou and Deng were themselves testing the warm waters of U.S. imperialism — which, at that particular moment, was equally anxious, not just to establish friendly relations with China "for them-

selves," but to get off the hot seat of the Vietnam War and the newly-opened Nixon war against Cambodia. Yes, 1970-71 — as that red carpet began being prepared for Nixon's arrival in China in 1972 — was quite a period of world tensions.

By that time, Lin did, indeed, have an active faction and while it is doubtful whether any of the "explanations" that Zhou, Mao and Jiang were propagating about him were true — and no one really knows whether Lin was in the airplane which crashed in Mongolia — there is proof of the "Outline of Project 571," which was a plan to fight Mao. Lin's code-name for Mao was B-52.



Extracts from the "Outline of Project '571.'"

One of the proofs that outside Communists — including those who had been as close as the Albanians — didn't believe the story of Lin being a "capitalist roader" and did surmise correctly that it was a question of the attitude to U.S. imperialism, was Enver Hoxha's statement: "Did Lin approve the negotiations with Kissinger and the decisions that were taken?" The reference was to the Nov. 30, 1971 Chinese press release about "those engaged in conspiracies or plots," by which Mao very obviously meant Lin Biao.

In a word, because Lin's downfall came within a few days of Kissinger's trip to Peking, it was not hard to reach the conclusion, so scrupulously kept secret by Mao, that Lin would, indeed, have been too serious an obstacle to "normalization" of relations with the U.S. The two years, 1971-73 — between the fall of Lin and the time when the Chinese people first learned the story as officially concocted by Mao and Zhou, who read it to the 1973 Congress — were years in which it was clear that so much power had gone into the Army during the Cultural Revolution that even the death of Lin and the calumny against him had not succeeded in eliminating the Army opposition to Mao.

What remained of the Party leadership and that of the government which had not been destroyed by the so-called Red Guards was in the hands of Zhou Enlai; and poor Jiang Qing was left as mistress of the reformed opera. With Mao's approval, they had to begin "rehabilitating" many of the old party leaders. Headed by Deng and focused on the economy as elaborated by Zhou and Deng, China was to continue on its state-capitalist road without Mao's pretenses of "permanent, uninterrupted, continuous revolution."

WHERE TO NOW?

Where the main Western scholar specialists on China were talking nonsense — from Schram's Permanent Revolution to Karnow's From Revolution to Revolution to Revolution — we entitled our analysis, "From Contradiction to Contradiction to Contradiction" (See my Philosophy and Revolution.) That is to say, it should have been clear from the Yanan days in 1937 — when Mao, in proclaiming his philosophy in On Contradiction, had denuded the concept both of the Hegelian objectivity and Marx's class conflict—that what characterized Mao Thought was endless class collaborationism, whether that was with Chiang Kai-shek in the war against Japan, or against Chiang Kai-shek but with a "four class bloc" of national state-capitalism; whether that was Sino-Soviet "unbreakable friendship" or Sino-Soviet conflict, with China as the center of "internationalism."

It is true that in taking a somewhat independent road from Russian state-capitalism and desiring not to travel the Russian road to full bureaucratization, he had attempted some aspect of the Maoxian concept of continuous revolution in the sense that revolution does not stop with the conquest of power. But once one reduces both the philosophy of revolution and revolution itself to the concept of Great Helmsman — to Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, fragmented into bite-sized pieces without any respect for historic conditions and mass movements from practice that would be inseparable

from movements from theory in a world that is totally capitalistic and imperialistic — there is absolutely no way to escape the capitalistic, imperialistic framework.

In any case, all that was left for Mao to do after he put down the self-created turmoil called the Cultural Revolution — and after he not only "rehabilitated" Deng, but what is a great deal worse, started to play with U.S. imperialism — there was no sort of revolutionary legacy he could possibly leave the Chinese masses. Thus it was that in 1975, while staying away from the National People's Congress run by Zhou and Deng with its "four modernizations," Mao met with Franz Josef Strauss!

It is wrong, however, to think that, because the scholars were deluded by Mao, the journalists have done any better in presenting the opposite side of the coin. Instead of overestimating Mao, they underestimated the entire Chinese revolutionary experience, though that was national.

In the New York Times of Jan. 2, 1981, Flora Lewis came up with the most superficial of all scenarios: "Winston Churchill got it backwards when he described the Soviet Union as a 'riddle wrapped in a mystery inside of an enigma.' It's the other way around; inside is the infighting to be expected, and the mystery wrapper is to conceal the fact that there really isn't much higher meaning . . . I think we'll manage understanding better if we remove the veils from our own dazed eyes. . . ." The only trouble is that it isn't the eyes that are dazed, but the thought. The crisis in China would hardly be as intense as it is now if it had no "higher meaning" than the "infighting to be expected."

When the first spontaneous mass demonstration in Mao's China sprang up on April 5, 1976 — in honor of Zhou Enlai who had died and was still being slandered by Mao, Jiang, et al. — Mao embarked on his last hurrah.⁵ Whether inspired by Jiang or otherwise, he ordered the demonstration put down and Deng, who was blamed for instigating it, removed. Within a few months, Mao himself died and Jiang was left to hold the bag. In no time at all, she was arrested.

Whether or not Jiang escapes death now in order, as Deng put it, not to make a martyr of her and whatever punishment is meted out to Lin's adherents, the point at issue is not those few who are now in the dock. What is at issue is where is China going now, nationally and internationally? Are there still illusions that when one has some H-bombs the backwardness of the economy, including the military, doesn't matter half as much as who becomes the ally, be it back with Russia or with the U.S.?

The truth is that it's not what is being decided at the trial that is decisive. The truth is that the only way to change direction, be it Maoist or Dengist, is to listen to the voices of revolt. China has a history of peasant revolt that is second to none, and it has a history of proletarian and youth revolts that have not stopped, either with Mao's last hurrah or Deng's removal of the Democracy Wall. It is they who have not yet said their last word.
—Jan. 12, 1981

5—"Mao's Last Hurrah" was the title of my Political-Philosophic Letter of Feb. 27, 1976; "Post-Mao China: What Now?" the title of my analysis in New Essays, a 1977 N&L pamphlet. For an analysis of China's development over the last three decades, consult my Marxism and Freedom, Twayne, 1958; "Mao's China and the Proletarian Cultural Revolution," in New Politics, Spring 1968; "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung" in Philosophy and Evolution, Delacorte, 1973; and a whole series of Perspectives Theses (see especially, "Nixon and Mao Attempt to Throttle Social Revolution," 1971); Political-Philosophic Letters; and columns in News & Letters (see especially "Confucius Who?" April, 1974 and "How New is China's New Constitution," March and April, 1975.) The most complete selection of Marxist-Humanist writing on China is within the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection: Marxist-Humanism 1941-1980, Archives of Labor History, Walter Reuther Library, Wayne State University, Detroit.

What is philosophy? What is revolution?

by Raya Dunayevskaya
 Author of **PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION**
 and **Marxism and Freedom**

Editor's Note: Below we print excerpts from a Political-Philosophic Letter written by Raya Dunayevskaya shortly after the takeover of the American Embassy in Iran, when much of the Left called the act an "anti-imperialist" one. The drive for political power on the basis of religion or on other narrow vanguardist grounds, and not on the basis of a philosophy of revolution, is within the world of the 1980s. The full text is included in the Political-Philosophic Letters of Raya Dunayevskaya, Vol. II, which contains as well, "The Carter/Brzezinski-Ordered Imperialist Intrusion Into Iran—and What About Khomeini/Bani-Sadr's 'Holy War' Against the Left?"; "Grave Contradictions in Iranian Revolution"; "Iran: Unfoldment of, and Contradictions in, Revolution"; "Special Introduction to Iranian Edition of Marx's 1844 Humanist Essays." The volume is available from News & Letters for \$1.50.

It sounds so abstract, so easy to say, with Hegel, that philosophy is the "thinking study of things". (para. 2). It surely sounds oversimplified to say, at one and the same time, that "Nature has given everyone a faculty of thought. But thought is all that philosophy claims as the form proper to her process . . ." (para. 5). When, however, you realize that this is the Introduction to Encyclopaedia of Philosophical Sciences; that it was written after the French Revolution, which made popular an actual "permanent revolution"—no revolution is ever its first act alone—you can begin, just begin to grasp the meaning of Hegel's expression, "second negativity."

Furthermore, Hegel had not found articulation that easy until after Phenomenology of Mind, until after the Science of Logic, until after he tried to summarize all of his works, including the 2,500-year history of philosophy. Then, of course, you realize why, when Hegel is speaking of philosophy, it is not an abstraction, that even though he limits it to thought and not activity, he can conclude in that very same Introduction:

"This divorce between idea and reality is a favorite device of the analytic understanding in particular. Yet strangely in contrast with this separatist tendency, its own dreams, half-truths though they are, appear to the understanding something true and real; it prides itself on the imperative 'ought' which it takes especial pleasure in prescribing on the field of politics. As if the world had waited on it to learn how it ought to be, and was not!" (para. 6).

WHEN A NEW OBJECTIVE stage arose in 1844-1848 which was proletarian, and not just semi-proletarian as with the enrages of the French Revolution, the young, new, revolutionary philosopher and activist, Marx, practiced Hegel's Idea of freedom by realizing it in an outright revolution. He had told his young Hegelian friends who were becoming materialists: You cannot become a true new Humanist by turning your back on

Hegel because he was both bourgeois and idealist and because he limited the revolution to a revolution in thought. The truth is that Hegel's dialectic was not just any idea, but the Idea of freedom, and must, therefore, first be realized in an actual material way. . . . I say that in issuing the challenge that will cause the whole capitalist world to tremble, we need to unfurl a totally new banner of philosophy as well as of revolution. And the philosophy of revolution now—that is, after the bourgeoisie has betrayed us in this 1848-9 Revolution, and it is necessary to depend only on our own forces—must be "Revolution in Permanence." (Address to the Communist League, 1850) . . .

In very nearly the last work of Marx—the 1881 Preface to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto—that permanent revolution gets spelled out on a still higher level—that is, internationally as well as nationally. It is there that it is concretized as the relationship between technologically advanced and technologically backward countries—i.e. that backward Russia could have its revolution ahead of "West Europe"—provided: 1) the revolution is accomplished within the context of European revolutions; and 2) the new forces, in this case the peasant communes, are never out of context of both internationalism and dialectics-of-liberation. The Idea is the power because it is concrete; it is

total; it is multi-dimensional; and at no time is the Individual made just to tail-end the State or "committee." Rather, let us never forget the principle: the Individual is the social entity, and society must never again be counter-posed to the Individual.

MARX HAD SPENT something like 45 volumes in expressing his thoughts, in participating in revolutions, in leaving a legacy that was the very opposite of an heirloom.

Comes World War I, and the shock of the simultaneity of imperialist war and socialist betrayal is so overwhelming that one and only one—Lenin—says, if I could have been so misled and considered that betrayer, Kautsky, my teacher, something is altogether wrong with my way of thinking. And while I will not stop shouting "down with the war—turn the imperialist war into civil war," I will never again be satisfied with the "correct analysis" of a political situation without first digging into Hegelian dialectics. It could not have possibly been an accident that Marx, Marx's Marxism, was rooted in Hegel. . . .

Trotsky counterposed his slogan "peace without annexations" and "mobilizing the proletariat for a struggle for peace" to Lenin's slogan "turn the imperialist war into civil war" which Trotsky rejected. What was even worse was Trotsky's rejection of Lenin's statement that the defeat of your own country is the lesser evil . . .

Listen to Trotsky on the Russian Internationalists trying to achieve a unity, first under his peace slogan which Lenin rejected, and then on Lenin's slogan which Trotsky rejected. Here is what he said:

"Under no condition can I agree with your opinion, which is emphasized by a resolution, that Russia's defeat would be a 'lesser evil'. This opinion represents a fundamental connivance with the political methodology of social patriotism, a connivance for which there is no



THEORY / PRACTICE

April, 1981

reason or justification and which substitutes an orientation (extremely arbitrary under present conditions) along the line of a 'lesser evil' for the revolutionary struggle against war and the conditions which generated this war."

... Trotsky's specific article from which I quote this was dated Paris, Oct. 14, 1915. That article was part of what was written by those Marxists who had not betrayed and who tried to reconstitute themselves internationally—but not on the basis of Lenin's revolutionary struggle of "turn the imperialist war into civil war", but on Trotsky's "Struggle for Peace" . . . In his 1919 Introduction to War and Revolution, The Fall of the Second International and the Preparation of the Third, Trotsky stressed the internationalism and repeated that: "The March revolution liquidated these differences."

But that is not true. Theoretical differences are not "liquidated" just because, in fact, you are a revolutionary. Quite the contrary. Once the heat of the battle dies, the deviations from Marxism first come to plague you.

The truth is that the theoretical difference reappears in a most horrible form exactly when the next new, objective situation arises. You must then dig for new philosophic depth on the basis of the highest theoretic as well as practical point last reached. If, instead, you remain without a philosophic rudder, the supposedly "correct" political analysis becomes, if not outright counter-revolution, definitely no more than tail-endism.

PERHAPS, I SHOULDN'T have asked only what is philosophy?, what is revolution?, but also what is anti-imperialism? . . . Calling oneself a "follower of the Imam" does not constitute a revolutionary act, no matter how many times one repeats that this is anti-imperialism . . . That kind of pseudo anti-imperialism, such as the taking of hostages, opens no new stage of revolution. Rather, it initiates a retreat from the original revolutionary perspective . . . The hardships on the masses intensify. The unemployment is greater. And so is inflation. As the Sheng Wu-lien found out, during Mao's Cultural Revolution which they at first heartily endorsed because they thought it meant the displacement of the bureaucracy: "The more things change, the more they remain the same" . . .

Lenin had to begin separating himself, not just from betrayers of the workers but from revolutionaries who would not see the new concrete, whether that was a new revolutionary force in another country or his own. What he had learned from the Hegelian dialectic that made him so sharp against his own Bolshevik

colleagues was that overthrow, first negativity, was not enough; that you must now see that counter-revolution can arise from within the revolution itself.

This and this alone made it possible not to stay at overthrow of Tsarism and bourgeois democracy calling itself "socialist", though headed by a so-called socialist, Kerensky and even supported by genuine revolutionaries . . .

It becomes imperative, therefore, to take a second look at these stages: February to April; April to June; July-August full counter-revolution; October. As soon as the overthrow of the Tsar occurs, and while this great, historic, spontaneous outburst achieved what no Party — Bolshevik or otherwise — could achieve, and though it was unanticipated by Lenin, he by no means let euphoria overrun him. Quite the contrary. He had already grappled with the Hegelian dialectic; he had already analyzed the new stage of imperialism not just economically but seeing new forces of revolution; and he already began to work out what became State and Revolution, that is to say, have the perspective of not

only overthrow but the total uprooting, so that only when production and the state would be in the hands of the whole population "to a man, woman, and child" would it be a new society.

... Once that became the basis for all the activities of the Party, there was no separating the revolution from the philosophy of revolution. But the masses wanted to go still further, directly to the conquest of power; they underestimated the forces still in power, and it was the beginning of all the counter-revolutionary moves that still passed themselves off as revolution, accusing Lenin of being a German spy and saying that is why he called for the end of the war. The relevant point for us today is that when outright counter-revolution was initiated by Kornilov so that one still had to defend Kerensky, the manner in which it was done has all the answers against tail-endism. It was at that point that whether it was the creation of a revolutionary military committee, which permitted no transfer of guns to the front unless they approved it, or whether it was such slogans as "All power to the Soviets," or whether it was "Land, Bread and Peace", there was no way whatever to confuse that Party with any other.



Contrast this to what everyone from Trotskyist to Qaddafi is saying to blur those new grave contradictions within Iran . . . Qaddafi and Khomeini and General Zia may think the Middle East as they define it will be the graveyard of U.S. imperialism. Nothing could be further from the truth . . . Qaddafi takes advantage of the fact that supposedly there is no government in Libya because there is no Parliament, and supposedly it's a collectivist society because it calls itself Jamahiriya, which means "a command of the people." Is it they who decide everything? No, even the word, committee, unless it's revolutionary—and unless the word revolutionary means total uprooting—is not the equivalent of destiny being in the hands of the people; that is to say, with control of production in the hands of the workers. And so must the state be in their hands.

What new retrogressive stage are we in now, when religion usurps also political power? First it was the Little Red Book of Mao. And now it's the Little Green Book of Qaddafi. And what part of the Koran will Khomeini embody in some brief sayings that all must repeat?

It is not a question that a leader must write fifty books, like Marx or Lenin. It is a question of being serious about revolution and therefore the philosophy of revolution, and being responsible to history, which means men and women shaping history. You cannot throw out philosophy, and indulge in sloganeering. Even a good bourgeois philosopher, at least in the stage when the bourgeoisie achieved its revolution, a good Lutheran like Hegel, who insisted all his life that he believed, had to submit to the dialectic drive of philosophy and subordinate religion to it. All his protestations notwithstanding—and "revealed religion" is pretty high in the sphere of the Absolute; nothing can change the fact that it isn't the highest; that philosophy is. Needless to say, that revolution in thought initiated by Hegelian dialectics was transformed by Marx's new continent of thought into reality. Ever since then no revolution was successful that wasn't grounded in a philosophy of revolution.

—December 17, 1979

THEORY / PRACTICE

May, 1981

Preface to Iranian edition of Marx's 1844 Essays

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of *PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION*
and *Marxism and Freedom*

The following Special Introduction for an Iranian edition of Marx's Humanist Essays was written by Raya Dunayevskaya at the request of young Iranian revolutionaries who are involved in the battle against a counter-revolution that not only threatens from outside Iran, but that arose so quickly from within the revolution itself. We felt that this month was an historically appropriate time to share it with our readers, while Raya Dunayevskaya is on national lecture tour, because this May issue of N&L commemorates both May 1 as an international revolutionary celebration and May 5—Marx's birthday—as a true birthtime of history.—Charles Denby

Because there is nothing more exciting than addressing revolutionaries in an ongoing revolution, I feel very honored to have this opportunity, in 1980, to introduce Marx's 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, which opened an entirely new continent of thought and revolution that Marx named "a new Humanism." The year that I was first able to publish these Humanist Essays as an Appendix to my work, *Marxism and Freedom*, a quarter of a century ago, coincided with the Hungarian Revolution against Russian totalitarianism calling itself Communism. Thus, both from below, from an actual proletarian revolution, and from theory, a today-ness was shed upon these Essays that had lain on the dusty shelves of archives and had never been practiced.

Because what the contemporary world needs most today is a unity of Marx's philosophy of liberation with an outright revolution, we must re-examine what it is that Marx had meant when, in his greatest theoretical work, *Capital*, he had declared "human power is its own end"; and what, in his very first historical materialist analyses in 1844, he had meant by saying "communism, as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society"—what the goal is, is the creation of totally new, class-less, human relations.

WHEN YOU TURN to the Essays on "Private Property and Communism" and the "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic," you will note three things at once. First and foremost is that the analysis of labor—and that is what distinguishes Marx from all other Socialists and Communists of his day and ours—goes much further than the economic structure of society. His analysis goes to the actual human relations. Secondly, it was not only Hegel whom Marx stood on his feet, uniting, instead of separating, thinking from being. It was also the "quite vulgar and unthinking communism" that completely negates the personality of man." Thirdly, and above all, is Marx's concept of labor—that it is the creativity of the laborer as the gravedigger of capitalism which uproots all of the old.

Whether capitalism achieves the domination of labor through ownership of or through control over the means of production, what Marx focuses on is this: any "domination over the labor of others" proves not only capitalism's exploitative but perverse nature. To further stress the perverse nature, Marx says that the whole of capitalism could be summed up in a single sentence: "Dead labor dominates living labor." This class relationship transforms the living laborer into "an appendage to the machine." Here is how Marx expresses it in the Humanist Essays:

Private property has made us so stupid and one-sided that . . . in place of all the physical and spiritual senses there is the sense of possession which is the simple alienation of all these senses . . . The transcendence of private property is, therefore, the total freeing of all human senses and attributes.

It is here, to make sure that one thereby does not jump to the conclusion that the abolition of private property creates a new society, that Marx rejected the substitution of one form of property—state—for private as any solution to the problem of exploitation. It is why he rejected "vulgar and unthinking communism," focusing instead on two other problems: 1) truly new human relations, the "new Humanism" in place of communism; and 2) the totality of the uprooting of all old relations so that the dual rhythm of social revolution—the abolition of the old and the creation of the new—would run their full course.

IN ORDER TO FULLY grasp Marx's Historical Materialism, the foundation for which was laid by these Humanist Essays, let us turn to the history of Marx's day as well as of today. What we see, first and foremost, is that Marx, in laying the foundation of Historical Materialism, was also creating the theory of proletarian revolution, the dialectic of liberation, Marx's greatest discovery — his concept of labor which revealed the laborer to be not just a force of revolution, but its Reason—meant that the proletariat was the "Subject," the Universal Subject that was not just a product of history, but its shaper, negating, i.e. abolishing, the

exploitative reality. The exploited proletariat is the transformer of reality. It is here that Marx saw the core of the Hegelian dialectic, naming "the dialectic of negativity as the moving and creating principle."

In actuality, continued Marx, there lies hidden in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Mind* "the movement of history." The mystical veil Hegel threw over it must be removed, but far from turning his back on philosophy, Marx transformed Hegel's revolution in philosophy into a philosophy of revolution. Which is why Marx held that "Humanism distinguishes itself both from Idealism and Materialism, and is, at the same time, the truth uniting both . . . (and) capable of grasping the act of world history."



Background for drawing of young Marx is a manuscript page of *Economic Manuscripts of 1844*.

"Grasping the act of world history" meant that he had to proclaim "revolution in permanence" when he saw that no sooner had the masses helped the bourgeoisie gain victory over feudalism in the 1848 revolutions than the bourgeoisie turned against them. And when he witnessed the greatest revolution in his time, the 1871 Paris Commune, and saw the masses take destiny into their own hands, Marx declared that non-state to be the "political form at last discovered to work out the economic emancipation of the proletariat." As Marx expressed it:

We should especially avoid re-establishing society as an abstraction, opposed to the individual. The individual is the social entity.

MARK RAISED THE QUESTION of "revolution in permanence" not only for his day but as the way out for all unfinished revolutions. No age can understand that better than our own, plagued both by transformations into opposite after each revolution—such as that which saw the first workers' state that arose from the Russian Revolution turn into the state-capitalist monstrosity that Russia is now; and by the aborting of today's revolutions before ever they come to completion.

The question is: What happens after the first act of revolution? Does conquest of power assure a classless society or only a new class bureaucracy? Our age, which has witnessed a whole new Third World emerge from the struggle against Western imperialism (U.S. imperialism most of all) in Latin America as in Africa, in the Middle East as in Asia, needs to demand that "grasping the act of world history" means spelling out total freedom.

Here again, Marx can illuminate our task in the manner in which he spelled out how total must be the uprooting of the old and the creation of the new. He turned to the most fundamental of all human relations—that of man to woman. In it we see why Marx opposed both private property and "vulgar communism":

The infinite degradation in which man exists for himself is expressed in this relation to the woman as the spoils and handmaid of lust. For the secret of the relationship of man to man finds its unambiguous, definitive, open, obvious expression in the

relationship of man to woman, and in this way, the direct, natural, necessary relationship of man to man is the relationship of man to woman.

Clearly, "each of the human relations to the world—seeing, hearing, smell, taste, feeling, thought, perception, experience, wishing activity, loving" must transcend mere equality, a needed first achievement but not yet the needed total reorganization of human relations. Abolition of the old is only the first mediation. "Only by the transcendence of this mediation . . . does there arise positive Humanism, beginning from itself."

AS ONE FOLLOWS Marx's view of total freedom, one can see how far beyond technology Marx's philosophy of revolution extended. Long before the atom was split and out of it came, not the greatest productive force, but the most destructive A-bomb, H-bomb and N-bomb, Marx wrote in these Essays: "To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie." With Hiroshima, we saw what a holocaust the lie of separating the reason for being from the reason for scientific development can become. Now, with the eruption of the world-wide anti-nuclear movement, we see all over again how urgent it is to study and practice Marx's new continent of thought. As the great English poet, William Blake, expressed it, nothing is more binding than "mind-forged manacles." Let us finish with those manacles once and for all.

It is with the striving for such a manifesto of total freedom that I, as Marxist-Humanist, express my solidarity with the Iranian revolutionaries as we all aspire to a new internationalism. The struggle continues.

November 1, 1980, Detroit, Michigan