

The Two Worlds in Each Country; The Need to Transform Reality

I. The two worlds in the U.S. and the Reagan-Haig genocidal war in El Salvador

Reagan's coming to power has, far from getting Big Government off the backs of the people, so militarized it that the cost of its "Five Year Plan" is counted out in the stratospheric number of \$1.3 trillion. In this "richest land in the world," where such insane numbers are calculated for nuclear militarization, the 22 million citizens who need food stamps just to reach the poverty level are to be deprived of them, as inflation and unemployment continue unabated.

This is a land where the eight percent average unemployment for the nation does not reveal the truth of industrial centers like Detroit, where fully 60 percent of the population is on some form of government assistance; on June 16, the mere rumor of eight job openings in St. Louis brought 4,000 jobseekers to line up at 7 p.m. the night before. Big Government is not "getting off the backs of the people"; it is reaching further into their lives to take food out of their mouths.

Nor are the ideologues who follow the Reagan line—or, more correctly, Reagan who follows the reactionary "supply-side economics" line—supplying the masses with tax relief. They are creating windfall profits for Big Capital—and with no guarantee whatever that this will go into investment to increase production. Rather, they are taking over other enterprises with a quick profit; the oil companies are taking over everything from coal mines to retail stores like Montgomery Ward.

What the Reagan Administration is doing in the U.S. is no different from its imperialist actions as they extend to such genocidal dimensions as the war in El Salvador. Its "White Paper" turned out to be so big a lie that the Administration itself had to admit some of its errors. Which didn't mean they have backed down from supporting the reactionary El Salvador government's war against its people. The latest action, 36 miles outside of San Salvador, was described by a peasant woman witness as so much shooing that "the earth trembled." (New York Times, July 12, 1981)

There is no reactionary government in the world that doesn't find a sympathetic ear among the Reagan-Haig-Weinberger bureaucrats. Thus, they not only protect South Africa "in general," but specifically, even where that action is a betrayal of the very resolution the U.S. itself voted for on Namibia.

When the U.S. Congress did finally express some opposition to the Administration's perverse, dehumanized attitude to human rights by rejecting the nomination of the outright racist—and supporter of every fascist government from South Korea to Chile—Ernest Lefever as Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, Reagan-Haig put him on the payroll anyway, simply retitling the job to be "anti-terrorist consultant."

Reagan's ignorance of foreign affairs matches his arrogance and "humor." Even a conservative pundit like James Reston was amazed at Reagan's press conference where he indulged in asinine humor on as global a danger as U.S.-Russian confrontation, by alleging that Haig had sent Brezhnev the following note, to explain his reason for not being ready for an arms limitation treaty: "Roses are red, violets are blue, stay out of El Salvador, and Poland too." The other nations weren't laughing, said James Reston in "Thunder on the Potomac," NYT, June 24, 1981, adding that "things had changed in Washington; the tough guys had taken over; billions more for guns and no more nonsense about human rights." Nowhere was Reagan's grim one-liner more bestial-sounding than in El Salvador, where it's not the Russians but U. S. imperialism which is prodding the ruling junta onto their rampage.

* Because of the imperative need we felt to express our solidarity with the El Salvadoran masses against both their government and U.S. imperialism, we are issuing the bilingual Spanish-English pamphlet, *Latin America's Coerced Revolutions: In Fact and in Theory* and including essays on "El Salvador: Reagan's genocidal war and the unfinished Latin American revolutions," "The peasant dimension in Latin America: its test of the relation of theory to organization," and "Latin America: revolution and theory," as well as a report from an El Salvadoran revolutionary.

It is true that Reston's critique stemmed not from worry for the masses, but fear that the Administration keeps on "goading the Soviet bear," it may become "a threat to the peace."

Such volatility playing with hot war by the capitalistic-imperialistic Behemoth, armed to the teeth with nuclear weaponry, demands that we develop our absolute opposition to it in intensified activities with labor, with the Latino, as well as Black dimension in the Women's Liberation Movement and among the youth, and articulate that absolute opposition in the battle of ideas also among the Left.

This is made all the more imperative by the counter-revolutionary activities the mullahs are now carrying on in Iran, which, far from isolating

the U.S., has presented it with the best opportunity for actually strengthening itself also in the Arab world. This should have been clear, but wasn't, from the joint Resolution, elaborated by the U.S. Representative to the UN, Kirkpatrick, and the Iraqi representative—a Resolution that was so rapid that its "condemnation" of Israel's pre-emptive bombing of Iraq's nuclear reactor included no punishment whatsoever for the neo-fascistic blitzkrieg. Our Political-Philosophic Letter—"What Has Happened to the Iranian Revolution? Has it Already Run its Course into its Opposite: Counter-Revolution? Or Can it be Saved and Deepened?" (News and Letters, 1981)—is to be considered part of these Perspectives, and needs further elaboration here.

II. Iran, the Iran-Iraqi war, and Israel's pre-emptive strike

The Iranian Revolution achieved a great historic turning point not alone in Iran and throughout the Middle East, but globally. Whereas, up to that point, seeing Israel as the enemy had united the whole Arab world, the mass revolution in Iran created an altogether new division in the Middle East. It literally changed everything, and nowhere more so than within the Arab world. Thus, the decisive point in the Middle East and among the Western powers, became not only oil, and not just a question of race, but the preponderant, internal, irreconcilable division between the ruling class

and the masses in each country, with the only unity between the rulers of the Arab countries now being that they were all against revolution. Khomeini's appeal to the Shi'ites of the world threatened every country from Saudi Arabia—whose holiest place, Mecca, was actually occupied—to Iraq and Lebanon, where, unadvertised, the Shi'ites were battling also the PLO. Where Syria pretends not to be threatened and relies heavily on its alliance with Russia, the truth is that it is not only in Lebanon that it is in deep crisis, but in its own country, and precisely with its own masses.

It has also become clear that the use of oil as a political weapon was by no means due only to the Arab-Israeli war, but became also a weapon in inter-monopoly rivalry between the U.S. oil monopolists and the Arab oil potentates. Beyond the peradventure of any doubt, what was involved by 1979 in the unconscionable rise in oil prices had nothing whatever to do with Israel. The contradictions were glaring, indeed, since the usual imperialistic profiteering was further bloated by the fact that so many of the recycled petro-dollars came back to the U.S.

The four-fold increase after the 1973 Arab-Israeli war paled when it became twelve-fold by 1980, shocking all oil experts, who had predicted that such a rise would not occur until the year 2000. Tensions between the Arab countries and the U.S. would have grown more, now that it was clear that oil as a political weapon was by no

means due to Arab-Israeli hostility—but none could forget that the masses had taken center stage in the Iranian Revolution. While a change in oil ownership, with the mullahs in control, did not stop production, still the whole question of the so-called "front-line states" against Israel (Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon)—which had already changed so fundamentally with the Camp David treaty—now made another 180 degree turn. Far from the crises in the Arab world being due to "ordinary" contradictions, occurring when "modernization" confronts the status quo (in

this case, Islam), it was now clear that, be it the Shah or the mullahs, it is the class division in each Middle East country, including Iran, that is decisive.

One other complication was added: the Iraqi attack on Iran, whereupon the masses did rise to the defense of Iran, including the Kurds. Suddenly everybody did remember what the Iranian Revolution had been. It was this which led to such a spectacular change in the capitalist world that two such "enemies" as Iraq and the U.S. could join in that UN resolution which did no more than slap Israel's wrist.

With the stalemated Iraq-Iran war, Egypt's isolation from the Arab world was not so total, and there has been a great deal more leaning towards the Camp David treaty, or at least toward the U.S. presence in the Middle East, than any Arab country is willing to admit. The U.S. is now being looked on once more as the "protector" of the Gulf—that is to say, the military titan against social revolution. So great is the fear of revolution that what, just three short months ago,

was said at the super-think-tank called the Trilateral Commission as if that were the new truth—"We no longer live in a world where America occupies a dominant position and exercises her leadership"—is no longer the whole truth.

It doesn't fundamentally matter whether we single out the Middle East as the point closest to an explosion, or take a look, instead, at Western Europe, which has been shaken as much by Reagan's hot war rhetoric as it was in the 1970s by

the Middle East oil crisis. The point is that western Europe knows that it will be the first spot Russia will threaten with direct, total destruction; the point is that, outside of the White House and the Pentagon, one or another form of neutralism is in the air. And that also includes China, which, on the surface, seems to be totally in tune with Reagan in considering Russia Enemy Number One. But when one examines carefully the document issued by the recently concluded Plenary Session of the Central Committee of The Chinese Communist Party (CCP), a very different picture emerges.

III. China: deMaoization and heightening contradictions in state-capitalism

Ever since Nixon's day, U.S. imperialism has been convinced that it has China, lock, stock and barrel—and without any cost to itself, as if a thousand million Chinese will rush out at "its" (!) command to attack Russia. Consider Haig's latest trip to China where obviously he was executing a policy that he created all by himself and right on the spot, offering China everything from limitless arms to the disregard of Taiwan should that subject disturb China. The magic communicator, so adept at Class B movie productions, not to mention cheap "one-liners"—President Reagan—said exactly the opposite at his news conference. If the contradictory statement didn't disturb the Administration, it most certainly did disturb China, which rushed to make it clear not only that there is no arms agreement as yet, but that it will under no circumstances stand for a "two-China policy" under any other name, such as "Taiwan Relations Act."

To grasp what is most crucial to China itself, we need to look, not at the on-high maneuverings and double-dealings with other powers, but to the contradictions within China itself, as reflected in the Resolution of the recently concluded conference. This was no ordinary annual conference; it marked a decisive turning point—the most decisive, if not since the conquest of power, surely since 1956. It is a crucial turning point in world events.

That is not because they are allegedly turning away from Maoism, which they are not fully doing. The first period after the conquest of power (which they designate as 1949-1956) was as distinctively Maoist as was the "Cultural Revolution" which they now reject (and designate as 1966-1976).

What led to the first division between Dang and Mao, and later to the "Cultural Revolution," was the different attitude to an event faraway

that penetrated China—the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Though Mao and Deng moved in opposite directions, it was that emergence of an opposition to Communism from the Left that compelled them both to move away from what was new, what was historic, what was great, what came from below. Once that kind of opposition from the Left had appeared on the world scene, and once Mao lost his illusion that he could keep such an upsurge from China with his democratic thesis, "Let 100 Flowers Bloom, Let 100 Schools of Thought Contend," then and only then did both Mao and Deng begin their attack on the dissidents. They took different paths, not on the question of those dissidents, but on Mao's "Great Leap Forward," which a good part of the Central Committee resisted. What soon became clear was that there is no "peaceful co-existence" between the ruling class and the exploited classes.

There was still one unanimous effort on the part of the CCP to create a different axis in the world, independent of both U.S. and Russia. It was the attempt to have a Third World axis—Djakarta-Peking—which collapsed in a bloody counter-revolution in 1965. The Communist Party of Indonesia, which had followed the Mao line and had been second only in size to China's itself, was destroyed. It was then that the division between Mao and those in the Central Committee he had called "capitalist roaders" became permanent and resulted in Mao's so-called "Cultural Revolution." Of this there is not a word in the document.

Nor is there a single word of the whole Vietnam War, when the parties who had sided with Mao in the Sino-Soviet conflict had appealed to him that, to defend Vietnam from American imperialism, a united front should be established among all Communist Parties, including Russia. That, too, Mao rejected. By 1970, when Nixon extended the Vietnam War into Cambodia, the crisis in China came to a climax. The most shocking reversal of all was the rolling out of the Red Carpet for Nixon, on the one hand, and the simultaneous struggle to the death with Lin Biao, on the other.

1. For a further analysis of the Resolution, see Raya Dunayevskaya's *Theory/Practice* column on page 7 of this issue. The complete Resolution appears in *Peking Review*, No. 27, July 5, 1981. An officially excerpted version was published in *The New York Times*, July 1, 1981.

Let's Reagan-Haig-Weinberger think that this gives them a free ally against Russia, let's remind them that long before China considered Russia to be Enemy Number One—in fact, ever since Mao's conquest of power in China—U.S. imperialism had been their Enemy Number One. Listen to what the Resolution says:

Our party led the whole people in gradually realizing the transition from the new democracy to socialism, properly rehabilitating the country's economy, undertaking planned economic construction and in the main, accomplishing the socialist transformation of the private ownership of the means of production.

Need one be reminded that this was the period of "the unbreakable friendship" with Russia following their Five-Year Plan?

The most ironic element in the document is that it is Mao's late "foreign policy" which gives the new rulers a reason for holding that Mao should still be considered great. In never facing

the objective situation—and especially so in regard to the Vietnam War, when the U.S. was Enemy Number One, not alone to the Vietnamese, but to the whole world—the Chinese try to give the impression that Russia has always been Enemy Number One. The exact opposite is the truth. Indeed, the reason Mao gained such a mass following among the independent Left, who were ready to forgive Mao's every crime—and leave a few blank pages for any he might commit in the future—was the contention that the U.S. was the world's Enemy Number One and Mao alone, not Russia, was sure to fight U.S. imperialism to the end.

The last word on how far the flirtation with U.S. imperialism will go has not yet been spoken. Even if Deng had not left loopholes to change policy, the point is that Chinese state capitalism calling itself Communism, though eons away from any genuine Marxism, is not exactly the equivalent of Reagan's re-establishment of "pure" private capitalism.

IV. Will the 'restructured' American economy bring us to the nuclear holocaust?

That reactionary Reaganomics coincides with the "restructured economy" is no accident whatever. Ever since the 1974-75 global crisis, the deepest economic recession in the post-World War II world, it was clear that the economy had reached an outright structural change. The fact that by 1981 high technology and energy had become the only profit-producing industries was evidently the ground for great delusions about the viability of private capitalism. Enter the bull in the china shop, who cared so little about humanity and so much about the multinationals that he would actually try to concretize this delusion of private capitalism. He has evidently not even learned the lesson of the Great Depression, which compelled it into what it called "welfare economics."

In place of the search for profits as it expressed itself in a "production for production's sake" mentality, the present rush for unconscionable profits tells this of decadent capitalism: if profits can be achieved without much production; if multinationals, even more than ordinary monopoly and oligarchy, keep expanding these profits; if profits cut of oil reach altogether stratospheric proportions; and if the same is true of armaments which have always ceded great profits for destructive purposes—then there is no need for any pretense that we care about production, rather than just gobbling up other industries, like oil, coal or just retail trade like Montgomery Ward.

Though bourgeois economists like to regard the replacing of obsolescent capitalism with the latest in technology as "creative destruction"—i.e. investment in other new industries, which in turn would bring about price reductions, as, say,

the canal boom in the 19th century reducing transportation costs—today's profit glutty finds that the state will grant it further windfall profits without even calling for a reduction in prices.

It would take a Reaganite in the multi-billion dollar bracket to be able to quote percentage-wise prices and profits: energy prices advanced 115 percent faster than prices as a whole; 107 percent faster than old-line manufacturing, and 429 percent faster than agriculture; 179 percent faster even than high technology, and 202 percent faster than services.

The only thing "private" about this capitalism is that they rake in the profits. They are getting the same free ride from the state as capitalism got when it first came on the scene without advancing a shilling. Marx called it the "hot-house development" of capitalism, by which he meant the carving up of Africa, Asia, and the conquest of Latin America, pointing out that there wasn't a single penny in the "free" capitalist West that wasn't capitalized blood of the slaves.

As for Reagan's whirlwind "solutions" to today's economic crisis, they are a rerun of the earlier turn-of-the-century, free-enterprise form that brought on the Depression. So alarmed have the masses become that there has been an upsurge of membership in all kinds of organizations,

from liberal to Left. The fully orchestrated and well-heeled attack on everything from abortion rights to ERA has brought new allies to the Women's Liberation Movement, with NOW reporting that both in members and contributions they have never experienced a greater outpouring. The Administration's determined effort to

push back all the gains made by the Black revolt of the '60s, brought even so mild a person as the head of the NAACP board, Margaret Bush Wilson, to introduce Reagan's speech to their convention by saying that "the NAACP does not necessarily subscribe to the views that are about to be expressed." The ovation that greeted her remark was but one sign that the opposition to Reagan has just begun and not only on the part of the NAACP or the Urban League, but above all, by the Black masses.

To promise "pie in the sky" as Reagan did at the NAACP convention, when unemployment remains sky high, and for Blacks is always double what it is for whites; to claim that all will be righted by 1986, when he is taking away every program that might keep one alive until 1986—only strengthens the opposition to him.

Labor certainly has no illusions about all the promises. They are finding out that the intense propaganda to move to the sunbelt, where jobs are supposedly plentiful, fails to add that these are non-union, low-paid jobs in an area where housing costs are so inflated none can afford a house. Nor is labor fooled about the low productivity being blamed on American workers, which is actually due to two facts. First is the capitalist drive to break up unions and lower wages which have been achieved through a century of class struggles, and at a time when runaway inflation has already sucked that "high" wage dry. Second is the fact that, with energy costs so high, industry is not buying new machinery but prefers to return to labor-intensive, obsolete machinery; this, as they well know, is the true cause for low labor productivity.

The retrenchment of the Administration is not only against labor, against Blacks, against women, but also against lower middle-class youth who can afford an education only with the help of student loans. The deep retrenchment in all the public schools from Headstart through college will exacerbate the illiteracy we already see. The youth are by no means limiting their struggles to those against the retrenchment in education. It is estimated that no less than half a million young men have refused to register for the draft.

At the very same time, great numbers of Vietnam veterans have become a vocal opposition to Reagan, including many who were never active during the anti-Vietnam War movement, but now find themselves victims of Agent Orange. So insensitive is Reagan even to the veterans, that he refused to meet with them, despite their sit-ins at Veterans Hospitals, their marches in front of the White House, and the actual hunger strikes they have engaged in to bring attention to their plight.

The most intense struggle is on the anti-nuclear front. There is hardly a country on earth where it has not already erupted, from the U.S. to West Germany, from England to Japan, from the Scandinavian countries to France. This is the movement in which we must intensify our activity. It is becoming so urgent a matter that even a conservative writer like George F. Kennan—the very one who directly after World War II, wrote the famous article on containment which he signed as "X"—is now sounding the alarm, not by disregarding that Russia is doing exactly the same thing as the U.S., but by realizing that there is no end but "utter disaster" for all humanity unless we reverse entirely the "fiendish and inhuman tendencies" of endless nuclear armament by both nuclear titans. What Kennan called attention to is that:

"It was we who first produced and tested such a device; we who were the first to raise its destructiveness to a new level with the hydrogen bomb; we who introduced the multiple warhead; we who have declined every proposal for the renunciation of the principle of 'first use'; and we alone, so help us God, who have used the weapon in anger against others, and against tens of thousands of helpless noncombatants of that."

The intensification of our activity in class struggles, in anti-nuclear demonstrations, with the Black dimension, with youth, with the Women's Liberation Movement, can in no sense be separated from the intensification of our activities in the battle of ideas. The need to transform reality demands both.

2. See "A Modest Proposal" by George F. Kennan, *The New York Review of Books*, July 16, 1981.

V. The audience for Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution—and our organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanism

The relationship between the need to transform reality and the need to grasp philosophy and organization as action is spelled out in a most unusual way in the book, *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*. The dialectic in Marx's concept of revolution is traced there not only in the revolutions of Marx's day, but in those of our own. It is our age which has, on the one hand, achieved maturity and, on the other hand, is surrounded everywhere by counter-revolution that threatens the survival of humanity itself.

We see its gory face, no matter where we look, in this crises-ridden world, be it in the U.S., where Reaganomics and the Immoral Minority calling itself the Moral Majority rule the roost; or in Iran, where the counter-revolutionary elements have gained such dominance as to make it appear that the revolution has already run its course. Like Chiang Kai-shek's "extermination campaigns" which were conducted against Mao, Khomeini's are being conducted not only against the whole Left, the near-Left, and all revolutionary participants against the Shah, but extends itself savagely to children, with prosecutor Lajvardi claiming that "the Koran authorizes believers to finish off Islamic renegades. . . . We are not going to feel sorry for little girls of 13 or 14, or even 9, who wield knives." But, just as opposition to the mullahs is growing every

day in the underground, so, in the quiescent USA, Labor, Blacks, Women's Liberationists, Youth are heading for decisive confrontations with the ruling class. The direction these actions will take depends not alone on what is their underlying philosophy but on whether that philosophy of freedom becomes goal, encompassing the transformation of reality.

It is true that, whether in the U.S. or Iran, El Salvador or Poland, South Africa or Great Britain, it is the exploitative ruling class that has state power and is armed to the teeth and not the revolutionary opposition. It is no less true however, that, whether the masses in opposition are visibly massive or invisibly in the underground, they are armed with the most powerful weapon of all—the idea of Freedom, so passionately striving to be as to look past death. There is nothing abstract about the Idea of Freedom; every one of its victories has been concrete, comprehensive, historic and has never come to be without masses struggling for it.

The 1980s have already left not a single spot on earth untouched by revolt. Britain has been rocked by mass revolts not only in Northern Ireland, not only in Brixton, but throughout the length and breadth of the land, while Scotland included. In Japan and West Germany the anti-nuclear movement is especially massive. In Italy, a most Catholic land where a super-political Pope and the reigning Christian Democratic Party have carried on the most vicious campaign against the right to abortion, the masses—women especially—voted overwhelmingly to retain that right. In France, the masses voted for the Socialist Party to turn DeGaulism back.

In Azania, the Black masses have never for one moment in three long decades stopped their struggle against apartheid South Africa.

The African states have also exposed the neo-fascistic bent of Reagan's USA which is betraying even itself on the question of Namibia. This is not the only point on which Reagan is moving even closer to apartheid South Africa and to the most extreme Right in Begin's Israel. U.S. imperialism, like Russia, is reaching everywhere for single world domination.

Confronted with that, we cannot leave Marxist-Humanism at the theoretical stage alone. We must take organizational responsibility for concretizing these ideas. Organizational responsibility for ideas means a great deal more than the mere naming of tasks, as if organizational growth concerned only a quantitative measurement, or chore. Be it the raising of \$35,000 that is the bare minimum needed to assure the continuity of our 12 page *News & Letters*, or creating an audience for *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*, or a subscription drive for *N&L*, there is nothing routine about it, as is clear not alone from the 25 year existence of our Marxist-Humanist paper, the only one edited by a Black production worker, but also as it has become the theoretical-practical form for both the British and the Iranian Marxist-Humanist papers.³

3. Further concretization of this will be developed in the report on "News & Letters and Our Archives" at the Plenum.

Organizational responsibility for philosophic/political/historic Marxist-Humanist ideas carries with it a special urgency on the eve of the 100th anniversary of Marx's death. Both in the new book, scheduled for publication in 1982, and in our other major theoretical works—*Marxism and the Philosophy of Revolution*, which are to see new editions, as well as in the Archives, we have indeed amassed 40 years of serious contributions to Marx's Marxism. It is not only a matter of catching the historic link as crucial as that is, to Marx's Marxism. It is a question of extending it to this day, and not as a mere updating but an actuality for transforming reality itself.

Organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanist ideas doesn't mean mere loyalty, much less any sort of elitism. Just as ideas aren't disembodied, don't float on high, but are ideas only so long as human beings think, articulate and realize them, so organizational responsibility for them means projecting them in a way that convinces others, who are equally interested in ideas

A new and expanded Raya Densyevskaya Collection: Marxist-Humanism, Its Origin and Development in the U.S. from 1941 to Today is available on microfilm from Wayne State University Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs, Detroit, Michigan 48202. The new 45 page Guide to the collection can be ordered from News and Letters for \$1 plus 50¢ postage.

of freedom though they don't call themselves Marxist-Humanists.

It is in our age, beginning with the mid-1950s and continuing through the decades since, that the masses from below brought onto the historic stage Marx's 1844 *Humanist Essays*. These new continents of thought and of revolution hold the key for our age, whether you take it at its origin in the early 1840s, through the actual 1848 revolutions, to Marx's 1850 articulation of these ideas of freedom as "revolution in permanence" or whether you examine it in the last decade, 1873-1883, when, following the Paris Commune, Marx had disclosed that "freely associated labor" having taken destiny into its own hands, had "at last discovered the political means whereby to work out its economic emancipation," and returned, in his *Ethnological Notebooks*, to the fundamental Man/Woman relationship he had singled out in his earliest *Humanist Essays*.

Because Marx's concept of revolution is the warp and woof, the bones and sinews, the heart and soul, not alone of the revolutions of his age but of ours, we have re-examined all the 20th century revolutions—beginning with 1905 and stretching to the Iranian Revolution of 1979. It is because Rosa Luxemburg, *Women's Liberation*, and Marx's *Philosophy of Revolution*, encompasses both Marx's concept and those objective revolutionary developments, that it casts a special illumination not only on our specific tasks but the urgent mass needs to make the Idea of Freedom a reality.

—THE RESIDENT EDITORIAL BOARD
Detroit, Mich.
July 14, 1981