

5 2 3 6

THE POLITICAL-PHILOSOPHIC LETTERS OF RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

News & Letters, 2832 E. Grand Blvd., Rm. 316
Detroit, MI 48211
Price: 50c

Letter #5

July, 1976

TWO SUMMITS: THE U.S. CALLS "WESTERN" SUMMIT IN NEO-COLONIAL
PUERTO RICO AND RUSSIA CALLS ONE IN ITS EAST GERMAN SATELLITE

Dear Friends,

By sheer accident, the two poles of supposedly two different worlds--U.S. and Russia--met, one right after the other, the last week in June. By no accident whatever, the conclusions these two unconnected summits reached were of the same class nature: national state-capitalisms with global reach, wracked by class struggles at home and economic-political crises abroad, vying for single world mastery at the expense of the proletariat in each country and the broad masses of the technologically underdeveloped lands.

Because President Ford's call was so blatantly low-level election politics, when he is struggling not to get unseated even before the election by his own Republican Party by one Reagan even further to the Right than he, the press has paid little attention to the summit of the seven nations that control two-thirds of the world's production--the U.S., West Germany, Japan, France, Italy, Britain, and Canada. And because, ever since the Sino-Soviet conflict reached the no-holds-barred stage in the mid-1960s, no world conference of state-capitalist societies calling themselves Communist could be held, Brezhnev's "success" in getting the Eurocommunist nations to meet after some three years of maneuverings was covered lavishly only to the extent that Brezhnev "had to" compromise on "independent" roads to state power.

In truth, each of the "summits" was important for very opposite reasons for which they gained attention. In the case of the U.S. imperialist conference, the summit revealed that the "West" (which in-

5236

cludes Japan!) is in such deep crisis on native grounds that no international "unity" was possible. In the case of Russia, the West European CPs' independence of Moscow not only did not signify an independent revolutionary perspective, but was further compounded by the pretense that they thoroughly voided the "Brezhnev Doctrine" which excused the invasion of Czechoslovakia. Not only have these Parties no power to stop Brezhnev from repeating such counter-revolutionary acts in East Europe; they don't want to.

They are too busy reaching for state power with existing capitalisms in their own lands, be it via collaborating with the SP, as in France, or with the most reactionary Christian Democratic Party, as in Italy. In a word, they gave proof of the class collaborationism that has always characterized Stalinism, national and international, including its Maoist variety.

Where there was likeness between the summits, "West" and "East" (and this includes the East that wasn't there--China), it was in the capitalistic way to try to get out of the "economic crisis on the backs of the working masses via "wage restraints," that is to say, unpaid hours of labor. It is this class nature of both summits which makes it necessary to take a closer look at those conferences which "planned" to soften, but in fact exacerbated, the world crises.

* * * * *

Under the banner "Yankee Go Home!", the Socialist Party of Puerto Rico held a rally. The 15,000 Puerto Ricans who demonstrated against Ford may not have been seen by Ford. After all, security was so tight that the Governor of Puerto Rico, Rafael Hernandez Colon, could barely get in "to welcome" the President who had not bothered to invite him to the "summit." But while Ford didn't see the thousands who demonstrated, he knew of the millions throughout the Caribbean who wanted to shed the U.S. imperialist stranglehold. He no sooner got off the plane than he lashed out against Cuba:

"Those who might be inclined to interfere in our freely deter-

mined (sic) (1) relations should know that such an act will be considered as intervention in the domestic affairs of Puerto Rico and the United States; it will be an unfriendly act which will be resisted by appropriate means." Thus he was setting the stage not just for the summit on the "West" but for the UN, where Cuba may reintroduce the Resolution on Decolonization and for "the recognition of the National Liberation Movement of Puerto Rico" that Cuba had introduced last year.

When the following day, June 27, the two-day conference opened and the invitees--Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, President d'Estaing, Prime Ministers James Callaghan, Aldo Moro, Takeo Miki and Trudeau--got down to facing reality, it was clear that the economic recession was continuing on a world scale, that high unemployment was unconscionable, and the higher inflation and falling pound and runaway lira would hardly be "solved" at this conference of "industrial nations in search of unity."

Thus, none agreed with Treasury Secretary William E. Simon that production must be "slowed" so that inflation be "lowered" even if that means "unemployment remains high"--between 7% to 9% "average" and in fact between 10-12%! Canada could show that though they had instituted hard wage controls, inflation rose to 8.9%. West Germany, which has the lowest inflation rate in Europe, had to point to the fact that unemployment was just too high for nations to turn away from that most critical of all "issues." As Prime Minister Callaghan put it at the end of the summit, "Because of differing backgrounds and social traditions, each of us is going our own way."

Which doesn't mean that all didn't agree that millions will remain unemployed now that unemployment has become a permanent feature of capitalism in its automated stage. (2) It only means that each capitalist nation will present it differently, as a "temporary" phenomenon, and none will be as openly unconcerned and obtuse as well as brutal as Treasury Secretary William E. Simon. All showed great admiration for Britain's Labor Party getting organized labor to agree to a maximum raise of 4.5% although inflation was no less than 18%! Thereby inflation is supposed to

5 2 3 7

have been brought down 2%, and this means inflation remains over 3 times as high as wages were allowed to rise. This "labor strategy" caused as much sympathy as the fear of Italy's CDP's fall to the CP's electoral successes.

The wealthier industrialized nations came up with a single agreement: establishment of a multinational financial aid package to bail out both the CDP in Italy and the Labor Party in Great Britain.

Outside the unity to save private capitalism when it is threatened with total collapse, the nations could agree neither on what to do with production, nor with inflation; not on unemployment, nor even on "flooding" international trade. Thus, while individually each spoke about not letting export surplus grow where it endangers national trade balances, none dared put any pressure on Japan not to let its export surplus grow. That serious point of imbalance for the Western industrialized nations was by-passed as each continued to talk of "unity."

In entered Secretary of State Kissinger⁽³⁾ who, the previous week, had once again tried reshaping the Atlantic Alliance. This time the tone--only the tone--was different. Instead of the imperial politics stance of "The Year of Europe" as spelled out by Pax Americana, Kissinger acted the elder statesman-professor, speaking globally about "the whole West." In the last four years, he pointed out, East-West trade had grown no less than 400%. Surely the West should "benefit" from that, have a single, unified policy, and, above all, see that the poor nations do not "saddle the world" with a "system of commodity cartels." The latter point is all that was agreed on, but the "unity" broke down when the talk was on anything except against the impoverished nations. But when it comes to oil and OPEC, d'Estaing reiterated what he had done ever since the 1973 Middle East war and the quadrupling of oil prices--that he had a "special relationship" with the Arab world and that was best suited to his "nation."

* * * * *

Just such capitalistic nationalism also pervaded that other sum-

mit in East Berlin over the following two days, June 29-30. The Western press, which had played down the narrow nationalisms in the West, concentrating instead on the "interdependence of the Atlantic Alliance," began glowingly to describe the nationalism of the West European CPs and Tito's as the very apex of "creativity," "independence," and such total disintegration of Russian monolithism that the European CP summitry signifies "probably the last of its kind." (4)

The "West" gloats too soon and too unheedingly. There is no doubt that Russian monolithism, where it has no state power and armed forces to support it, had no magnetism for national CPs as we showed in the last Letter on West European CPs and the new stage of state-capitalist crises. There is nothing new in the nationalism within that world which calls itself Communism ever since Stalinism caused Russia's transformation from a workers' state into a state-capitalist society. What is new in the present summit is Brezhnev's presence and Tito's and the dissident CPs and the class similarity of all with the rulers of the West. Let us listen to what came out of their mouths (5) instead of the Western interpreters' pens.

Thus, why not, in playing up Tito's demand for and getting "equality and sovereign independence of each party," stress the reason he demands revisionism in Marxism: "Time brings new demands in line with the growth of productive forces..." And in this attempt to reduce workers' control of production to "growth of productive forces," none--neither the CP dissidents nor even the Western "futurologists"--can exceed the Russians. (6)

"The progress of science, technology, and production constantly places people in situations which require a ramified and at the same time efficient managerial apparatus and constant flexible intervention in the affairs of society." Out of such "leaps in science" Russia saw nothing short of "The monotonous and formalized mechanical actions can be left entirely to machines and the searching, heuristic creative activity to man." (7)

One hundred thirty years ago, Marx declared, as he first battled political economy when it still was a science and yet could not penetrate

the class contradictions so that it blamed the exploitative conditions of labor only on "feudal blemishes" which would disappear with industrial revolution: "For them there was history, but history is no more." The continuing reality of the class struggles--not productive forces but production relations, exploitative production relations--is what will bring down their system and their capitalistic class ideologies.

Take Carrillo's "bravery" in saying, "Communism has lost the character of a Church with a Pope...We will not return to the structures and concepts of internationalism that prevailed in the past..." Why not ask him about the role of the Spanish CP in undermining the 1937 Spanish Revolution? There is no doubt that the most treacherous Mr. Moneybags, Chief Arms Salesman, as well as Chief International Communist Ideologue was Stalin, and his policies led to the destruction of the Revolution and paved the way for fascism's victory. But the Spanish CP which was likewise overcome in that holocaust lost, not because of any "concepts of internationalism," but its own class-collaborationism.

The Popular Frontism that Carrillo is expounding now is a repeat of what brought Republican Spain down. The West is so busy playing up all Carrillo says on "pluralism" that none stop to ask--and indeed, why should they be interested in asking, since they too fear proletarian revolutionaries?--whether "pluralism" would indeed include, not just class-collaborationists, but genuine revolutionaries whom the Spanish CP helped destroy, from the Anarchists who were the mass movement to the small Trotskyist grouping, from the minority indigenous FOUMists to the revolutionary masses who laid their lives down in the great Spanish Revolution.

And why not ask Tito himself, who was Stalin's man in Spain and helped murder Trotskyists? Did that change when he returned to Yugoslavia, did lead a national revolution, and gained state power? Or when he did break with Stalin? Despite that Single State Party which remained untouched in 1948, the Left was so elated at that historic first national break with Stalinism that illusions abounded, among Trotskyists especially, that it was the beginning of the end of Stalinism. In fact, it remained a narrow-

ly nationalistic departure so that the break with Stalinism as a foreign ruler changed nothing fundamental in the capital/labor relationship within Yugoslavia. Indeed, by then--the end of World War II--it was clear that Stalinism was but the Russian name of the world stage of state-capitalism which had learned to statify, to plan, to do anything and everything, "mixed" or "pure," to save capitalism, once in its private form it had met its end in the Depression.

And now what the Yugoslav workers would really like to know is how they win freedom from his exploitative rule, with Tito's vainglorious "We have opposed and will continue to oppose all forms of interference in the internal affairs of other countries." It is the "internal affairs," precisely--both its exploitation and bureaucratization--that they oppose.

If we turn from Communist Parties that do have state power, whether, like Tito, separated from Russia, or the East Europeans who dared genuinely to revolt against totalitarianism, but now, by machine-gun strength, are there to support Brezhnev's "internationalism," and turn once again to those who do not hold state power, it is just as clear that their "pluralism" is less than paper-thin. Take Berlinguer, who had become another favorite with the "West" when he declared, "there is not and cannot be any leading party or state." And, again, when he lashed out against "arbitrary labelling as revisionist...of every position that differs from one's own." But what about the total revisionism of revolutionary Marxism which he, along with all other "Communisms," has achieved, not only theoretically as he expels dissidents within his party, but as he practices to save capitalism while urging wage restraints on the Italian workers?

None outdoes Marchais when it comes to narrow nationalism and his calling it "Socialism in French colors." The fact that he expressed his anti-Germanism as anti-West Germany cannot hide the national reality he disclaims against, any more than d'Estaing's very nearly "loving" collaboration with Helmut Schmidt can cover up his anti-Germanism as he searches for a stronger alliance with Great Britain to counter-balance Germany, and makes sure that never again should Germany, East or West, become the key to Europe. (e)

The narrow nationalisms within each of the summits, and the class similarity between the summits, can in no way resolve any of the economic-political-ideological conflicts. The totality of the world crisis demands a total uprooting of both systems and only social revolutions can achieve such a transformation of human relations.

Raya Dunayevskaya
Detroit, Michigan

- (1) What must be most galling to the people of Puerto Rico, after a half-century of full colonial oppression and a quarter of a century of so-called commonwealth status, is to hear the imperial President of the richest land in the world speak of "freely determined relations" when even at this point, when Puerto Rico is in the deepest crisis, with a full fifth of the nation unemployed, Ford has kept mum on even that minimum bill that could at least aid trade but which he had kept bottled up: "Compact of Permanent Union Between Puerto Rico and the United States."
- (2) It isn't only the reactionary Simon that is being criticized in the corridors of even this elitist summit. One--I believe Helmut Schmidt was the unidentified source--was heard to say that even the liberal Democratic Party Humphrey-Hawkins Bill for so-called full employment with a goal of only 3% unemployment of "adult labor force" actually spells out 4.5%.
- (3) Since the reporters too were not allowed to listen to any of the speeches, and had to depend on "brief summaries" by such as Simon and Kissinger, there is no way to know what was going on behind closed doors. But it is a good guess that Henry Kissinger who had been trying to act the elder statesman these days in Europe, especially in his "scholarly" speech to Strategic Studies in London on June 25, 1976, prevailed here too. Part of the speech was reported in the Christian Science Monitor, 6/28/76. See also US News & World Report, 7/12/76, for its editorial: "Two Summits: The Real Significance."
- (4) See Hella Pick in Manchester Guardian, 7/11/76, both her report on the East Berlin Conference, "Three Ways to European Communism," and "Soviet Union Bows to the Tito Doctrine."
- (5) The New York Times, 6/30/76, carried substantial excerpts of Brezhnev's talk, and the 7/1/76 issue carried both the official Conference Document and excerpts from individual presentations of Tito, Marchais, Berlinguer, and Carrillo. It also carried a series of articles by the head of their Paris Bureau, Flora Lewis, who has obviously also gotten a new title regarding her specialization on "ideological" themes. She has lengthy articles both as the conference was in progress and in the 7/1 and 7/4 issues which carry elaborate analyses. All they show, however, is that she still has a lot to learn on "ideology," by no means restricted to the error in date--1912 in place of 1903--as the origin of the "word," Bolshevism. The documents themselves are valuable and, among other things, we must remember for the ramifications of this summitry both Brezhnev's reference to "Nine years ago representatives of many fraternal parts in both of our continents drew up together...", and Carrillo's use of a word that is a favorite with Mao--"hegemonism."

(6) Voprosy Filosofii #8 (Problems of Philosophy), 1972.

(7) Survey, Autumn 1975, carries an interesting study of what Western ideologues call "Post-Industrial Society, East and West" by Robbin Laird. The laughter, however, that the West expressed against Russian "conceptualization" when those Russians talk of "dialectical essence" (which indeed has nothing to do with Marxian dialectics) bears a remarkable resemblance to what the Western "futurologists" do. Read how the Russians conceive of "the gigantic leap forward in production forces" transforming work, leaving mechanical action "entirely to machines and the searching, heuristic creative activity to man" and compare to almost any work by Daniel Bell on "futurology" and see for yourself.

(8) See Manchester Guardian, 6/27/76: "Giscard Seeks British to Balance Germany" by Walter Schwartz.

* * * * *