

National Chairwoman's Perspectives
Report to Convention of News and
Letters Committees, Sept. 4, 1976

Perspectives 1976-1977

PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION IN
TODAY'S GLOBAL FREEDOM STRUGGLES

by
RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

- I. AZIKWELWAG: New Stage of Black Revolutionary Consciousness, Precursor of Global Struggles to Uproot this Decadent, Crises-ridden, State-capitalist, Imperialist World
- II. Crises on Home Grounds
- III. Imperial U.S., the "Non-Aligned Countries", and "Peaceful Co-existence"
 - 1) The Colombo Sparring, or the Non-Event
 - 2) Peaceful Co-existence, Chinese Style
 - 3) Once again, the Middle East -- this time and France, and the UN, and the "Law of the Sea"
- IV. Creation of a Philosophic Nucleum is not just an Organizational Task, but the Pressing Need for Ongoing Revolutions and Revolutions-to-be

POST-CONVENTION BULLETIN NO. I

SEPTEMBER 1976

NEWS & LETTERS

1900 E. JEFFERSON

DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48207

PRICE: 50c

Perspectives Report to News and Letters Committees Convention
by Raya Dunayevskaya, National Chairwoman

PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION IN TODAY'S GLOBAL FREEDOM STRUGGLES

I. AZIKWELWAO: New Stage of Black Revolutionary Consciousness, Precursor
of Global Struggles to Uproot This Decadent, Crises-Ridden,
State-Capitalist, Imperialist World

AZIKWELWAO: "We will not ride." Like Montgomery, Ala., which began its
march to freedom with a bus boycott, Black South Africans embarked on a new
phase of their struggle against apartheid South Africa with the simple word,
AZIKWELWAO: "We will not ride."

What was new in this stage of struggle and what distinguishes the times--
1976 as against 1955--is the maturity of the age. The dialectic of liberation's
first act, two months back, was the opposition to the very language of the op-
pressors: Afrikaans, the hybrid of the Dutch oppressors' claim to be "Africans."

Black African youth having won that fight (after 200 lay dead), a lull
appeared. In a few weeks, however, the phoenix rose from the ashes and hit in
the most vital place of all for the white economy: production. It is run by
Black labor. It cannot function without it. A three-day general strike was
declared.

Once again, the youth became the spark-plugs, putting up the blockades
at bus and railroad stations. Black workers did not ride to Johannesburg.
Neither age, nor sex, acted as divisive point. Even when the bloody govern-
ment succeeded in instigating some Zulu vigilantes to help them wield the
whip of the counter-revolution, the rulers heard from the factory owners, shop
managers, and even homes: "absenteeism," they reported, was no less than 80%.

We cannot know how many retreats will be forced upon them. We do know
the joy the rebellion has released. Listen to one Colored (as those of mixed
race are designated in apartheid South Africa), Pabel Hendricks, the president
of the Methodist Church, speak:

"Have you seen their faces? This is something I think the whites

don't realize. When they (the Blacks) give that (clenched-fist) salute, the look on their faces is joy. They have human dignity for the first time in years. Have you noticed? Only when someone is getting hit or dragged away does it change. But now they are happy."

Joy does not make the protest movement a revolution. That, however, was not all. Not only was it also spontaneous mass activity, but it had leadership--not elitist--and from much deeper layers. Listen again: "No sooner were leaders arrested, than others stepped in and carried on." From below, ever-new leaders emerged.

* * * * *

I have started with Soweto rather than either with the economy--the "objective" situation--or an outright revolution, in order to show just how politically-philosophically mature our crisis-ridden age is.

Here is a "local" situation in far-off South Africa, that totally racist, most vicious, and mightiest military-capitalist bastion that is keeping a whole continent so tightly in its iron fist, that even the revolutions of the 1960s that have reshaped the political face of West, East and North Africa, will remain but half-way houses until that, just that one, is rooted off the face of the earth.

And yet that "local" situation not only shook up those rulers (and not without tipping the scale against the super-diplomat, Henry Kissinger, embracing Vorster in a tightrope walk as his forked-tongue dares speak of "Black majority rule"). It also unfolds a banner for freedom and fires the imagination of all the world's revolutionaries. It allows for no separation between philosophy and revolution.

Therefore, instead of presenting this Report in two separate parts of "Objective" and "Subjective"; or needing to go back to 1953 (when our new epoch of Marxist-Humanist revolutions in East Europe began); or staying in 1968, where the turbulent 1960s of Black revolutions, the anti-Vietnam war movement, and youth revolts reached their climax in May in France, we can at once proceed

to the headlines of the two short months since the writing of the Draft Perspectives, as well as the convening of this gathering. This type of politicalization is the concretization of philosophy that is inseparable from the need to create a philosophic nucleus. That is to say, the organizational tasks set forth in the Perspectives are there to meet the objective needs.

What becomes imperative is that we hold on, as a unit, to philosophy-revolution, nationally-internationally, objectively-subjectively. It was no accident that 1953 was both the year of the first revolt from under Russian Communist totalitarianism and our breakthrough on the Absolute Idea as a movement from practice to theory and a new society. (Indeed, as we know, the latter--the philosophic breakthrough--preceded the actual East German Revolt by some weeks.)

It is no accident that the 1960s couldn't catch theory "en route," and had to go in for some deep philosophic diggings in the 1970s. Philosophy and Revolution isn't just the title of a book. It is the imperative of the on-going revolutions, and those to be.

After the totally ghoul'ish Christian Right destruction of Tal Zaatar,* two American Embassy officials (Robert Houghton and David Mark), took a most circuitous route to get safely to the Christian port of Junieh to meet with those same neo-fascist leaders, plus Sarkis, the so-called newly-elected (with the Left's aid!) President.

Those four days of talks--Aug.20-24--^{have} may very well/not only once juggled again nationalism along its narrowest bypaths, but also been ordered by U.S. imperialism to lay ground for global confrontation between the actual two nuclear giants--U.S. and Russia--for a time of its (U.S. imperialism's) choosing.

So obsessed, however, is Jumblatt with Israeli power that (Arafat-inspired or otherwise) he speaks of that nuclear Goliath, U.S. imperialism, as "subordinate to Israeli interests." Here is what he told a news conference: "All the U.S. is interested in where the Lebanese crisis is concerned is to

* We are not going into detail on the civil war here in Lebanon only because we have already analyzed it in Political-Philosophic Letter #6 (August, 1976), which is to be considered as integral to this Report.

serve Israel's interests." As if the tail wagging the dog weren't a sufficiently shaggy story, he then adds the magic word that it is all a "conspiracy."

Descending to the realm of conspiracies can hardly disclose the real source--the class nature, the irreconcilable class contradictions between exploiter and exploited which produced the civil war in Lebanon. It also revealed the difference between the dialectics of national liberation struggles, and the narrow nationalism which led to the illusion of Syria's role. It was, after all, Arafat who cleared the road for Syria's army's entry into Lebanon while declaiming to the UN about "Israeli aggression." Finally, like all declarations about "Enemy No. 1," it allows for the embrace of the class enemy, even as Mao's China's declaration that Russia is "Enemy No. 1" allows for both class collaborationism at home and a possible unholy alliance with U.S. imperialism. (See Political-Philosophic Letter #1 on UN Resolution on Zionism.)

The class enemy is always at home, and for American revolutionaries, it is of the essence that we turn to look at it here, and thereby we will also see the myriad crises that beset it abroad as it reaches out globally for the American.

* * * * *

II. Crises on Home Grounds

All the hoopla, and not only at the Republican convention, but in the daily press, about the "economic recovery" notwithstanding, the depth of the economic recession seems very nearly bottomless.

Thus, unemployment has become a permanent feature of automated capitalism. Not only does it stay at this unconscionable "average" 8% which is actually above 10% in all industrial centers--in Detroit it is 13%--and it is twice that among Blacks, but even when the contenders for Administration--the other of the Tweedledee-Tweedledum major capitalistic parties--try to serve up utopia and promise "to end unemployment," the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill shows that actually what they will call "full employment" will be 4.3% unemployed!

-5-

Thus, racism, that Achilles heel of benighted USA since birth, is so blatantly instigated directly from the White House, that not only is there retrogression even in so-called education in defiance of the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision, but we have seen the rise of both the Nazis and the KKK, and not only in the South, as Chicago and Boston have shown. Because Black Revolution has ever been continuous, fall and winter this year promise to be hotter than summer.

Thus, the retreat on every aspect--busing, abortion, public housing, the ERA, gun control--is not just characteristic of the lunatic American Independent Party, but underlies all the platforms, even when it seems to be limited to the question of abortion, as is evident by the anti-abortionists who dare call their conspiracy "Right to Life." It is Rightist opposition, even to the Supreme Court, who donated money to Dole's campaign.

Thus, the vigilante attitude toward Youth. The police crack-down on "youth gangs" is in fact the attempt to keep militant youth out of sight and activity. To keep this live proof of the impotence of the system to provide any quality of life out of sight, we get the rancid, beefed-up police force everywhere. It certainly has emptied downtown of people--raised fear to a pitch where no one dares look at a stranger.

Beefing up the police can no more hide the true source of total breakdown of this society--unemployment, racism, sexism--than can elimination of statistics on unemployment among youth when it hit 50%! How can you hide whole generations that never see employment? These are born on relief and remain there!

What we need to do now is to take a further look into the economy, to measure the depth of the recession, not for statistical purposes, but for the relationship of dialectics of liberation to economic ills. Let's begin with their--capitalists', and therefore, the government's--bright spot. The one thing that truly gladdens their hearts and souls--and narrows their vision--are profits, super-profits; or, as Business Week (8-16-76) puts it, "stunning increases in profits," in any case, for the first quarter of 1976.

Where inflation has hardly gotten out of the double-digit variety

5701

(though you couldn't prove it in the daily bread-basket of the common people), there has been nothing short of triple-digit increases in profits in the biggest corporations! Based on a survey of the nation's largest corporations in 48 key industries, Investors Management Sciences Inc. reports the glad tidings and proves it by showing that even the airlines are into the black for the first time in many quarters, with Eastern zooming up nearly 500%. And the average--average--profit among auto companies--this at a time when GM has the gall to ask for a cutback in workers' benefits--is 200%.

What these statistics don't tell you is the way this has been achieved, for there has been a spectacular rise in labor productivity, not reflected in workers' wages. Unemployment has remained high, and this helps bring down the standard of living of all workers. Indeed, to make ends meet at all, there had to also be a spectacular rise in members of a family working. In a word, it takes two working--husband and wife--to be able to support a family.

We are so constantly fed the shibboleth of this being the richest country, and "therefore" the best of all possible worlds, that we get brainwashed to think it also applies to the workers. I have news for you. Not only is there no gold in the streets of America, the U.S. has become a cheap labor economy when compared to West Europe. While U.S. workers still head the list when we talk of straight wages, what West European workers get in fringe benefits actually makes those total labor costs higher. Also, the workers get four-week paid vacations.

Moreover, this is not in "democratic socialist countries" like Sweden, but Belgium and Italy and France. The latest Bureau of Labor statistics show that while fringe benefits in the U.S. add only 30% to basic wages, in Italy they amount to 88%, in Belgium 69%, in France 64%. West Germany and Canada are just behind the U.S. Add to that the fact that European workers get more paid holidays. And do you think that any can possibly not know it is an exploitative society who enter that hell-hole called a factory? Then there is unemployment. Along with this being a most exploitative system, its mode of production is so contradictory that it can never escape crises: that is the very nature of its being.

As Karl Marx said over 100 years ago, "The real barrier of capitalist production is capital itself." That is to say, since all it lives for is profits (unpaid hours of labor) and it can only get those from living labor; yet mass production

means more and more dead labor, i.e., machines, there just is no way to escape the "General Law of Capitalist Accumulation"--on the one hand, an unemployed army; on the other hand, an ever greater number of machines. Thus, there is a discrepancy--a large one--between the capitalists' total invested capital and the total return of unpaid working hours from an ever, relatively smaller army of employed living labor.

Now, whether you call it, as Marxists do, a decline in the rate of profit, no matter how lush the mass; or, use the expression bourgeois economists do--the "law of diminishing returns"--it is a fact that neither (least of all the capitalist himself) can escape. The way the capitalists try to escape is to see that real wages do not rise as much as labor productivity rises with the introduction of machinery, automation especially. The capitalists also devise ways of getting profits back indirectly, through inflation. They get retrieved only when the inflation also hits them. Thirdly, and most importantly, is the creation of an unemployed army to force down the standard of living. Thus, we need to work to make ends meet in a family.

The new in this recession, especially at its height, or rather depth, in 1975--and that is what makes it no ordinary recession, but a real turning point--is that, as against Nixon's planned recession when for the first time we had inflation and unemployment, wage controls and Arthur Burns' tight fiscal control aiming at a slow-down of economic growth, now the crisis itself had created conditions for profitable production. That is to say, with the standard of living forced sufficiently down, and productivity way up, the capitalists decided to raise investments, and now they wish to make sure the strikes will not upset their new unconscionable profits.

And just as radical economists have finally learned that "planning" isn't socialism, so professional bourgeois economists keep repeating that, after all, even Marx never said there would be an automatic economic collapse. The general contradiction of the capitalist mode of production has its counter-acting tendencies. Thus, they whistle in the bright sunshine of this quarter's profits, conveniently forgetting the second part of that sentence about no automatic collapse of capitalism, which reads: since capitalism also produces its grave-diggers--the proletariat--they will be sure to bring it down. Not only will

workers not stand for this lowering of their living standards and permanent unemployment, but since the government's political crises are as sharp as the economic ones are, the masses will take to the streets rather than only to the ballot box.

That the workers will not forever tolerate their conditions of labor is clear from the massive strikes, official and unofficial, that are constantly besetting industries. Nor will the mass discontent go away with the end of the elections. On the contrary. The crises will first then heighten as it becomes clear that no fundamental change will be undertaken by the new Administration. The recently concluded general wildcat strike among miners against both management and labor leadership was directed also at the government. It is a portent of things to come before and after Nov. 2.

* * * * *

III. Imperial U.S., the Non-Aligned Countries, and Peaceful Co-Existence

Except that each wanted personally to be President, the total hypocrisy and fakery in the contest between Conservative Ford and still further-to-the-right Reagan was seen nowhere more clearly than Ford deciding not to contest the Reaganite platform, while the latter agreed not to name Panama in as blatant a naked, 19th-century imperialist manner as characterized his speeches.

U.S. imperialism has, after all, never had any intention of letting go of this enclave ever since it was expropriated "in perpetuity" in 1903, and now its per capita investment there is the highest anywhere in Latin America. Moreover, the figures of per capita investment--\$93 in Panama as against \$50 average in Latin America--is likewise a fake. The reason for being of Pax Americana is not Panama in general, but very specifically the Canal Zone. And if this is added to the per capita U.S. investment there, it zooms astronomically to \$5,680!

The Panamanian peoples' revolts against U.S. imperialism have always been brutally put down, even where, as in 1959, all the Panamanian students wanted was to put up their own Panamanian flag. The current state of unrest is, how-

ever, so great that Kissinger-Ford have talked of removing that thoroughly detestable, old imperialist, slave phrase: "in perpetuity." And not only will the UN present some sort of mealy-mouthed resolution on the question, but what is a great deal more worrisome to U.S. capitalism, the Panamanian masses' constant struggle also with their own government, which is not pushing for freedom, may result in a guerrilla movement.

Just how alike Ford and Reagan are imperialistically we saw more clearly still when no question of electioneering was involved; the country was not neo-colonialized Panama, but "Commonwealth" Puerto Rico. It is there Ford met West European and Japanese rulers in a summit to which, however, the host country was not invited. The very first words out of Ford's mouth as he landed were a blast at Cuba, which intends to introduce into the UN the "Resolution on Decolonization and Recognition of the National Liberation Movement of Puerto Rico." Ford warned that intervention in the domestic affairs in Puerto Rico would be "resisted" by the U.S. "by appropriate means."

Nor is it only a question of Latin America which U.S. imperialism, ever since the Monroe Doctrine in 1820, holds to be its "sphere of influence," that is to say, imperialist domain. As we saw this year, there is no place on earth where this nuclear Goliath's reach doesn't extend, from elections in Italy where Kissinger warned that the U.S. would "not tolerate" inclusion of Communists in the Cabinet; or South Africa, where both investment and political affinity hold; or Portugal, where in disregarding social revolution, NATO considers it its enclave; or at the present secret and not-so-secret dealings with the Christian Right in Lebanon, to which on Sept. 1 those two U.S. Embassy officials returned for still further talks.

It isn't that Carter, should he win, will change that imperial hand, just because the name changes for both President and Secretary of State. It is that the absence of a revolutionary opposition powerful enough to challenge the powers-that-be (at the very time when they are in political disarray and beset by the totality of a world economic crisis) makes room for all sorts of pseudo-alternatives.

And while the other nuclear Goliath either gloated or waited for the charade to end so that the two superpowers can get down to "real business"--- either

for another detente in the Middle East, or the ground for the final confrontation--the so-called self-designated non-aligned countries met in Colombo.

* * * * *

(1) The Colombo Sparrings, or the Non-Event

Although, geographically, the 85 countries in attendance covered almost all the southern half of the world, spreading across South America and Africa, through the Arabian peninsula, it was a non-event. It could not have been otherwise since, by now (21 years after its original founding in Bandung in 1955), these lesser powers do indeed match the Big Powers in the number and depth of nationalist contradictions.* Clearly, they could hardly have moved unanimously on any subject, even on the very question of their very reason for being: anti-colonialism.

Thus, none dared move against one of "their own"--Indonesia--though clearly, brutally, it had invaded East Timor fighting for its independence. Needless to say, Prime Minister Bandaranaike, who hosted the conference, didn't find a moment, as supposed National and Women's Liberationist, to remember Rosa "Muki" Bonaparte, Secretary of the Popular Organization of Timorese Women, who was killed Dec. 7, 1975, by the Indonesian troops invading Dili. Let me read you part of her last statement:

"The ideology of a system in which women are considered as 'inferior beings' submitted Timorese women to a double exploitation: A general form, which applies without distinction to both men and women and which manifests itself by forced labor, starvation salaries, racism, etc...Another form of a specific character, directed to women in particular. By separating them from their husbands through forced labor, by depriving them of the means of sustenance for home and children, colonialism has thus created conditions which force women to sell their bodies into prostitution.

As the total destruction of all forms of exploitation is an objective of our revolution, led by Fretilin...the front has adopted a fighting

* Let me just read you some of those who attended: Assad, Sadat, and Qaddafi; the King of Nepal, Cuba, and instant totalitarianism--Indira Gandhi's India; Foreign Minister S. Rajarathnam of Singapore, Nakarios, and Bandaranaike, not to mention such other "non-aligned" like North Korea!

-11-

strategy to restore to women the position and rights due to them in the new society which we are building through revolution...

...the militant women of OFMT reinforce their political consciousness through classes in revolutionary theory and practice, and develop their efforts in the direction of the final objectives of the revolution, the revolution of the Mau Beré people of East Timor.

Long live the Popular Organization of Timorese Women!
Long live the Revolutionary Front for an Independent East Timor!...
Long live the world revolution!"

There was a lot of anti-colonialist talk directed against "the West," especially the U.S., but even here it was only talk. And the declaration that the Indian Ocean be a "peace zone" was again a non-event, since nothing was said about "one of their own," India, already having the nuclear bomb. Finally, what was supposed to climax the conference--a variation of nothing short of a "New Economic Order"--ended up just calling for the establishment of a Bank for the Third World!

The press coverage of the conference, in focusing on "Non-Aligned Nations: Have Come a Long Way Since Bandung," has stressed how they were but 29 in 1955, and are now 85; how more powerful and "recognized" they are; and how, since colonialism has very nearly been "eliminated," they can shift to economic issues, where they do have clout, as witness the OPEC's success in quadrupling oil prices. As their power is now the majority at the UN, they can demand a totally new relationship between industrialized and the non-industrialized world: a "New Economic Order."

Naturally, the bourgeois press does not call the UN a "thieves kitchen" (the name Lenin hung on the old League of Nations), as this world body of rulers is, and their quantitative descriptions avoid facing qualitative transformations. The real questions, however, will not go away. How could the near-revolutionary vision of Bandung, 1955, become the non-event in Colombo, 1976? How could a challenge to imperialism be reduced to plans for the establishment of a bank? Isn't that a transformation into opposites?

* * * * *

(2) Peaceful Co-Existence, Chinese-Style

Consider: Chou En-lai, Nehru, and along came Sukarno, collaborated on the

-12-

"Five Principles of Peaceful Co-Existence." Though Mao has designated "peaceful co-existence" as "Russian revisionism," it was he, in fact, who came out with it first as a way to get into new company, away from total Russian dependence, and a way to promote his original philosophy of national existence superceding strict class divisions. Thus, from the start, to get the Arab nations to attend, Mao agreed to excluding Israel.

By the time--a whole decade afterward--Russia was designated as Enemy No. 1, Mao and Sukarno aimed not just at non-alignment of some, but a global Third axis, apart from both Russia and its satellites, as well as the U.S. and its. Sukarno quit the UN; Djakarta-Peking was to be the new world center. Before, however, that could be consummated, the bloodiest counter-revolution ever removed Sukarno and broke relations with China. It is that totally different regime that now rules. Nevertheless, Indonesia is considered a "founder" nation--exactly on what principles is not explained. The noose was not around it, or Colombo; it was around East Timorese liberation. To avoid Indonesia's walking out, no resolution was passed against its invasion of East Timor!

* * * * *

(3) Once Again, the Middle-East--This Time and France, and the UN, and the Law of the Sea

One tragic-comic--or perhaps this time we better just call it comic--occurrence outside the conference can illuminate some untalked-about essences. France having been singled out for condemnation for its sale of a nuclear power station to South Africa, France's Foreign Minister Jean Sauvagnargues had Reuters distribute a statement for it before the non-aligned leaders left Colombo. The significant passage in the denial that such a sale would "increase South Africa's military potential" reads:

"It appears difficult to imagine that the oil producing states could give effect to a recommendation that is so without justification and so manifestly in opposition to actions undertaken, largely at France's initiative, aimed at introducing more equity into international political and economic relations."* (Christian Science Monitor, 8-23-76)

* Very obviously he won, because the Arabs then said that they signed it only as a last resort "if France did not change her ways." (Manchester Guardian, 8-29-76) It is not to be buttressed by any boycott or other anti-France actions now!

5708

The single fact (and that, too, is a half-truth)--the reference to "introducing equity into international political and economic relations"--is France's view of its actions in the Arab-Israeli War, 1973, "independently of the U.S." and "Zionism" on the question of the Arab boycott and quadrupling of oil prices. Naturally, this led to the very special esteem in which France was held by the Arab countries at the 1973 conference of the non-aligned nations in Algiers. And they succeeded in stopping the Asian delegates' attempt at getting France condemned for its nuclear testing in the Pacific.

It is true also, and that as recently as Ford's summit in Puerto Rico at the end of June, when Kissinger pontificated on the idea that the industrialized nations must not allow the underdeveloped countries "to saddle the world with a system of commodity cartels," that Giscard said yes, but when it comes to the Middle East situation and quadrupling of oil prices, France had worked out "a special relationship" with the Arab world that was best suited to his nation.

If Giscard was fairly crying at the 1975 "non-aligned" conference's ingratitude, think of the Arab oil nations when they saw what their oil money wrought within the Middle East itself. Thus, despite those spectacular oil prices which, by 1974-76, brought them no less than \$146 billion in surplus sales; despite the shaking up of the industrial nations' complacency; despite getting a lot of votes at the UN; and despite all they have done for their own lands, what confronts them at home--and how they fear a great deal more to come!--are undercurrents of such unrest that it led to the murder of the King of Saudi Arabia.

Anyone who thinks that they think it was only the act of an individual, and that since they practice such unanimity in rule that the kin of the student-murderer was the one to execute him; that therefore the Saudi Arabian rulers have no further discontent to worry about there, or elsewhere in the Middle East, ^{had better} take a second look at Lebanon. Here we see both the Arab oil kingdoms and Syria bring the Palestinians "down to size" even to the point of collaborating with the Christian Right! Ruling class solidarity--capitalism with or without feudal trappings--

* Re the "petro-macho" nations and UN votes, see "The Stones of Jerusalem," by Herbert Mitgang who quotes a young Israeli novelist, Amos Oz, as saying: "If someone introduced a resolution in the UN declaring that the earth was flat, it would pass by a two-thirds majority of the Arabs and the Third World bloc, with Franco abstaining." (New York Times, 8-19-76)

-14-

far supercedes religious divisions.*

The tragedy is that even the Left keeps mum when it comes to being tied perennially to a single issue, when it is end is not the issue--anti-Israel. At this moment, Russia has finally come out with a cautious critique of Syria, asking it to withdraw its army from Lebanon, so that as Pravda (8-29-76) puts it, the Arab world can "return to the struggle against Israel," and "Syria can cooperate with its natural allies in the anti-imperialist struggle." And that, of course, is the single and only issue on which Arab oil bankrolls the PLO. It cannot be the issue around which revolutionaries unite and open new roads to liberation and a new society.

Just take a look at what happened to Africa as it turned to align with the Arab world and dream dreams of wealth and power as oil and war, 1973, made OPEC rich and powerful. African countries which followed the Arab world from 1973 until 1976, voting on the Arab-sponsored "Zionism is racism" resolution, have thus far not seen even the \$200 million the Arab League had promised the OAU to deliver to the bank! Emboldened by the automatic majorities obtainable in the UN, which they delude themselves means ^{economic} power, they find with the latest drama still going on at the UN, on the "Law of the Sea," where economic and military power is--with the two super-powers: Russia and the U.S. These, the U.S. especially, and for that matter, other industrialized nations as well, are resisting implementing the "consent agreement" that the riches of the ocean are "the common heritage of mankind."

I cannot here go into this at any length. The point is that the maritime discussions--and they, too, began in 1973 when the developing nations did think that UN votes were power--would mean working out an agreement between the capitalistic-imperialistic ocean countries that are rich in capital and technology, and those not rich or landlocked, who likewise are entitled to some maritime privileges. The U.S. rejects proposed internationalization of seabed mining, especially as even now, without new discoveries, navigation fisheries, and offshore oil and gas fields annually yield almost \$100 billion in revenues. Henry Kissinger is on the way to the UN, allegedly to work out a compromise, but in fact

* And don't think it's only Saudi Arabia that is the most reactionary. Kuwait, which is listed as "radical," has suddenly suspended the 66-member National Assembly and applied a strictly restricted press law. The reason? 1) Worry about Lebanon's crisis spilling over to Kuwait, as witness the bombing of a Syrian airline office there and other terrorist activities. 2) 270,000 Palestinians live in the Persian Gulf area; 3) The newspaper Al Watar was suspended because it questioned the government's action.

5710

-15-

concluding: by the early 1980s, an entirely new industry involving billions, maybe even trillions, of dollars, may flourish--with or without the blessing of the UN or the "group of 77." (Christian Science Monitor, 9-1-76)

The world has never been in greater disarray outside of a world war.

* * * * *

IV. Creation of a Philosophic Nucleus is Not Just an Organizational Task, but the Pressing Need for Ongoing Revolution and Revolutions-To-Be

It is time to draw all threads together, especially since here there will be no "peaceful co-existence" of ideas, or, to use Hegel's expression, ideas that "come before consciousness without being in contact." Serious revolutionaries know that not only cannot Ideas of freedom co-exist with actual exploitation, racism and sexism. "Coming in contact" becomes a life-and-death struggle to release totally new dimensions, whether that be of class struggle, Black dimension, national liberation, Women's Liberation, and the Youth who will uproot a world they did not make, and create new human relations.

The self-determination of Ideas, as of struggles, knows that separation between "immediates" and "ultimates," put off for the "day after," dooms the revolutions the day before.

We haven't discussed the ongoing revolutions in Portugal and Angola; and how in Portugal it has to function under the whip of counter-revolution. As this still remains a focal point for revolutionaries the world over, let us first now refresh our memories with what we wrote in the Draft Perspectives, and then trace the latest developments:

"So varied were the new revolutionary forces--proletarian and peasant, youth and women liberationist, and even petty-bourgeois and literary--that what emerged in 1975 was a movement that was not only anti-fascist, but anti-capitalist, and not only Socialist and Communist, but independent of all existing state powers. What emerged, in a word, was a strong revolutionary current that was anti-Stalinist and anti-Nazist; what emerged was the perspective that the impossible was possible.

Thus, though Portugal was the most underdeveloped country in Western

5711

Europe, it had, at one and the same time, the greatest appreciation of African reality, working with the national liberation movements in Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Angola, and the most massive and active proletarian movement...

We have witnessed the birth of a whole new generation of revolutionaries--and in this case they are both old and young since the new relates to the new perspectives raised, and not to age--who are independent of both Socialist and Communist parties. This anti-Stalinist, anti-Maoist revolutionary Left--PRP, MES, LUAR--has raised questions against elitism and the "party to lead" concept, not because they do not appreciate the need of a revolutionary organization, but the party to lead has been a noose around the revolutionary movement that appreciates the need to work out new relations of theory to practice..."

Contrast the effectiveness of the spontaneous revolt of the students in Thailand, who succeeded in throwing out the old Prime Minister the minute he dared set foot in the country from which he had been expelled by that same mass youth revolt, with new Socialist Prime Minister Soares very nearly welcoming back the neo-fascist General Spinoza. That is one sure sign of how short-lived will this so-called socialist state's stay in power be.

Here we have a reactionary General who had been compelled to flee because of his complicity in the right-wing attempt to re-establish fascism after the first stage of the revolution he himself had "led," who seems nevertheless to feel at home. And no wonder: the Socialist Prime Minister had, after all, appointed as Defense Minister an outright right-winger, Lt. Col. Miguel, who was with Spinoza in Guinea-Bissau in 1970. Here is one who, while in exile, was busy with endless counter-revolutionary activities to stop the deepening revolution in his homeland in its tracks. Yet he now feels no fear of punishment from the rulers that emerged once the revolutionary struggle had been diverted into controlled parliamentary channels, now presided over by General Eanes.

What is far more telling of the retrogressive moves of the present government are the acts of its Prime Minister, a Socialist, taking responsibility for "disciplining labor," i.e., saddling it with a capitalistic austerity program. To them, the capitalists, he is promising free reign. The masses, however, are warned against further seizures of land or occupations of factories, or constituting Tenants' Commissions that would take the law into their own hands. To them, the workers, he closes all the avenues of self-development that had been released during the revolution. And so alike in capitalist mentality is the Communist Cunhal

-17-

with this Socialist Prime Minister, that after a mild, very mild criticism, he assured him and the capitalist world that there is, indeed, "a possibility of the capitalist economy to recuperate."

No wonder President Eannes is satisfied that very little, indeed, will be demanded of him, though he pledged to follow the new Constitution on the road to socialism. Here is what he said of the minority government Soares is running: "A minority government which has the support of the President is not a minority government." If it weren't so tragic it would all be very comical indeed, for while Soares is blessing private capital, he is demanding that the workers not introduce "ideological criteria."

As we see, philosophy and revolution--and its total, absolute opposite poverty of ideas and counter-revolution--far from being anything academic, or only to be discussed "the day after," gain urgency for daily tasks. The creation of a philosophic nucleus is by no means restricted to something we need, as an organization. It is a necessity for the whole Movement, its theoretic preparation for not only preserving the beginnings of the revolution, but releasing it for total development.

It is no accident that the young Marx had no sooner discovered a whole new continent of thought--Historical Materialism with its self-developing Subject, masses as Reason as well as Force--than he wrote: "Philosophy, having extended itself to the world, turns against the apparent world." It is this turning against the world which is the inseparable activity from the philosophic content, dialectics of liberation.

Otherwise, what is left? Mindless terrorism? How can that stop the retentive of capitalism, much less its ever deeper entrenchment, not only with multi-nationals, but NATO? And looking over NATO's shoulder, naturally, is "the Godfather," U.S. imperialism, competing with Russian state-capitalism for single world mastery.

Take still another look at Lebanon, where no less than 40,000 have died, and see where anything short of a totally new banner of liberation, anything narrowed to single, Enemy No. 1 issue--be that Israel or Russia--leads to. The very totality of the crises compels philosophy, a total outlook that is not just an outlook but an action. To limit oneself to the single issue of being against Israel--and

5713

-18-

Don't let's forget that the PLO does say Israel, and not just Israel's capitalist government, is what they wish to destroy--doesn't just doom others; it dooms them. And the Palestinian masses hungering for self-determination cannot entrust their fate to any leaders other than themselves.

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. Also what you say of transformation of the non-aligned countries is true. But, look, China was not there this year. And not only that--much above that--the total world view, beginning with philosophy but by no means stopping there, is Mao's revolutionary Thought.

"Why, the Chinese Revolution was not only the greatest revolution to emerge out of World War II, that 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 or Lenin (and this in a tiny whisper, for my critic doesn't really wish to be heard on this) or Stalin, because it is our age, it is today, it is the future. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution pointed the way for all of us the world over."

OK, for the sake of argument, and only that, 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 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

5714

from the moment Mao started his most original path to military power by taking the peasant army he 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 in Yanan, 1937, as On Contradiction.

Now, if 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; if, 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, not with "revisionists."

Hold fast, please, to the fact that originally, i.e., in 1956, to 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 the tanks into Hungary to put down the revolt. Clearly, even philosophically, the On Practice which had been inseparable from the concept On Contradiction 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, has 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 to be Enemy No. 1,* after the removal of not only Liu (the Party man), but Lin (the

* 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.

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 absolutely 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 small countries"--anywhere in the whole wide world outside of the two superpowers. That exclusive two-fold evil is further made exclusive--Russia is the more dangerous of the two superpowers.

Now, this concept, "Second World" which heretofore everyone, Mao included, considered capitalistic, was suddenly anointed as possible ally of the Third World, socialist China included. This concept was delivered not only in a speech to the UN as "foreign policy," but before that, was presented as the greatest event of "New China's Philosophic Front Since Its Founding in 1949," re-told by "The Revolutionary Mass Criticism Writing Group of the Party School," brought into the historic development of "The Three Major Struggles on China's Philosophic Front, 1949-1964." It reached its breath-taking climax in the 1970s with this concluding paragraph:

"The inherent laws of dialectics are independent of the will of the revisionists. It has become an irresistible historical trend today for the people of the whole world, and many medium-sized and small countries, to unite and oppose hegemony by the two superpowers, U.S. imperialism and social-imperialism...Revolutionary dialectics is striking firm root in the hearts of the people, is being grasped by more and more Marxist-Leninist political parties and revolutionary people. It has become their sharp weapon in making revolution..."

The rhetoric notwithstanding, Mao's concept of the Second World vitiates proletarian internationalism, replacing it with the narrowest nationalist "anti-imperialism" with global reach, even as "On Contradiction" vitiates the class struggle and subordinated it to political super-structure. In both historic periods--1937-49 and 1966-76--philosophy was transformed from theoretic preparation for social revolution to military strategy and tactics of reaching power.

For all factions now involved in the power struggle for Mao's mantle, in-

cluding "radicals"--Russia as Enemy No. 1--and those who argue for equidistance from both the 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, war was somehow said 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.

* * * * *

Absolute Method: not for purposes of Hegelian scholasticism (though our Old Politics could certainly benefit from some knowledge of the dialectic, Absolute Method), but within the historic context of Marx's theory of proletarian revolution, and Lenin's development of national self-determination as well as world revolution, whether that begins in Moscow, Berlin--or Peking, Turkey, Afghanistan--or today in Portugal.*

Thus methodology, i.e., dialectics of liberation, whether "at home" or "abroad" is unavoidable as it is life; it is everywhere; it is an Absolute Universal, but absolutely concrete and everywhere. And yet so far distant from its actuality have Marxists--Marxists, not Marx--gone, that they keep religiously, i.e.

*Allow me to skip directly to today, directly to Portugal, for what would appear to be a minor footnote. In fact, this little item buried in the paper, "Israel Seeks Diplomatic Relations with Portugal," touches, touches exactly, the relevance of Hegel. It reads: "Director-General (of Israel's Foreign Ministry) Shlomo Avineri's trip to Portugal was occasioned by the convening of an international conference dedicated to the philosophy of the 19th-century German genius, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel." (Christian Science Monitor, 8-26-76)

-22-

mystically, vulgar materialistically away from it.

Who could have appeared to be more internationalist than Trotsky with his theory of permanent revolution and his actual leadership of the Russian Revolution as the start of the world revolution? In fact, however, the concept of the world revolution and that of the Russian Revolution when it was institutionalized as nationalized property--that fixed particular--were sitting alongside of each other, rather than being jammed up against each other. How could it be otherwise when it left out the self-developing Subject --as against Lenin who developed it as, first, the National Question, and then a new departure for world revolution starting "If not through Berlin, then perhaps Peking." That is true revolutionary philosophic mediation. Without a Subject, no concept can become real: a subject that is uninhibited by any elitist view of "the backwardness of the peasantry" while clinging to Party structure as the be-it-all.

Even during the darkest period of counter-revolution, 1908, Lenin always insisted that the positive, the highest achievement of the revolution before its defeat, must be held on to as the ground for the next revolution. By 1914, when confronted with the betrayal of the Second International, nothing of the Hegelian dialectic so moved him as Hegel's principle "to hold fast the positive in the negative." And with the dialectic of second negation--the negation of the State and the creation of the non-state: "the population to a man, woman, child"--Lenin was ready for October, 1917. And even on his death bed, he never stopped repeating that when a revolutionary fails "to grasp the dialectic," as he feared Bukharin failed, the whole revolution is endangered.

Which is exactly what was involved in actuality and in Hegel's celebrated last three syllogisms of the Philosophy of Mind, which become the center-point of Ch. 1 of Philosophy and Revolution. There is no other way of escaping the theoretic void since Lenin's death sucking you into the abyss of incomplete, aborted revolutions.

* * * * *

It is for this reason that the Committees' Perspectives, in centering on the creation of a philosophic nucleus, have held it inseparable from politicalization as the concretization of philosophy.

5718

The six Political-Philosophic Letters that have already been written are beginning. They will continue. With them, we will also expand News & Letters to 12 pages three times annually.

The one new Committee that will be built this year is in that very crucial U.S. labor city, Chicago, where our next pamphlet on the 100th anniversary of the St. Louis 1877 General Strike will have special significance, not simply because its authors are going there as organizers, but because objectively Chicago has always--from the Haymarket, to 1937 Little Steel massacre, to the present Black and Women's Liberation and Youth developments--been a pivotal point for revolutionary development. So contradictory and urgent are these developments more now, that both Working Women For Freedom and the pamphlet-to-be, Black Thought (though that will come out of the West Coast) will be central also to the work in Chicago, indeed, to the further development of the Black movement itself, I believe.

The Working Women For Freedom pamphlet needs now to become an organization builder. What greater objective ground for development of this is there than today--and I'm not referring only to the U.S., but the world over, whether it be East Timor or Belfast, where one day 10,000 women, Catholic and Protestant, marched in protest together, and the next time it was 20,000. And this in a country that has had such bloody war between Protestant and Catholic--it took the women to show that that was not the real division. A new page has developed because Women's Liberation is truly an Idea whose time has come.

The Youth may not yet be massive enough to plan for a pamphlet of their own, but they are ready, very ready, for the action. In this, too, philosophic mediation as action is key.

A single dialectic process upsurges from actuality and from thought, which is why philosophic mediation is simultaneously the subjective-objective method, the process which makes of knowledge itself a way to produce liberty. It is high time it was here as reality. Let's get down to trying to make it so.

September 4, 1976

Raya Dunayevskaya
Detroit, Michigan