

National Chairwoman's Report to Convention  
of News and Letters Committees, Aug. 30, 1980

## TODAY AND TOMORROW

by Raya Dunayevskaya

### PART ONE: U.S. CAPITALISM-IMPERIALISM, AT HOME AND ABROAD, especially in the Middle East and Latin America

#### I. Missiles, Missiles, Missiles -- But What About Jobs?

This August, the TV subjected us to the hollow spectacles of the quadrennial circus acts of the two dominant capitalist parties -- the Republicans and Democrats -- called National Presidential Nominating Conventions. One thing, however, neither the wholesale psychedelic ballooning of red, white, and blue nor the totality of the hypocrisy could cover up -- the overriding law of this state-capitalist age -- joblessness.

That which Marx, a century back, had called "the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation" -- the unemployed army -- unimpaired capitalism has transformed to such extremism that the unemployed army, from being a sometime feature of capitalism in crisis, became its permanent state. Even at these elitist conventions it dominated all questions, all speeches, all platforms, all motions, and so disrobed capitalism that it stood stark naked.

In a word, what everyone saw and heard were not the unctuous speeches, but their exploitative, racist, sexist, militaristic, decadent character. Which didn't stop the politicians from transforming that question into something that could bring us to the brink of nuclear holocaust.

The politicians this August, thinking that Aug. 4, the outbreak of the First World War, was but the beginning and that that's what they should be celebrating, brought out their biggest guns, Defense (read: War) Secretary Harold Brown, to talk of missiles, missiles, missiles. Just follow this sequence:

First (last?) it was the Neutron bomb that aimed at destroying people and leaving intact military and production facilities. (They didn't tell us who will run them.)

Next, the MX missile. That was supposed to be something Carter was against but, as is characteristic of the Milquetoast in the White House, the degree of being "against" didn't take priority over trying to get votes -- this time for SALT II. He not only didn't get the votes; he withdrew SALT II from consideration -- and appended his signature to MX, too. So much for "leadership" and principles!

And now we get a fantastically new "change" (except that War Secretary Brown, in the interview with Cronkite, stressed that it wasn't so much change as an addition to the others) called "military targeting" that would go out for killing "military" targets -- and leaders -- of the enemy. "Ours," however, the very "leaders" that had brought on the holocaust, would be safeguarded! Such callousness about humanity brought about such a great outcry against such callousness toward all the rest of humanity that they denied the truth about the type of shelters that would protect "the leaders"!

What they play up as the "star" of Presidential Directives 59, 58, and 53 that would indeed eclipse the ICBMs are these tactical missiles that are "so smart they will change the face of warfare and supply the equalizer for outnumbered U.S. forces in any military showdown with the Soviet Union." Business Week (Aug. 11, 1980) continues: Their "deadly one-shot accuracy" is so perfect that they have been nicknamed "fire and forget."

For once, the initials M.A.D., mad -- Mutual Assured Destruction -- is the right word for it. And for once, Russia is right when it fires back the phrase "nuclear adventurism" at all these new revelations. The only trouble is they are busy doing the same thing. Indeed, the whole world is now spending \$600 billion annually on militarization!

Nothing less than the absolutely fantastic sum of \$1 trillion during the next five years is scheduled to be spent by Carter on missiles, missiles, and more missiles! Whereupon President Carter still has the gall to send a message to the UN-sponsored conference meeting then (Aug. 13, 1980) to study the Non-Proliferation Treaty: "The acquisition of nuclear explosives by additional states would decrease the security of the state acquiring them, decrease the stability of the region in which they are located, and increase the risk of nuclear conflict."

As if that weren't sufficient enough to scare us out of our wits, all of this was done in such a hurry and so secretly that even the Secretary of State, Muskie, knew absolutely nothing about it -- until he read it in the newspapers. Very obviously, the only ones deserving of knowledge -- and protection of their lives -- are the War Secretary they call "Defense," Harold Brown, and the biggest war hawk of them all, the National Security Director Brzezinski, their two Deputy Undersecretaries, and the Air Force General, Jasper A. Welch, who co-ordinates the military policy of the White House, and who supposedly told the President -- at least he got his signature.

Without blushing, they are busy revealing one other fairy tale we're supposed to believe. All this insanity on missiles was supposed to have "evolved" out of Carter when he first took office, when he asked Harold Brown whether we could reduce the strategic arsenal from 1,800 long-range missiles to about 200. Not worrying about any dialectical transition from how a request to reduce could be transformed into its opposite -- the senseless running after more, more, more -- what is imposed on us is nothing short of plans for "Mutual Assured Destruction," and a trillion <sup>dollars</sup> in cost which our great, great grandchildren will have to pay off, if they ever are born.

What hadn't been done in such a big hurry -- in fact, it took over two years before we even found out about it, and then only if you read select papers -- is the story of how "The U.S. Failed War Test for Europe" (Washington Post, Aug. 3, 1980). This, too, had a fancy name -- "Nifty Nugget" -- and it failed totally. But back in October, 1978 when they were on this military maneuver they found: "No reserves were called up. No tanks were put on ships. In fact, no one knew about the exercise except for about 2,500 officers..." It was a total failure in both the shortage of weapons and reservists, not to mention being totally void of any brains in military heads planning and managing these "war games."

There was no co-ordination whatever. No wonder that West Europe began to doubt the capability of this super nuclear giant to defend it. No wonder that West Europe decided to go its own way, and while it's hardly any smarter than tailending the U.S., it is "independent" of the U.S. and genuflecting before the Middle East oil potentates and their alleged "star" -- the PLO -- as well as

flirting with the other nuclear giant, Russia, whether it's a question of trade or the Olympic Games or soft-pedaling Russia's invasion of Afghanistan. And when they aren't "independent" of the U.S. they are "independent" of each other, as witness France's latest supplying a nuclear reactor to Iraq. What matters to us is that the class enemy is always at home -- it is the crisis here, the unconscionable unemployment, the runaway inflation, the two nations right here -- separate and unequal -- Black and white.

If you haven't been able to picture what a trillion looks like, you might ask Carter how he can allot that inconceivable sum for missiles, but think that \$12 billion for a jobs program for the millions unemployed is "inflationary." Very clearly, "flexibility" applies only to refusing a pittance for the life of the masses and spending like crazy for destruction of the masses.

There is hardly a day that passes that doesn't have some outbreak of Black youth revolt, and it isn't only South. The press can't deny that whether it's the South Bronx or the 15-year-old Watts rebellion in Los Angeles, where exactly nothing has been done, it is all ready to explode again -- even if no one can name the exact date. All the hypocrisies at both the Democratic and Republican conventions testifying to the contrary will not cover up the totality of the crises we are now in.

On the other hand, the fact that even the Democratic Party (at its Aug. 12 session) refused to bow to Carter's appeal for "flexibility," that is to say, not to specify the sum of \$12 billion for making jobs a priority, but roared its approval of it, shows not only how very broad, deep, omni-present is the question of unemployment (reaching up to 30 percent among Black youth) but how even so select a group as delegates to the Democratic convention couldn't keep from revealing how very scared they all are of the undercurrent of revolt that will face them in the realities outside the convention hall.

It is this undercurrent of revolt -- and not only among the unemployed but also the employed thoroughly disgusted with their conditions of speeded-up labor called "higher productivity" and "higher quality product"; and not only jobs and joblessness but Youth refusing to become cannon fodder for World War III; and not only Labor, Black and Youth forces as Reason but also Women's Libera-

tionists. The last word will not be in the voting booth but masses in motion against this decrepit society.

## II. U.S. Imperialism's Tentacles: From Iran to South Korea, and from El Salvador to Iraq; Also Relations with Other Capitalist Imperialisms

### 1) Iran

No one needs to delude him/herself by thinking that because Carter's imperialist intrusion into the Iranian desert was such a failure as well as fiasco that, "therefore," he won't try again something even more ominous. Nor need one think that all those all-seeing, all-knowing missiles "against the Soviet Union" are all aimed only at the Soviet Union.

Consider all the shifting about of the Sixth Fleet in the Middle East.

Consider all the threats; they weren't made for naught. The fact that there was such great opposition -- and not only from Iran, and not only from U.S. allies, but from the masses of American people, especially the youth who know very well that they would be the ones sent there, draft or no draft -- that it had, publicly, to be called off does not mean that it's in fact called off. Trial balloons are no joke any more than was Carter's request, that 1,800 long-range missiles be reduced to 200, anything but sheer hypocrisy -- the pretense he was saving lives when in fact he was playing with them, lulling us to sleep while mapping a monster plan for missiles, missiles, missiles costing a trillion.

Nor should one think that because so much demagogery will spill out from the Democrats to distinguish them from the more hawkish-still Reagan, (not to mention Nixon), that it isn't a Democratic Nixon-type who is actually writing the scenario for World War III, even if that spells the end of civilization as we know it. It will be instructive to take a quick look at Nixon's The Real War to see what these monstrous minds are planning. And don't be taken aback by the fact that Nixon, now that he's out of power and has no responsibilities to the public (here or abroad), declares that already "we are at war." The point is that, just like the fact that the truth may out when

thieves fall out, so when one is not in actual power, he does let the cat out of the bag.

Nixon openly states that the "real war," that is, World War III, began before World War II ended, thus extending the Cold War indefinitely -- well, until the hot war finally arrives. I'm sure no youth who had to fight Nixon to stop the Vietnam war will be surprised to hear Nixon say that "The Vietnam war was not lost on the battlefield but in the classrooms of great universities." Except that even in that last phrase he lies -- it happened not in the classrooms, but in the streets, on the campuses, where they found that they didn't need to go to the battlefield to meet death at the hands of home-grown capitalist rulers, as witness Kent, Ohio, Jackson, Mississippi, and Augusta, Georgia, or, for that matter, just in fighting for civil rights.

The reason we've called attention to Nixon's book was not only its "in the distance" affinity to what we have been discussing on missiles -- but that right now, the actual fact about Middle East policy as formulated by Nixon-Kissinger is what Carter-Brzezinski carried out, including the fawning before the Shah, as they made him "guardian of the West" to "protect" its Oil. And it is that attempt to control the Gulf oil region which the Carter Administration is still trying to recoup, whether it is through Iran; or via the Egypt-Israeli treaties -- or just outright invasion.

For that matter, it isn't only the Middle East; it is the whole world, and it isn't only from the flirtation with China against Russia that we see this. We see this most dangerously right this minute in counter-revolutionary, militaristic, neo-fascist South Korea.

## 2) South Korea

Nothing tells more clearly and sharply how very precisely, consistently, and without letup U.S. imperialism is looking for still one more Shah like General Chon.

First and foremost, let us be under no illusion that it's only the South Korean neo-fascist Gen. Chon that is acting in such a counter-revolutionary manner against his own people. From the very first, there was no doubt at all

about the commander of the U.S. forces, Gen. John A. Wickham, who assisted Gen. Chon and who said, "We will support him because that, of course, is what the Korean people want" (NY Times, Aug. 9, 1980). Gen. Wickham is not that ignorant of U.S. politics, even if at the moment the State Department here claims that he is not representing its "line".

The truth is that that's what the Korean War (1950-53) was about -- to keep South Korea as the U.S.'s outpost in the East. The truth is that it was the U.S. that imposed the tyrant, Syngman Rhee, on the Korean people. The truth is that the Korean people struggled for a whole decade to topple that reactionary, and they no sooner achieved victory than they were saddled with Park Chung Hee. The fact is that so great was the dissatisfaction with that dictator that his own secret police assassinated him.

All Carter's rhetoric about "human rights" can't possibly hide these facts: 1) The U.S. had done nothing whatever when Kim Dae Jung, back in 1971, had obviously won the election against Park, and fraudulently Park took office. 2) They did nothing again when, in 1973, Park abducted Kim Dae Jung, who was then in Japan, intending to murder him. It was the international outcry that stopped that attempted murder. 3) And now it is Chon who is staging a kangaroo court trial to make the premeditated murder of Kim "judicial". 4) Above all, the U.S., nearly 30 years after the Korean War ended, is keeping 40,000 troops in South Korea, with many, many more ready to fly there to keep the neo-fascist South Korean government in power.

The U.S. has yet to join even so mild a group as the Liason Committee to Save Kim Dae Jung, which has grown up in Japan. For once, the Beijing Review (Aug. 4, 1980) is right when it writes that the attempt to railroad Kim Dae Jung to death itself "is a diabolical move to effectively silence the political opposition..."

As we see, U.S. imperialism's tentacles don't stop either at planning attacks on Iran, or at pretending to keep their distance but allowing Chon Too Hwan to complete the counter-revolution. Those tentacles have been ceaseless -- and, indeed, before the U.S. was fully an imperialist land, they extended to Latin America. More precisely put, it is the war with Latin America that made the U.S. an imperialist land, and that early Black masses proved their vanguard

nature. They were the very first and only to organize an Anti-Imperialist League to oppose the war with Spain for Latin America.

### 3) Latin America, El Salvador especially

Neither space nor time will permit me to go into that long imperialist history. Nor can we begin in the immediate post-World War II period, except to say that when, in 1954, the U.S.-engineered coup in Guatemala took place, we at once singled out two factors, which remain to this day the ones that characterize the U.S.'s role all through Latin America. In attacking Dulles' CIA, we said that U.S. imperialism learned all too fast from Russian totalitarianism how to "take over" a country. We stressed that what U.S. imperialism was doing, under the guise of "saving Latin America from Communism," was destroying the genuine, indigenous revolution which began in 1954. It was not Communism that U.S. imperialism was fighting, but any kind of democratic agrarian reform. Finally, they were installing the type of dictatorship that couldn't lead to anything but neo-fascist regimes which is exactly what Latin America is suffering from wherever there is U.S. backing.

What we see presently there from the "regular" militarist actions, the "irregular" death squads, to the outright butchery at the Embassy of Spain, is not just a logical conclusion to what had been started in 1954. We singled out Guatemala not just to show its "history" since 1954, but because in 1980, it is helping the El Salvador military in its genocide.

El Salvador is a country where the U.S. could still stop the genocide of a whole nation, but won't. Here is a country that has, even according to bourgeois scholars, "the most rigid class structure and worse inequality in all Latin America" (Foreign Affairs, Summer, 1980). Here is a country with so minute a landed elite as to be openly called "los catorce" (the "fourteen families") which plus the military owns 60 percent of the farmland, the entire banking system, most of the nation's industries, and 50 percent of the whole national income -- while 200,000 peasants are totally landless!

They have only one fear, one they have never forgotten -- the massive peasant uprising in 1932. And they haven't forgotten that they crushed that with no less than 30,000 dead. On the contrary. That's exactly what they're

doing now with these new death squads that by now are so dehumanized that they're not satisfied with endless murders but proceed to mutilate the bodies in the most unspeakable ways.

The White Warriors Union, the White Hand and the Phalange specialize in murdering not only revolutionaries, workers and youth, but the Jesuits. In fact, it's only when (June, 1977) they announced they would kill "all the Jesuits in the country" and at once began assassinating some, that the U.S. vetoed, temporarily, a \$19 million Inter-American Bank loan. The murders may have stopped for one day, whereupon the U.S. approved the loan. Whereupon not only did the murders resume, but the most Draconian "Law for the Defense and Guarantee of Public Order" was enacted.

As the NY Times (May 8, 1978) reported it, U.S. Ambassador Frank G. Devine, speaking to the Salvadoran Chamber of Commerce, endorsed the right of the government to do "whatever is necessary to maintain public order."

The death squads resumed their assassinations. The Carter Administration in the spring added \$6 million to the other sum of military aid, and \$50 million in economic aid. And they did that despite Archbishop Romero's personal appeal to Pres. Carter that aid would only "sharpen the repression." Could anyone doubt that when one knows that the El Salvador Army killed more than 3,000 this year alone? This, too, didn't stop Carter from giving the aid, and the death squads then proceeded, in cold blood, to murder Archbishop Romero this April.

The U.S. now has a new Ambassador; the name is different and he's supposed to be a "liberal" -- Robert White. But just yesterday (Aug. 15, 1980) he spoke on TV to tell us how order was kept, despite all "provocations" from the Left! The "provocations" from the Left were 1) a general strike; there are, after all, no less than 30,000 unemployed, and runaway inflation. 2) There are three guerrilla forces -- the Popular Forces of Liberation were founded in 1970, but where, at best, they have 3,000 people under arms, the Salvadoran Army not only has 15,000, but all those death squads. 3) What now worries both the oligarchy-military and U.S. imperialism is that there is a very new, most indigenous and exciting revolutionary force -- the Indians. And they have succeeded in some regions like Quiche to try to initiate some reform.

That U.S. imperialism's nature is as reactionary as it is, is a surprise to no one. What is new is the pretense of being for "human rights." Carter isn't the first one to play around with the word "conceptual." Kissinger was the one to introduce it at the very moment when the bloodiest of all counter-revolutions was being helped by the U.S. -- Chile. By no stretch of imagination could these rulers accuse the Left of "conceptual weakness." Carter's fantasy, as Reagan's, is equally hollow. It's the Left's task to complete the unfinished state of the Latin American revolutions. And they have remained unfinished, whether we look at Bolivia in 1952 or Nicaragua in 1979. What we <sup>wrote</sup> in the Political-Philosophic Letter of May 15, 1978, "The Latin American Unfinished Revolutions," is more than ever true in 1980. Study also, please (in the Appendix to that Letter), how Silvio Frondizi was caught in the Cuba illusion.

The whole of Latin America is a tinderbox. No one is more hated, not even their own oligarchic military oppressors, than Yankee imperialism. We express our solidarity with them on that. And we feel it imperative to say that unless a new banner like Marxist-Humanism, which expresses what you're for and not only what you're against, is unfurled, we will once again face another barbaric counter-revolution.

#### 4) Iraq

At the moment, U.S. imperialism is more preoccupied, however, with the Middle East. The latest flirtation is with Iraq. It would be easy to say that that proves their desperation, since Iraq ever since the 1967 Arab-Israeli war has broken off relations with the U.S., is the staunchest anti-Israel, and if they don't call for a "holy war" against Israel, it is only because they are supposedly secular leaders -- and would rather have a nuclear war. But unfortunately, it is "correct" for the U.S. imperialists to flirt with Iraq just now, because what unites them presently -- anti-Iran -- is solid enough for the many crooked alliances the rulers on both sides indulge in.

That, too, does not tell the whole story. The full truth, the class truth, the irreversible affinity begins with the counter-revolution against the very first and genuine anti-imperialist revolution in Iraq. It was 1958. It did nothing short of undermining the whole structure of U.S. imperialism in the

Middle East and, indeed, shake up the whole global structure of U.S. imperialism. What was known as the Baghdad Pact was overthrown. This world-shaking event took place, moreover, under a leader unaligned either with Nasser or Ba'th. Under Kassim, the 1958 revolution proceeded to take some acts of social revolution such as throwing the landed aristocracy out of power as well as initiating reforms both in relationship to higher worker wages and considerable housing. Moreover, as a child of a Sunni-Shi'ite marriage, he did gain support of the Shi'ite poor.

At the same time that he opposed U.S. imperialism, and the ruling class within Iraq, since he did not want to subordinate himself to either Nasser or Ba'thism, the Ba'th Party and the CIA collaborated in trying to overthrow Kassim. At first they did not succeed. A Ba'th ruler then, Ali Salih Al Saadi, admitted: "We rode into Baghdad on a CIA train!" That coup was short-lived, falling in the same year, 1963. But it was time enough for the CIA to have provided lists of names of the Communist Party who had collaborated with Kassim and the Ba'th revenge squads murdered many when, in 1968, they returned -- and are in power still.

One other thing of a revolutionary nature must be stated. The beginnings of revolutionary fervor in Iraq go back to the break-up of the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Revolution, especially the latter. Think of it -- and all you Luxemburgites, be happy -- the very first group of Marxists in Iraq, in 1919, dates itself back to a member of Spartacus.

There were actually three different tendencies of Marxists in the early 1920s, and again, in 1935, when they were first engaged in anti-imperialist work. None of this, however, is in any way whatever reflected in Hussein, whose anti-imperialism is as fake as Khomeini's, and whose ambitions are as great. He wants to be the leader of all of the Arabs of all of the Middle East. Right at this moment -- and that's what I was referring to in the early part of my talk -- he is engaged not only in being an oil potentate and in suppressing all opposition, hanging everyone from Jews to Communists, but in trying to enter the exclusive nuclear club.



### 5) Is West European Capitalism Different?

It isn't, of course, only U.S. imperialism's tentacles but those of the whole capitalist world, private or state. For France, please read carefully on De Gaulle France both the 1958 and 1962-63 sections of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S.: A 25 Year History. Nor is it only France that is extending itself to Iraq, -- and let's not forget Djibouti and Africa.

West Germany, as the main economic power in West Europe, holds the key. It is all the more ironic that West European capitalism is acting as if the economic crisis is only in America, and only it is indecisive. The way West Europe has been "escaping" from U.S. capitalism's "indecisiveness", be it on Afghanistan or the Middle East, is to bow before the Middle East potentates while looking for every opportunity to gain money from trade, whether it be supplying arms, nuclear reactors, or grain.

Take Le Monde's analysis, which has to admit that the crisis is not just of this year; in fact, they entitled the series of articles "The Crisis: Year 7 and Stagflation as Before." It is also clear now that "prosperous West Germany" is by no means without crises, or unemployment, just because its inflation is on a much lower level than the other countries. It keeps explaining its restrictive policies as necessary to combat inflation. Whereupon the U.S. says that whereas it's necessary to fight inflation, it "is not valid to follow such policies simply to cut their balance of payments deficits." The Under-secretary of State, Richard N. Cooper, said, "If Germany thinks that it can eliminate its deficit in an era of \$100 billion deficits, it is exporting its problem. That would be an anti-social act" (Business Week, June 23, 1980).

The latest "World Development Report, 1980", issued by the World Bank, is predicting a global economic decline, not just this year but for the next five years. And while it has to admit that it is Africa and South Asia that will experience "absolute poverty," that in fact Sub-Sahara will be worse off in 1990 than in 1980, it is also showing that there is very nearly zero growth in all industrialized countries. Up front screaming for ever more, not so much production but "labor productivity," is Prime Minister Thatcher, that reactionary who openly claims credit (!) for the worst unemployment -- 9 percent --

since the Depression. The reason she is so proud of her record turns out to be that supposedly there is no other way to fight inflation; the workers must produce more and more and get paid less and less and less. She relies on her two gods -- profits and militarization -- to save her from the wrath of the British proletariat who know how to rid themselves <sup>even</sup> of Churchill -- a British lesson she better learn.

In all industrialized countries the rulers are talking of "revitalizing industry", which includes getting rid of as much living labor as possible, making do with "robots" -- ever speeding up that production line -- and getting state subsidies, as so-called private industry has done ever since its gory, primitive birth to its gorier imperialist extension from its super-exploitation of the national proletariat.

What the ruler-exploiters don't know -- the one thing they should have learned from Marx who long ago discerned capitalism's law of motion: the "absolute general law of accumulation" -- is that that unemployed army brings with it also not only a decline in the rate of profit (no matter how big the mass of profit), but the gravediggers of capitalism when masses in motion sign its death warrant.

### III. Religion in General and Jerusalem in Particular in this State-Capitalist Age

Israel has been moving so steadily to the Right that no reactionary action should surprise anyone. Nevertheless, the world -- and this includes Pres. Carter who is still pretending that the so-called Peace Treaty he engineered between Egypt and Israel will bring real peace to the whole of the Middle East -- was shocked by the timing, if nothing else, of the "sudden" fiat from the Knesset that Jerusalem, East and West, that is, Arab as well as Jewish, was "one", was "indivisible," indeed, was the "eternal" capital of Israel, as if really its order extended into the eons of time.

If, however, we take a second, objective look at that phrase, "if nothing else," we will see that it is, precisely, the timing, the provocative timing, which is the logical conclusion to the extremist imperialist moves ever since Menachem Begin came to power, and that very week visited and approved a controversial new

Jewish settlement in Arab land. It has gone on and expanded ever since. It is necessary, however, to limit ourselves to this year.

In March, 1980 the <sup>government</sup> of Israel announced it would be taking 1,000 acres of mostly Arab-owned land. It was the first such major expropriation in a decade, and the second largest ever since the victorious 1967 war. Indeed, by the mid-1970s, Israel pried 30 percent of East Jerusalem from Arab ownership. Could anyone doubt when the biggest war hawk of them all, Geula Cohen, was chosen to bring in a draft for the new status of Jerusalem that it would be anything but what is was?

That the neo-fascist religious fanatics called Gush Emunim have no intention whatever of stopping was clear enough from the prevailing terrorism -- not from the PLO this time, but from that reactionary, religious, Zionist group who bombed the cars of two Arab mayors, maiming Mayor Bassan Shaka of Nabulus and Mayor Kerim Khalaf of Ramallah.

Worse still, Menachem Begin is stonewalling the investigation. The correspondent of the Washington Star, David Halevy, asked: how did it happen that the Shin Bet (the Israeli FBI-CIA combined), that has an 85 percent success rate in probing such terrorist acts, did not produce even a suspect? and wasn't it true that the head of that secret police organization resigned because Menachem Begin wasn't giving him a free hand? Whereupon Menachem Begin enters the fray with all the hypocritical hyperboles at his command: "...Never was a calumny so odious as that dispatch." Despite Begin's demagogic rhetoric and the fact that he also got Avraham Achitov, the head of Shin Bet, likewise to say that his resignation was "in no way" connected to soft-pedaling, that that was a "total lie," the general feeling throughout Israel is that both the Shin Bet head and the former terrorist turned Prime Minister doth protest too much.

What is new -- and it is by no means limited to Zionism -- is the new politicized forms of religion. Nor is it a question of whether you listen to the money-wise electronic "evangelists," or you follow the Old or New Testament -- or the Koran, and quote Muhammad, who is supposed to have said: "Whoever goes on a pilgrimage to the Jerusalem sanctuary shall be forgiven all his sins."

The point, rather, is why this rush to power. One need not go abroad to

see it is so. All one has to do is look right here at the New Right, the Christian Religious Right. We saw what they did at the Reagan convention. And it is clear that, though they now are settling for Reagan, they, no more than the KKK and the Nazis, will stop there, any more than Solzhenitsyn stopped when he got religion and returned to the Greek Orthodox Church.

The biggest bluff of all in modern Russian literature is contained in Solzhenitsyn's voluminous writings, be it in the rewriting of the history of the Russian Revolution, Lenin especially, or the so-called return to the simple life of the Dark Middle Ages which he has now baptized as model, and, lo and behold, they have become the Enlightened Middle Ages. The truth, however, is always concrete, and what is concrete in Solzhenitsyn's life (outside of flirting with the Nazis during World War II) is what happened between 1956, when Krushchev permitted the publication of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich when Solzhenitsyn was trying so hard to get out of Russia that he aligned with the Jewish dissidents -- not something the Greek Orthodox Church had been associated with, either in the Middle Ages or the Tsarist Black Hundreds practicing the worst pogroms -- and last week's praise of the new women's liberation movement in Russia by this male chauvinist calling himself women's liberationist. Just as Khomeini know how to use technology, especially of tapes, and hypocritical embrace of shoras when they fought against the Shah, not against him, so Solzhenitsyn knows how to use the mass media, not to mention the ideology of the military brass about Russia as Satan, Enemy No. 1.

The real point is this: the totality of the crises, especially since 1973-74 -- by no means only on the Arab-Israeli war, but the economic crisis that resulted from the oil embargo -- has shown that the undercurrent of revolt may -- and in some cases, did -- lead to revolution. It is this, especially as it is evolving in the last year, which has led the capitalist rulers to flirt with nazism and occultism all over again.

Occultism has ever been the escape from reality, and since it doesn't have quite as obnoxious an odor as nazism, non-taxable dollars are spent on that electronic miracle to bring the message to the public. In any case, the New Religious Right, as in Begin's Israel or in Khomeini's Iran, or the Christian Right here, even when they get masses to follow them, by no means signifies that



what the masses want, and what the leaders are striving for -- power -- has the same motivation. Which is why Karl-Marx made so sharp a distinction between the religion of the oppressed and that of the oppressor. The whole theory of alienation started there. "Follow the majestic historic sweep of Marx's goal: "To unmask human self-alienation in its secular form now that it has been unmasked in its sacred form." Marx goes on:

"Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of men, is a demand for their real happiness..."

"Religion is only the illusory sun about which man revolves so long as he does not revolve about himself..."

"Man makes religion; religion does not make man. Religion is indeed man's self-consciousness and self-awareness so long as he has not found himself or has lost himself again. But man is not an abstract being, squatting outside the world. Man is the human world, state, society." (Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right)."

Nor was it only religion that Marx called "the opium of the people." The same was true of science. 130 years before ever the atom was split, and out of which came, not the most constructive new energy force, but the most destructive atomic bomb, Marx wrote: "To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie."

We have been living this lie altogether too long. State-capitalism has reincarnated both Religion and Science as moves away from real human needs and new human relations. The turning of the clock backwards must be stopped and will be stopped when we stop separating the philosophy of revolution from social revolution.

\* \* \* \* \*

PART TWO: LONG MARCH OF REVOLT, LONG MARCH OF PHILOSOPHY;  
IMPERATIVE NEED FOR A NEW RELATIONSHIP OF PRACTICE  
TO THEORY

Nothing is either conceived or known in its truth except in so far as it is completely subject to method.

--Hegel, Science of Logic, Vol.2, p.468

...cause is the highest stage in which the concrete Notion as beginning has an immediate existence in the sphere of necessity; but it is not yet a subject which, as such, preserves itself also in its actual realization.

--Hegel, Science of Logic, Vol.2, p.472

The objective situation, when one looks, is not only the totality of the myriad crises, brought on by decadent capitalism, in all their goriness that we have just examined, but the great pages of freedom being written by the insurgent Polish proletariat, carving out a new revolutionary form in the period when, in the U.S., "the little shorties" -- the 11, 12 and 13-year-old Black youth in Miami -- are participating both in the revolt against the police state and helping the adults reject the established Black leadership, looking only at themselves to bring forth liberty.

These two events will make the defining of our organizational-philosophic-newspaper tasks easy, whether we grapple with our 25-year history or just work out the tasks for the year. Let us turn at once to the breath of fresh air and inspiration coming from masses in motion.

I. All Roads Lead to Gdansk, Poland, And...

The most exciting new form of freedom in the world today is being created in Poland. Every day brings news of unprecedented acts of rebellion by the Polish workers. What started out as the occupation of the Lenin Shipyards in Gdansk and became 17,000 strikers in three other cities soon snowballed and had no less than 50,000 other workers join them, and 200 factories were shut down.

What seemed at one place to be just opposition to high meat prices and at another place just a strike in opposition to the firing of Mrs. Anne Walentynowicz who had been active in the 1970 strike and who was fired a few months short of being entitled to receive a pension, so broadened and widened the participation that we now have a general strike, including other industrial units from aircraft and textile plants, to city garbage collectors and bus drivers. What started out as demands for a rise in wages became, at one and the same time, a demand for free trade unions as well as free speech, free press, free TV communications.

Indeed, the shipyard strike everyone was talking about as the first occurred in fact after six full weeks of non-stop labor unrest that had begun with 3,000 railway men who insisted on nominating independent candidates for workers' council elections. This report (by Eric Bourne in the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 13, 1980) is, indeed, borne out not only by other reports in the daily press, but by what we hear from within Poland by the strikers and intellectual dissidents:

Indeed, what worries the Communist rulers more than anything is the fact that a small dissident group of mainly intellectuals called the Workers' Social Self-Defense Committee (KOR) which was established in the mid-1970s from those who had been fired or imprisoned (whose spokesman is Jacek Kuron), has expressed more than solidarity with these workers, by establishing a co-ordinating committee that, at one and the same time, tells workers of strikes in other regions and tells the Western press the actual situation in contradiction to what the official press carries. As Kuron, who is once again in prison, put it: "It is a solidarity strike, and has a political character. It is a step toward a free trade union -- a very important step. These committees create an absolutely new situation."

By now (NY Times, Aug. 28, 1980) the shipyard workers of Gdansk have truly established "a world apart," and right within a totalitarian land at that. Their occupation -- occupation, not just strike -- they are not only fanning out across the whole country and have international representatives of labor from France, Norway and Austria, but they established their own system of internal broadcasting over loudspeakers so that every word of the negotiating sessions with government

representatives is piped out to workers lounging on the grass or clustered in discussions! 800 delegates from other factories are in the conference hall and they tape-record the sessions for the workers in their districts.

The exhilaration of producing their own newspaper -- Solidarity -- is catching on with even some government journalists there. And a dissident spokesman -- Western TV cameramen who concentrate so on pictures of the Pope on the shipyard gate, do note! -- criticized Cardinal Wyszynski's statement, saying "The workers will disregard it. They are too determined." And they -- the workers -- now number no less than 300,000.

Whether the Communist totalitarian government will attempt to put it down bloodily, though the workers thus far have not used any arms, it is absolutely impossible to dim the penetrating illumination cast by this great revolt, both of conditions in state-capitalist lands calling themselves Communist, and the burning desire for freedom. Poland especially has been the place of revolt ever since 1943-44 when, as we wrote then, "All Roads Lead to Warsaw," when the Jewish ghetto was the first to revolt till death and then when Stalin's Red Army stayed outside of Warsaw as the Nazis put the city to the torch after the uprising.

In 1956, Poland again was the stimulus which led to the great Hungarian Revolution -- and its bringing onto the historic stage Marx's Humanist Essays. These discussions lasted longer and were broader in Poland, so much so that not just the dissidents were calling for a new humanism, but the official philosopher, Adam Schaff, likewise had to make a gesture toward Marx's Humanism.

The 1960s revealed still another facet -- the politicalization of the struggles and the analysis, using well-known Marxist categories, in the "Open Letter to the Party" by the young Kuron and Modzelewski, whose analysis of Poland was as state-capitalist.\*

In 1970 the spontaneous upsurge of Polish workers\*\* again inspired the

\* This letter was published as a separate pamphlet by International Socialism in England, in 1966.

\*\* We reproduced the 1970 minutes of the shipyard workers' meeting, smuggled out of Poland, as a separate pamphlet.

whole world. (and also was the very ground on which Chapter 8 of Philosophy and Revolution, "State Capitalism and the East European Revolts," was created. Be sure to reread it -- it deals not only with the strike but "The Movement From Practice Is Itself a Form of Theory" as well as "Once Again, Praxis and the Quest for Universality.")

What we have now in the 1980 general strike is, at one and the same time, a 40-year-long struggle for freedom and one that will not be silenced either on the front of struggles or the front of political economy or that of philosophy. Once such a flare is set up, it lights up the world.

### ...The Road to the Black Ghetto, USA

The maturity of our age is seen also in every act of opposition to the powers-that-be even when there is no revolution and even where it seems to be as isolated as the Black ghetto of Miami.

For one thing, when at the beginning I mentioned that 30 percent of the Black youth are unemployed, I was just quoting the NAACP report which, while higher than what the government reports, is, in fact, completely untrue. In the Black ghettos of the North as well as the South, and specifically in Liberty City of Miami, 8 out of every 10 Black youths are out of work. And so filthy are the living conditions there, that so-called Liberty City is referred to as "Germ City."

The Miami Courier, a Black biweekly, revealed one other fact that is quite exciting. It is about "the little shorties." The little shorties refers to some of the most militant Blacks in that revolt who were no more than 11, 12, and 13 years old; and who obviously are best at throwing bottles and stones at every passing white motorist. And when an adult, Homer Brennan (who is 27) spoke up, he said, "You know, a lot of us aren't scared of dying no more." He was referring to the fact that he was a Vietnam veteran and he hasn't found conditions now in his hometown any better. Insofar as the Miami Blacks are concerned, they struck not only at the Government, but the established Black leadership in or out of the NAACP, Urban League, SCLC. "No need for bullets," said another, "Unemployment and inflation are killing us."

At one of the public housing projects (the James E. Scott), the reporters were being chased away and then someone yelled at them: "And one more thing. Tell those old Black leaders to stop jumping in front of the television cameras, giving interviews, because they do not speak for us." The most serious lesson to learn from the Miami uprising which few are even listening to is the complete rejection of leadership. And that, the rebellious made clear, applies most sharply to the Black leaders who think that what they did in the 1960s entitles them to leadership evermore whereas, in fact, insofar as they are concerned, it is all a period of "broken promises." The new revolts will not stop, and neither will the search for a philosophy of freedom.

### II. Our Tasks

Now, then, you can view with new eyes how the six organizational ramifications we saw looming ahead in the Draft Perspectives, Tomorrow is Now, have gained an ever greater urgency, whether these focus on the expansion of News & Letters to a 12-pager and the \$35,000 Fund needed to assure that and other work, including expanded participation in mass activities of Blacks, Youth, Labor, employed and unemployed, and Women's Liberation, or the completion of the book, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

This year, as we are getting ready to appear with the 12-pager as the regular format of News & Letters and to finish the book, we do have, accidentally or otherwise, the advantage of looking at our 25-year history. In many respects, the first five years were the most difficult and the most fundamental, as they laid the ground, philosophically, politically, organizationally for the existence of Marxist-Humanism on U.S. soil.

First and foremost is that which characterized us from our birth. We, at one and the same time, listened to new voices from below and singled out new revolutionary forces whose movement from practice was itself a form of theory, as well as taking on the responsibility of filling the theoretic void in the movement since Lenin's death, and transcending it, that is to say, restating Marxism for our own age. Where we stress that listening to the new voices does not free the intellectuals from their responsibility of what Hegel called Absolute Method, or "Self-Thinking Idea," it is also manifest that the Idea cannot itself think

without human beings thinking it.

We continued to dig deep for American roots, not only when we first started, but as a constant characteristic, so that in the mid-1970s, we also produced, first, America's First Unfinished Revolution, and then The First (1877) General Strike in the U.S.: Then and Now, and most recently, "American Black Thought and Black Reality" you'll be discussing under Organizational Reports. It is this type of theoretical working out what is, as relevant for history as for method, i.e. dialectics of analysis of current events, which now that we are transforming the paper, needs to become a regular feature. For this, we need a whole nucleus of "philosophers," or political analysts, if you insist.

Outside of "praxis," nothing is less understood, though most often repeated, hardly more than as if it were a cliché, than the words "method", "dialectics". Where these are not reduced to a "means" or a tool, they are used as a mere substitute for dynamism. Dynamic vs. static is about as far as vulgar materialists permit themselves to go. That is not what dialectics -- that development through not only contradiction but absolute negativity -- means. Therefore, let me point to at least a few events of our own past to show how the analysis of one period can indeed show the method for analyzing a current event. You saw what I did with the analysis of Guatemala in 1954, or rather, with U.S. imperialism's counter-revolution in Guatemala in 1954, in order to analyze the dialectic of developments there right now.

And I dare say that if I had tried to use China as an example, it would be too easy since I analyzed Mao in 1949-50, in 1954-55, and again in 1957-59, 1965-68, and finally talked of Mao's Last Hurrah when he was still alive and had suppressed the Shong Wu-lien / <sup>--but it is that movement,</sup> as witness also Wang Xizhe's "For a Return to Genuine Marxism in China" (the title in Chinese is "Struggle for a Class Dictatorship of the Proletariat") which is alive and growing while Mao really is dead -- and not only physically, but philosophically, be it the alleged Great Leap Forward, or the so-called Cultural Revolution.

For that matter, take the Iranian Revolution of our time which was born out of the greatest, most powerful, and sustained mass mobilizations for months on end before the three-day insurrection of Feb. 9-12. At the same time, the

workers who had been out on general strike had refused to turn over their guns even when the Ayatollah commanded them. All sorts of spontaneous organizations arose, by no means limited to former guerrilla groups. Quite the contrary. There were shoras, women's liberationists, there were workers' councils, there were ajumenis.

And in all of them youth was dominant. There was also no end to the freedom of the press and the great attraction for the student youth of new Marxist translations and of those Marxist groups, the most eagerly sought after, were those who were independent of any state power. The most persistent fighters for self-determination were also the most organized, and it was not only the Kurds but the Arabs. Because they were all part of the mass revolutionary outburst which overthrew the Shah, they felt confident in continuing the fights for genuine self-determination, even as the Women's Liberation Movement aimed at opening up a second chapter of the revolution as they were involved for five days in continuous marches under the banner, "We made the revolution for freedom and got unfreedom."

But it is Khomeini who is in the saddle, trying to roll it all backward. He, on the one hand, and Begin, on the other, are every bit as reactionary as the two dominant nuclear powers -- the U.S. and Russia. Imperative, therefore, is the question that preoccupies us this year: responsibilities of intellectuals who are Marxists. If you will look back into the Archives, you will see that on April 30, 1962, the Weekly Political Letter was entitled, "Theoreticians at the Crossroads, Or Towards a New Formulation of the Relation of Theory to Practice." And I wrote, not to those who never tried to fill the theoretic void since Lenin's death, but as a challenge directed to the new African leaders:

We now see added to the patchwork of "African socialism" and "communocracy" and "African personality" and "Negritude", not to mention Toure's "Toward Full Re-Africanization", something called "Nkrumahism" which runs the gamut of "uniting" Gandhi and Lenin, and CND and Pan-Africanism, and just plain Osagyefo-ism.

Now, look at the very latest appearance of the new Religious Right right here, and know that I warned against it when it first manifested itself in the late 1950s as "Moral Rearmament" which tried flirting with Azikwe. Which is why I analyzed it in the pamphlet with that long name, Nationalism, Communism,

Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions in order to stress that the battle of ideas is every bit as important as the revolutions themselves.

What I'm trying to articulate is that when you witness some phenomenon that seems to have arisen clear out of the blue, don't despair. It isn't all that new. You will find one or another form of it in the Marxist-Humanist "Archives", whether that be on Marx's "Economics", as in my 1944 Outline of Marx's Capital, or as in the 1974-5 global crisis and the need to battle also with Ernest Mandel and Tony Cliff; or for that matter, the Black Dimension, whether back in 1943 when I fought both the bourgeois Myrdal and the Black intellectuals who capitulated to him -- and this year you will also have "American Black Thought and Black Reality." In a word, it isn't history "as such"; it is dialectics which is the method to judge the new.

For example, by 1966, when Mao launched the so-called Cultural Revolution which so befuddled the Left, in Japan, too, even those who talked of state-capitalism kept their distance from "philosophy" which, though they used it as an abstraction, was in fact Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, not to mention our extension of it. It became clear then that we alone could work out Philosophy and Revolution, even as it is clear today that we alone can work out Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

It was no accident (nor only related to the objective situation of Carter's drive for war) that we posed the question of expansion of News & Letters. The more fundamental reason was the imperativeness of philosophy as action, and the need, therefore, of a philosophic nucleus, whether that be every Marxist-Humanist a philosopher, or as a sort of thought-exuding nucleus. It goes without saying that it's needed most if we are fully to comprehend why the Rosa Luxemburg book has the title it has.

Nor do I mean that the three parts -- Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution -- are of equal newness. I mean that never before has Marx's philosophy of revolution been fully presented; at best, it was a theory of proletarian revolution that was strictly political.

I mean also that it could not have been presented in full, because we did not have all of his works until recently. It is for this reason that I consider

it also no accident that we started publishing the book not with Chapter 1, "Two Turning Points in Rosa Luxemburg's Life," but with Marx's Ethnological Notebooks, or more precisely put, "The Relationship of Philosophy and Revolution to Women's Liberation: Marx's and Engels' Studies Contrasted." That is to say, just as the question of Women's Liberation could not fully be understood as a Marxist when thinking that Marx and Engels were one, so Marx's total philosophy of revolution could not be as fully worked out as it will be in this book because we do finally have nearly the whole of Marx's writings.

It is there, i.e. in the Ethnological Notebooks, where Marx returns to the question he first posed in 1844 -- the Man/Woman relationship as the manifestation of the whole of human relationships -- and in the Grundrisse, 1857, where he described the human relationship as "the absolute movement of becoming."

The relationship of theory to practice is not the easiest problematic to work out, as it changes with every historic period in every historic culture, with every different country, and above all, in the relationship between the mass movement when it is in motion, and the counter-revolution and its strength. Not to mention the whole world context.

The overriding question is this: since it is only now -- 100 years from the last writing of Marx (and through the Ethnological Notebooks, see also with new eyes that 1881 Preface to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto) -- that we can grapple with nearly all the writings of this founder of a whole new continent of thought, this presents a new challenge to the whole Marxist movement and the need to face not only the relationship of philosophy and revolution, but also philosophy of revolution.

One of the many new things in the 25-year history of Marxist-Humanism -- and nearly 40 years since the state-capitalist theory -- is a fact we didn't fully grasp when we first worked out the latter theory. It is this: if state-capitalist theory does not extend itself to Marxist-Humanism, there is nowhere for theoreticians of state capitalism to go. Once they disclose what is and what they are against, without working out what they are for, they will once again land in the mire of tailending new state powers, as was shown by CLRJ's tail-ending Castro -- he even rewrote, that is, gave it a new twist in a fantastic

new preface to Black Jacobins -- Nkrumah plus "the bewildering profundities of Mao" (Radical America, November, 1971). (And I might add the state-capitalist theoreticians like Tony Cliff who weren't part of the Johnson-Forest Tendency -- indeed, refused so much as to vote for us at the Fourth International conference since he was going to wait to complete his purely economist analysis, looking for something called "cause" rather than Subject -- haven't fared any better either on vanguard "party to lead", or on attitude to state-capitalist societies calling themselves Communism.)

We, on the other hand, were working out, with the new forces of revolution -- Rank-and-File Labor, Black, Youth, Women's Liberation -- as well as the Self-Thinking Idea, that is to say, the self-determination of the Idea of Freedom, Marxist-Humanism for our age.

Thus, whether it was with the Black masses as vanguard, which produced everything from Freedom Riders Speak For Themselves and American Civilization on Trial to Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal, or with the section of the Zengakuren that had broken from Communism and were rethinking Marx's Humanist Essays; whether collaborating with the Free Speech Movement where, again, it was not only activity but speaking on "The Theory of Alienation: Marx's Debt to Hegel"; or with the East European dissidents who could be said to have been the co-authors of Chapter 8 of Philosophy and Revolution; whether it was the Sheng Wu-lien's Whither China? that we reproduced and included in Philosophy and Revolution, or what is presently manifesting itself in the new dissident manifesto, "For a Return to Genuine Marxism in China," by Wang Xizhe, and as we are now expanding News & Letters and finishing the Rosa Luxemburg book, it is clear that the ceaseless work on theory is every bit as hard as manual labor: by no means can Theory and Practice be separated and still achieve a successful revolution.

There is no way of separating doing from being without losing the multi-dimensionality of the human being, that is to say, its Universality -- the struggle for, and achievement of total freedom.

Put differently, be it the long march of revolt, or the long march of philosophy -- but I don't mean the 2,500 years Hegel kept in view, but "only" the 200 years since the age of revolutions -- industrial, political, social,

intellectual, opened by the American-French Revolutions of the late 18th century -- it is in those dialectics of liberation that the relationship of theory and practice is worked out in such a totally new way that full freedom comes to be.

1- Raya Dunayevskaya, Aug. 30, 1980

Toward that end, it may be valuable to add here the core of what I said on the relationship of philosophy to leadership. \*

"...It is the nature of the fact, the notion, which causes the movement and development, yet this same movement is equally the action of cognition."

Hegel, Philosophy of Mind, para. 577

# Prolegomena

I've put this seemingly pretentious heading, instead of writing simply Preface, or introductory remarks, in order to stress that, instead of "Elections" being merely a naming, or fight for, "positions", not to mention a lot of factionalism, our executive session has always been a matter of summing up the convention, in the sense of seeing what and if the Perspectives have been modified so that the leadership elected to carry out those Perspectives measure up to the Individualism "purified", as Hegel put it, "of all that interferes with its Universalism, i.e. freedom," Both the tasks of this year -- from expansion of paper to completion of the new book, and from mass activity to classes on our Political-Philosophic Letters and our History -- and the preparation for the next plenum must be creatively worked out in a way that we have both continuity with the Marxism of Marx, as well as our original contributions for our age, tested in the objective world. In a word, because of the crucial importance of philosophy, I call this introduction Prolegomena.

Therefore, let us take a look, no matter how briefly it must of necessity be, at what organizational problematic has meant to Karl Marx, to V.I. Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Antonio Gramsci, Leon Trotsky, and those who broke from the latter in order to analyze the putrid reality of Stalinism and World War II.

Unless you recognize Marxism as a whole new continent of thought, you cannot but divide Marx up into economics, politics, a little bit of

\*This presentation was given to the Executive Session of the Convention, Aug. 31.



philosophy and "no theory of the party." Now, whereas it is true he had no theory of the party as we know it since Lenin's What Is To Be Done?, what Marx thought of as "party" was organization as tendency -- political-philosophic tendency so that the class nature of a workers' organization moves from spontaneity to a "party of their own", which becomes what he described communists to be. That is, though an integral part of the workingclass, communists, in Marx's view, have a view of the class struggle as a whole, and not just of the immediate demands; and they are internationalist and not nationalists.

After Marx unfurled that great historic, class and international banner in the Communist Manifesto, and participated in both the 1848 Revolution and the greatest revolution of his day, the 1871 Paris Commune, he criticized unflaggingly the 1875 Social Democratic Party. Only Lenin measured up to Marx's Critique of the Gotha Program, and not with "Party" but with State and Revolution; and only Lenin measured up to 1881 with his 1920 Thesis on the National and Colonial Questions -- yes, indeed, if not through Berlin, then perhaps through Peking!

Let's not forget that, though we reject the "vanguard party to lead", even in that 1903 program, Lenin did underpin it with "there can be no successful revolution without a theory of revolution." Which is something the latest British book on Marxism and the Party by John Molyneux surely fails to do. And Lenin did criticize himself as soon as the 1905 revolution broke out. The British SWP sees that without making as many changes in their 1980 concept as Lenin did in 1905, when Molyneux does get to mention Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, he has next to nothing to say, excusing himself on the ground that he'll discuss philosophy when he deals with Gramsci, but then he deals with Gramsci's philosophy, not Lenin's.

The great Italian revolutionary Antonio Gramsci, while imprisoned in Mussolini's jail, was the one revolutionary in the late 1920s and early 1930s who was working out precisely the problem of the relationship of theory to practice, of philosophy to revolution. As he put it in his Problems of Marxism:

"The philosophy of praxis is consciousness full of contradictions in which the philosopher himself, understood both individually and as an entire social group, not merely grasps the contradictions, but posits himself as an element of the contradictions and elevates this element to a principle of knowledge and therefore of action." \*

-- Selections From the Prison Notebooks

\* But what Gramsci called "hegemony" -- be it in winning over intellectuals to the revolutionary proletariat, or the worker who has a comprehensive conception of the objective world and the battle of ideas as well as the class struggle -- could, in the end, be won only by the "party."

Contrast this to Lenin's singling out from Hegel: "Cognition not only reflects the world, but creates it." It doesn't even enter the Tony Cliff mentality of Molyneux that that is exactly where the great tragedy comes in -- that whereas Lenin reorganized himself on dialectic, on State and Revolution, on Imperialism, on the National and Colonial Questions, and in the Will regarding Bukharin, he stopped short of reorganizing himself on the concept of the party. (If Molyneux had just paid attention to that single word, dialectic, he would have gone a great deal further than the whole 188 pages of his book.)

Molyneux's full Trotskyism comes out when he deals with Rosa Luxemburg. He is so happy that, though a vanguardist, he can now appear to be for spontaneity, that he doesn't even know that he is economist, as Trotsky was. He steps right back into vanguardism as he attributes all Luxemburg's mistakes to her not having appreciated unevenness of development. Ah well, he isn't important. What is is the fact that Lenin stopped short of reorganizing his concept of the party, no matter how fundamentally he did modify it, especially after 1905. And that is what is most relevant today, so let's go to Marxist-Humanism, instead.

Have you recently reread my letters on the Absolute Idea? Read the last part where I begin arguing with Lenin because he said that the last half of the last paragraph (Larger Logic, II, p. 485; Lenin's Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 234) of Hegel's Science of Logic is unimportant. He stopped, instead, at the first half of that paragraph, at the word, "Nature"... Lenin says that Hegel here "brings one within a hand's grasp of materialism ... This is not the last sentence of the Logic, but what comes after is unimportant." My argument was that Lenin hadn't lived through what we had suffered -- thirty years of Stalinism.

What Hegel was telling us in that last paragraph was that he was not through when the Idea had a form of Nature, that there was still a long way to go through the Philosophy of Nature and Philosophy of Mind, and only then, when you've gone through the whole of the Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences would you know what else was in store. In truth, he wasn't even satisfied with that ending, and in the year before he died, he added the three syllogisms. These reveal that he 1) does nothing short of throwing out the Logic; 2) does not really construct a "system" as is seen in the third syllogism which isn't a syllogism. Instead, Hegel practices the unity of theory and practice, of objective and subjective, because once you have reached Subject you need no

"system"; the other two forms -- Nature, Mind --- are where "it" is manifested. Now all that remains is Method, Absolute Method. In a word, Self-Motion as Method is all a Subject needs:

As I discussed it with the REB when we took up the question of leadership, Johnson found in Absolute Idea what he already had <sup>as</sup> presupposition, which he had expressed as early as 1944 in his "Education, Propaganda, Agitation." What seemed as a glorification of masses from below was, in fact, just pointing to one truth -- the workers acting spontaneously, in order to hide the greater truth -- that he, like Shachtman, would saddle the workers with responsibility for what we had to answer to history for -- our responsibility. Do we or don't we have an historic right to exist?

It was not only opportunism, much less outright betrayal, that impelled Johnson to those positions. The drive to that end came from "not completing" the objectivity of the theory of state-capitalism with the indispensable subjectivity -- not of Leader Numero Uno, but of Marxist-Humanist philosophy.

It is too easy to go from Marx's Humanism to Marxist-Humanism, so permit me a detour via Hegel; and George Armstrong-Kelly, who criticized Philosophy and Revolution precisely at the point on Method which is leadership responsibility, i.e. Absolute Method. First, let us listen to Hegel:

"In the absolute method, however, the universal does not mean the merely abstract but the objectively universal, that is, that which is in itself the concrete totality, but not as posited or for itself ... The progress is therefore not a kind of overflow..."  
(Science of Logic, Vol. II, p. 471)

Now George Armstrong-Kelly accused me of "baptising" an unchained dialectic as Absolute Method, and quoted me about "the cogenity of the dialectic of negativity for a period of proletarian revolution as well as for the birth-time of history" when he knew very well: 1) that Absolute Method was Hegel's expression, not mine; and 2) what I called "unchained dialectic" was what Hegel called "absolute negativity", and what Marx (and I, borrowing from Marx) called "new passions and forces" for reconstructing society on Humanist beginnings.

In a word, the point of difference was not philosophy "in general" but the Humanism of Marxism, which Marx drew both from "negation of the negation" and actual live human beings taking destiny into their own hands.

That is why I chose the quote from Hegel's Philosophy of Mind with which I began this section: "... it is <sup>the</sup> nature of the fact, the notion, which causes the movement and development, yet this same movement is equally the action of cognition."

Do you realize that it is 100 years since the Ethnological Notebooks were written and since that amazing 1881 Preface to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto, and that it is only in our age that we finally have seen those "Notebooks" of Marx and can truly say that we have his complete works and can sum up Marx's philosophy of revolution as "From a Critic of Hegel, to the Author of Capital and the Theorist of the Permanent Revolution," not just of 1850, but 1881?

It's exactly that, that is, philosophy as leadership, that distinguishes us from all others, and, moreover, it distinguishes us not because we are in any ivory towers, but because philosophy which is leadership, is also action.

-- Raya Dunayevskaya, Aug. 31, 1980