

Draft perspectives thesis, 1977-1978: TIME IS RUNNING OUT

Introduction: the Neutron Bomb and Dehumanized Thinking

So crises-ridden is our world that no country, not even the mightiest giant of all — U.S. imperialism — has been able to get out of the recession, incoming "recycled petro dollars" and fantastic new weaponry expenditures notwithstanding. At this very moment — although the world is not at war and the global "peace" military expenses are \$350 billion, and rising! — still each slight economic upturn swiftly turns into a "pre-mature cyclical downturn."

The unconscionably high unemployed army has become a permanent characteristic of decrepit capitalism. And it is so overwhelming a phenomenon among youth—unemployment is no less than 50 percent to 60 percent among Blacks, Latinos and other minorities in the teeming ghettos of Harlem, Brooklyn, the Bronx — that even reporters hostile to the "looting" that occurred when the lights went out in New York, July 13, at 9:34 p.m., were forced to call attention to the unending unemployment and unceasing poverty, ever as compared to 1965, when the lights last went out in New York. And as staid a publication as *The New York Times* entitled a report on the New York uprising on its commentary page, "Time Is No Longer Running Out; It Is Gone."¹ (See our lead article, p. 3).

Capitalism has obviously reached abysmal ultimates when such contradictions tearing at its system become very nearly "secondary" compared to the death-ray-type of new weaponry touted both from the White House and the Kremlin.

Nothing in Hitler's Germany, from the "secret weapon" with which Hitler threatened world destruction, to the actual genocide he practiced within his domain, is any match for the actual military technology now in the hands of the superpowers, U.S. especially. What dehumanized creature could compete with the super-scientist-military-industrial complex of State Planners which dares describe a bomb as "clean" because, though this neutron bomb can mass kill by radiation it leaves property intact!

Nor is this dehumanized thinking characteristic only of the powers-that-be. While fear has dulled the senses of some of the "New Left" so that they are willing to reduce Marxist philosophy of liberation to a gobfest about "tactics," the extreme Right think-tank in a famous French university calls its anti-Marxist, anti-Socialist, anti-left views the "New Philosophy" because it is so "total" that it describes capitalists approving of detente as having "capitalist bodies with Marxist heads."²

(1) Interestingly enough, the report on the "Op-Ed" page of the Sunday New York Times, 7-17-77, was by one who teaches African studies—Clayton Riley.

(2) The "Barbarism with a Human Face" calling itself "The New Philosophy" by its guru, Bernard-Henri Levy, hails from the same famous university that produced Althusser in the early 1960s, and in the mid-1970s had produced this Solzhenitsyn-inspired elitism with the ex-Althusserite, Andre Glucksman, who now calls Solzhenitsyn "the Shakespeare of our time." Their works have

To think that one can laugh off the latest appearance of retrogression by such supercilious remarks as, "You can't refute a joke"³ is to allow one's senses to be dulled while shaking off the revolutionary intellectuals' responsibility for unfurling a Marxist banner that would unite philosophy and revolution and thus lay the ground for a new society on truly human foundations. Time would indeed be running out not only objectively but subjectively, were we to bow to an attitude that would accept a "lesser evil" — as if state-capitalism calling itself Communism is the only alternative to decrepit private capitalism.

Marx's Humanism expressed itself unequivocally also on the question of time when it defined "Time" as "space for human self-development." The very urgency of time's "running out" demands concreteness on all matters, subjective as well as objective, beginning with facing the alien reality as is, as rooted in economic crises and in political crises. The lunatic fringes feel thoroughly at home in these crisis-ridden times, as witness the brazen, open appearance of the KKK and the Nazis joining forces in anti-Semitic and anti-Black pogroms in Georgia, in Ohio, in Chicago. The fact that militant counter-demonstrations stopped them in their tracks does not mean they will not reappear — especially when the very day before the lights went out, the President at his press conference spoke out so vehemently against abortion rights and showed such indifference to the poor and to segregated education.

I. The Sick Economy

That this, the fifth post-World War II recession, is so hard to come out of, has brought the capitalists themselves face-to-face with the reality, that the overriding fact of present day capitalist economy is stagnation. Thus, the only two "healthy" economies in the West — the U.S. and West Germany — are in an investment slump. Thus, the mightiest, the U.S., which is experiencing a 5 percent growth, is finding it is barely keeping up with population growth, that is to say, it is at a standstill.

The answer the capitalist ideologists themselves give to the question "Why Does a 'Healthy' Economy Feel So Bad?"⁴ is that there has actually been a fundamental structural transformation of the U.S. economy. First, the longest period of stagnation since the late 1950s demon-

not yet appeared in English, but a preview of them can be read in *The Manchester Guardian*, 6-26-77, "Despairing Voice of France's Lost Generation," by Walter Schwarz. As against this critique, the "Le Monde" section of the 7-10-77 issue of *Manchester Guardian* published a panegyric by Philippe Sollers.

(3) The author of the statement is Regis Debray (*The Manchester Guardian*, 6-26-77).

(4) *New York Times*, Sunday, 7-10-77, Section 3, "Business and Finance."

strates these hard facts: (1) slower growth, (2) lower investments, (3) higher unemployment, and (4) hard-core inflation of 6 percent as against the 1-2 percent inflation characteristic of most of the 1960s. Moreover, this "hard-core inflation" is actually not what it is, but what it is hoped it will be brought down to. It is true we are no longer in the two digit inflation of 14.6 percent rise in 1974, and 13.5 percent in 1975, but we are not too far behind the 9.3 percent inflation of last year.

Secondly, and inseparable from that pivotal "investment drought" even when there is some growth, is the rise in energy cost which means that, along with the rising cost of automated equipment, too much value is invested, compared to labor productivity, when so little living labor is being used in production. The capitalists may not be ready to "agree" with Marx that the supreme commodity, labor-power, is the only source of all value and surplus value, but they do see that there is such a decline in the rate of profit compared to what they consider necessary to keep investing for expanded production, that they are holding off — so much so that now their ideologists are saying low investment is, by no means a temporary factor that the capitalists would "overcome" with the next boom. There is to be no next boom.

Thirdly, they, on the one hand, keep complaining about the workers', especially the young workers', attitude to labor — "the blue collar blues" — and, on the other hand, admit that, with a massive 34.1 percent youth unemployment, the very survival of the capitalist system is in question.

It was not only an academic — the serious bourgeois economist, Simon Kuznets — who, ever since the end of World War II, maintained that the "emergence of the violent Nazi regime in one of the most economically developed countries of the world raises grave questions about the institutional basis of modern economic growth — if it is susceptible to such a barbaric deformation as a result of transient difficulties." ⁶ It was a high Western governmental leader, Giscard d'Estaing, in 1977 who questioned the survival of the capitalistic system. Solzhenitsyn-inspired, retrogressionist intellectuals complain that capitalism has seen the emergence of a "strange siren whose body is Capital and whose head is Marxist."

But governmental statistics show good cause for those capitalistic headaches: the biggest increase in poverty since 1959 occurred in 1975 and has persisted. No less than a rise of 10 percent in the number of poor, totalling now 25.9 millions, are below poverty level. That means that no less than 12 percent of all Americans had an income of less than \$5,500 annually.

When this pervades the richest country in the world, consider the irony that a famous Trotskyist economist is so bent on selling us state-capitalist monstrosities as "not yet fully fledged classless, that is, socialist societies: the USSR, the People's Republics of Eastern Europe, China, North Vietnam, North Korea and Cuba," that he perverts Marx in his greatest theoretical work, *Capital*, as allegedly holding that, without an unemployed army, "capitalism cannot survive." ⁷ As we

(Continued on Page 2)

(5) See *Foreign Affairs*, January, 1977, "A Troubled World Economy."

(6) Simon Kuznets, *Postwar Economic Growth*. See also his *Capital in the American Economy*.

(7) See Ernest Mandel's Introduction to the new English (Pelican Marx Library) edition of Marx's *Capital*, as well as his analysis "A Hesitant, Uneven, and Inflationary Uplturn" in *Intercontinental Press*, 11-29-76.

wrote, "The point is that, even if one didn't wish to accept our analysis of state-capitalism as the total contradiction, absolute antagonism in which is concentrated nothing short of revolution, and counter-revolution, one would have to admit that the totality of the contradictions compels a total philosophic outlook . . . Therein is the genius of Marx who, though he wrote during a free enterprise, private property, competitive capitalism era, saw that, instead of plan vs. market chaos being the absolute opposites, the chaos in the market was, in fact, the expression of the hierarchic, despotic plan of capital at the point of production. 'Materialism' without dialectics is 'idealism', bourgeois idealism of the state-capitalist age."⁸

Such Marxist revisionism, like anarchist total rejection, not just of "vanguardism", but of all organizational forms (See Part III), can only make room for outright retrogression that has yet to complete any of the revolts and near revolutions that have spontaneously arisen in the movement from practice these past two decades.

II. Political Crises (Sino-Soviet Conflict included) in Our Age of State-Capitalism

The Plenum Call, in recalling past Middle East crises and wars, including the critique of the UN Resolution "Zionism is Racism", pointed to the tentacles of U.S. imperialism globally:

... Take but a single paragraph from our very first critique of the UN Resolution on "Zionism is Racism" and you will see what the REB had in mind for opening the discussion as of today on the question of the totalitarian agency proposed for Energy and how that relates U.S. imperialism's hand from the Middle East to Africa:

"In fact, detente or no detente, B1 bomber or no B1 bomber, does not mean the U.S. will stop its imperialist drive. Or that the U.S.'s imperial hand will not be present in Angola. Or that it has forgotten the Arab Mideast oil, or Israel. In this, the over-riding goal of U.S. imperialism, whether it acts 'for' Israel and threatens Mideast oil kingdoms with invasion, or the opposite, 'capitulates' to them and pressures Israel into concessions, is but one thing. It has no intention whatever of letting the world's main energy source run out of total control of American oil companies."

With that in mind, it is necessary to take a second look at the latest and most volatile spark to yet another Middle East war that the electoral victory of the extreme-right Likud produced. Nothing more reactionary has occurred in Israel, then called Palestine, since the Likud leader, Menahem Begin, led his terrorist organization, then called Irgun, into the perpetration of an Arab massacre in Deir Yassin. Just as the "genuine Jewish revolutionaries, then fighting for independence from British imperialism, considered Begin a racist counter-revolutionary (though both were fighting Britain for a new homeland for the Jews),

(8) "Today's Global Crises, Marx's Capital, and the Marxist Epigones Who Try to Truncate It and the Understanding of Today's Crises" (*The Political-Philosophic Letters of Raya Dunayevskaya*, No. 9-10, Dec. 15-30, 1976). This, as well as the Special Editorial, "Carter Recreates Sedative for Nuclear Proliferation and Economic Crises," (*News & Letters*, June, 1977), are considered integral to the *Perspectives*, 1977-78.

so now the Jewish masses must fight him to the end.

No illusions can be entertained such as are now being fed by the daily press, that supposedly power will soften the Likud's aims to prepare Israel for another holocaust. With sober senses, the truth must be faced:

Nothing could better have fed the most extreme factions in the PLO that oppose Israel's very right to exist than Likud's victory. And nothing could have been thought up by the most rabid anti-Semites that would have been more provocative than Begin's appearance at the ultra-rightist Camp Kadum in the Israeli-occupied West Bank of Jordan, near Nablus, the very place where most militant Palestinian anti-Israeli demonstrations have taken place. If that was Menahem Begin's very first action as soon as he smelled victory, what can he have in store for the Israeli masses other than war?

Since the fratricidal Lebanese war, nothing so heated up the volatile situation as that extremist victory in Israel which showed that state-capitalism there, as everywhere, has as little use for its laboring masses as for the Palestinian masses. The retrogression is on every front, from attitude and preparations for war over occupied territories to the backwardness in attitude to women and education. At the same time, the U.S. is looking at the Arab potentates to see if they could not as well protect "Western" rights in the Middle East. It brings the situation as close to war as it has been since 1973.

There are already signs of restlessness in labor, especially rank-and-file, since Menahem Begin is as anti-labor toward Jewish workers as he is politically and globally reactionary towards the Palestinians. Here too, however, the U.S. is sure to play its most reactionary role. In the erratic tilting back and forth ever since the 1973 war — made even more ambivalent with Carter's speaking out of both sides of his mouth when he meets Arab potentates and when he meets Menahem Begin — there is only one thing that is clear, and that is that U.S. imperialism's aims come first and last, with no in-between.

No one can possibly know when the final confrontation, the nuclear holocaust between the two superpowers — U.S. and Russia — for single world control, will explode. One look at the latest, tiny, decolonized country — the Republic of Djibouti — and one can easily see that, even before the new independence flag was raised, not only were the countries in the immediate region

— Ethiopia, Somalia — looking hungrily at it, but the super-powers as well. Russia, in this case, was ready to align with the most reactionary military regime in Ethiopia to have a foothold from where it can meet both the challenge of Arab potentates and the beady eyes of the U.S. and Western imperialism. In a word, even the little value of Djibouti's "national economy" is disregarded as the strategic geography is looked at for control of the Red Sea.

Gone are the mid-1950s and early 1960s when Western Europe deluded itself that with its economic growth in that decade, it could outdistance the U.S. Gone is Mao's China's illusion that the superstructure (especially his Little Red Book) is superior to any new weaponry.

For that matter, gone also is Russia's delusion that because it is catching up with the U.S. in military might, it can make that be the economic superpower U.S. alone has. By now, so wobbly is the foundation of global capitalism that the global titan itself, U.S. capitalist imperialism, has to fight for its life against its own masses, Black especially. The ideologues themselves have begun substituting "balance of weaknesses" for "balance of terror", which was supposed to be what will keep us from the final holocaust.

The serious capitalist ideologues know that it is impossible indefinitely to "stabilize" the shaky system as the two nuclear giants keep girding for the final holocaust, and the North-South "imbalance" finds no "adjustment." That message came through loud and clear from the latest inconclusive conference between the industrially developed countries and those technologically less developed lands. Which is why not only U.S. "diplomats" who worked for detente with Russia, but West Europe (especially West Germany) is trying to prod the Carter Administration not to be so "naive" as to let the crucial detente with Russia come unglued over some abstract "human rights" issue when everybody knows that there is no lack of violation of human rights in each of their own domains, the U.S.'s most of all as it collaborates most profitably with all counter-revolutionary regimes, from Chile to South Africa.

Even so totalitarian a regime as Russia can ask — and this time be listened to because that is a question it is correct on — "How can one pose as a champion of human rights and at the same time brandish the neutron bomb that threatens the lives of millions of people ... (What) revolts the reason and conscience of mankind must evoke a feeling of delight among the 'lovers of man' in Washington."

Naturally, the fact that Russia calls itself Communist cannot possibly eliminate its own class, state-capitalist class, nature, either in its exploitation of its own proletariat, or in the many crises that beset it as it competes with "the West," which now includes Japan as honorary member. But that is not what prompts Western Europe to prod the U.S. to cool off on the question of "human rights." Quite the contrary. What worries them is fear of revolution in their own countries; none has ever forgotten Paris, May 1968. Because that is so, they are trying to buy

time in the continuation of detente with Russia, rather than rushing into any confrontation among the superpowers.

In a state-capitalist age, full state-capitalism has proven no more capable of resolving its crises than had private monopoly capitalism, either in the pre-World War I period, or pre-World War II. Capitalism in any form goes from crises to war and back again. World War III, however, threatens the very survival of humanity. Which is why everyone — from the Left, to the capitalist ideologues, to the mystics — tries to designate something as a lesser evil which is "preferable" to chose. But the truth is the lesser evil only brings on the greater evil.

Long before Solzhenitsyn discovered the Gulag Archipelago, we exposed the forced labor camps in Russia. Ever since the first workers' state was transformed into its opposite, we analyzed the class nature of Russia, declaring it to be state-capitalist. From early on, however, we stressed that Stalinism was but the Russian name of the new stage that world capitalism reached as the Great Depression sounded the death knell for private capitalism.

The outright counter-revolutionary role of Stalin's Russia, far from ending with the Hitler-Stalin Pact (or even with the death of Stalin), first began confronting the revolution against its imperialism with the June 1953 East German Revolt.

Khrushchev's so-called de-Stalinization did not convince anyone in Hungary not to oppose Russian imperialism as they started an altogether new chapter in Marx's Humanism as the true classless society.

Brezhnev reached the apogee of counter-revolution when he tried to make a "universal" of this counter-revolutionary act in Czechoslovakia, 1968, declaring it a "socialist international right" of Russia to intervene anywhere. This, far from getting Communists to help his competition with the "West", brought about such disintegration in Communism as to produce, among "Western" Communists who were not in open rebellion against Russia, the revisionist phenomenon of Eurocommunism.

It is not that, however, which undermines Russian imperialism. What shakes it to its foundation are the outright revolts in East Europe, those

(9) International Socialism, No. 100, July, 1977, is opening a special discussion on the theory of state capitalism. Michael Kidron praises Tony Cliff to the skies as if he originated the theory, never once mentioning Raya Dunayevskaya who had made the study of the "Nature of the Russian Economy" from original sources as well as working out the theory nearly a full decade before the appearance of the book by Tony Cliff. At this late stage he has discovered that state-capitalism is a world stage. In introducing the discussion, the IS editorial is even more absurd both in its claims and its openness as it finally gets around to admitting that "it neglected the massive reality of the oppression of women and everything it involved—the whole gamut of sexual politics." How long before we can expect an acknowledgement that the state-capitalist theory, as originally developed in the U.S. in 1941, not only refused to be limited to the "Russian Question", showing it was a new world stage, but proceeded both to relate it to the dialectic of Alienated Labor, and to single out Women as a revolutionary force that was Reason as well? Too many, in Old and New left alike outdo even capitalist ideologues both in one-sidedness in writing history, and wholesale revision in rewriting it.

reported and those unreported, that have been continuous for two long decades. Moreover, the latest 1976 revolt in Poland has revealed that its dissidents, far from being mainly intellectuals, are massively proletarian.

When myriad crises beset each country and the world as a whole, it may be pointless to try to single out which one will explode first. But one thing is sure. The Middle East is not the only one, though it may be the most immediate one. It may also come from the Panama Canal Zone. After all, that is a pure case of 19th century "in perpetuity" imperialism. It is there where there have been many revolts, and at this moment, it has the UN also on its side to try to end that vengeful, endless imperialism.

For West Europe to glory in its being the key to the international situation means allowing the U.S. to continue its neglect of Latin America to the point where, not the Secretary of State, but Mrs. Carter, loudly calling the President "Jimmy," delivers the final snub of indifference. In truth, it is neither the Middle East nor Latin America; neither Europe nor Djibouti-Ethiopia, which is likely to have the deepest, long-range effect of all the global crises this year. It is the death of Mao Tse-tung and the consequent reorganization of Chinese planning to more rapid industrialization and new weaponry that looms as most significant. It is no accident that about the last person Mao arranged to see (and Hua saw just a few days after Mao's death) was Schlesinger, who was most against Russian detente and most "for" modernizing Chinese weaponry.

Whatever de-Maoization is to develop now, abolition of the Sino-Soviet conflict is not one of those "principles." The border incidents in 1969-70 that nearly catapulted into an outright Russo-Chinese war encouraged U.S. imperialism to learn to take advantage of that conflict it so long had ignored. In the midst of the Vietnam War, Kissinger-Nixon taught the U.S. to take full imperialist advantage to get both Russia and China to help the U.S. get out of the Vietnamese War on its terms. U.S. imperialism was appreciative of such collaboration because at the very moment, the internal anti-Vietnamese War movement and Black Revolution in the U.S. were shaking it up so massively that it couldn't possibly have won without Russo-Chinese aid!

Naturally post-Mao China's present preparedness to intervene in a global way is not a matter of it being "for" the West, but of its aims that China itself become a global power. Russia, to it, is "Enemy No. 1" and this concept (which became dominant during the Cultural Revolution) is the one solid piece of Maoism they all adhere to. This has already led to such fantastic counter-revolutionary positions as to be very nearly with South Africa in opposition to the MPLA's victory of Angolan independence with Russian-Cuban help. While calling the Cubans "mercenaries," China did nothing short of opposing the Portuguese Revolution to the point of being for NATO.

Such imperialist collaboration Schlesinger naturally prefers to detente with Russia. This is the same Schlesinger who, as Secretary of Defense, gave the go-signal both for the neutron bomb and B-1 bomber, and who is now head of the new totalitarian monstrosity called Energy Research and Development Administration. It is necessary, therefore, to take another look at the N-bomb, keeping in mind also the sneaky adumbrated one-liner, in the 1978 budget for ERDA (Energy Research and Development Administration) in which it was cited: "W70 Mod 3 Lance Enhanced Radiation Warhead." If doomsday weapons can thus be slighted over, if Russia can shout to the skies that it is not they but the U.S. that is in over its head with death-ray experimentations—even as we found some 15 years after the event that the CIA planted germ warfare in New York subways and other such "foreign" places—what fear need we have of a "foreign" enemy? The enemy is right here; it is our exploitative, racist rulers.

III. Dialectics of Liberation: "Ultra-Leftism," Apertidarismo, and the Politicalization of New Forces of Revolution as Reason

The Political-Philosophic Letters actually began in the special January-February, 1976, News & Letters, with "Will the Revolution in Portugal Advance?" By no accident, our activities likewise

expanded internationally and nationally and not only in class struggles with the ARA women workers or with Black struggles and in all strike actions, but also in unscheduled publications—*New Essays and Sexism, Politics and Revolution in Mao's China* . . . that will actually initiate new activities this year, again both nationally and internationally. The new international relations established from England to Portugal, and from Italy to Mexico, may also extend to China, to which subject we will return as we formulate the conclusion at the end of our Perspectives, 1977-1978.

Because politicalization had, in the hands of the Old Left, meant vanguardism and program-hatching, we have kept away from the very word. It is high time not to let "the vanguard party to lead" appropriate the word, politicalization. The return is to its original meaning in Marx's new continent of thought as the uprooting of the capitalistic state, its withering away, so that new humanist forms like the Paris Commune, 1871, emerge. Marx himself was so non-vanguardist that, though "his" first International had dissolved itself, he hailed the railroad strikes spreading throughout the U.S. (climaxed by the 1877 St. Louis General Strike), as both an elemental "post festum" to the First Workingmen's International Association, and point of origin for a genuine workers' party. ¹⁰

Naturally, this does not mean living in the 19th century. Rather, its recreation for our day is rooted in what has been original with us from the start, i.e., 1953, when, at one and the same time, we broke through on the Absolute Idea as a movement from practice, and an actual eruption—the very first revolution from under totalitarian Communism—did occur in East Germany. Both movements, in thought and in practice, compelled a working out of so new a relationship of theory to practice; that, with it, came the task of singling out new forces of revolution as well as unequivocally articulating those forces of revolution themselves as Reason, instead of the come-from-above vanguardist party "to lead." Though to most others in the U.S. the 1950s was

(Continued on Page 12)

(10) Marx's statement, dated July 25, 1877, is to be found on page 42 of *Then and Now: On the 100th Anniversary of the First General Strike in the U.S.*, by Terry Moon and Ron Brokmeyer, recently published by News & Letters.

the quiescent decade with its own "beat generation," while women, at best, were looked at only if they "made it" in a man's world, we singled out women as one of the forces of revolution, along with Blacks, labor and youth. From this followed not only activities in struggles at the point of production as well as in all freedom movements, but breaking with the concept of "vanguard party to lead" as well as all prerogatives of elitist leadership. Not only was *News & Letters* established as the forum for voices from below, but we chose as its editor a Black production worker, Charles Denby, and as West Coast editor another production worker, this time white, Felix Martin. While the principle of decentralization is carried throughout the paper, there is no division between theory and practice, as both are integral to the paper and its readers-writers. Though, by choice, we are not a Party, but a Committee, we are active participants with a unique Marxist-Humanist philosophy in all class struggles as well as Black revolts, in Women's Liberation as well as anti-war movements. (See Kent State article, p.9.) The intensification of these struggles this year goes hand-in-hand with the internationalization of *Philosophy and Revolution* — Portuguese, Italian, Japanese and German editions will be published this Fall and next Spring. The Spanish edition is just off the press (see ad this page).

When compared to the turbulent decade of the 1960s, the 1970s seemed at first to be a comedown, practically like the "quiescent" 1950s—so much so that even the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Portugal in 1974 was at the beginning looked on as if it were no more than the substitution of "democratic" capitalism for fascist capitalism. With the overthrow of Spínola, however, not to mention the world economic crises of 1973, the whole of the Left, Old and New, flocked into Portugal in recognition that a new age of revolutions had started.

The shock of recognition, moreover, was to the new, to the fact that something revolutionary was happening at one and the same time, in Europe and Africa. From Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and Angola, new international relations were established.

From Portugal a new word was born, *apartidarismo* (non-partyism); a new philosophy articulated of freedom in a new organizational form, with totally new elemental revolutionary forces. The non-partyism was no aberration away from the need of organization. Rather it was a rejection of the vanguardism that has destroyed so many revolutions — and not only by totalitarian Communism, but also by the elitism that stifled revolutions even before they self-developed.

The fact that the Portuguese counter-revolution of Nov. 25, 1975, could not, could not fully destroy the ongoing revolution, the rethinking in the country, as well as in the world Left, shows that it is not just a question of a word, *apartidarismo*, but a matter of facing anew the relationship of spontaneity to organization, of theory to practice, of philosophy to revolution.

The international event this year that made the greatest impression in the U.S. because of its affinity to the Black Revolution here is Soweto. From Soweto came the most profound and most crucial Black Revolution in the most virulent racist regime in the world—apartheid South Africa. High school youth, who read Frantz Fanon and Martin Luther King, look more to the Black Revolution in America than even to the revolution that started so new a global decade with the

1960s' revolutions in West and East Africa. It is this relation to the Black Revolts here that gives a totally new aspect to the Black Revolution in the U.S. Though it seemed to have stopped, it actually continued in a new form, trying not only to do, but to think, and to work out the very same type of relationship of philosophy to revolution as is characteristic of, on the one hand, Portugal, and on the other hand, China.

It is this which makes our tasks all the more urgent, because the time that is running out is for capitalism, the time that is coming is for a total uprooting of that which is. With that in mind, we project the following tasks (all of which will be fully developed in the Organization Report):

● First, a new pamphlet, **Frantz Fanon, Soweto, and American Black Thought**. The publication date is to be April, 1978. April is important to African Liberation, which from the start actually meant Black Revolution in the U.S., in the Caribbean, as well as in Africa. The draft of the pamphlet will not only be available for discussion at the Plenum to non-members as well as members, but, far from being "literature", it will be a basis for new activities with other groups.

● Secondly, new international relations must be further concretized, and not only for Europe and Africa, but with China. The good beginning that was established in 1966 has clearly had its ramifications into the 1970s.

Along with the translation into Chinese of the chapter from **Marxism and Freedom**, on "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung", has come the chapter on "The Cultural Revolution"—published by an anarchist group, **The '70s**, which compiled "Ultra Left" writings in **The Revolution is Dead—Long Live the Revolution**. The most exciting parts of that book are the voices from mainland China. It is clear that ever since the Cultural Revolution, many of the Chinese youth took Mao at his word that it was "right to rebel," that the Party headquarters must "be bombarded," and "capitalist readers" stopped from introducing Russian "revisionism", and instead, have the Paris Commune put into practice. The fact that Mao and his Little Red Book promptly declared the Sheng-Wu-Lien "ultra-left" and imprisoned its leader⁽¹⁾, simply drove the movement underground, but did not stop its further development. Quite the contrary. They arose again during the anti-Confucius, anti-Lin Piao campaign, and once more in the spontaneous mass demonstration in Tien An Men Square April 1976. The fact that many of these youth have a passion for a philosophy of liberation as well as actual liberation opens the debate on an altogether new level.

To this end came our two unscheduled pamphlets. The first—**New Essays**—has not merely "updated" **Philosophy and Revolution** with the

(1) An interview with an "ultra-Leftist" published in **Undergrad**, No. 15, 1974-75, and republished in **The Revolution is Dead—Long Live the Revolution** (p.245), states that "Yang Hsi Kwang's 'Whither China?' had brought him 20 years of imprisonment and actually no one really knows whether he was alive or dead."

essay on "Hegel's Absolute Idea As New Beginning", but made its entry into the battle of ideas in a new field. The essay, "Leon Trotsky As Man and As Theoretician", anticipates the 100th anniversary of Leon Trotsky's birth in 1979, with a more challenging balance sheet than Trotskyists, orthodox and split, can ever meet, for it relates Marx's "New Humanism" with the revolutionary philosophy of our day that opened up with the Hungarian Revolution.

The other unscheduled publication, **Sexism, Politics and Revolution in Mao's China**, which the Women's Liberation, News & Letters Committee brought out, not only meets the challenge of the most current event—the fall of Chiang Ch'ing—but raises the questions left unanswered by the Women's Liberation movements today, Marxist as well as anti-Marxist, apolitical as well as "strictly" feminist. This, likewise, will aid in the establishment of relations with Chinese revolutionaries.

● Thirdly, nothing is more urgent in this neutron bomb age than the continuity with what was Marx's new continent of thought and the discontinuity with all attempts to degrade Marx's Humanism as well as Lenin's philosophic reorganization to no more than a tactic for vanguardists' narrowing of the global crises to some sort of welfare-statism, capitalist-style, as in the case with the Trotskyist Ernest Mandel's "Introduction" to a beautiful new translation of Marx's **Capital**. This sets another task, the British-American decision to publish a joint pamphlet, **Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crises**. This will be introduced by Harry McShane and will reproduce the four chapters on **Capital from Marxism and Freedom**, placed in the context of a critical analysis of the present global crises by Raya Dunayevskaya.

● Finally, we can under no circumstances limit our opposition to the neutron bomb to analyses, but must undertake activities with all other movements wanting to make sure that the rulers are not permitted to really set off that nuclear holocaust, be it with neutron bombs or cruise missiles or death rays or whatever insanities the exploitative, racist, sexist rulers devise for purposes of single world control to put an end to civilization as we have known it. In that respect, nothing is more important than continued proletarianization as well as maintaining and expanding **News & Letters**, which has always been a forum for all voices from below, as well as theoretical development not isolated from proletarian voices. Because we feel confident that our readers feel this same urgency, we are appealing to them to help us raise this year the barest minimum — \$15,000 — for the **News & Letters Sustaining-Organizing-Publishing Fund**.

The new urgency, for work here as well as internationally, demands the working out of such a new relationship of philosophy to revolution that its very philosophic articulation as well as the elemental revolts from below will produce totally new organizational forms with which to realize socialism on truly human foundations.

—The Resident Editorial Board
June 28 - July 17, 1977