

REPORT TO THE CONVENTION OF
NEWS & LETTERS COMMITTEES
SEPTEMBER 2, 1972

PERSPECTIVES

1972-73

BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

INTRODUCTION: Lord Nixon, or Super-Patriotism, Last Refuge of Scoundrels	p.1
I - A "Pentagonal" World, or a State-Capitalist World in Total Crisis and Disarray?	p.3
II- The U.S. Colossus Has More Than One Achilles Heel: Nixon's Genocidal Vietnam War; the New Global Probings; the Plunge into State-Capitalism; and the War on Black America	p.3
III- The Todayness of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION	p.12
and	
Table of Contents of <u>Philosophy and Revolution</u>	p.17

News & Letters 1900 E. Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. 48207

PRICE 50¢

4497

Raya Dunayevskaya

PERSPECTIVES REPORT 1972-1973

INTRODUCTION: Lord Nixon, or Super-Patriotism as Last Refuge
of Scoundrels

We've all recently suffered through a deluge of words from the euphoria-ridden Republican Convention, which deprived all words of any meaning. Words, words, words. Lying words which try to cover rabid racism with a euphemism about "quality education" and the preservation of neighborhoods by the very people who, the moment they see a Black face in their precious neighborhood, escape to suburbia.

Shameful words that, in trying to deny the deliberate destruction of dikes by "smart" bombs which can only lead to the breakup of the most basic of human relations -- that between nature and man -- yet dare utter such depraved words as that dehumanized brute Nixon had used: "we are not using the great power that could finish off North Vietnam in an afternoon!"

Forked-tongue words which communicate as the witches did in Macbeth when they prophesied a kingdom for Macbeth without revealing that it involved murders "most foul", including, finally, his own. In just such manner, Nixon prophesies peace, though he knows full well that he means the peace of the dead.

From the start, "honorable peace" meant to Nixon transformation into opposite: 1) Vietnam war turned into a full-scale Indochina war; 2) bringing of the wars abroad home against the anti-war American youth, against Blacks, and finally against labor; and 3) Vietnamization -- i.e., carrying on the Vietnam War to the last Vietnamese, or exchanging the color of the dead bodies.

To see these in a world context, we need to take into account still another word -- this time not directly from Nixon, but from the strange intellectual he keeps in residence at the White House, Dr. (Strangelove) Kissinger. The newly-minted word, one of those Kissinger invents as cover up for the greatest nuclear colossus of the word, is Pentagonal.

Whatever Freudian slip of the pen entered into the coining of a word bearing such striking resemblance to our Pentagon-run world, the intellectual had in mind, not the residence of the military staff of the imperialist colossus. Rather, the intellectual was out to prove the existence of the many powers.

No cheap skate was he. A "mere" tri-polar world would only prove it is still a bi-polar one -- the third, China, having gained its independence

from the Sino-Soviet orbit when that turned into Sino-Soviet conflict. Nor would the inventor of words be satisfied with the projection of the International Institute of Strategic Studies, which, in its annual report, spoke of the new "great power quadrilateral" -- that "genuinely global system with two non-white countries (China and Japan) firmly among the leaders."

Alice in Wonderland couldn't have been happier with her reformed Wizard of Oz than Mao's China was bedding down with Tanaka's Japan, according to these pragmatic wonder boys! But the quadrilateral exponents didn't satisfy the inventor of the word, pentagonal, for he saw no less than five superpowers -- since he had not forgotten Europe, at least Western Europe. (And now that Brezhnev, with Nixon nodding at his side is calling for an all-European Security Conference, do we need to go in for sextuplets?)

Before the Superpowers' euphoria robs us of all our sober senses, let us face reality in this year of Lord Nixon, 1972, who proclaimed in his State of the World message last February -- just before he embarked on that journey to the only other nuclear superpower, Russia -- the end of the bipolar world and the emergence of "increasing self-reliance of the states created by the dissolution of empires."

For his part, he had initiated the decade of the 1970's by the invasion of Cambodia, while he continued to lay waste Laos and napalm Vietnamese children, and not only in the "enemy" North, but in the "comradely" South. Vietnamization makes sure of the latter, while "smart bombs" keep ever higher the honor of Nixon's Amerikka! Super-Patriotism has ever been the last refuge of scoundrels. And the U.S. has never produced a bigger one than its present President.

As American revolutionaries, we need to work hardest to stop that mad bomber, and thus it was natural that in our Draft Perspectives, "How to Combat Nixon's Pax Americana", we concentrated our analysis by sticking to native grounds. We will do so here again today, but it is necessary to do so in a world context, and thus we turn first to our allegedly pentagonal world.

-3-

I A PENTAGONAL WORLD? OR A STATE-CAPITALIST
WORLD IN CRISIS AND DISARRAY?

Let's begin with Japan, since that is the country to which, it was said, just last year, the 21st century belonged.

In industrial strength, Japan certainly is a giant, and not only, as is Russia, in traditional industries, but, as our scientific age in love with itself would have it, in "science-oriented technology." Came 1971, and that nuclear imperialistic colossus, USA (though it, itself, was faring very badly in everything from foreign trade imbalance -- the worst since 1893 -- to domestic revolts) slapped a tax on Japanese imports that forced devaluation of the yen, and embarked on an unprecedented trip to mainland China without bothering to inform, much less consult, Japan. Of necessity, the Japanese industrial giant discovered its clay feet, stuck in the quagmire of too many exports in a world market that is both Western-oriented and state-capitalistically controlled. At once, politics and economics fused.

Let no one think that just because the state-monopolistic clique still rules Japan, the change in premiership amounted to nothing. No matter how many "secret" trips Kissinger makes to Tokyo, and even when Nixon himself finally meets Tanaka "to explain it all", things will never be the same. Many a Japanese must be saying to himself -- DeGaulle was right after all, the U S. "nuclear umbrella" cannot be trusted.

Chou En-lai may have convinced Reston that Japan is not only an industrial but a military giant, and that the same old militaristic clique is in control. But that military clique knows its people -- and the only nation in the world that experienced the horrors of an atomic blast is not about to allow its rulers to play at militarism!

Statisticians may declaim that the Left has lost the phenomenal strength of the 1960's, which kept Eisenhower out of Japan. But the truth is that the Left, despite the splintering and Maoism and even Weatherman-type lunatic fringe, is a power. Added to these facts is a not unimportant experience -- the rest of the Orient has not forgotten what fascistic militarism has wrought in the world of World War II!

No, Japan is not a "pentagonal" power in a non-existent pentagonal nuclear world.

For that matter, take a true nuclear titan which certainly is challenging the U.S. the world around -- Russia. We have heard a great deal (at the very moment when we were supposed to have had a breakthrough in the nuclear race and when the arms buildup would supposedly stand still once the SALT agreement was signed) as to how "superior" Russia

4500

-4-

is to the U.S. in some fields, how it is the only one to make headway in the Middle East, and has more submarines, and the equivalent of MIRV -- and how we just must not stop doing the same.

People, however, do not eat ICBMs. The discontent of the Russian masses, though not as obvious as that in the East European countries, is there. Brezhnev may not have the flamboyance of a Khrushchev, who claimed in the 1960's that Russia "will surpass the strongest and richest capitalist country, the USA, in production per head of population", claiming ^{only} that the 5th Five Year Plan would "surpass" it in "traditional" industries (steel, coal, cement -- but hardly agriculture). But the truth is that in both absolute terms, and in decisive industries in our age -- electronics, chemicals, computers (especially computers) -- it is "receding" rather than "surpassing". Thus, in relative terms, Russia in 1950 had but one-third the wealth of the U.S., and in 1970 it had one-half of its wealth. But in absolute terms, the American Gross National Product was \$275 billion greater than Russia's in 1950, and at present it is \$500 billion greater.

And, because it is its own masses it fears the most, the Russian rulers, in 1967, did finally admit that we live in a state-capitalist age -- though, of course, it still excluded itself! The point was, to try to explain away the persistence of capitalism's life and Russia's own backwardness, it had to demand more and more labor productivity. The claim was that state-capitalism had achieved the high stage because of science and because they had learned from "socialism" to plan, though "not fully". Since the "socialist lands" had done away with private property, all the wealth belongs to the people, and just as soon as labor is more productive its wages would rise. Nixon couldn't have explained his wage controls better!

Where Russia does have the advantage over the U.S. is on the ideological front. Counter-revolutionary state-capitalist society was born out of a revolution; though it was transformed into its absolute opposite, Russia does remember the betrayed revolution's words. Leszek Kolakowski may still hope Communism can be "reformed" (under pressure, of course!). Trotskyism may continue to speak of revolution while it tail-ends Stalinist nationalized property. And Herbert Marcuse may remember that one needs at least one technologically advanced land whose proletariat "could" help the third world, which "should" learn about some sort of "peaceful co-existence" with such a land as Russia. But the truth is that Russia is out for world mastery just as is U.S. imperialism.

For that matter, so is Mao's China, which, at least since the 1960's, has been motivated by a single "principle", that it has never openly announced, but always practiced: Russia is Enemy No. 1, and must be so recognized by the "revolutionary movement" the world over. Just now it is gloating over Egypt's expulsion of the Soviet "advisors".

(4501

-5-

Sadat did not expel Russian imperialism for revolutionary perspectives, but only in order to exchange, or at least bargain for more, be it from American imperialism or Qaddafi's militaristic Islamism. It is one thing for China to approve anything and everything against Russia. After all, she rushed to approve the Sudan-Libya slaughter of the Communists (and others) who tried overthrowing the military clique running both countries. But why should the independents become professionals at being "anti-Russia"? And what will they say as the unholy trinity of Saudi Arabia - Oman - Libya move to overthrow the Union Emirates?

China does more now to clothe outright imperialism and genocidal warfare a la Pakistan in Marxist language and play the Uriah Heep "little person" game than even Russia, which has the greater counter-revolutionary experience.

No sooner had China proclaimed how she is no super-power and doesn't wish to be one, than she proceeded to use her pentagonal power to veto the application of Bangla Desh for membership in the UN. And what about the 75 million Bengalis, now forming the eighth greatest nation in the world, who survived the Mao-supported fascistic military regime of Yahyah Kahn in their fight for self-determination? To Mao, they mean nothing. Not only must that be exposed, but so must all the apologists for Mao.

It is no accident that Mao, who understands power very well indeed, wanted first and foremost to learn all about atomic power. His disdain any fear of it may have shocked Nehru straight out of his wits in 1957, but insofar as Mao was concerned, the moment it was clear that Russia would not let him be privy to that power, the parting of the ways of the two "Communist" powers was inevitable.

And it is no accident that though in all other respects, China is still a most backward country where per capita income is one of the lowest in the world -- \$145 per capita per year, China at once gave priority to the military. Far from relying on "mass mobilizations", the priority went to developing atomic power. Thus, the first atomic explosion came within hours of Khrushchev's downfall (or was it vice versa?) in October 1954. The following year, in 1965, they began to build ICBMs. The first nuclear test came in 1967. That is, China did in three years what it took the more industrialized and richer France eight years to achieve. Their first satellite followed, twice the size of Sputnik Number One. And this year, 1972, China deployed a handful of new missiles with a range of 2500 miles. (Moscow is less than that from Chinese soil.)

This does not mean that they are yet a match for Russia's awesome nuclear power, but China did begin to look like a serious threat to Russia in the wake of China's flirtations with U.S. imperialism, which was transformed by Mao from Enemy No. 1 into one for whom the red carpet was rolled out.

4502

In a word, whether it is Russia, which has become an industrial power, but not the equal of U.S. imperialism, or whether it is China, which is nowhere near the U.S. or Russia -- the "equalizer" in a nuclear world is the bomb.

And don't under-estimate the impact on South East Asia of China's Bomb. But, again, the edge China (like Russia, only "purer") has on gargantuan U.S. is not ordinary capitalistic military might, in which the U.S. remains tops, but the ability to use Marxian language to cover up its internal exploitation and its global ambitions. Nor can it be forgotten that China is the most populous nation on earth.

But would the beginnings of nuclear know-how -- if you were in the center of Europe, faced Russia on the one hand, and, on the other hand, did not have the so-called nuclear umbrella of the U.S. -- really make you a global power by economic strength alone? Let's examine Western Europe and see. Let's go on the assumption that it is a unified pentagonal entity -- which it isn't. But it is an economic power. Its GNP is no less than \$640 billion -- that is, two-thirds of the strength of the U.S., no mean wealth. It has 40 percent of the world's trade, and there surely is room for many illusions there for, as 1971 showed, the U.S. imbalance of trade made Europe look healthier than it was.

Europe's 250 million inhabitants surely occupy a most technologically advanced land. During the 1950's, it thought it would surpass the U.S. since its rate of growth was phenomenal, while the U.S.'s stagnated. 1973 is supposed to be its "year of decision", as not only Great Britain becomes part of the Common Market, finally, but both France and West Germany face elections after very critical periods, especially in "Social Democratic" West Germany which initiated so phenomenal a turning point in post World War II politics as Ostpolitik.

Nevertheless, far from meaning a united West Europe, West Germany's new independence in its political stance was the major reason for France finally voting Great Britain into the Common Market. Though De Gaulle was about the only one who had recognized the Oder-Nieson line as the realistic dividing line emerging out of Nazi Germany's defeat in World War II, the fact that West Germany acknowledged it would also have had him decide that Great Britain was, after all, "European".

After all, it was to counter Great Britain's strength and "special relationship" to the U.S. that led De Gaulle to lean on West Germany -- that is, where it didn't entertain the grand illusion that, though Germany was the greater economic power, France was the "center" if not the whole of Europe.

- 7 -

And now what was needed, in France's eyes that looked at the land mass all the way to the Urals as "Europe", its Europe, were a great many "counterweights". It is smiling at NATO again and rushing headlong right back to deGaulism, as it fears that May 1963 may not be quite as dead as it had thought.

That Russia now considers Ostpolitik a great victory for itself (and has made East Germany toe the line accordingly) itself shows a very changed world from 1964 when Khrushchev's very mention of contemplating a trip to West Germany contributed mightily to his downfall.

But what kind of change? Ah, there is the rub.

These realignments are not of a class nature. They are inter-imperialist, inter-state-capitalist realignments, all aimed against the proletariat, the internal class enemy. And that class enemy, not in Ostpolitik of West Germany, but in true East Europe, has not stopped revolting for two full decades. Instead, Brezhnev and Nixon, when he smiles at the European Security Conference, act as if East Europe's masses are represented by the Warsaw Pact, and Western Europe's by NATO.

The players have changed somewhat, and the differences may not be minor. The strains they reveal, the trades needed, the inadequacies of even the biggest power in Western Europe, West Germany, to make it on its own, are by no means to be disregarded. Inter-capitalist rivalries, as they intensify and surface, are not unimportant signs of a pre-revolutionary situation, when the proletariat itself carries on class battles, and the deluge comes. And, indeed, there is no doubt whatever that it is precisely because of the economic crisis, the class discontent, the alienated restless youth, new forces of rebellion (watch how the nationality problem worries a Tito and brings ever new strains in both East and West Europe) -- that the changes have come But to conclude from this that the Cold War is over, that there are multi-centers of nearly equal power, is to substitute the convolutions of one's own head, pentagonal or otherwise, for the class reality.

The class reality shows that the richest, the mightiest super power, U. S. imperialism -- West Europe's, like Japan's "nuclear umbrella" -- has not only not escaped from any of the ordinary ills of private capitalism, but likewise has had to plunge into a form of state-capitalism.

Let's examine the Nixon-style in the NEP, so tightly tied to the ceaseless Vietnam War, which also sent him on those unprecedented journeys to Mao's China, where he went in to panegyrics, including the quoting of The Chairman's poetry, and to Brezhnev's Russia, where he went about the business of conspiring to make SALT appear a veritable "journey to peace". What we will see is that there has been no stopping of what Marx long ago called "the law of motion of capitalist production", which like a tidal wave carries capitalism to its downfall, even where this concerns the single mightiest power on earth.

- 3 -

II THE U.S. COLOSSUS HAS MORE THAN ONE ACHILLES HEEL:
Nixon's Genocidal Vietnam War; Global Probing; Plunge into State-Capitalism; and the War on Black America

The self-created euphoria of the well-heeled, the perverse, the war-hawks, the racists, following the White House script at the Republican Convention and bursting balloons proclaiming the coronation of Nixon and the good life in this "the best land on earth" -- all this hoopla notwithstanding, the American reality, even in "purely" economic terms shows itself as follows (and I'm not quoting some wild-eyed radicals, but the staid Business Week's "Who Has the Wealth in America?" of Aug. 5, 1972) :

1) Not only are the rich getting richer and the poor poorer, but the gap between the richest and the poorest continues to widen. Indeed, according to the census statistics reported in the New York Times last year (5/9/71), the year 1970 reversed a 10 year trend and we are back again where Marx started. And we are long past all the loud guffaws heard whenever Marx's law of pauperization was mentioned, so loud that even Marxists (the Trotskyist Ernest Mandel) felt obliged to say Marx didn't "really" mean that.

2) The top ten percent own fully 56 percent of all wealth, while the bottom ten percent not only get a mere one percent of that "affluence", but they owe more than they own. The fancy word for that poverty -- and we have by no means got down to the lowest and deepest -- is "negative wealth".

(So they do know such Hegelian terms as "negative"; too bad they use it to hide nothingness. Since there is only nothingness, not being, being and nothingness cannot equal becoming. No, Virginia, there is no Santa Claus; one is just weighted down by debts -- and that, as Marx had long, long ago seen, is the only "wealth" that belongs to the people!)

3) Alongside the domination of dead over living labor, capitalist exploitation of labor, there are also a few big fishes who eat up little fishes. That is to say, the concentration of wealth is in ever fewer hands. The ten percent who own the 56% of the wealth get down to the one percent who really control. And if anyone had been naive enough to think that the Depression affected all and thus there has been a decrease in concentration, look at the latest statistics and you will see the truth that, far from decreasing, concentration of wealth, monopolization, keeps increasing.

Once again, only Marx saw it all along, as he discovered the law of motion of capitalism; traced vampire capital sucking all those unpaid hours of labor from the only productive force -- the working class; went on to trace such centralization of its wealth that it would end up "in the hands of a single capitalist or single capitalist corporation"; and showed that all along it would also suffer a decline in the rate of profit since all its mass kept coming out from relatively fewer and fewer living laborers.

That's when Nixon stepped in to intensify the exploitation of labor. As if that were not enough, galloping inflation cuts that controlled wage still lower. And, contrary to the one-dimensional thinking of our philosophers, the

workers are not getting integrated into capitalism, but keep revolting as strikes abound everywhere -- from Lordstown, Ohio to Southampton, England, and from Milan, Italy to West Virginia.

Ever more and more sweat is needed since so much of the production goes into bombs that produce nothing but total destruction and loss of "capital", none of which stops Nixon's mad militarization. The former Secretary of Defense, Clark Clifford, has detailed it in the New York Times, 7/2/72, as follows:

Right after Nixon's February journey to China, Laird announced that the escalation of the Vietnam War would cost up to \$5 billion more than anticipated. In May, Nixon journeyed to Moscow, and within days of his return with a SALT agreement, we find that the added price tag for nuclear arms control is about \$25 billion for new strategic weapons systems. Are these examples of what President Nixon means by "a generation of peace"? From '63 through '72 the government collected \$691 billion in income taxes, and in the same ten year period paid out \$680 billion for defense. Naval power in the Gulf of Tonkin has about doubled to 40,000. The number of B-52's has increased four times, with up to 100 B-52 sorties daily, at the cost of \$41,000 per sortie. Tactical aircraft has tripled with as many as 800 sorties daily at a cost of \$3,500 for each flight of a fighter-bomber. Arms limitation, in fact, has been converted into arms escalation. The four year deficit, besides unemployment and inflation, is close to \$100 billion!

The fact that Nixon can deny any contradiction in his Defense Secretary Laird's statement that, if Congress fails to approve the extra billions for nuclear weaponry he would oppose the SALT agreement, is proof of only one thing: for Nixon, words have truly and fully lost all meaning. After all, he of the forked-tongue is the one who ordered the holocaust against Vietnam at the very moment he pontificated about a "generation of peace." He must mean the peace of the dead.

Just as U.S. imperialism has never for one moment loosened the noose of neo-colonialism around the African nations though politically they had won their independence, so Nixon in his new globalism means to be master of the world. The one word of truth the President uttered as he asked Congress to approve SALT on his return from the Moscow summit was that three-fifths of the world's population have lived all their lives under frightful nuclear terror. What he failed to add is that they will hardly take the word of the male witch he is, as to how to end that nuclear terror.

As far as international trade is concerned, Nixon has certainly chalked up many firsts, Gargantuan ones. Thus, in 1971 the alarming truth which sent Nixon into protectionism was that for the first time since 1893, U.S. chalked up a deficit of \$171 million. And far from getting any better, trade deficit averaged \$557 million per month in the first half of 1972, which is way above the \$171 million recorded last year. U.S. News & World Report (Aug. 28, 1972) has all sorts of data by weeks, by days, by months, by quarters, by

- 10 -

years for those who care to follow that sorry state of the Nixon era.

Nothing, absolutely nothing, however, compares to the most disgusting of all of Nixonomics, and that is the unemployment, and the Welfare -- which he dared claim would make you (you, not him) "rich men" in many countries. He and his cohorts do not, however, propose to move there; it is the Blacks he'd like to move there. The retrogressionism here has moved us further back than before 1954, which would have only nullified Supreme Court decisions. We have seen retrogression further back even than 1993 -- all the way back to pre Civil War days.

The color of the deepest poverty, misery, permanent unemployment is BLACK, especially Black youth -- and to that Nixon pretends blindness. He has "solved" that problem by ordering that no records be kept.

Let us not forget the simultaneity of the "new" racism with Nixon's NEP as the way to break up class solidarity -- and global summitry as the way to get "Communist" China and Russia to betray Vietnam. Unfortunately, the counter-revolution does learn faster than the revolutionaries, just as the capitalist class has a more active class consciousness than the proletariat -- and so let us return to the scene through words. I do not know how many were aware of one new phrase in the Republican Party platform: "Reason and Order". Whether it was his intellectual ghost -- that strange, strange, strange Dr. Strangelove Kissinger -- or just the plain Madison Avenue kind of public relations man, the truth is that in contrast to last election's Mitchell-stamped slogan "law and order", this year's platform speaks of "Reason and order."

Not that it changes the class nature of state-capitalism in the U.S. Its only importance is the recognition that even the likes of Nixon are aware of the hunger of the masses not only for bread, but for reason, sanity, freedom. But words cannot possibly cover up the unreason of state-capitalism in crisis and disarray.

Of course the state intervention in the economy in this decade differs from that in the 1930's when we were in the depths of the Depression. And of course Nixon-style state-capitalism still has a long way to go to get to full state-capitalism, Russian or Chinese style. But that quantitative measure is not the key point of private capitalism turning into state-capitalism any more than it was the key in transformation of competitive into monopoly capitalism. The key point is the fusion of state and economy -- the fusion, that is, of politics and economics.

Naturally there is a difference, a big difference, between the 1930's, when Depression forced state intervention into the economy, and the 1970's when affluence compels the entry into state-capitalism. But that is just it. The difference in economic periods notwithstanding, the new quality -- state-capitalism as the fusion of state or politics and economics -- remains the

4507

- 11 -

characteristic of our age, in the U.S. as in Russia, in China as in Japan. That new transformation into opposite, as against a mere extension of monopoly capital and its imperialism, moves first and foremost against labor so that the ordinary capitalist disciplining of labor at the point of production has a new overseer: nothing less than the state. And because the state is in every nook and cranny, I doubt the Blacks see Nixonomics as so very different from the full horrors of totalitarianism of Communism or fascism.

This is state-capitalist terror. This is the wars at home of imperialism. This is the enemy -- and not the stupidities of the New Left busy inventing a category like "consumerism" as "domestic imperialism".

(I'd like to suggest a book that gives some important documentation on the peculiar role of the Left that does not have a class foundation -- OSS: the Secret History of America's First Central Intelligence Agency, by R. Harris Smith, U of C Press, 1977

Put differently, Nixon's state-capitalism is horrifying precisely because U.S. capitalism is so very strong that it would have seemed, on the surface, to have been able to make it without state intervention. Nixon may be under the illusion that his NEP, having achieved a little more production and a great deal more profit, he can scuttle controls and return to what is dear to his heart -- so-called private enterprise. But the truth is that world capitalism, U.S. included, is at the state-capitalist stage and nothing, nothing that is except a revolution, a proletarian revolution, can dislodge it.

Unfortunately, the totality of the crisis of our single state-capitalist world and its disarray is very nearly matched by the disarray in the Left. Which is why there is such urgency for philosophy and revolution, with little p and little r. We must turn to the book from this, just this, objective world situation. The simultaneously objective-subjective mediation of dialectics of liberation demands that we view the book and objectivity in unison.

III THE TODAY-NESS OF PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION

The first step leads through the Draft Perspectives as it engaged in the battle of ideas with the section on the Almost-Dialectic, Almost-Revolution, and by beginning with how 1968 May, in Paris, was "recreated" in words by the Il Manifesto group, 1972, in Italy -- after which we can relate it to Part II of the new book, Philosophy and Revolution, "Alternatives".[†]

1968's defeat notwithstanding -- and it was a defeat, and we cannot afford many more such misses of pre-revolutionary situations -- the victory of the counter-revolution was not all that total. The stability of France was undermined. The very serious moves to the right can be met provided we keep away from holding on to the coat-tails of an existing exploitative state power, in fact or in ideology.

Take the sorry spectacle of Italy, 1972, where the neo-fascists have scored a substantial and surprising forward lurch -- over 9 percent of the vote. To try to disregard it and say it is "only 9 percent" is not only to forget that Nazis never did gain a majority until after they were already in power, but, worse still, for our era, to be fatally blind to the new, where neo-fascism denies being what it is, as Wallace here tried to appear as a "populist" rather than the reactionary racist he is.

More disheartening than the whip of the counter-revolution that can act as a spur to revolution, is to follow the almost-dialectic, almost -revolution of the newest Left, in this case the Il Manifesto group. There is no doubt that when it arose first in 1969, this breakaway from the Communist Party seemed to be the most serious independent theoretical departure, trying to base itself on the lessons of 1968. It appeared as new, not because Sartre said if there were such a party in France he would join it, but because it had a base among the proletariat and did try for a new type of unity between worker and intellectual, refusing at first to see revolutionary ferment only in the Third World or only in guerilla warfare, and while sympathetic to the "cultural revolution" in China, it did not swallow it in one gulp, whole.

But all too soon ennui did set in against the "labor, patience, suffering, and seriousness of the negative". Il Manifesto got the wherewithal to become a daily, but it plunged, not into the dialectic, the philosophy of revolution, but into electoral politics, and vanguardism. It ran an anarchist, Pietro Valpreda, who allegedly was the one involved in throwing a bomb into a Milan bank which had killed several people. In any case, the slogan of Il Manifesto was "If you let Valpreda rot in prison today, you will be there tomorrow" -- which hardly meets the challenge and the imperative needs of the Italian working class, who have been carrying on endless strikes, are used to being treated as

[†]The Table of Contents of Philosophy and Revolution, which will be off the press next year, is appended, at the end of this bulletin.

a mass force, which they are, and who are hungering to work out the dialectic of their class struggles and become the Reason of revolution.

The results were the following: 1) Il Manifesto was swept under before ever it got on its feet, getting a mere 0.7 percent of the vote; 2) the Communist Party strength wasn't dented at all; and 3) the fascists got over nine percent of the vote.

The counter-revolution does not reside in Italy alone -- as we saw with Wallaceism (and Nixonism is Wallaceism, in power, running for four more years!) -- but everywhere. Over and over again reality forces us to face the truth, that not only can there be no successful revolution without a philosophy of revolution, but when no banner that is truly independent and genuinely works for a unity of theory and practice is raised, there is no polarizing force -- even for preparations of "the day". There isn't even a revolutionary "face" anyone can claim in Italy. All Il Manifesto has achieved thus far is to create such pessimism and depression among those who had on their own broken from both capitalism and state-capitalism calling itself Communism, as to give the counter-revolution the illusion that it will have an easy victory. It won't.

Let's see how that relates to the three "Alternatives" in Part II of Philosophy and Revolution, for that is how I arrived at the "Almost-Dialectic, Almost-Revolution" (and that is how you need to use methodology -- and not only in Part II, but Parts I and III -- in working out the problems of the day.)

The first alternative to the methodology of Hegel-Marx-Lenin was "Trotsky as Theoretician". The two central theses which led away from the historic continuity as a present imperative were the concept of nationalized property, or the particular form in which Socialism was established in Russia in 1917, as if that were the universal of socialism. Hanging on this universalizing of the particular as if it truly were the future was the theory of permanent revolution.

Now, no doubt the Il Manifesto group would deny they were Trotskyist in mentality, since they never were in organization. Moreover, they would point to Mao's "Cultural Revolution" as proof that they weren't "mechanists". (We'll get to that "Cultural Revolution" later.) We will give Il Manifesto credit for not being so arrogant as Althusser, who boasts about considering Marxian dialectical methodology, "process" "without subject". Trotsky surely did no such thing in his concept of permanent revolution when it came to force of revolution. But when it came to reason, the peasantry was disregarded not merely as theory but in the actually developing Chinese revolution.

Or, put differently, the dialectic remained abstract both because the actual dialectics of liberation in China following the defeat of 1925-27 and the new world situation of the 1930's were different, and because, though Trotsky was the greatest opponent of Stalin, no theoretician developed a new relationship of theory to practice on the basis, say, of the Spanish Revolution which had produced a new Subject.

What is concrete for 1972 is that when you don't understand dialectic philosophy as dialectics of revolution, you are forced also not to see the Reason, the Subject of revolution, even when you are a Trotsky -- and believe me, Il Manifesto cannot shine his shoes. So it is not only dialectics of one and not the other -- theory and practice -- but the unity of the two. That is why we do appeal to intellectuals this year, for the proletariat, too, cannot do it alone. It is the unity of theory and practice for which we stand in fact and in book, in analysis of the current situation and in the activities which will flow from it. And both must be rooted in and self-develop in the new Subject.

The point, insofar as the Chapter on Leon Trotsky is concerned, is not to think of it as the name, Trotsky, any more than we thought of state-capitalism as only Russian. It ^{was} only by seeing it as world stage of development of the economy and, with it, looking for the new forms of revolt that we were able to arrive at the breakup of the Absolute Idea in 1953-- seeing it as a movement from practice AND (and we too often forget this) from theory, as the restatement of Marxist-Humanism for our age.

If you couldn't have worked out the generalizations flowing from the Trotsky chapter as applicable to Il Manifesto in Italy or, say, the Black Panthers here -- then let's see the relationship to that other alternative, to which the tendencies both in Italy and USA did identify -- The Thought of Mao.

The almost-dialectic here came out in most precise terms in one of the famous interviews with Chou En-lai, who was explaining the leap from "ping pong tournament" to the welcome to Nixon, by the generalization: "The inevitable often comes through the accidental."

This bow to the dialectic without due acknowledgement to Hegel vulgarized what Hegel did in fact state. Though that is not the essence, let's know what Hegel did say -- which was that there are no accidents in history, that the sum total of "accidents" is the actual course of history. The essence here is that the ping pong tournament, as none knew better than Chou, was the most elaborately planned "accident" -- but there were consequences they had not planned for: the violent opposition of Lin Piao to the overnight transformation of Nixon from Enemy No.1 to Friend No.1, greatly superior to "social-fascist Russia."

The key to the denuding of the Marxian dialectic of its class contradictions, was that the class collaborationism which began with the freeing of Chiang Kai-shek from the army that had arrested him, was arranged by none other than Chou back in 1936. This is the innermost, not-so-accidental character of Maoism for which, for "diplomatic" reasons, the Sheng Wu-lien had singled out Chou En-lai as "the Red capitalist."

As we stated way back in 1963, when all others were still talking of the Sino-Soviet conflict as if it were only ideological, it is precisely be-

cause both Russia and China are state-capitalist societies that they are non-viable, and it was not at all excluded that, like among any inter-capitalist rivals, war could result between the two nations that call themselves Communist.

But it wasn't only differing national interests, much less the so-called Cultural Revolution that was to descend upon the world, 1966-69. Rather it was the retrogressionism in thought which was demanding that the proletariat wait a century, a 1000, or even 10,000 years to achieve its goal.

It was not all the words about "world revolution", but the concept that it would take a century or several centuries before ever we got to "socialism" that was the key in the Sino-Soviet conflict and the Cultural Revolution against Mao's own dissidents. To see the empty, endless flow of words, words, words, it is best, instead of looking at the Sino-Soviet conflict, to look at the betrayal of Vietnam by both Russia and China, especially China. This began not only when Nixon's new globalism arose -- China certainly sold Vietnam cheap from the very start, when LBJ began raining bombs on the country in 1965, and everyone was hoping for a united front with Russia on that one issue, including Mao's own Political Committee, but Mao adamantly refused. Instead, he launched the so-called Cultural Revolution when, in addition to Vietnam which Mao considered a "diversion" from the Sino-Soviet conflict, the whole project of a third axis with Indonesia collapsed ignominiously.

From 1966 to 1969, when the "Cultural Revolution" was the one and only concern of China, enough youth took the Revolution at its word and worked to build a real prototype of the Paris Commune. It was only then -- when the work against the genuine Left like Sheng Wu-lien became predominant -- that Mao, Lin and Chou rushed to put an end to it and the 9th Congress named Lin Piao the successor.

The fact that neither his downfall nor the welcoming of Nixon moved the New Left outside of China, only goes to prove that our state-capitalist age, with its administrative mentality, permeates revolutionary intellectuals hardly less than bourgeois ones. They are all ready to do "for" the proletariat what they plan, what they decide is "right", according to the Thought of One, the Thought of Mao Tse-tung. The more they talk of the "masses", the less they listen to them. And the less they work out philosophically either the continuity with history or with the dialectics of liberation of today.

If anyone should think: Yes, but Il Manifesto is only Italy, not USA, and only concerns a CP faction, even though it be ex-CP -- let's take the USA itself. Let's take such a new phenomenon (at least they were new in the mid-1960's) as the Black Panthers, and see how they, too, found it easier to repeat Mao's dictum "power comes out of the barrel of a gun" rather than work out Marx's concept that "Human power is its own end."

Sadder than the Black Panther case is that of Angela Davis. I believe that, as woman, she had the opportunity to see further, not because women are greater than men, but because just at the time that she became an activist

-16-

the WL movement did arise, and they were brave enough to also fight the Black Panthers when Aptheker took them over politically. But the only way she differed with them was that she was wholly, and not just for opportunistic reasons, in Aptheker's pocket. Herbert Marcuse, in his latest book, Counter Revolution and Revolt, says that she is working out the Woman Question and Marxism and that it's great. I doubt it, and not because I doubt his word "as a man" but because of his intellectualism. Angela does not bother to listen to the masses; she follows the "vanguard". Already, she has said that WL, "though necessary", should not divide up Blacks. Already, she has refused to associate with Czech dissidents. It is clear she is out to use all the mass fervor against her jailors to direct it to Communism, as if the U.S. Communist Party had not betrayed Blacks in World War II, when they were told to subordinate their fight against U.S. capital "until after". It is always after, never today.

Today, to Angela, is neither Black nor WL nor masses. Today, to Angela, is Russia. The Talented Tenth -- with all their contributions, and they have made some great ones -- were never with the masses because to them the masses were never Reason, but just "Matter".

Finally, of the Alternatives, we have Sartre. I do not think I need here to go into Existentialism, before or after it was "fused" with Marxism. I doubt Sartre has any followers in this room. The reason for calling attention to that chapter is for you not to think that this generation is so superior to that following World War II, who likewise thought themselves independent, who surely were committed and most certainly did not wish only "to interpret the world, but to change it." Nevertheless, once they did not start anew from below, once their "independence" was independence from the Marx of Marxism, the historic-philosophic continuity, then the inevitable end was to hold on to the Russian CP line, as today's "New Left" hangs on to Maoism.

For what, in the people who call themselves Marxists, do we have in that Ivory tower but the Althusser? In France he is the CP theoretician, but in England his followers are against the CP, yet nevertheless follow him "structurally". In America, he gains popularity supposedly by the "rigor" of his theory, but in fact it is only the way for each to make his own Ivory tower. Anything goes, anything at all so long as they need not be activists, or if they are, need not listen or build on what is there, but can luxuriate in the rigor of books sans proletariat.

No, it is not these types of intellectuals we are looking toward when we say in the Perspectives Thesis that this year, in addition to the fundamental proletarianization of the organization and the specific activities around factories, we also need some intellectuals -- the type who will grasp PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION, and therefore wish the unity of worker and intellectual, theory and practice, philosophy and revolution, this time not as book alone, but as the need of our age.

4513

In a word, instead of any of the Alternatives which only lead in this state-capitalist age to choosing between existing state powers, we need intellectuals of the fiber, if not yet of the stature, originality and power of a Marx, a Lenin -- who are nevertheless so rooted in the movements of Labor, Blacks, antiwar Youth, WL, as to become practitioners of the dialectic as preparation for revolution.

Dialectics is the form for the intellectual, as for the worker, the form of self-development that itself is a form of self-discipline and self-organization which not only has inherent in it the answer to the so-called party to lead -- the philosophy of revolution -- but that of making freedom a reality.

In the next sessions at this Convention -- on Organization, and on Finances -- you will concretize further the five tasks listed on the last page of our Perspectives Draft -- especially our new type of intervention in the battle of ideas, whether that be in leaflets before factories or within caucuses; or in the anti-Vietnam war movement that is at such a critical impasse precisely because it is not sufficient to be against only U.S. imperialism, though that is surely the most evil, but also to show the betrayal of Vietnam by China and Russia and therefore work out totally new ways of solidarity with Vietnam; whether the activity is with Blacks, not as talented tenth, but in the recognition that as masses they are vanguard; or with the creative ways WL will define not only its attitude but its labor, i.e. activity re P&R; and in all the other activities that recognize the two opposing worlds in each country, especially the U.S.

At this very moment, the retrogressionism on Black rights, education, employment, the endless Vietnam war, has become a permanent feature of Nixonism. Far from having any intention of ending it, Nixon is making the war fully genocidal. Thus, as if 27,000 men are nothing, he is presenting it as if that is ending the war, not even mentioning the 100,000 more who fly from Thailand and Guam killing, killing, killing the people and the land alike.

All this and more you will take up under Organization, when you discuss the type of activity we will be engaged in next year. Here we wish, in conclusion, once again to concentrate on methodology and explain why we did not begin where no doubt all would have got along more swimmingly -- with Part III, especially the final chapter, "New Passions and New Forces" -- because, because, because, unless we learn our methodology in the actual battle of ideas with others, unless we fully appreciate that without Part I, neither Parts II nor III could have been written, then we fail to grasp the dialectics as each must practice it.

Inseparable from "Why Hegel?" is "Why Now?" and it is the NOW that has made the penetration into the dialectic possible not merely against alternatives of our day, but even differently from our founders, Marx, Lenin. That is to say, each generation must reinterpret Marxism for its day; the founders cannot answer the problems of our age. We must do it ourselves, and we have now the confidence with the uniquely new that we have been

-18-

able to work out, though we are no Marxs or Lenins.

Put differently, the NOW is the proof that no new stage of cognition is possible without the mass discovery of a new stage of doing. In a word, we could do what none others could do because of 1) the maturity of the age we live in, and 2) the fact that the masses (and this does include, in addition to Labor, the Black dimension, the anti-war youth, WL) have themselves reached a new state of world revolution, and, therefore, we and we alone saw the need for the unity of philosophy and revolution as the urgency of the day on a world scale.

Small as the beginning we have made to that sweeping goal may seem -- whether we consider the whole expanse since our birth in 1955, with the establishment of that unique type of paper edited by a production worker (a Black production worker now, but we hope also to soon have a white production worker as co-editor) called News & Letters, and Marxism and Freedom which established our Humanist and historic roots; or whether we limit ourselves to the Perspectives for this year which will include Philosophy and Revolution -- I repeat, small as the beginnings may appear, when one thinks of the sweeping goal, nevertheless they are earth-shaking beginnings for the simple reason that we alone project as the concrete and the universal, Marx's concept: HUMAN POWER IS ITS OWN END.

And so it is. Now let's get down to the labor of helping to make it the reality.

-- Raya Dunayevskaya
September 2, 1972