

REPORT TO THE CONVENTION OF
NEWS & LETTERS COMMITTEES
OCTOBER 20, 1973

perspectives
1973 - 1974

BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA,
National Chairwoman

I WAR AND PRACTICING WAR BY OTHER MEANS.....1
 The Secretary of State with the Mailed Fist:
 While Watergate, on the one hand, and spontaneous
 revolts on the other, did more than undermine Nixon-
 Kissinger's "Year of Europe," the counter-revolution
 in Chile and the war in the Middle East disclosed new
 forms of reaction.

II THE ECONOMY, THE WILDCATS, THE UNREST VS.
 "COMPETITIVE DECADENCE"..... 6

III PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION AS AN ON-GOING PROCESS...10
 Dialectics as Absolute Method, as absolute negativity,
 determines, for Marxists, Hegel's Absolutes as New
 Beginnings--but as a process rather than a conclusion.

IV TASKS..... 16

Post-Convention Bulletin #1 November, 1973

News & Letters 1900 E. Jefferson Detroit, Mich. 48207 35¢

Raya Dunayevskaya

PERSPECTIVES REPORT 1973-1974

I WAR AND PRACTICING WAR BY OTHER MEANS

Has any one here counted the myriad festering tensions, sharp class struggles, endless crises, youth revolt and counter-revolution, at home and abroad, during the 8 short weeks that have elapsed since the Draft Perspectives, dated August 20?

The "year of Europe" disappeared into the year of Watergate, then became the year of wildcats, but, from above, paved the way for reversals and became the year of counter-revolution in Chile, followed by eruption of war in the Middle East--but while the threat of world war imbedded therein still hangs over us, out exploded the positive--none but the Thai youth, Thai people, overthrowing their military all in this year of unresolved contradictions. No, we are not in any Ivory tower when we declare it to be the year of philosophy and revolution!

For the moment, let's concentrate on the negative objective situation as it comes through our fork-tongued Secretary of State Kissinger who, at one and the same time, pronounced that Russia is a "responsible" superpower, but threatened: "We shall resist aggressive foreign policy. Detente cannot survive irresponsibility in any area, including the Middle East."

The few phases of Nixon's counter-revolution that have aborted (or at least been exposed) and have given us a momentary breathing space, have been followed with Congressional and academic euphoria around the new intellectualistic Secretary of State with the mailed fist. Too many have already forgotten that it was Kissinger who kept the Vietnam War going for "four more years" to extract, or rather to fool the American people that Nixon has extracted "peace with honor"; forgotten that Kissinger had never opposed the Vietnam War--not when it began with "advisers" in the Kennedy regime, not when it became genocidal war in the Johnson years, much less during the Nixon regime. Dr. Strangelove Kissinger had always practiced "benign neglect" that made sure wars would erupt in Latin America, indeed, made them erupt, be it during the Bay of Pigs (and let's not forget those CIA agents, practiced in incompetence there, were the ones directing Watergate) or the Chilean counter-revolution.

The wars at home--against the anti-war youth, against labor, against the Blacks, especially against the Blacks--were the specialty

of those Eastern intellectuals so favored by the Western president for their "theory" of "benign neglect" and practice of not-so-benign neglect.

The precise expression for their Eastern as well as Western so-called intellect is: militarism. They practice militarization of the economy--and in this they also carried Congress with them.

Militarization of lawless "law and order" police actions centered around the Black dimension. And now our Harvard professor carries out militarization in what he has the gall to call "the philosophic underpinnings" of Nixon's "State of the World" message. Presently he has interpreted it as "responsibility" for others to practice, but not for themselves.

Meanwhile, not only is Secretary of State Kissinger also maintaining the post of head of the National Security Council, but before he assumed that dual power-charged post, he had sent his "aide", General Haig, to take over the post of the Watergate high command public relations man, Haldeman.

And before that, Kissinger authorized the FBI to tap his closest associates! And as if all that were not enough, he kept friends with the Chilean junta long before it achieved its neo-fascistic coup in Chile. It becomes incumbent upon us, therefore, to examine carefully the three new threats that have surfaced with the present state of world counter-revolution:

First, in Chile itself, with the brutal murder of Allende (the duly elected president with his illusory parliamentary majority), there has sprouted a new neo-fascistic "mass base"--the middle class, including the professionals, the housewives, the rightist college youth.

Never before has this type of base been that active, that organized, that "respectable", and that willing to be led by the outright fascistic "Fatherland and Liberty," a military junta that began its "patriotic mission" by destroying the country's national palace, its whole history lying in ruins, spattered by the blood of its leaders extracted by the counter-revolutionary junta and continuing with the murder of thousands of workers.

Second, so abysmally corrupt is the Nixon Administration (and as the Vice President on the take showed, their corruption is by no means only morally so) that the ITT offer of a million to stop Allende's election was far from being the lowest point reached by the Republican Party.

Rather, the key to American imperialism's stranglehold on Chile--the U.S. intervention in Chilean affairs--was everywhere, from having the World Bank withhold credit from the Allende parliamentary government, to keeping money flowing freely to the junta planning that coup.

Keep in mind, please, that though at this very "point in time" the U.S. imperialist stranglehold was not in the form of outright invasion as was Kennedy's Bay of Pigs (which, moreover, was a failure); and though it was not in the form of LBJ's gunboats speeding to the Dominican Republic (in Chile, that neo-fascistic comprador military junta did it all by itself); still, the old American dollar imperialism achieved a new form of "benign (and not so benign) neglect" throughout all of Latin America except Cuba.

Third, that which was so phenomenal, so historic, so sharp a 180-degree turnabout--Nixon's spectacular trip to China--is already in a thousand little pieces, as both Mao's China (along with the Arab lands) and Israel allow not a single word about any "cease fire" to infiltrate into the U.N. chambers. Notwithstanding the secret "peace" moves by the U.S. and U.S.S.R., the U.S. resupplies Israel and Russia urges other Arab lands, especially its present favorite, Iraq, to enter the Middle East war, even when vicious fighting is underway between Iraqi troops and Kurdish autonomist forces within 35 kilometers of Mosul in the heart of the Iraqi oil-fields (New York Post, 10/13/73). What the superpowers don't know is that diplomatic--and war!--activism cannot abolish social revolts.

So overwhelmed, however, were both Congressmen and journalists by the "brilliance" of the Harvard professor, so great the "pride" in their own "democracy" that "a Jew born in Germany" has become Secretary of State, that none paid any attention to the truth that, in fact, they just voted for the most militarist-minded man ever in civilian clothes to handle foreign policy.

It would indeed be foolhardy to be deluded (as, no doubt, the conceited egotist Kissinger is) that it is that "brilliant professor" and not the dirty rightist politician and trickster, President Nixon, who is setting foreign policy. Nixon, not Kissinger, set policy; Cold War policies have become hot "peace" ones.

Nixon, no doubt, has underestimated just how great was the opportunity that came his way with the Sino-Soviet conflict. For the other truth is that it was not so much the Nixon Doctrine that opened new doors. Rather, it was the new reality of power

-4-

in a nuclear superpower world, when one of the two nuclear titans is undercut by China--with a little nuclear know-how, 700 million human beings and a lot of Marxian verbiage. On top of it all, China has the longest-in-history common border with its "Enemy Number One," Russia. In a word, this third "little" nuclear power sits astride both the borders of Russia it claims, and those of Southeast Asia that the U.S. has failed to conquer.

Thus did the "new world relations" arise from world realities and detente become the new form of sharp confrontations. Knowing that, let us see what Nixon did learn from confrontations with that conflict as it relates to his hunger for world mastery; what is new in world relations; and how does he intend using the "brilliant Harvard professor" to rationalize Pax Americana as nothing short of a global "philosophy."

So much attention has been given to Kissinger's predilection for studies of Metternich's "concert of Europe" and "balance of powers" strategy (as witness Kissinger's public policy last year of a pentagonal world); and to Bismarckian behavior with friends that is every bit as hostile as with enemies (as witness the shock treatment Nixon administered both to Japan and West Europe with his secretly planned spectacular trip to China) that hardly any time was left to the "study" he was practicing. I'm referring, of course, to the "study" (that's what professors are for; they "study" everything--or have their students do so!) that suited Dr. Strangelove Kissinger best: Clausewitz's infamous theory that "war is extension of politics by other means." In reverse, Nixon-Kissinger, the practitioners of never-ending wars, are now practicing politics as an extension of war by other means. It is so at home, and abroad; with friends and with enemies; in Nixonland, it has become a way of life.

Thus, along with initiating his secret war in Cambodia, Nixon-Kissinger have initiated "peace treaties" that command Asian to kill Asian just so that the continuation of war can proceed under the nomenclature of "peace with honor."

Thus, Nixon-Kissinger "tilted" American policy against their ally, India, and toward Mao's ally, Pakistan, at the very time Pakistan was conducting a genocidal war against East Pakistan!

Thus, in turning to trade with Russia, Nixon-Kissinger did not stop the wheat deal to tilt it in any other way but for American oligopolies and against American farmers, against the American housewife, for resulting wild inflation.

In a word, the Nixon Doctrine (which got both China and Russia to help "end" the Vietnam War so that the Big Powers can get on with their business) was directed not only against Indochina and for Nixon's re-election, but against world revolts, and those at home, especially against the anti-Vietnam War youth, be they on demonstrations, in exile, at the front, or AWOL or POWs, i.e., in prison, and always, always against the Black Revolution.

Ironically enough (but still along the planned line and in total ignorance of the spontaneous outbursts) Kissinger's Harvard colleague, the originator of the theory of "benign neglect" specifically of Blacks, Patrick Moynihan, has just used that theory to tilt slightly in favor of India by not charging it for the grain loaned it. Of course, the loan was never meant to be paid, but it sounds very benign to say: we give it to you-- well, almost; another part you'll pay in ten years and by then the tilting may again be the other way. Having achieved this "miracle", Moynihan is being offered a job in the State Department. Whether he will give up his post of Ambassador to India to work as second fiddle in Kissinger's tight little ship here is not the question.

The point is that Kissinger's way of practicing "benign neglect" is to carry on politics as extension of war by other means--and vice versa--not to mention designating our age of war an "age of peace."

II THE ECONOMY, THE WILDCATS, THE UNREST VS. "COMPETITIVE DECADENCE"

There is but one thing in that "year of Europe" (that was proclaimed back in April and never came to be) about which a private state-capitalist mentality like Nixon's has a right to feel "betrayed" by his capitalist co-rulers in Europe who, after all, were pro-Nixon.

No Watergates were necessary to trick West Europe's rulers into "voting" for Nixon. From the start (and before) they knew exactly what was involved for this putrid capitalistic system that had long outlived its usefulness; each had his/her 1963; each has been kept in pieces ever since despite the fact that they came out the "victors."

Although the counter-revolution not only has all the military might and the financial resources and the state power, and despite the fatal error of the near-revolution in failing to unite the philosophic vision of liberation with its revolts, still so great was the fall of the Humpty Dumpty capitalistic system that all the superpowers in the world could not put Humpty Dumpty together again.

Put more precisely, they all knew that "the enemy" was not abroad but at home. That is, they all considered their own masses--labor, youth, Women Liberationists and, above all, minorities, Black or "immigrant" labor--all these were their "real enemy" and "therefore" they had to display their class solidarity with that foreign nuclear power they hated and envied and depended on so much: Nixonland-U.S.A.

Rather perceptively someone has designated our age as one of "competitive decadence", which is why they could let intra-imperialist rivalries--from Brandt's ostpolitik to the secret bi-polar maneuverings between Nixon and Brezhnev; from U.S. "industrial helotry" to its financial arrogance despite its falling dollar value--win out over the invitation plus promise that some sort of "new Atlantic Charter" would be forthcoming. By then, however, the Middle East eruption, not to mention the shocking Thailand overthrow, made the trip impossible. O Lord, we will have to suffer through 1974 all over again as "the year of ..."

The point is that the imperialistic solidarity across national boundaries had even to forego what they knew to be truth against themselves for Pax Americana has never been abandoned by Nixon. As we wrote regarding Watergate and "the year of Europe" on the one hand and, on the other, against the labor bureaucracy, it all comes down to the

question of labor and production. As we approach the latest on the economy, let's refresh our memories with what we wrote then:

Nixon had never given up his vision of "the American century" which lasted but a few years in the euphoria of the immediate post-World War II universe when all the world lay prostrate and America alone had the A-bomb. Nixon, being a most ambitious man, determined "to make history" his own retrograde way, is ready to turn the clock of history back. He is a man of the Taft-Hartley era, who wants to make sure the Black Revolution of the 1960s will not only be stopped in its tracks, but be rolled back forever.

Hence, his "Southern Strategy." Which is why the Water-gates and all election chicanery cannot be disentangled from his concept of "national security" and "global responsibilities." (News & Letters, June-July, 1973)

As against the labor bureaucracy that was playing around with management over "30 and out" and still continues to do so, the proletariat broke out into wildcatting, first and above all, over the inhuman conditions of labor, and secondly, for a decent wage to stop running a continuous losing race against runaway inflation. The very UAW bureaucracy--whose class-collaborationism did not stop even at the point of odious informing on who were the "radicals" at Chrysler plants, but went the whole hog to the class enemy when it called upon the police to eject workers from the factories they occupied--had, at the same time, to admit the unsafe conditions that would now have to be given a high-priority rating. Whatever cover-up the labor bureaucracy will desire for its class-collaborationism and its sure betrayal at contract-signing time, nothing can hide the fact that it is the prop for the whole exploitative system. The stench of Water-gate may not be on them, but that is only because Nixon never invited them that high up. The point is that the lying, forensic style of the President characterizes the labor bureaucracy as well. They are indeed the last barrier to labor's control over its working conditions. (Draft Perspectives, 1973-1974, by Raya Dunayevskaya)

Now then, how has Phase IV (which the Draft thesis correctly named "How to Bring on a Recession") been functioning? Just now they have found still another trusted conservative, Dr. Fellner, to put on the President's Economic Council, and he evidently does look toward "a salutary recession" to bring down wild inflation; clearly, he prefers

greater unemployment to inflation.

Prof. Fellner held a press conference (reported in Christian Science Monitor, 10/1/73) and told the public not to expect that unemployment can be brought down below 5 percent through government intervention. You know, when the Full Employment Act was introduced at the end of World War II for fear of what the masses would think this war was fought for anyway, only one to two percent unemployment was considered acceptable, i.e., the aged and sick who could not work, plus "a few others."

Suddenly with the Korean War, three percent became "acceptable" -- not exactly achieved with the end of that war but it was the "aim". But as the recessions began piling up, the Nixon era decided to "aim" for four percent unemployment and consider five percent unacceptable. Then, in 1972, after Nixon had assured us we were "the wonder of the world" for bringing down unemployment, but inflation went hog wild, the latest is let's go in for more unemployment!

Please remember in this juggling that a single percentage point means another million unemployed. To that add the fact that "average" of unemployment skips over urban unemployment which, far from "averaging" five percent is eight to ten percent. Now add to that Blacks and women which, in their areas, equal double the unemployed. Finally come the youth, especially Black, whose unemployment rate they simply stopped counting.

But they are worried, so on that question of youth they are proposing training programs plus scholarships. And what do you suppose that means? Well, Fellner is proposing that the minimum wage be reduced for teen-agers so that both they and the unskilled can be made to accept undesirable jobs. The demeaning capitalist mentality does not stop there. The President's Economic Council (i.e., the President himself sending out trial balloons through his surrogates) is proposing that the employers be granted tax incentives to provide on-the-job training as if their profits aren't skyrocketing ever since Nixon got power and as soon as he had to face a decline in the rate of profit, which he promptly "corrected" by planned unemployment and recession and forced a rise in labor productivity. Finally, we arrive at unbridled inflation: a mini-recession (the new economists' vocabulary) is supposed to cure that.

Not a single word is to be found in that new vocabulary for the real producer of inflation--the militarization of the economy, deficit financing for all of U.S. imperialism's ventures.

-9-

On the contrary, the Congress which was supposed to have learned to separate itself from "executive privileges" has just been conned by the Pentagon to vote so fantastic an expenditure for the Trident that all other "defense" figures pale beside it.

And that at a time when SALT agreement was to have brought us to the stage of reducing nuclear armament expenditures, not to mention the Vietnam War which just "ended" and thus is supposed to have released the \$25 billion annually that it cost. Far from reducing the defense budget which can produce nothing but destruction and inflation--hocking not only us but our children and grandchildren for generations--we are tilting that trillion dollar economy with ever further inflation and lower production because, heaven forbid, more production means more wages and they will "bring on" inflation as if not having goods when some have plenty of money to pay will not send prices skyrocketing.

As for wheat deals with Russia and with our own monopolists that sent prices on such staples as bread wild, we are not supposed to look at such "temporary" issues. Instead, we are never to take our eyes off from the minimum wage which has been maximized by them to be the cause of inflation and "therefore" cut that bare minimum when it comes to employment for teen-agers, and then cut welfare rolls, and thereby, you see, they will all be forced to accept "undesirable" jobs, not to mention the capitalistic hope that they will also learn to be strike-breakers and pit themselves against "highly salaried" unionized workers.

Meanwhile, the labor bureaucracy has succeeded in selling out wildcatters who were rebelling against the inhuman conditions of labor. Which doesn't mean that workers will remain quiescent about those unbearable conditions of labor and "high wages" being eaten up by galloping inflation.

Surely, "benign neglect" will not contain the Black dimension, especially here, where 90 percent of the production line is Black. The Black Revolt never was fooled by the Nixon mania for secrecy, or the pittance of Black capitalism, much less by the galling retrogression in asking, at this late date, for legislation against bussing! The revolt will be, is, continuous.

And as we have just been shown from Thailand, the youth will not remain quiescent; let's never forget that the "quiescent", "beat generation" youth of the 1950s produced the turbulent 1960s. The undecided question is: How do all these forces of revolution coalesce under a banner, a philosophy of liberation. Which is why we must now turn to Philosophy and Revolution not as result but as process.

4973

III PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION AS AN ONGOING PROCESS

Philosophy and Revolution as an ongoing process rather than a final result is the need of the hour, and "the hour" is an historic period--the present moving toward the future. It is actual.

The first thing we have to do to practice dialectics is to hold in hand, in mind, two opposites. Thus, we are to look not alone at the new threats that have surfaced with the counter-revolution in Chile, the Middle East war in which we support neither side, much less consider them mere coincidences severed from the world situation. ---

But we also must consider the absolute opposite to the counter-revolutions spurting all around us---the wildcatters that have begun a new phase in labor struggles, the youth who just toppled the military oligarchy in Thailand, the Black Dimension which, at this high stage of labor militancy, has sensed an affinity of ideas with white labor in struggle against the labor bureaucracy and with a philosophy of liberation.

And, because we are going to view them philosophically, we will also take one more look at the rulers in Nixonland and its intelligentsia. I doubt very much that Moynihan (and Kissinger, much less that idiot president, Richard Milhous Nixon) knew that the "theory" of "benign neglect" was but the lowest, mesi vulgar, empiric reductionism of what Hegel had designated as Absolute Indifference. One of the many exciting characteristics of the works of that genius Hegel is that the Absolute is not an ultimate which appears only at the end of "the system."

Far from Hegel's Absolutes being the ontological ultimate ascribed to them, there is an Absolute in each stage of cognition and of reality. In the Doctrine of Being, that Absolute is the lowly Absolute Indifference. What our intellectual midgots never dreamed about in thinking up "benign neglect" is that the philosophic indifference likewise has movement, the movement emerging precisely from the neglect, the negative.

Hegel warns us that Absolute Indifference cannot "attain to Essence," but it is a transition to it. Its dialectic manifests itself when it collapses, breaks down totally. We are then compelled, if we wish to move forward, to start all over again with new beginnings, new categories, different types of measures.

Those new categories in the Doctrine of Essence--Show, Appearance, Ground, etc.--abound in the all-pervading Contradiction which keeps multiplying, deepening, until it bursts into total crisis, Actuality. Reaching for the Absolute like a bolt out of the blue, they cannot attain to Subject, become enmeshed in Absolute Substance, a high enough stage way past Indifference, the mark of another great philosopher, Spinoza. The merit in his philosophy, Marx saw, was in his recognition that "every determination is a negation." If you say this is, you're also saying that is not. But it is not second negativity. Rather, it is the Great Divide Hegel marked off from all other systems as he discovered that only Subject, self-negativity, absolute negativity, can resolve contradiction.

Now then, for returning to politics in the present historic period-- just look at Actuality as Czechoslovakia at the point when Russian tanks rolled in to destroy its revolt. Russia must have thought it won; their absolute being totalitarianism, located in Moscow, and that is what Czechoslovakia was subjected to in toto. Russia has a "right" to delude itself that its power is invincible since the Czechoslovak Revolution was stifled at its very birth, and the terror that pervades the whole of East Europe "proves" the Brezhnev Doctrine rules more uncontestedly than ever did the Nixon Doctrine in Southeast Asia with its napalm bombs.

And yet, isn't it a fact that Pax Rosiya, even when no revolution has yet emerged, has now so many contradictions gnawing at it that Maoism, which never before formed any focal point for Czechoslovak revolutionaries, is now a point of attraction? And that means another state power, which is the one thing that totalitarians do understand, is now around in one form or another in its own backyard. Moreover, a state power that uses pseudo Marxist terminology plus philosophy.

You know, it really is funny how philosophy these days gets to everyone. Suddenly that super-Establishment New York Times correspondent who voted Nixon though his paper did not has suddenly become a spets, not just on the politics of Europe, but of China, and not just on politics but philosophy. I'm of course talking about C.L. Sulzberger who has been sending fantastically laudatory articles out of China that compete with his colleague Reston's when he was there and swallowed hook, line and sinker all that Chou fed him on the "remilitarized" Japan and no forward movement possible with Nixon unless he first agrees to "give up" Taiwan.

Well, now that Sulzberger has suddenly blossomed forth as "philosopher," he wrote on the "Use of Contradiction" (New York Times, 10/14/73) with a magical sweep. First he goes to ancient

-12-

China and the novel "Romance of the Three Kingdoms". That novel, you see, is what passed muster during the "Cultural Revolution" and won approval from "the Chairman." From ancient China he leaps all the way to 1940, when Mao made a speech that is supposed to fit exactly the situation in 1973. It held that it was necessary "To make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few, and crush enemies one by one." (Dayan, with or without "Contradictions", is surely its best executor. And what militarist isn't?)

Now what is the upshot of all this on October 14, 1973? Ah, therein is the rub. It seems that "the Chinese" had already explained to "the French" that there are two different (sic!) imperialisms-- "defensive" and "offensive." (I'm sure those subjected to imperialism for centuries will be happy to hear that "some" were for "defensive" purposes!)

So, concludes Sulzberger, quoting the Chairman and Chou and himself: "What this of course means is that there is no longer any fear of American attack, but great fear of Soviet attack." Why not tell so simple an opportunistic state-capitalistic policy without recourse to philosophy? After all, the only concrete point he is bringing out is the allegedly easy road Kissinger will have for his October 26th trip--if ever he gets there now that other areas have erupted without his approval and the Middle East war overshadows Cambodia, which is the real reason for that trip. To get Mao to force Sihanouk into another "peace with honor" should be easy for our Metternich expert.

So why the need for the needlessly complex, chaotic, dreary tale of the Chairman's hybrid love for an ancient Chinese novel, a 1940 battle, and a 1973 invitation to a "defensive" imperialist spokesman, Dr. Strangelove Kissinger?

It is not to be dismissed just because it is so totally illogical. The form is philosophic by no accident: in its way it proves Philosophy and Revolution is not just a book; it is the characteristic of the age. Philosophy is in the air. The passion for philosophy equals the passion for liberation and that precisely because the masses wish passionately to move away from aborted revolutions and ask: how? how? HOW?

Are the rulers merely deluding themselves that, with philosophy, they can get the "Left" to follow them? Judging by even that section of the Left that looks for philosophy but is enamored with the Frankfurt School dialecticians, there is more than a grain of truth in the delusion

of Mao. Here--Frankfurt, I mean--was a School, back in 1923 when it was founded, but especially in the 1930s, who rejected Reformism and wished also independence from existing state Marxism, and who wished not to be mere academics, shouting to the skies praise of praxis. That they preferred aphorisms to Hegel's "Absolutes" is no accident, though it would take a book to explain in full how aphorisms, like guerrilla shortcuts, are neither revolution nor philosophy. The point here is that like any sophistry, aphorisms can serve opposites, both academics and mindless activists.

So do listen to how revolutionary it can sound. The current favorite is from Adorno: "Philosophy which once seemed outmoded is now alive because the moment of its realization has been missed." The single grain of truth in this statement--we surely haven't "realized" philosophy in the Marxian sense of achieved total freedom--shouldn't that act as spur to "realize" it, rather than make philosophy as still one other form of escapism? And doesn't it call for the other truth Marx singled out, that the bourgeoisie and its intellectual prizefighters could not realize it since bourgeois consciousness was false consciousness, mere ideology rather than a total outlook, a philosophy of liberation?

Translated into action, or, more precisely put, unified with action, shouldn't that compel resistance both to Stalinist "peaceful co-existence" (that, in the concrete, today, also envelops Mao's China*) and Che-type guerrilla warfare as if that hadn't also failed? Why not, instead, go, for once, back to Marx and work out for this age the unity of philosophy and revolution, theory and practice, and not via any pseudo-socialist parliamentarism?

I'd hate to have to count how many pamphlets will now be written on the "dialectics of revolution," all offering new blueprints for new "strategies," none of which will reveal the slightest awareness of the Marxian dialectics that it is impossible to

* I'm referring to the fact that the Chileans in Peking had to call off the memorial they planned for Allende because, evidently, Mao's China is preparing to recognize the counter-revolutionary military junta in Chile as the government. Meanwhile, Russia has finally decided to recognize Sihanouk as the Cambodian government. There is no end to the maneuverings resulting from the Sino-Soviet conflict any more than there is an end to other more conventional intra-imperialist conflicts. Marxists cannot bother "to take sides" in such contests, but must work only from totally other, proletarian, Marxist-Humanist grounds.

-14-

tear out, root and branch, the old decrepit society and the "new" state-capitalist one calling itself Communist unless that struggle is governed by absolute negativity--the Marxian philosophy of liberation.

If we are to practice dialectics, daily, let's take a second look at Chapter One of Philosophy and Revolution--"Hegel's Absolutes As New Beginnings." The title isn't something to be learned by rote, nor can it become mere definition, phenomenal as that in itself would be, since all, Marxists and non-Marxists alike, have always looked at absolute as ultimate, rather than as new beginning.

Still, if it were left as mere definition instead of a compelling methodology for every single new event, objective and subjective, national, international, local, organizational (whether that be organization as ourselves, or as mass activity), no direction could flow to the action in any given situation.

Let me try to put it another way. The dialectic method, that "algebra of revolution," is not just a mathematical formula, or tool, conceptual or "strategic," for penetrating the contradictions of reality, serious a task as that is. The very fact that Hegel employs the word, Absolute, not alone to Idea but to Methodology--the Absolute Method being the dialectic of negativity, absolute negativity--means that "new beginning" is a process, a becoming, never a mere being; always a becoming. As we saw all the way from Absolute Indifference in the Doctrine of Being, through Actuality in the Doctrine of Essence, the "result," the Notion inseparable from Reality, was there from the beginning but it couldn't possibly manifest itself except through development, could become full-blown only when the objective and the subjective found unity in a subject.

To point to that is our uniqueness. It comes in with new beginnings, whether these be wildcatters and youth, Blacks and Women Liberationists, and even intellectuals who can no longer stand the oppressive reality and hunger to root out contradictions with all these new forces and passions and Reason of Revolution.

And when someone asks: "Yes, but what can we do?", is it really inconsequential when, along with pointing to the activities we are engaged in, for us to say: Yes, we also are working out a philosophy, practicing dialectics, not alone in theory but in organization, for with us it is not "the party to lead" that is the unifying force, but Marx's philosophy?

-15-

If we limit ourselves to a single issue of News & Letters, this is true. If we limit ourselves to the period between Draft and the present presentation, (whether in form of Report, or of new lead on the Middle East, or preparation for selling Philosophy and Revolution), this is true. And it certainly is true when we go back to our roots, the Constitution. No one can stop short of that little word, dialectics, philosophy, or try to confine it to what has been done by others--not only the cultural Frankfurt School, but even by Lenin, without whom we certainly could not possibly have reached the present stage theoretically, any more than we could have caught the new without the 1953 East German Revolt from practice. Nevertheless, even Lenin, from whose philosophic ground we take off, left us an ambivalent philosophic heritage and, of course, couldn't possibly have foreseen the problems of our age. No, only we could have done that.

Our uniqueness is in no way elitist, precisely because it is the unity of the movement from practice as well as from theory, in native roots as well as international.

IV TASKS

Great Divides mark off one age from another in philosophy as well as in economics, in politics as in theory--the stages in cognition inseparable from Reality because they signify totally new human relations that are to follow from revolution.

The uniqueness of Philosophy and Revolution, of Absolutes as New Beginnings, signifies the unity of worker and intellectual not as if each retained his or her own role and were "together" in a "single" organization. Rather, from the beginning it meant not only that the workers were taking on jobs that were considered prerogatives of intellectuals, like editor of the paper, but that not as the exception, but as the rule.

In a word, the whole paper is run by workers as well as by intellectuals as well as by women, not merely as "assistants" but in leadership roles. All are subordinated to but one vision--a philosophy of liberation--Marx's Humanism. Which is why we have turned to our tasks not as anything just internal, but the compelling need of the age in total crisis.

"First and foremost in this year of Philosophy and Revolution is spreading wide, selling Philosophy and Revolution, not as salespersons, but as founders of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S. as well as projectors of world concepts of revolution: proletarian, peasant, Black, youth, Women's Liberation, national and international--all the "new passions and forces" that are Reason for reconstruction of society on totally new human foundations. Only by projecting the unity of philosophy and revolution as organization builder can we counteract elitism--"the party to lead"--and at the same time elicit from below that elemental revolt motivated by the passionate search for a philosophy of liberation which has governed their action because it is their unifying force, that which gives action its direction."
(Draft Perspectives, 1973-74)

Though in the concrete the tasks get discussed not here, but at the Organizational Session, nevertheless I would like, at least briefly, to develop what goes inseparably with Philosophy and Revo-

4 9 8 1
-17-

lution, proletarianization--not just in the sense of getting new members, but of ourselves. Just as Marx singled out the proletariat as the revolutionary force not for romantic reasons but for their pivotal role in production, so we enter the factories not just to listen--surely paramount--nor only to be "full fountain pens"--a key to News & Letters existence--but also because we can project Marxist-Humanism as pivotal in their lives.

And in that we make sure that we will "realize" philosophy, that is, make Freedom real.

* * *

4981