

5 0 2 2

PROSPECTIVES REPORT TO
NEWS & LETTERS CONVENTION
AUGUST 31, 1974

ON THE THRESHOLD:

Philosophic preparation
for revolution

By Raya Dunayevskaya

I. THE GLOBAL MINEFIELD

- 1) From the Arab-Israeli War in 1973 to the Downfall of Nixon and the Cyprus War, 1974
- 2) Recession, Inflation and the H-Bomb in the U.S., in Europe, in India
- 3) Latin America; Back to Production and Inflation in the Age of State-Capitalism

II. THE DIALECTIC OF LIBERATION vs. FALSE CONSCIOUSNESS

- 1) Social Storms
- 2) Mao's Reductionism of the Self-Creative Subject
- 3) The Revolutionary Forces of Worker, Black, Women, Youth and Our Tasks

Post-Convention Bulletin #1

September, 1974

News & Letters

1900 E. Jefferson

Detroit, Mich. 48207

50¢

5022

Raya Dunayevskaya

ON THE THRESHOLD: PHILOSOPHIC PREPARATION FOR REVOLUTION

PART ONE: THE GLOBAL MINEFIELD

1) From the Arab-Israeli War, 1973, to the Downfall of Nixon and Cyprus War, 1974

We're treading in a global minefield. The crucible of events these past 10 months since we last met in Convention has revealed our world to be that global minefield.

From the October, 1973 war and its revelation of the disintegration of West Europe under the impact of the Arab use of oil as a "political weapon" when, in fact, it was an economic thunderbolt to the world "order," the global minefield has re-emerged in three other, seemingly unrelated, guises: the downfall of President Nixon, the outbreak of still another war, and world economic recession, all the gold flowing from oil notwithstanding.

Paradoxical as it may sound, the corrupt Nixon was made culprit of the Watergate cesspool, that is to say, the patriot-scoundrel was laid on the sacrificial altar of the decadent capitalist system which had brought him to power in its own image, for which it has designed the total cover-up--the "clean" idol, President Ford.

The real truth, however, is the shocking disclosure that Defense Secretary Schlesinger wouldn't so much as take a vacation during the impeachment proceedings on Nixon. The Military were taking no chances regarding the "chain of command" remaining imperialistically intact. Put bluntly, the frightening reality is that, but for the grace of mass pressures which led to impeachment proceedings and caused Nixon's speedy resignation, this "great democracy" came as close as any militarist junta regime to the generals instituting their own "7 Days in May" in August, 1974!

Bitter reality discloses other truths--open but totally different phenomena--unabating recession at home, and an impotence on the part of NATO far more incorrigible in Cyprus in 1974 than it was in Europe in 1973. Triple concatenations erupted in Cyprus:

(1) A Greek military junta supported by U.S. imperialism engineered the overthrow of Makarios when he suddenly started resisting enosis, though that is what had brought him to power in 1960. (2) It was itself overthrown when Turkey not only called its bluff but invaded Cyprus, which, in turn, (3) showed up the abject cynicism of Secretary of State Kissinger whose propensity for global brinkmanship went haywire.

The depth of the "West's" many crises has revealed NATO stark naked--it was as impotent when, under the fear of Russian intervention, it was all in one piece in Cyprus as it was when it was all in pieces during the Yom Kippur war.

Will the imperial system now send Dr. Strangelove back on still another type of shuttle "diplomacy", if not nuclearly armed, surely able to flex nuclear muscle?

-2-

Or will he be off hiding--in China? He, with the global scheming mind, wants to warm up relations with China, now that Russia, having begun playing with Turkey, has switched to Greece as it is daily expressing its anti-Americanism. Meanwhile, the equally cynical West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, who just last month was speaking of "chaotic" Italy in order very nearly to "write it off," is now offering it lush loans as its bases for NATO become crucial, should Greece really throw out all NATO bases.

The political nature of the state-capitalist world in which we live is in such disorder that even before we look at the economic recession--the root of the myriad crises the world over--a question mark over the very existence of the system needs to be placed. Equally crucial is this point:

Why, how can such a decrepit world system whose order is its disorder exist when it has long outlived its usefulness; when it's in total disarray, when it's daily being questioned even by its adherents, be they Messrs. Clean in the U.S. and in Greece, or General Spínola in Portugal who, in overthrowing his "old-fashioned" fellow generals, held out independence to its colonies? So far only the smallest and poorest--Guinea Bissau--will have its independence September 12; Angola and Mozambique are in abeyance. After all, it was the African Revolutions that undermined this entire imperial system.

The question is: Is the class enemy learning faster from the lightning global realignments and mass discontents which put an end to the post-World War II world than we, the revolutionaries, who want not only the end of the old, but the opening of a totally new epoch in human relationships?

Why?

Where is not only the banner but the philosophy of liberation?

We must probe very, very deeply; we must not be satisfied with exposing moribund capitalism or blame the decrepit system for all our agonies. We must ask ourselves, as revolutionaries, what has happened this year, indeed this past half century, since in 1917 the proletarian revolution did succeed in Russia, was hemmed into a single country, and was transformed into its opposite?

What happened since the 1960s witnessed the creation of a new Third World--is that going to let itself get sucked into the state-capitalist world system?

Why had not the development of theory in the early 1950s caught the presence of that totally new movement from practice that had erupted in East Europe soon after the death of Stalin in 1953?

We cannot; we must not let our eyes stray from what stares us in the face: THE POST-WORLD WAR II WORLD IS DEAD BUT NO NEW EPOCH HAS ARISEN. Let us face that.

First to be considered is the objective situation--the state of production, inflation and ideology in the age of state-capitalism.

Secondly, and a most demanding task this, comes the grappling with the subjective situation--the philosophical-political maturity of

the masses--the workers, the Blacks, the women's liberationists, the youth who have reached what Hegel would have called "THE SELF-CERTAINTY OF THE SUBJECT'S ACTUALITY AND THE NON-ACTUALITY OF THE WORLD", specifically as we view the objective world NOT in what Hegel calls Inquiring Cognition, without subjectivity of the Notion, BUT AS THE OBJECTIVE WORLD WHOSE INNER GROUND AND ACTUAL PERSISTENCE IS THE NOTION. THIS IS THE ABSOLUTE IDEA." (Science of Logic, Miller trans., p. 824)

Finally, though this will first be elaborated at the Organization session, we must outline briefly our tasks for the coming year.

2) Recession, Inflation and the H-Bomb in the U.S., in Europe, in India

Economic recession is here. Unemployment is edging 6%. Even as great a reactionary as Prof. Arthur Burns who chairs the Federal Reserve Board with tight-money fists had to say that "if" unemployment does reach 6%, some public works will have to be initiated. That "if" is the joker. He knows very well that "edging 6%" is the "average", an "average" that never has applied to Black unemployment which is twice the amount of white.

Moreover, such unemployment statistics disregard those on relief who have had to resort to buying dog food to "keep up" with inflation. The U.S. is the only industrialized country that has exuded a barbaric new phenomenon--the third generation unemployed!

Take two other horror phenomena--aiming at zero growth in order to slow down inflation. That last horror everyone, even the rich, even President Ford, does recognize as "Public Enemy No. 1." However, here, too, the intellectuals manage to exude a greater mess on that subject than even the military-industrial complex, its creators.

Thus, the latest, elitist, invented and totally abstruse word is "stagflation". It can hardly be called a precise description of the runaway inflation we're experiencing at the very same time when, far from a booming economy, we trend to zero growth. All stagflation (for stagnation and inflation) is a precise designation of is their empty, rootless "intellects."

But even if we deal for the moment only quantitatively, follow their statistics, we cannot possibly forget the poor record of the "shell-shocked economists" whose prediction of unsold stocks was a whopping \$7 billion off. Thus, in the first quarter of 1974, there were 16.9 billion, instead of 6.5, unsold stocks. And all those bigshot economists can tell us is that the statistical system is itself a victim of inflation.

Well, on one thing at least they are right: they are, with reason, afraid that double-digit inflation will last longer even than Burns's double-digit interest rates.

Of course, any "consumer", a housewife especially, can tell them more about runaway inflation, whether it is on such a necessary item as milk, or a so-called "luxury" item like a pair of shoes.

But no, they're too busy with their little computers, and their incomprehensible vocabulary. Thus, along with "stagflation", we have

"liquidity"--cash money, lots of it. This has been a favorite term ever since the days of Keynes and the Depression. But, here again, the 1970s have added something new, far, far away from production. Since, if anyone has a very great deal of cash floating about, it's the oil sheikdoms, they have succeeded in inflating the heads of our "shell-shocked" economists with even more figures than they can dream up, with or without computers.

The International Institute for Strategic Studies in London has estimated that within six short years, the Arab kingdoms, sheikdoms, emirates, plus the Shah of Iran, will control no less than 70% of the world's total monetary reserve. Think of it. By 1980, the oil-producing countries will have liquid surplus of a more fantastic sum than Midas could evoke--\$400 BILLION. The World Bank estimate for the oil-producing countries is \$650 billion compared with \$26 billion last year!

The Shah, the kings and the sheiks then proceed to "instigate" delusions about such gigantic industrialization and irrigation of their backward lands, that they dwarf God's parting of the Red Sea for Moses! This doesn't stop either our intellectual "leaders" or the "intellectual" Shah of Iran from imagining global roles. After all, says the Shah, his country has "an intellectual infrastructure" and is freed of all financial worries.

Prior to the Yom Kippur war, the revenues for 1974 were expected to be \$4 billion. Now they're sure to be \$16-17 billion. Indeed, compared to 1972, just two short years ago when it was \$2.4 billion, they have had no less than a 700% increase in liquidity!

Before these stratospherical figures lift you to another planet, stop a moment and ask: is there anything like that in production? And will there be quite that much liquidity when inflation, which is already 15% there, comes along with Iran's bill for the steel mill and petrochemical plant from France (who has already been paid \$1 billion in advance), and West Germany and the U.S. and yes, also his enemy, Russia, become his experts in State Planning?

The truth is simpler: the Middle East countries of kingdoms, sheikdoms and emirates thus far have very little more than sand and oil, oil, oil, while the technologically advanced lands have the coal mines, the steel mills, the auto factories, the petrochemical industries, not to forget the military might and enough nuclear bombs to kill the world's population over and over and over again. Nixon hadn't stopped short of introducing the possibility of nuclear fuel into that volatile imbroglio.

OVERHANGING ALL, THEN, IS THE NUCLEARLY-ARMED STRUGGLE FOR WORLD POWER--and all this intensifies as the exploitation of the people in each country brings untold misery--AND CREATIVE UNREST.

The boom that followed World War II, once U.S. imperialism decided to save European capitalism from its self-destruction so long as it didn't fall to revolution, brought in its wake industrialization to Europe's unindustrialized southern underbelly, because that's where the cheap labor was. And now that they do not have that, and Portugal can no longer pretend to be an empire (how long will Spain?), and Greece couldn't even play imperialist games on Cyprus, and Italy is in such total crisis that some are once again flirting with fascism--which is, after all, all that cap-

italism could exude to save itself from revolution--what is there to the present world "order"?

All they now have is the fear of the 1968 near-revolutions. By 1973, the total disarray in the world held out a single, a momentary illusion as Schmidt and Giscard came to power. Le Monde hailed their ascendance to power as being nothing short of a way to bring in a new stage of Western equilibrium. This has worn off. Now we're in a stage where such a staid magazine as The Economist (London) is embarking on the worst of the McCarthy Cold War days' hysteria: The Red Wolf Waiting to Devour Southern Europe" (reprinted in The Globe and Mail, Toronto, 8-13-74.)

Clearly, in our nuclear world not even the fetish of liquidity can long hold back what every country is really for--a stake in the H-bomb, and for a single foothold in that, the poor countries, "pacific" or otherwise, are entering the fray to any extent they can, ALWAYS AT THE EXPENSE OF THEIR TEEMING, HUNGRY, FAMISHED MILLIONS. Nixon held out that fatal branch--nuclear fuel--after India showed it could come up with a "little" H-bomb.

India, where the living standards have actually declined since the end of World War II and its gaining of independence from Britain; India, that thinks itself above "ordinary" capitalism; India, whose leaders keep mouthing phrases about "peace", "socialism", "democracy"--what is it celebrating? Its first nuclear explosion.

Think of it. Here is a country that indeed has its "intellectual infrastructure" in such large measure that 75% of the university graduates are at present unemployed!

But what has it done in the nearly 30 years since independence? Along with the H-bomb, it has 120 million untouchables who live in the exact same misery and under the same dead weight of superstition of the feudal times. Are we supposed to believe that the H-bomb will provide food for the 175 million Indians who vegetate below the poverty line of \$30 a year?!!!

As for that goriest of all bloodbaths in Indonesia back in 1968 when that military junta overthrew Sukarno--well, they "found" oil, and the new millions go to line the pockets of the corrupt government while the standard of living of the masses is worse off than even before. As the January revolts this year showed, unrest is the most intense even after those bloodbaths.

As for the affluent U.S. now that it has a supposedly "clean" president--well, he declared inflation to be "Public Enemy No. 1." Unless retaining the whole reactionary Nixonomic specialists of Ash, Greenspan and Rush who consider unemployment as nothing when compared to inflation is considered "doing something," Ford, like Nixon, is up to his eyes in imperialist interventions abroad, and "benignly" neglecting home imperialism, Latin America.

3) Latin America: Back to Production and Inflation in the Age of State-Capitalism

Ever since the Monroe Doctrine, at the very start of U.S. nationhood, Latin America has been considered its "province" in the very same

manner as ruthless imperialism of the experienced European nations bloodily carved out their "spheres of influence." The spoliation of that land never stopped with Roosevelt's so-called "Good Neighbor" policy, or our flamboyant Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who tried "to sandwich in" an overnight stay in Panama between his Middle Eastern and European and more "exciting" stays. Just as quickly as he appeared at the Pan American Conference in Mexico to declare something "new", a dialogue instead of imperial orders, he quickly disappeared after his monologue, even as President Ford now tries to send out "feelers" to Cuba--and letting the OAS bear responsibility for that.

And what has nearly two centuries of alternate benign neglect and outright counter-revolutionary interventions brought Latin America? Well, here is what confronted the latest Pan American Health Conference meeting in Mexico City this month:

1) So underdeveloped is its economy and so strangled its masses that only one city dweller in 20 enjoys an adequate sewerage system, and only two in five any sewerage system--between 1969-72, no less than 23,750 people died in a dysentery epidemic in El Salvador and Guatemala!

2) Less than one half the people of Latin America have a piped water supply and even in such "affluent" and technologically highly developed cities as Mexico City and Sao Paulo, "science" has so polluted the environment that, says Prof. Allen Kneese, "environmental conditions have deteriorated drastically and I think dangerously..." As for the land, "fertilizers and industrial wastes are polluting the land and deforestation is culling out plant and animal species."

To put it as starkly as it is in reality, an ever-increasing number of people live by scavenging the public dumps of towns lucky enough to have refuse collection.

And if the blame for all this is certainly as much on the native ruling classes as on American imperialism, no one but American imperialism can possibly be responsible for the out-and-out total imperialistic, racist domination of the Panama Canal than the United States. To this day, not even the CBS-TV journalistic crew was given an interview.

Yes, indeed, our Clean Dr. Strangelove Kissinger keeps his secrets well there as in South Vietnam, in China, while tilting toward Pakistan as East Bengalis fight for their freedom, or presently both in Greece and Turkey, in Cyprus and in the Middle East imbroglio, not to mention the outright counter-revolutionary support of the blood-thirsty fascist generals who brought down the duly-elected President Allende in Chile.

But whether it is outright military intervention or what has become known, by that other intellectual Ambassador in India, Moynihan, as "benign neglect," the truth of state-capitalism in this most affluent land is what I referred to previously--the utterly new barbaric phenomenon of three generations of unemployed. And that is strictly "homo-made".

We must therefore return to production and inflation, or, more precisely, to that CAPITAL/LABOR exploitative relationship which is the root cause of the whole global minefield.

What all these rulers want to forget is that there is ONE THING

AND ONE THING ONLY that matters and that is PRODUCTION and in that one thing, the ONLY RELATIONSHIP that counts and defines the whole system is THE RELATIONSHIP OF CONSTANT CAPITAL/DEAD LABOR to VARIABLE CAPITAL/LIVING LABOR.

It is that simple, that decisive, that SINGLE relationship, CAPITAL TO LABOR.

LABOR ALONE PRODUCES all, all, ALL value and surplus value (unpaid hours of labor).

Here the German ruler, Schmidt, who knows better, tried, instead, to say that the world struggle is for the product--and that product of course was oil--rather than production -- oil or anything else. One thing, however, he could escape through no trickery. Therefore, in saying it is a world struggle for product, what he threatened those who wouldn't listen to his solution is to say that, otherwise, THEY WILL HAVE TO CONTEND WITH THE EMERGING SOCIAL STORM.

When all is said and done, that is correct, and it is it in a nutshell. The laborers from whom all production of values is extracted, with as many hours of it unpaid as possible, aren't just going to sit quietly by and let themselves be exploited. Whether the profits are liquid or otherwise matters little to labor; what they hunger for and will revolt against will produce a mighty "social storm," a revolution.

You know, it's very funny. In the Depression when there wasn't enough liquidity for investment in production, Keynes tried to make capitalists think of production more than of money, connecting that directly with the army of employed and the very big army of the unemployed, both of whom would not look at computers. He knew what worried the people was food. What he didn't know was that they worried about freedom. They worried about revolution inseparable from a philosophy of freedom.

Keynes did a lot of "preaching," successful "preaching," to the capitalists, that they better pay attention to production or risk destroying the whole system. So, "pump-priming," public works, became primary, above the fetish of liquidity.

When I worked on the first study of state-capitalism in Russia and was told endless tales about the "worthless ruble," as if that was what I would be using for measuring the value of either capital or labor, I constructed a table (Marxism and Freedom, p. 230) which, except for one relative figure on wages (of which more later), had nothing whatever to do with "rubles," worthless or otherwise, or gold or "liquidity."

What it dealt with was production, production, production, heavy industry, light industry, agriculture and livestock--and population. On that material base, it was clear that the same relationship of constant capital to variable capital that existed in any capitalist country existed there, and, above all, the motion of development of dead over living labor showed the law of value operating.

Now then, wages, where I used the ruble figure officially stated--that was broken down to the simple question of actual foodstuffs consumed in Tsarist times and that in 1940, after those "miracle" Five Year Plans (see table, p. 232, Marxism and Freedom), showed real weekly wages to have

been 62.4% of what they were in 1913, whereas in 1928, before the Plan but when it was still a workers' state, they were 125%.

In a word, it comes down to some very simple things: (1) What do you eat? Food. (2) Where do you sleep? Housing. (3) How are you clothed? And (4) the capitalists who depend on one other thing to bring down your wages and threaten workers with becoming part of the RESERVE ARMY OF LABOR, the "back-up forces," THE UNEMPLOYED--the reproduction of the next generation of labor for capital to exploit.

What, then, is the truth of inflation? Of course, the quadrupling of oil prices has exacerbated the unflagging inflation to so intense a degree that it's easy to see only that as root cause, especially when our Energy Czar Simon, the American oil monopolists' apologist on the Federal payroll, dared to say it is only the press that is playing up the super-profits of the oil monopolists as if they were unconscionable.

But long before that scandalous conspiracy between sheiks and American oil monopolists, there was the undeclared Vietnam War in which U.S. imperialism sunk national wealth of no less than \$25-30 billion annually.

Now, production of armaments isn't production, much less expanded reproduction. All it produces is death and destruction--and inflation. If the World War II holocaust had hidden the Depression--that natural, inevitable consequence of capitalism--it was only for the time of heated-up production--war, destruction, death!

And how soon after that holocaust did the Korean War break out? All capitalism ever does is move from Depressions to Wars and back again. Such is the nature of the capitalist Behemoth. It must be sent to the grave. Even an Eisenhower was compelled to speak of the military-industrial complex as the greatest danger enveloping America. Of course, it was only after he left the Generalship and the Presidency!

As Marx long ago showed in his analysis of capitalism--that exploitative capital/labor relationship, vampire-like, sucks unpaid hours of labor from workers at work, and discharges itself also as inflation on the worker as consumer. One hundred years ago Marx put it succinctly enough. The only thing the workers "own" is the national debt. And that keeps ever-growing--we have already mortgaged not only our lives but those of our children and grandchildren.

* * * * *

PART TWO: THE DIALECTICS OF LIBERATION vs. FALSE CONSCIOUSNESS

(1) Social Storms

The fears that have been enveloping capitalism, ever since the near-revolutions of 1968 nearly toppled it, were reawakened when the Arabs in 1973 began to use that all-crucial lubricant, oil, as a political weapon,

not because they thought the Arabs almighty, but because of fear of the social storms that an economic crisis would evoke.

The same intensity of fear reappeared in spring of 1974 when General Spinoza came to power: again, not because of fear of Spinoza, but because "advanced" capitalism knew that (1) Spinoza was reacting to the African Revolutions that were, indeed, undermining Portugal's colonialism, and world neo-colonialism that is bringing it famine. Now that will be an unquenchable fire that will bring forth the second social revolution. And (2) they know that Spinoza's "democratization" is by no means the end, but only the beginning of revolutionary developments he himself truly does not really understand. So, the Economist is giving him "lessons."

Historically, it has, of course, always been true that the Spinozas don't know. The 1905 Revolution in Russia began with "Father Gapon" appealing to the "Little Father" (the Czar) for very little, indeed, for his mass peasant demonstrators.

In our age of state-capitalism, so very much of the "subjectivity" of the masses--their philosophic-political maturity--is in objectivity itself. That is to say, it is simply impossible to talk of the objective situation without being conscious of the revolutionary opposition forces to capitalism and its ideologists, for the masses themselves seek to go beyond spontaneity. THEY ARE ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE UNITY OF THEORY AND PRACTICE.

Hegel

That is what makes/so contemporary-sounding a person. Because he himself, though immersed only in thought, was a product of an age of revolutions--industrial, national (1776), social (1789), and intellectual (Kant)--he so profoundly analyzed the objective world as a product of philosophy and revolution.

It needed a Marx and the proletariat to spell it out in more concrete terms of class struggle, and proletarian revolutions. But, as generalization, no one has surpassed him. Which is why both Marx and Lenin had to return to him. As I stated at the start, here is how Hegel expressed the relationship of Subject/Object:

"Objectivity, not, however, as in Inquiring Cognition, merely as objective world without subjectivity of the Notion, but as objective world whose inner ground and actual persistence is the Notion. This is the Absolute Idea." (Science of Logic, Miller trans., p. 824)

This is not the place to detail why only in our age have the masses themselves grappled with it as they acted out that phenomenal movement from practice to theory and a new society. The fact is that ever since 1953, soon after the death of Stalin, the East German workers did rebel, did initiate a new epoch also in thought, did dare what sceptics said could never be done: struggle openly for freedom from under totalitarianism and thus, not in academia, or other illusory utopian gabfests, place on the historic stage Marx's Humanism as revolution, today's revo-

utions, the uprooting of capitalism, state as well as private, along with its parties to lead.

But what stares at us is a series of counter-revolutions that are successful, and a heightened class consciousness of the enemy. Which is why they began to look further than Portugal to all the southern underbelly of Europe, not stopping by any means at Greece. Indeed, what was heretofore considered and talked of as Western Europe--Italy--was now suddenly referred to only as Southern Europe. And in Italy, it isn't quite so simple a question as a military junta collapsing, but a country which has a Communist Party 2 million strong, a restless proletariat involved in continuous, militant, political strikes, and ideological battles that far surpass the academic debates on ideology.

The reversal of the staid Economist of London to McCarthy hysteria. "The Red Wolf Waiting to Devour Southern Europe," is all a desperate cry for "the West" to do some "long range thinking," for thus far, it writes, "if there is any organized, long-range thinking about ideological expansion being done in Europe today, it's still in Moscow that it's happening."

But, in fact, it isn't Russia half as much as their own rebellious masses that is the "danger." Helmut Schmidt had preceded the Economist in calling it by its right name, "social storms." They are all deathly afraid of the passion for philosophy that is inseparable from revolution.

They hope to keep those two separated, first by attributing "ideology" to Russia, and secondly, by calling "ideological revelation" as "spurious." No doubt Russia's and China's and theirs, where the miners' strike had brought Heath down. But the philosophical-political maturity of the age and the mass passion for philosophy and revolution can by no means be passed off as any sort of conspiracy made "in Moscow"--or Peking.

(2) Mao's Reductionism of the Self-Creative Subject

Should this belated McCarthyism (just as fascism, it is sure to reappear in new forms so long as capitalism exists), however, make you embrace either Russia or China because they had had revolutions before undergoing transformation into opposite, state capitalism, REMEMBER THEY, TOO, ARE IN THE FOREFRONT OF THIS GLOBAL STRUGGLE FOR POWER. Indeed, it is this struggle of the super-powers for single world mastery that defines precisely the mess the world is in, and will bring it down, (something the African Liberation Solidarity Committee forgets, as its special July, 1974, issue of African World shows--we'll return to that later).

Here, let me repeat, it is this, just this, triangular world out for single world mastery--U.S., Russia, China--which suits the Chinese expression: "Great disorder under heaven." Spurious is the claim that China's ideology equals "From Revolution to Revolution to Revolution," whether it was the actual revolution of 1949, or the "Great Leap Forward" in 1958, or the "Cultural Revolution" in 1966. But let's look at China as it is now.

Between the October, 1973, Arab-Israeli war, and August, 1974, fall of Nixon and outbreak of the Cyprus war--the ten months of our overview--there was April. Spring brought China's Deputy Premier Teng to the UN. He delivered a speech--by no means limited to the UN audience--stemming directly from the latest Tenth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party and its present mini-cultural revolution. He was sent there, though China has a very high ranking--permanent representative--in order to stress that it came directly from Mao, from Chou, from the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, and it contained the current international position.

Teng surely did speak with a world sweep to the UN in April. (The New York Times printed excerpts, 4-12-74.) I should have said three worlds sweep. Teng spoke of three worlds. It wasn't the three worlds that heretofore in Communist jargon stood for (1) the socialist world, (2) the capitalist world, and (3) the Third World of newly-independent countries in underdeveloped Asia, Africa and Latin America.

There used to be a time when the West Indies, the whole Carribean in fact, used to be referred to as the crucible of revolutions-to-be, since that part of the globe had both African origins and European so-called civilization, so that they would lead both U.S. Blacks and "backward" Africa. But that was long, long ago--and except for surprising single outbursts as in Montreal, by Jamaican and Trinidadians which did bring Maoists around--they do not figure in Teng's world sweep.

The post-World War II world, says Teng, has witnessed "great reversals." THERE NO LONGER EXISTS A SOCIALIST WORLD. In one sweep, then, he has done away with what was World No. 1--indestructible as Stalin-Mao announced it to be.

By the time Mao's China, though it considers itself "socialist", said that now it counted itself to be of the Third World, that may have sounded appealing to the Third World--except it sounded altogether too much like what Russia has been telling the Third World: Follow me. What is drastically now this time is that whereas heretofore, China had fought within the Communist world for leadership of it, this time China is disclosing the global ambition to fight alongside everybody and anybody who will fight Russia as Enemy No. 1.

Another "great reversal" followed. Suddenly, West Europe and all those technologically advanced countries that were always considered capitalist were now merely called the "Second World", "middle countries" with whom the Third World could collaborate.

Finally, the enemy, the super-powers, those designated as out for "hegemony," single world power, the nuclear titans--Russia and the U.S. Here comes the greatest shocker--it turns out that, though both are super-powers, one is "especially vicious," Enemy No. 1.

There is no limit to the gall of this super-revolutionary who had rolled out the red carpet for Nixon, told West Europe to remain in NATO

-12-

as the needed counterweight to Russia, flaunted the possibility of a Bonn-Paris axis--anything, anything at all against Russia.

Moreover, Teng did not just limit his "proof" of Russia as Enemy No. 1 to such obviously counter-revolutionary deeds as the invasion of Czechoslovakia but extended it--and in the very same sentence!--to the creation of the national revolution of the East Bengalis, which he merely refers to as "the dismemberment of Pakistan," which "dismemberment" was "instigated by Russia."

And all that was said in the Assembly in which he alone vetoed the application of Bangladesh for membership.

Western capitalism's fetish of liquidity has its counterpart in China's fetishism of "ideology," which Marx had analyzed as "false consciousness," that of bourgeois intellectuals, and to which he counterposed "a new Humanism," the dialectics of liberation.

The latest such "momentous development" (actually, it was stated in 1963 on rural work, but not so designated until a decade later) is blown up as something momentous, a new development of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought. It is this: "Matter can be transformed into consciousness and consciousness into matter."

This bourgeois, philosophical idealism, surpassing the idealism of Hegel himself, was said, and criticized by their leading philosopher, Yang Hsien-chen, and forgotten. Suddenly, what was said to get the rural workers to work harder and harder becomes, a decade later, "an irresistible historical trend today for the people of the whole world, and many medium-sized and small countries to unite and oppose hegemony of two superpowers," never forgetting, however, that one of those two is "especially vicious" and "has become an international merchant of death." (Excerpts printed in the New York Times, 4-12-74.)

So is all of capitalism, private or state, North, South, East and West, and to be fought most sharply ideologically are those state-capitalist lands that dare call themselves Communist!

Mao's reductionism of the creative Subject as the maker of history to sheer voluntarism imposed on the masses by the Chairman is actually a result of what Mao never admitted, but, in fact, everything he says is based on that underlying assumption--his acceptance of state-capitalism as the next stage of humanity's "development."

In their first constitution after gaining power, they openly designated their state as state-capitalist, but saying that since the "commanding heights" of the economy and state were in the hands of the Communist Party, the masses need not worry. With the "Great Leap Forward," they suddenly started calling themselves socialist--indeed, they would reach full Communism ahead of Russia.

And now that they are "just Third World," this is more than false labelling. This is false consciousness. It is a claim to Chinese

leadership. That is it in a nutshell. The decisive feature that reveals the truth is the role of labor, exploitation of it. By whatever name that is labelled, the domination of labor defines the society.

(3) The Revolutionary Forces of Worker, Black, Women, Youth, and Our Tasks

The Convention Call on June 1st presciently stated:

"The nuclear explosion on the Asian sub-continent can no more protect Indira Gandhi from the class struggle that will yet bring her down than the "miracle worker" Dr. Kissinger can extricate Nixon from his crimes that were heavily-laden, as they were, with fictitious "national security." No. Not all the king's men (including all the pretensions to "generations of peace" amidst unremitting terrorist massacres and endless reprisals) can put that Humpty-Dumpty together again."

Yet that's precisely what capitalism, and all its ideologists with the press in the lead, is trying to do now that Humpty-Dumpty has been replaced by that over-six-foot-tall ex-football player nonentity, Ford. Mr. Clean having replaced Mr. Corrupt, the recession is deeper as Nixonomics remains intact with its two most reactionary tops in place--Ash and Greenspan. Each prefers greater unemployment--and higher profits--to inflation (not that that is abating), but the only way they know to try to abate it is on the backs of the workers.

The crisis is deepening. New York and Detroit both have long passed the 6% unemployment statistic. Ash is calling for cutting back on social programs. No, there is no change in Nixonomics. Or the Democratic Congress. Or the judicial system. The Supreme Court which parted Nixon from his tapes is the same Supreme Court, in the very same week, which reversed civil rights "victories" in education a whole century back, with but one change: the notorious "separate but equal" education doctrine has been renamed anti-busing.

The miseducation bill bears Ford's signature. The gesture of meeting with the duly-constituted caucus of Black Congressmen will hardly save him from the wrath of the Black masses, whether those are the unemployed, those on relief--or the youth returning back to the overcrowded miserable classrooms after not having been able to get a job all summer.

Nor is the unrest to be limited to immediate problems. The one thing that was significant in, say, the Youth Organization for Black Unity that participated in the African Liberation Rally in Washington, D.C., was in their declaration that 1974 was to be the year of "educational seminars" and discussions of directions for the Movement.

The fact that there is plenty of elitism, and acceptance of Maoism by calling it also the philosophy of Cabral, is not half as significant as the passion for philosophy from below which this constant reference to dialectics, as a word, by the leaders signifies.

-14-

I should correct myself as well. When, at the beginning of the presentation, I said that the myriad crises that presently envelope the world arise from the fact that the post-World War II has ended, but nothing new has emerged, I should have added: BUT WE ARE ON THE THRESHOLD.

We are on the threshold of a new world IF we face reality, not merely as it is not, not yet. The opposing revolutionary forces that signify the social storms are on the horizon, strive to be born not only as spontaneity but as Reason. They will not experience release, liberation, until this generation stops burying its head in the sand about so great, so historic a happening as the movement from practice and recognizes it as HAVING INITIATED A NEW EPOCH FOR MANKIND.

Whether we look at the U.S. or Europe, Asia or Latin America, the whole Caribbean, the Middle East or Africa, as well as the Black Revolution in America, in the West Indies, throughout the globe indeed, for they are an international people, the pivotal question is this:

How many Marxist intellectuals have so much as looked at this movement from practice?

Outside of ourselves--Marxist-Humanists--none.

Yet that which began in 1953 and has persisted for two full decades was a totally new phenomenon, not only because that struggle for freedom emerged right under totalitarianism soon after the death of Stalin, BUT IT WAS ITSELF A FORM OF THEORY. And it circled the globe.

As against the empty debates of "the committed intellectuals" a la Sartre-de Beauvoir who tailended Stalin as they now tailend Mao, the proletarian revolutions placed on the historic stage of the day Marx's Humanism, not alone as theory, but as the actuality of the day. This was imbedded in Hegel's "objective world whose inner ground and actual persistence is the Notion."

It is this which so enthralled Lenin as he grappled with "Cognition as objectivity which truly is." And as the world of World War I was falling to pieces, he was theoretically, philosophically, preparing himself for proletarian revolution. Because of that vision, he "translated" it as:

"The result of activity is the test of subjective cognition and the criterion of objectivity which truly is." (Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 219)

This is one way to see objectivity rise up "in" the Subject, and the Notion becomes no longer "only" Subject, but is equally immediate actuality, the objective world.

ONLY IN OUR AGE, HOWEVER, DID THE MASSES THEMSELVES EMERGE TO PROVE IT, TO ACT IT OUT, TO LABOR TO CONCRETIZE IT FOR US.

What, then, are we to think when two decades after that first happening--and the birth also of a new generation of revolutionary intellectuals--we are confronted with a group like the ones who did start a new serious journal, Telos, which, when it comes to philosophic matters, has made a contribution. Yet, in spring 1974, it reprinted from 1954 a series of studies of a great German philosopher, Adorno--ON OCCULTISM?

That they have space--about a half of the journal, no less--for this, and not a single page for a review of Philosophy and Revolution says a great deal about them. But they do not matter. What does is to see what happened to ROOTLESS INTELLECTUALS, even as original as Adorno, a head of the independent Marxist school, so far removed from the proletariat that the year following the 1953 Revolt, the year after we had broken through on what the Absolute Idea has for our age--the movement from practice--he analyzes some American penchant for the occult.

Just as this great intellect, obsessed with the low level of American culture and its daily astrology column, so the New Left, once they cared not a whit for the proletariat, are repeating all the errors of the Old Left and compounding that with arrogance of their own rootlessness.

On the other hand, the Blacks, even the intellectuals, have a very great advantage: they are concrete, must be concrete; they live in no ivory towers for even when they are in academia, they live, if not in the ghetto, live Black. They do not commit such vulgarisms as the white New Left.

But when it comes to the Sino-Soviet conflict, does it do any good not to see that that is, in fact, the sharpest, most divisive, most shocking development from within existing Communist states?

African World opts for Mao. Abernathy tilts toward Russia--or, at least, Angela Davis (Christian Science Monitor, 3-28-74, report on the SGLC mini-convention.) Bobby Seale is for "the system." And Huey Newton is--in Thailand.

And in all the Women's Liberation reports in African World, only Joyce Johnson acknowledges "male supremacy," and even she subordinates Women's Liberation to their primary struggle, as Black, as male. In any case, nothing the women said was so much as mentioned when the "theoreticians," all male, presented "position papers" which set the new perspectives.

Here we are living in an epoch fraught with famine and the H-bomb, terrorism and racism, wars and nuclear explosions that threaten the very survival of civilization, and that has been spread about so that now not only the superpowers and China have it, but France and India--and the last gesture of Nixon was a promise to introduce that into the volatile Middle East.

Will choosing sides within the Sino-Soviet orbit, each of which

has accepted state-capitalism as if that were indeed the next stage for human development, really do anything but send us to perdition?

And just when the philosophic-political maturity of the age, the passion for philosophy and its inseparability from revolution, shows us what is the characteristic of the age? That type of passion exudes as much energy from thought as from battles at the point of production and struggles against imperialism, racism, capitalism, including its male chauvinism.

What is to be done? What is to be done now that the 1970s are upon us with their threatening wars and recessions, if not full Depression, and total disarray in the ruling classes, but none dare challenge them outside the embrace of some state power?

What is to be done to match the movement from practice, with its daring to trust the ENERGY OF THOUGHT as well as the actions?

What is to be done now that the 1970s are upon us and the Movement does begin--only begin, but each beginning is a leap forward--to recognize that (1) theory is needed, (2) that Black is beautiful, though true, is insufficient to engage in the final battle where whitey cannot all be lumped together as if there were no class divisions that would help uproot the system, and (3) that all the revolutionary forces--worker, Black, women's liberation, youth--must seek unity, not for unity's sake, but for establishing new principles, new human relations, new creativity?

What is needed for the decisive determinant--philosophic preparation for revolution, i.e., to prepare to cross that threshold into revolution?

* * * * *

Precisely because these myriad crises are so threatening, I did not this year separate the objective-subjective situation from our own tasks. What the masses will do, they will do. They need no leaders. They do need a philosophy of liberation to meet their challenge.

Here are our five immediate tasks:

First there is the internationalization of Philosophy and Revolution. The very fact that the first international edition will appear in Latin America demands of us at one and the same time international solidarity and work with Chicanos and Puerto Ricans here.

Secondly, internationalization cannot be separated from proletarianization any more than we can let the recession kill that proletarianization of our own organization.

And, let me repeat, the points here are just to indicate what the Organization Session and Women's Liberation reports (after the International

Report, which will also deal with Black, Brown and Red) will work out. We don't discuss these five points. Now, then, to points three, four, and five:

I'm going to combine three and four, not because either Black or Women's Liberation is subordinate to the other, but rather because both are placed in a more comprehensive context with a total outlook because, of course, I should have made a separate point the totally new kind of class Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution, as a unit, that I began expounding to the REB.

For projection of Philosophy and Revolution, it must be first internalized. Both Black and women's liberation have a heavier responsibility here because, whereas proletariat was always projected as Reason as well as force, and concretized as such in our very reason for existence--in that Black stood pivotal because it was Black as masses who wore vanguard in the American revolution.

Women's Liberation is first testing itself.

Now, Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution as a unit, in leadership, in ranks, in "inside" and "outside", compels METHOD-
OLOGY, DIALECTICS AS UNIVERSAL. So, though this, too, will first be developed in the Organization Session, and more so after, let me at least say, briefly, a few words on both the continuity and discontinuity of M&F and P&R.

Marxism and Freedom is "easier", not only because it is 15 years old, but because it didn't wait till the 1953 chapter to show the new in the world of the movement from practice. M&F itself PRACTICES that throughout two hundred years of history, 1776-1956.

Now, Philosophy and Revolution REVERSES that (1) with the passion for philosophy from below, not because M&F was wrong, but because we could no longer "put it off," that is to say, leave it at a stage of generalization, and (2) UNLESS WE begin, BEGIN, with DIALECTICS AS ABSOLUTE IDEA, ABSOLUTE NEGATIVITY, DIRECTLY, knowing its "results" and "antecedents in practice" we'd know it only as "history," and results then become what Hegel called "a pillow for intellectual sloth."

We must be prepared to meet the unexpected, the totally new, the unexplored regions, the unpredictable circumstances with as much confidence as meeting Actuality--so we begin with Hegel, and show Marx began with Hegel, and Lenin was compelled to do the same once revolution was the goal as concrete, and this philosophic preparation for revolution is the only thing that can assure our "making" it, that is to say, have the encounter become reality, for us, here, now.

It is this, too, that will come simultaneously with (5) the internationalization of Philosophy and Revolution as well as News & Letters, as the new page for Puerto Ricans, Chicanos and American Indians, and Third World in this world, whether it is the Caribbean, Africa, or Latin America.

-18-

Finally, the truth of "the certainty of the Subject's actuality and the non-actuality of the world" will by no means exhaust itself with the Perspectives for 1974-75. On the contrary. It becomes central this year, but it does not become real until we have reached the actuality of the American revolution.

Raya Dunayevskaya

August 31, 1974

504C