

Draft Perspectives, 1980-1981

6239

TOMORROW IS NOW:

U.S. IMPERIALISM IN THE IRANIAN DESERT, AND AT HOME, IN DEEP RECESSION AND RESURGENT RACISM

In this special issue we are publishing our Draft Perspectives Thesis, part of our preparation for the national Convention of News and Letters Committees over Labor Day weekend. We are asking you to join in the discussion of these Perspectives with us. We have done this every year since 1975, breaking new ground for the Marxist movement as we work to overcome the barrier between "inside" and "outside", workers and intellectuals, theory and practice, philosophy and revolution.

I.

1980, though only six months old, has shown itself to be so perilous, fantastic, as well as contradictory, that it's very nearly impossible to see ahead without speaking in such extremist terms as *Apocalypse Now*, and *Tomorrow is Now*. Already the U.S. is in deep recession, and when it comes to the Blacks, nothing short of a depression will describe their situation. Still, the Carter Administration continues to act as if the Black Revolt, which burst open in Miami—where an all-white jury acquitted the four racist, murderous cops who beat a Black man to death for supposedly disobeying the speed laws—is unrelated to this depression, this unemployment, this American racism which elevated police brutality to National Guard stature, putting the Black community to the torch. Furthermore, the "Midwest's" affinity to the South was glaring with the attempted assassination of Vernon Jordan, head of the Urban League, in Indiana. We can be sure of a long hot summer.

The endless number of tragic fiascos of this Administration keeps bringing us to the brink. Carter's specific brinkmanship in the Iranian desert, which could have brought on nothing short of World War III, was hardly accidental. This was so, not because of the revelations of its long-term planning in the "rescue mission" for the hostages, but because of what wasn't revealed, that no one can go it alone, not even when a "born-again Christian" heads a nuclear Titan like U.S. imperialism! Neither the prior sudden declaration that Russia's invasion of Afghanistan aimed at the "U.S.'s national defense line" for which U.S. youth must be ready to lay down their lives, nor the desire for maintaining his power in the White House, can possibly excuse the thoroughly irresponsible U.S. imperial adventure in the sand. Under those circumstances it is "lucky" that the supreme commander himself aborted the mission. (The Political-Philosophic Letter of April 29, 1980, "The Carter/Brzezinski-Ordered Imperialist Intrusion into Iran—and What About Khomeini/Bani-Sadr's 'Holy War' Against the Left?", is to be included as part of this thesis; excerpts were published in *News & Letters*, June, 1980).

Just as Carter had deluded himself with his analysis that Russia's invasion of Afghanistan would induce Khomeini to transfer the title of "the Great Satan" from himself to Brezhnev, so his ignorance of what Europe is plus his distorted remembrance of what U.S. power in Europe was in World War II, convinced him of Kissinger's and Brzezinski's idea—in this there is no difference between the two war hawks. West Europe, however, hurried to teach Carter a lesson as to whose interests are only "regional", and whose global. The speed with which the Allies backed off from identification with Carter, either on the issue of the American hostages, or Carter's intrusion into Iran, must have finally forced Carter to see that U.S. imperialism is a great deal more isolated than his personal, perennial, self-willed isolation each week at Camp David. For what the latest turn of events has proven is that the one who does live again is De Gaulle.

De Gaulle's concept of Europe "from the Atlantic to the Urals," (making sure to exclude Britain as not really part of Europe, and the U.S.

as its "daughter" being a provincial young lady who doesn't know the score), carried out Giscard d'Estaing-style, in its turn, tops Carter in delusions. From his intervention in Zaire to participation in the Moscow Summer Olympics, Giscard d'Estaing has shown how he hopes to emulate De Gaulle with the Great Illusion that it is France, despite its anemic economy, that is the superior to the economic giant, West Germany, in a new Franco-German axis. In trying to go against Germany as well as against the U.S., Giscard is indeed rushing in where angels fear to tread, since this would invite nothing short of a global shifting of power away from the U.S. Giscard may have gotten such illusions from Brezhnev, and then again he might not. After all, Brezhnev has plenty of troubles of his own in East Europe, which has been in revolt for nearly as long as three decades and, in Poland, it has even got a mass proletarian base and has been involved in large strikes. Why dissipate France's Great Illusions that could aid Russia's global aims?

Ever since the Hitler-Stalin Pact,* we are certainly aware of shocking reversals of international policy on the part of the Big Powers that become



Black protesters marched on the Dade County Justice Building in Miami, on June 14, carrying signs such as "Racism begets revolution".

a matter of life and death for millions. But no matter how many "scenarios" we project in peace time, we can be absolutely sure that when the Big Power Games end and the nuclear button is pushed, we will not only have to face a reversal we hadn't counted on, but the holocaust itself.

Take a look at China, now that it, too, has successfully tested an ICBM that can reach both Russia and the U.S. Ever since the mid-1960s, it has held Russia to be "Enemy No. 1." This did not change with Mao's death and the ouster of the "Gang of Four." Quite the contrary. Not only was the Red Carpet that Mao had rolled out for Nixon when he was in power repeated by Deng even after Nixon was out of power, but it was followed by an invitation, first to Schlesinger, who was then Secretary of Defense. The most recent embrace of U.S. imperialism was the agreement with the Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown, who promised them everything.

*1939, the year of the Hitler-Stalin Pact which gave the green light to World War II, was also the year that brought about the multiple splintering of Trotskyism when Trotsky declared that, though "degenerate," Russia must be "unconditionally defended." The theory of state-capitalism was born both in opposition to such a position and for re-establishment of the Marxism of Marx. See "The Party Dnevnyevskaya Collection, Marxist-Humanism from 1941 to Today," available from the Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs, Walter Reuther Library, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich., 48202.

Nevertheless, out of a clear blue sky, there suddenly appeared an article in the Chinese press which said that it was wrong to consider that Russia will forever be "revisionist", implying that it could again become "socialist." Andre Fontaine, in *Le Monde* (in *The Manchester Guardian*, May 4, 1980), claimed that the Soviet ambassador to Paris, Stephan Chervonenko, had said that President Carter "would have some jolly firework displays on his horizon over the next few months, particularly in the Middle East, but suggested that a thaw in Sino-Soviet relations was in the cards."

It is true that immediately thereafter an "official" press release was put out restating the "principle" that Russia is "Enemy No. 1," and hitting out against the "fantastic error" made by a subordinate. No doubt that is the prevalent "principle." However, what is the greater truth is the duality—China telling the U.S. that if they don't accept the Chinese interpretation of how to fight Russia in Afghanistan, then it's not excluded that China will not forever continue to be the U.S.'s "China card."

On the other hand, what makes the Iranian revolution, despite all contradictions, still a determinant is that it has brought an entirely new dimension into the Middle East. No longer is the Middle East equivalent to oil only, and no longer does the Middle East stop at Arab-Israeli conflict. Indeed, what has shaken up the oil kingdoms and made them even more distrustful of U.S. imperialism than its fathering the Egypt-Israeli Treaty, is that it couldn't "protect" that Shah of Iran. Once an actual revolution upsurged and rid Iran of the Shah, it undermined the U.S. empire in the Middle East and lighted the way for dissidents within their own empires, as witness the occupation of Mecca in Saudi Arabia.

To this day, we do not know who inspired the Nov. 20, 1979 occupation of Mecca. The fact that Saudi Arabia still has its throne cannot hide its fragility, much less get to the root of the occupation other than throwing sand in one's eyes about the "religious fanatic who thought himself the Imam." "The religious fanatic who thought himself the Imam" was not alone; his followers were not all his kind; he was not unarmed; he was not out of communication with his adherents; in a word, the attack was masterfully planned, had a variety of tendencies within it, and most surely was not limited to Saudi Arabia. Though Saudi Arabia was claiming them all to be indigenous, an insignificant fanatical minority, the truth is that all regions were shaken up, including North and South Yemen, Iraq, Syria, Kuwait and Bahrain. Even Oman, whose ruler had allowed his territory to be used by the U.S. for refueling, has abrogated that agreement.

The point is that so affected is the Middle East on the one hand, by the U.S.-failed intrusion into the Iranian desert, and on the other hand, so influenced by the undercurrent of dissatisfaction in their own lands, especially the takeover of Mecca, that it is impossible to sweep either historic event under the carpet. Whether the Islamic world, as Khomeini envisions it, or the pseudo-Islamic-Russian-influenced, as South Yemen sees it; whether Iraq, which certainly itself hungers to become "the leader of the Arab world," was in any way involved in the Mecca occupation, or whether there is an actual youth movement that people thought about as far back as 1975 when the nephew murdered the King, none believed Saudi Arabia's explanation that it was only an isolated

religious fanatic who did it. In many respects, short of the Iranian revolution itself, the Mecca occupation is the most significant phenomenon, both religious and social, that has occurred in the Middle East and relates to global problems. The very fact that Khomeini, too, knows how to use the deep Black revolt in the U.S. for his purposes, shows that it is impossible to separate the religion from the power politics, as witness the mass demonstration in Iran "in support of the oppressed Blacks in the U.S."

II. Uniqueness, Peculiarities, and Grave Contradictions in the Iranian Revolution

Everything in the world changed with the Iranian revolution. It wasn't limited to the Shah's ignominious downfall, and U.S. imperialism's decline. No. What was involved was that Iran was a genuine social revolution and therefore Saudi Arabia was a great deal more disturbed by it than by Kissinger's 1974 sabre-rattling.

The reality is that no matter how contradictory, no matter how unfinished, no matter how even counter-revolutionary elements are within the Iranian revolution, it is that upheaval which is, at one and the same time, the greatest event not just of the year but the decade, for outdancing in its implications the other Middle Eastern hotspots, including the Arab-Israeli wars of 1967 and 1973, shifting the locale of the possible superpower confrontation. What is genuinely new is that this possible pivot of superpower confrontation is, as we have pointed out, by no means one only regarding oil.

Heretofore, i.e., ever since the 1973 war and the 1974 quadrupling of oil prices, oil seemed to be the focal point for Western imperialist politics. Furthermore, it revealed deep divisions within "the West," between the European powers and Japan, on the one hand, and the U.S. on the other. Oil was considered the "ultimate" divide, and none of the Big Powers expected from Iran that it was more than oil.

The European powers may have been more sophisticated than Kissinger's imperial arrogance of deluding himself that he can reverse all that by sabre-rattling. But it was still just ordinary intra-imperialist, intra-capitalist jockeying between "the West" and the oil kingdoms themselves. Saudi Arabia, first and foremost, wasn't scared out of its wits. It knew it had the commodity everybody wanted. Different national interests, in vying for that commodity, gave the Middle Eastern kingdoms plenty of room for maneuvers. In that period, none was more positive and megalomaniacal about it than the Shah of Iran. None gave him more reason to be so and more sophisticated weaponry to feel himself the holder of the key to "stability for the West" than the U.S.

Up to 1978, the Shah even flirted with the idea of moving into Afghanistan when it had its revolution. At that time, the West, including the U.S., held him back. The reason for U.S. caution was not any concern for Afghanistan's independence. Quite the contrary, it was total belief in Iran's might as "protector" of the Gulf oil region. Once the Shah was no longer in power in Iran; once there was no Shah holding the key to "stability" in the Middle East; once a revolution against the Shah had succeeded, everything was changed, including how the April, 1978 uprising in Afghanistan was viewed.

It is true that some illusions remain because the Imam and the mullahs were "anti-atheistic Communism." It may even be true that they remembered the dualism of the role that the mullahs played in the 1906-09 revolution when, at one and the same time, it was counter-revolutionary.

*The Trotskyists have evidently become so enamored of the "students following the Imam's line" that they have reproduced the students' statement on the Blacks (*International Press*, June 9, 1980): "In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate . . . It continues that 'Iran has captured the Great Satan—the American beast—inside its own country, the United States,' and Blacks should follow 'the great Khomeini . . . our Imam . . . But the uncultured government of Carter not only does not respond to this rightful demand of ours so that he can save the lives of the hostages, but he militarily attacks our country—a country which has already given so many martyrs.'"

as well as revolutionary, so that its "anti-imperialism" was not always just anti-West. Its 1905-09 role was anti-Russia and anti-Britain, but mainly anti-Russia. While they were instrumental in throwing out the Shah, and elaborating the Constitution, once the revolution gained a momentum of its own—which included the revolutionary role of women—the mullahs had turned around and so "modified" the Constitution that the Shah, in returning then, very nearly regained all powers he had before the ouster.

With the mass movement, however, when a totally new revolutionary movement against the reigning Shah developed which gave force also to the isolated guerrilla groups, both Mujahedeen and Fedayeen, which had been functioning for nearly a decade, the greatest part of all was the spontaneity and the proletarian nature of the actual mass movement that carried on an organized resistance for a whole year before the Imam arose to usurp it. We don't know the relationship ideologically and numerically of the trade unions and the genuine Left to the actual membership in the mosques and what became the Islamic Republican Party.

And while we do not know the exact relationship within the Left between the various nationalities, the Kurds have the longest fighting record. They have always been revolutionary nationalists, whether they were part of Russia, part of Iraq, part of Iran, part of Turkey, or part of anywhere else. And the Arab revolutionaries who rose to the front during this revolution were deeply rooted in the trade unions and rose to leadership of the oil strikes. While none had the organizational advantage of the mosque as both haven, sacrosanct places, and ideological discipline, with the emphasis on discipline, the movement emerged, developed and persisted long before Khomeini rose to be in sole command.

Whatever the Grand Illusion of Khomeini, that his Shi'ite "primitiveness" can inspire a total return of the Arab world to Shi'ism, not to mention the Grand Illusion of a reorganization of the rest of the world, that isn't what throws fear into the reactionary monarchies such as Saudi Arabia—and the so-called moderates of the modern stripe like Bani-Sadr—to follow him. What throws fear is Shi'ite activism in their own country, that is all the more intensified as they see that Khomeini has demonstrated that he knew not only how to capture the mass movement in Iran, but to influence much of the Arab world.

Insofar as China is concerned, however, although it is busy trying to convince West Europe that the key to the world situation presently lies there and not in the Middle East, it, too, is overwhelmed by the "Will" of Khomeini. Nevertheless, China keeps claiming that Russia's concentration on the Middle East is a "diversionary" tactic, that Russia's global aim is the entity of West Europe. But is West Europe an entity?

III. Is West Europe a Single, Unified Entity?

The sudden expression, "we", the Europeans, as if Europe really was an entity, unified as one, is not to be bypassed just because one could prove the divisions within Europe and the differences as well as likenesses between each country and the U.S. While there is no point to having the illusions that having a "European Parliament" makes it an entity, there is also no reason to bypass either the fact that America is not a whole continent, much less a world unto itself; that its strength has eroded even if it is still the biggest single nuclear-armed Titan. The truth is that if there was no U.S.-Russia conflict, Europe could stand on its feet, and in fact, it already does insofar as monetary (rate of exchange) matters are concerned. The combination of Germany and France is a power that all the rest of the Europeans certainly pays attention to as the stronghold no one better minimize.

It's easy enough to point to the vulnerability of Europe were Russia to threaten nuclear war-

fare, and to point to the fact that Europe is very well aware of it, since they not only accept it, but actually urged that U.S. nuclear power (TNF—NATO's theater nuclear forces) be stationed in Europe. "NATO's decision last December to start producing . . . and deploying 108 Pershing II and 463 cruise missiles on the European continent was a triumph of alliance diplomacy," as Theo Sommer puts it in his article, "Europe and the American Connection."^{***}

Far from any "alliance triumph" signifying credibility in U.S. leadership, the truth is that no one is now laughing as they did when De Gaulle announced back in the late 1950s that unless the U.S. was directly threatened, it would not defend Europe. Now nearly all of West Europe acts as if that were, indeed, a proven fact. Thus, Sommer quotes Kissinger's 1976 speech at Brussels, that "the introduction of new nuclear weaponry predestines five European countries to become special objects of Soviet blackmail . . ." After which he adds, "Western Europe ought to start thinking about the organization of a truly European deterrent with far more determination and zeal . . ."

The decisive point is that Western Europe definitely does not wish any return to the Cold War. Whether it does or does not think nuclear holocaust "unthinkable," it has so little faith in the U.S. that it will not leave such "timing" in the hands of a U.S. President who has lost all credibility, pointing to the remark that Carter made, that it was Russia's invasion of Afghanistan which first revealed to him the "true nature of the Soviet nation." Though no one wants to believe such naivete on the part of the President, they also want to make sure that their connection to Russia does not get disconnected by the U.S.

And, indeed, we need to say that if Carter was really so naive, that is to say, ignorant, of Russia's global aims, that it took Russia's invasion of Afghanistan to wake him up to the threat "to the peace of the world," i.e. to something so crucial that he had to declare it to be the most critical moment since World War II, why was he so totally silent the previous year when the Daud regime had been overthrown, and the new regime that came to power openly declared itself close to Russia? Indeed, so eager was the U.S. not to intervene in any way, that they even played down the murder of U.S. Ambassador Dubs. What, then, changed between 1978 and 1979, when Russia invaded the faction-ridden regime that was definitely "within its sphere"? A deeper look at the difference between 1978 and 1979 is needed.

The real difference is that when the Afghan revolt first occurred, the Shah was still in power and Carter was quite confident that, as he kept assuring us, Iran was "the island of stability" in the Middle East. The only one that was worried by the situation in Afghanistan, and wished to intervene, was the megalomaniac Shah. The whole West—and not just West Europe but the U.S.—put a stop to this megalomania of the Shah before it could express itself militarily. In a word, it was not Russia's invasion of Afghanistan, but the revolution in Iran, which changed everything.

This revolution was nothing as "simple" as the quadrupling of oil prices that followed the Arab-Israeli war of 1973, nor, in the eyes of Carter, Sadat and Begin, was it as grandiose as the Egypt-Israeli Camp David agreement. At that moment, instead of being concerned with what Russia had always considered "its sphere of influence"—Afghanistan—they were positive that, with Sadat and Begin, they were holding the turnkey to Western dominance in the Middle East, where all supposedly understood that Russia was Enemy No. 1 in the Middle East and a revolutionary Iran was nowhere on the horizon.

After the Iranian revolution, however, when everything planned from the height of superpowerdom had fallen to pieces and only after the new Iran was not just oil but a possible new social order, it was only then that Carter's proposal that American youth be registered for war was meet-

^{**}The emphasis is added, not because we think that Western Europe as an entity is a joke, but because Western Europe is truly under the delusion that it could become an entity totally independent of the U.S.

^{***}See Foreign Affairs' special issue on "America and the World 1979," Vol. 58, No. 3 (1980).

ing resistance; was only then that the word Afghanistan, suddenly was said to be a thrust at the "national defense line"; and it was only then that Carter gained his greatest illusion—that he could convince Khomeini to accept Brezhnev instead of Carter as "the Great Satan."

And, having learned nothing at all from all his failures, our born-again Christian President is busy grooming another Shah-like military autocrat, South Korea's General Chon.

IV. A New Type of Shah, Fully Militarized, This Time In South Korea

To be fully militarized this time we mean that General Chon Too Hwan isn't giving up any of his absolutist power, not even to a general staff that follows his orders. He alone heads the total counter-revolution, and by total we mean not only the declaration of full martial law in South Korea, but getting the U.S. Ambassador to approve the General's declaration of martial law, and by getting the U.S.-Korea Joint Command to approve his withdrawal of Korean troops from the Joint Command to put down the Kwangju revolt. At the same time, the U.S. kept its 39,000 troops on full alert.

Though the tyrannical General Chon has slandered the genuine social revolution in his country against himself as if it were North Korean inspired, and though Carter knows that to be a lie, he nevertheless hurries to issue a warning to North Korea. Out of all the lies, slanders, hypocrisies on the part of both South Korea and the U.S., let us view what has been really happening in the revolt in South Korea.

On April 30, the Japan Emergency Christian Conference on Korean Problems issued a Korea communique in which it detailed no less than 10 months of political ferment which began with a peaceful meeting of 800 people in a church on Aug. 6, 1979 to protest the illegal detention of a member of the Catholic Farmers Association. It was followed on Aug. 11 by a peaceful sit-in of 250 unarmed women protesting the loss of their jobs, whereupon the Korean rulers sent in no less than 1,000 riot police who so brutally dragged them out of the offices, that one woman was killed. It was this police brutality which transformed the protest into mass demonstrations including by then both students and workers. How very popular the revolt was on the part of both workers and students and ordinary citizens can be seen by the fact that it touched even the upper reaches of the military with President Park's assassination on Oct. 26.

While in November there was supposed to have been some change in the military martial law that existed with the announcement that the universities would be allowed to reopen, the police raids under the new military regime continued so brutally this year that the so-called parliament walked out, the workers in both steel and other industries went out on strike, and again the police put them down brutally. By the middle of May the regime extended martial law throughout the land, and it was only then that the students in Kwangju decided to so massively resist as to inspire the whole population. On May 21, no less than 200,000 Kwangju residents surged through the streets, seized arms and drove out the police and the army and formed citizens committees to take over control of the city. It was at this point that the U.S. military in this country had the gall to say that the martial law was just temporary, that "democracy" (sic!) was sure to be restored, but "first, law and order must be restored."

The "law and order" is the counter-revolution of the General who is being propped up by the U.S. in the exact manner in which the U.S. propped up the Shah. There not only is no democracy—whenever has there been democracy ever since the U.S. put in the first tyrant, Syngman Rhee?!—there isn't even a pretext now to any aspect of any civilian life with Kim Dae Jung—who is the presidential candidate who got the majority of votes in 1971—in jail, and the most ghostly type of putting down the insurrection in Kwangju char-

acteristic of the control in the entire country. The Christian Science Monitor reports no less than 1,740 detained after the revolt was put down.

There is no place on the globe where U.S. imperialism's tentacles don't penetrate, whether that is indirectly as with massive investments in South Africa, whose rulers are busy now putting down the most massive Black revolt since Soweto in 1976, or directly as in the Maldive Islands. This time in South Africa the revolt is not only by students and by workers, and not only not just in one center, but in Cape Town, in Durban, in Johannesburg, in Pretoria, but this time—and this is the very first time when that apartheid regime had to face a totally new phenomenon—it includes the blowing up of an oil installation, which had been inspired, said one of the exiled mem-



South Koreans commandeered military equipment as hundreds of thousands of residents took over Kwangju in opposition to the government's drastic imposition of martial law.

bers of SASO, by Mugabe's victory in Zimbabwe after a decade of guerrilla fighting.

U.S. Blacks, of course, need not go to South Africa to experience racism. What was especially galling to them this time in Miami, besides their own subjection, was to look at the way the Administration acted toward the Cuban refugees and the disdain and non-action towards the refugees from Haiti. Carter's token gesture to the Haitians—after the Miami explosion—did not fool Black America.

Let us look at one more trouble spot. It is the Maldive Islands in the Indian Ocean, only 450 miles north of Diego Garcia, presently the sole U.S. base in the Indian Ocean. (*Business Week*, May 19, 1980 has a map.) It turns out that in April the Russians and the Moslem nation of the Maldives signed a cultural agreement appearing innocent enough. What worries the U.S. is that the Russians' real objective is the abandoned British air station on the Island of Gan, at the southernmost tip of the 1,192-island Maldivian archipelago. U.S. imperialism remembers that in October 1977, just before the Somalis broke with the Russians, the Russians offered to lease Gan for \$1 million a year. But at that time the Maldivian government did not wish to get involved with either superpower.

Now just as the Russians lost the part of Berbera, the U.S. finds that the Sultanate of Oman is so mad that its territory was used to stage the U.S. failed attempt at Iran, that it has reneged on its offer of bases to Washington. Since Gan would offer the Russians a very good listening post now that the U.S. intends to maintain a permanent presence in the Indian Ocean—all the so-called Allies from World War II having left the area (including Britain, who evacuated Gan in 1976 as part of their "retreat from East of the Suez")—so now the U.S. sees Moscow's projected use of Gan as drawing a net around the Indian Ocean. Its imagination runs wild because Russia also has bases in the Horn of Africa, Aden and Afghanistan.

V. Back To The U.S.: Once Again, Tomorrow Is Now

There is no way to measure the myriad crises when one knows that not only will other crises emerge that one did not expect, and not only will this election year increase the idiotic ex-

pressions of the two power-hungry capitalistic parties vying for the White House, but more crucial is that it's not a quantitative matter at all but a class relationship. That, not the idiocies, will be sure to burst open. The deep undercurrent of revolt in labor; the open revolt of Black America; the passion of the Women's Liberation Movement for a great deal more than the stalled ERA as they not only "Reclaim the Night" and demand equal wages for the working day, but display a passion for philosophy matching that of the Youth resisting draft registration—none of these forces will stand still throughout this Administration-induced deep recession supposed to "cure" inflation. When, on top of this, we have to confront the endless, irresponsible militarization—not to mention the holocaust that would have descended on humanity had the alleged "computer errors" in the "nuclear shield" not been reversed—we can see how, in returning to home ground, the totality of the crisis very nearly spells out **Apocalypse Now**.

With the latest figures showing that 10 of the 12 economic indicators experienced the greatest decline in 32 years, even *Business Week* of June 16, 1980 says the economy is in a "free-fall . . . Since February, it has been falling at a faster rate than that of the worst months of the steep 1974-75 recession." Just as it was clear from that deep recession that no new boom would come, and just as it is clear that there have been the greatest structural changes with this stagflation—that is to say, where even an economy that is stagnant gives vent to the highest inflation—so it is obvious that state-capitalism as a world phenomenon has reached a stage, as seen in Japan, where robots are the talk of the industry, and multinationals are the supposedly quiet form of this type of imperialism.

As we expressed it when we summed up the 1974-75 recession, it wasn't only the quadrupling of oil prices that led to the crisis and the decline in the rate of profit.* Rather, our statement that there would be no next boom meant that, far from being a cyclical downturn, this deep economic recession was internal, deeply decadent, and that the foundation for it was laid with the Vietnam War and the continuing, endless, militarization, so that today we have reached a completely retrogressive economy.

Japan, at the same time, has now become involved in high stakes economic investment in industrialized countries: in the last five years, their investments have totalled no less than \$33 billion, and Japan thinks that will be quadrupled by the end of the decade!

When it comes to its own factories, like Datsun, one plant is so fully automated that 67 workers on each of two shifts produce 1,600 autos a day. It is this which GM, Ford, and Chrysler are trying their best to emulate and we can see even at its start, this automation has already resulted in so great a permanent army of unemployed that here, too, it has outdistanced the deepest recession since the depression, i.e. that of 1974-75.

As against seven percent average unemployment in 1974-75 we now at midpoint have eight percent as average, which is sure to go to 10 percent, and actually in the most highly industrialized cities like Detroit it is officially already 14 percent, and has by no means reached its end. Even in an election year, Detroit unemployment is predicted to be 18 percent; in Flint it already is 17 percent.

The depth of the crisis in the U.S. is not only economic; it is equally, crucially, political, both nationally and internationally. It becomes imperative to stop the insane drive to war that Carter has initiated, and that Reagan is sure to exacerbate, over Russia's invasion of Afghanistan. Everything from Carter's disastrous economic policies and unconscionable rate of unemployment as well as raging inflation and total lack of credibility, has led the Administration into turning away from what Carter himself, but a few months back, declared to be pivotal on a world scale—**SALT II ratification**.

*See *Mars's Capital and Today's Global Crisis* by Raya Dunayevskaya, available from *News & Letters* for \$2.

Neither West Europe nor Japan, however, are willing to toy with the revival of the Cold War or to link the Middle-East crisis to detente. They accept neither Carter's analysis of the hostage crisis in Iran, nor Russia's invasion of Afghanistan as the determinant for any revival of the Cold War, much less going to World War III. It goes without saying that Khomeini is not the man to fall for Carter's attempt to push him to recognize Brezhnev rather than Carter as the "Great Satan." The U.S. giant is, indeed, threatened with impotence abroad and totality of crisis at home. It is high time to work hard at realizing new alternatives to degenerate capitalism and imperialism that have long since outlived their usefulness.

Unfortunately, the Iranian Revolution has soured so consistently that in no way can we use that as the alternative to U.S. imperialism. For the Left to keep repeating the truth of the monstrosity of U.S. imperialism as if that meant that Khomeini's "anti-imperialism" equals social revolution is to bring on self-paralysis. This has blinded the Left from seeking out the genuine sources of revolution in Iran that have been consistently put down by Khomeini, Bani-Sadr, and Ghotbzadeh as they continue to use the phrase, "American imperialism," in order to hit out instead against the genuine Left in Iran itself. Thus, the Left is closing the doors to an actual social revolution.

As the Political-Philosophic Letter of April 29, "The Carter/Brzezinski-Ordered Imperialist Intrusion into Iran—and What About Khomeini/Bani-Sadr's 'Holy War' Against the Left?" made clear, we will not, of course, permit the grave contradictions in the Iranian revolution to stand in the way of the need for solidarity with the Iranian masses against American imperialism as well as the retrogression in Iran itself. But this solidarity must be built on the solid foundation for genuine freedom—a class-less society.

At this very moment, the open Black rebellion in Miami which erupted when an all-white jury acquitted the four racist, murderous cops who beat an innocent Black man to death for nothing more serious than alleged speeding, has at once made anti-racism integral to labor and 23 percent unemployment. Furthermore, the very fact that Black youth also are in no mood to listen to Black leaders either, when they urge end to the rebellion without ever asking actual freedom, shows how very inseparable is the passion for philosophy of liberation from the freedom struggle itself. It becomes crucial that Marxist-Humanists are active in the mass intervention in this highly volatile situation, and not just philosophically but politically and actively. Needed most urgently now, therefore, is the relationship of our activity to the 1980-81 perspectives and its organizational ramifications.

(1) First and most important, of course, is the expansion of *News & Letters* into a 12-pager, which, at one and the same time, calls for the creation of a nucleus to write theoretical analyses of burning issues as they happen, and a forum for workers, Blacks, women and youth to speak for themselves.

(2) Naturally this means expansion of all our activities, especially with the unemployed; especially with the youth in its fight against the proposed registration for the draft; especially with the Black masses as a whole, who are the greatest victims of the present recession and who have already demonstrated their passion for revolt and totally new human relations; and especially with the Women's Liberationists, internationally as well as nationally, who have not only deepened and expanded their activities but are everywhere also involved in the most serious theoretical re-consideration.

(3) Neither the expansion of the paper nor the deepening of our activities can materialize unless we first of all establish a Sustaining-Organizing-Publishing fund of \$35,000. Because that is an overwhelming sum for a small organization like ours, we have not waited until after the Convention to begin raising such a fund. A special

Appeal went out to close friends of *News & Letters* who, because they recognized the urgency of the objective situation and our historic contributions, have sent in \$7,500. Such an Appeal will now be sent to all our readers, simultaneously with the publication of these Draft Perspectives, to help us meet the remaining goal of \$27,500. While the main responsibility remains that of Marxist-Humanists, there is no doubt that *News & Letters* readers will, as usual, help generously. The 12-pager will also mean that the price of each copy will have to be raised to 25 cents.

(4) From the vantage point both of the objective situation and of the need to assure a new stage of organizational development, we need to bring the Archives of Marxist-Humanism up to date, with the completion of the draft of the book, *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*. There is not a single problem today which is not illuminated by that study. This holds for such widely divergent topics and periods as the Iranian Revolution of 1906-09 and that of today, and Women's Liberation—which both in its origins and in its 20th century appearance relates not only to Rosa Luxemburg but to Marx's philosophy of revolution.

Looking at the book as a totality (write for a copy of the Convention Call for a full listing of the contents), let's single out a few chapters and see how they relate to the burning issues of the day. The first chapter, "Two Turning Points in Luxemburg's Life, Before and After the 1905 Revolution," acquainted us not only with Rosa Luxemburg's revolutionary attack on the very first historic appearance of Revisionism as well as her participation in the 1905 Russian Revolution, but it illuminated the Iranian Revolution, both of 1906-09 and 1979-80. At the same time, in the Appendix to the chapter, "Once Again on the Theory of Permanent Revolution," we could see why Trotsky's theory remained a stillbirth as against Marx's, when Trotsky's theory was tied to, and obstructed by, rejection of the revolutionary role of the peasantry. In a word, to play down a force of revolution as if it could not also be Reason ineluctably led Trotsky to transform revolution itself into an abstraction.

The section of Chapter 2, "The Break with Karl Kautsky, 1910-1911: From Mass Strike The-

ory to Crisis over Morocco," which had to deal with the hushed-up "Woman Question," revealed the male chauvinism within the German Social Democracy, which our age can certainly not only understand better than Luxemburg's, but is the age that has unfurled a totally new banner of Woman as Reason. Not only has "The Interregnum of Luxemburg, and an Excursus into Marx's New Continent of Thought" (Chapter 3), especially on the National Question, laid the foundation for us to bring Karl Marx's *Ethnological Notebooks* (which were unknown to Luxemburg) into the Appendix, and contrast them to Engels' *Origins of the Family*, but irrevocably leads to the final chapter, on the totality of Marx's philosophy which is by no means limited to Women's Liberation. Rather it encompasses the whole of Marx's philosophy of revolution, which the final chapter rightly entitles "Philosophy of Revolution: The Development of Marx from a Critic of Hegel to the Author of *Capital* and Theorist of Permanent Revolution." There we will not only come face to face with Marx's new continent of thought, 1843-1883, but the labor of working it out for our age.

(5) To co-ordinate the activities and the writings on a national as well as international scale, we need, at one and the same time, to reorganize and expand the work at the Center, as well as schedule a lecture tour for the National Chairwoman.

(6) Both the urgency of the objective situation and the uniqueness of our own contribution to the Marxism of our age determine the nature of the classes this year, not on a book, but on the Political-Philosophic Letters as well as their relationship to, and development of, the Marxist-Humanist Archives, "The Rosa Luxemburg Collection," 1941-1981, which will develop a theoretic nucleus for revolutionary journalism of the expanded *News & Letters*. On this, the 25th anniversary of the founding of *News and Letters* Committees, the REB will reissue the "First Conference Bulletin of the Marxist-Humanist Tendency" of April, 1955, for which the National Chairwoman will write a new introduction which will illuminate the uniqueness of Marxist-Humanism's contribution to theory and to organization from its very beginnings through the past quarter of a century.

War is always the decisive life-and-death question: whether we look at this year's Draft Perspectives, which, in projecting next year's tasks, needs to concentrate on this year's, and Carter's drive to war; or whether we turn back to our very first bulletin in 1955, when, on the one hand, war clouds threatened over Quemoy and Matsu, and, on the other hand, we saw a new world arising with the Bandung Afro-Asian conference; or whether we turn to the end of the 1960s, when revolution didn't materialize in 1968, though the near-revolution then made us think we would finally be participants in revolution rather than having to witness Nixon extending U.S. imperialism's mailed fist and bombers raining death on Cambodia. As against capitalist-imperialist war, what was new in the three periods we singled out above—be it this year, the decade, or a whole quarter century of Marxist-Humanism—is the inseparability of theory and practice. Revolution is more than just a banner. To succeed it needs a vision, a philosophy of revolution, which is the unifying force of theory and practice.

While it is impossible to concentrate on the full quarter-century of Marxist-Humanism, much less the 40 years these Archives represent—and while it becomes necessary to limit ourselves to the last two years, but having the opportunity to see the draft of the book-in-progress as a totality—such a study will relate Marxist-Humanist origins, as *News & Letters* newspaper, as *News and Letters* Committees, and as that movement from practice that reconnects with the Marxism of Marx, in book form, in philosophy of revolution, and, we trust, in its actualization.

THE RESIDENT EDITORIAL BOARD

Detroit, Michigan

June 12, 1980