

POST-PLENUM BULLETIN NUMBER THREE

OCTOBER, 1975

# PERSPECTIVES 1975-1976

COUNTER-REVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION IN EVERY  
CORNER OF THE GLOBE: WHAT CAN WE DO?

By RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

Report to the National Editorial Board  
Meeting of News & Letters Committees  
August 30, 1975

NEWS & LETTERS

1900 E, Jefferson

Detroit, Mich 48207

Price 35c

5148

COUNTER-REVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION IN EVERY  
CORNER OF THE GLOBE: WHAT CAN WE DO?

Introduction:

When Philosophy and Liberation Get Separated.

Part I:

[Resegregation and the Permanent Army of Unemployed at home, while abroad, U.S. Imperialism dominates, most specifically over Panama -- "in perpetuity"!

Whither Portugal -- and Bangladesh, not to mention West Europe and NATO and India and Japan?

What about Dhofar, and Angola and the Middle East? The Sino-Soviet Conflict, Africa and the Philippines -- AND Global Militarization, or is it what nuclear super-powers call Detente?]

Part II:

Dialectics of Organization and Dialectics of Liberation

Prefatory Note: Why the word, Organization precedes the word Liberation when Dialectics directs both as Development of Movement

- 1) "Fact emerges Out of Ground": New Passions and New Forces
- 2) Theories of Revolution and of Organization: Lenin, Luxemburg, Marxist-Humanism
- 3) A Few Concrete Tasks

NEWS & LETTERS COMMITTEES PERSPECTIVES REPORT, 1975-76COUNTER-REVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION IN EVERY CORNER  
OF THE GLOBE: WHAT CAN WE DO?Introduction: When Philosophy and Liberation Get Separated

So extreme, global, intense is every struggle in the crisis-ridden world we inhabit that, whether it is so elementary a question as secondary school education in Detroit, or so complex a question as the five-way bloody struggle in Portugal, we cannot but focus on the death and life aspects of counter-revolution and revolution.

Thus, (1) 21 years after the U.S. Supreme Court declared that there is no such thing as "separate but equal," a Detroit Federal District Judge named DeMascio has just declared that segregated education is "quality" education! As if that were not retrogressive enough a step for a white District Judge to make, Detroit's Black Mayor Young (who certainly not only "knows better," but was involved in many of the civil rights and labor struggles where his life was on the line) has turned so mealy-mouthed that he's barely distinguishable from that white racist.

Thus, (2) in Portugal, where the Socialist Party began courageously enough first in the revolution against fascism, and then against Communist dominance over the proletariat, it is now, in the North, hardly distinguishable from the Catholic hierarchy--and the Maoists. In fact, the other day the Socialists and Maoists marched together to Communist-led union headquarters, pelting it with stones. As if that weren't enough, the Socialists formed "Committees" and, with pre-arranged majorities, barged into meetings, voting down everything that the day before was voted for by Communist-led trade unions.

Now where did they learn that? From the Communists? Or from the Maoists with whom, not so surprisingly as it may sound at first, they are now functioning? That is not so surprising, because Maoists collaborate with any and all who oppose Russia, be it Social Democrats in Portugal; capitalist class rulers in West Europe that Mao now calls "Second World," as if that could hide their class nature; or with Mobutuism in Zaire and Angola, U.S. imperialism, NATO, the PLO, or the Shah of Iran. They even trade with South Africa. In a word, there is but one condition: being against Russia. That Russia is no doubt doing the same thing does not make China "revolutionary."

There is (3) no end to what abysmal depths hypocrisy has sunk during these counter-revolutionary times. Ever-new facets keep appearing. The latest occurred in Bangladesh. Having murdered Sheik Mujib and his entire family, the murderers buried him with "full honors." Or so the new rulers announced. The self-declared president--Ahmed--then dubbed the counter-revolution a revolution, first calling Bangladesh the Islamic Republic of Bangladesh, then denying the theocratic designation but practicing it nevertheless. Whether or not Pakistan (with Mao laughing all the way to

- 2 -

the next round of class compromises) had anything to do with that coup, it certainly was no revolution. It does, however, change alignments on that sub-continent. Government by assassination has replaced politics of double cross.

Or: (4) not many have exceeded the Shah of Iran as empire builder, but let us not forget that the tentacles of U.S. imperialism are by no means only in Panama where it is at its rawest, but the multinationals, as the U.S. government, are everywhere. Europe keeps talking, rightly, of American industrial helotry there, but the truth is that one-third of the U.S.'s quadrupled foreign trade this past decade is in the American sphere, and don't think that Canada is the only victim. The unvarnished truth is that American surplus in Latin America is no less than \$1.2 billion. The Shah's military build-up should not let anyone think India is "only" totalitarian, since Indira has assumed totalitarian power. India possesses by far the largest land, sea and air forces of any Indian Ocean littoral power. With the total number of armed forces numbering more than 1.1 million (including border security forces), the Indian Army of 830,000 soldiers is said to be the fifth largest in the world.

Last year, when we traced a good deal of the Shah's new riches and new ambitions, we couldn't have dealt with what he daily adds to that list. For example, when you now hear of Dhofar, where rebellion against the Sultan of Oman has been going on for nearly a decade, do you see the Shah? Well, he sent in his troops against the Communist-backed rebels--and, for the moment, it is "quiet" in Dhofar, as it is in Afghanistan, where the Shah has been aiding that Communist-backed "revolution" of yesteryear to get from under Russia's sphere of influence.

Finally--but again, only for the moment--his latest brainstorm is for a trilateral "security" idea for Iran, South Africa and Australia--for the Persian Gulf? Red Sea? Indian Ocean? and on, and on, and on. Not that he can be sure of all that long a life, even though he has now acquired a "friendship" which stretched all the way to Washington D.C. where the Maoists were shouting slogans against Dayan as "fascist" and calling for "Zionists (read: Russia) out of Iran," "Israel out of Eritrea." (And just in case slogans need to be changed, the leaflet continued: "Follow the tactical leadership"!)

In a word, so concrete has the dialectic--that every unit contains its opposite within itself--become, that nothing, absolutely nothing can be done to stop the counter-revolutionary direction once philosophy of liberation and actual revolution become separate and theory and practice move millenia apart. And because that is so, no form of organization--be it Party, or Guerrilla focus, Workers' Councils, or Revolutionary Committee, much less the state--can give action a revolutionary direction unless it is grounded, deeply grounded, in philosophy.

Only when organization of thought and organization of masses from the Paris Commune on, both as self-organization and as historic-philosophic continuum, are one, can we weitergehen, advance, from this crisis-

ridden world to a total revolution in human relations. How can we know where Portugal is going when none has raised a revolutionary banner that fuses the philosophy of liberation and its practice as a single unit?

This becomes our preoccupation today as we try to unravel the endless contradictions in the objective world and set our tasks for 1975-76.

\* \* \* \* \*

PART I

The New York Times has sent its main pundit, James Reston, to Latin America. Reston is worried over the time-consuming detente conferences and Middle East shuttle, not that he disagrees with that imperial global view, but because his good journalist's nose smells possible explosion where least expected--Panama.

Thus he is caught in the paradox of holding that Kissinger's policies are "correct in theory and wrong in practice." The truth, however, is that they are wrong in practice because they are wrong in theory; imperialist theory calls for imperialist practice. As far as Latin America is concerned, there has been no fundamental change in policy for 150 years, when the Monroe Doctrine first appropriated Latin America as its "sphere of influence." In the specific case of Panama, the unvarnished, 100 percent pure 19th-century imperialism, when predatory conquistadores--not just Spanish, but U.S., U.S. especially--forced upon victims land-grabbing pacts "in perpetuity," still holds.

It is this, and not the question of how much time Kissinger spends in Latin America, which has produced the latest crisis, for by now guerrilla warfare against the U.S. cannot be ruled out since nothing else has worked. The thing that is new is that by now the stench of U.S. imperialism throughout Latin America is so strong, there are so many global crises, that President Echeverria of Mexico thinks he can step into the cauldron. He goes, not to the masses, but to Cuba, which is where Reston is.

The Mexican students whom Echeverria massacred, the Mexican workers and peasants whom he is exploiting, may not recognize that ruler as of the poor, exploited "Third World," but the Mexican rulers are busy on that tour to present themselves as "representative" of that "revolutionary world." This they "prove" by proposing that the next UN General Secretary to replace Waldheim be one from the "Third World." However, since that is only for the "future," there is, in the meantime, a lot of empty rhetoric about "new economic world order"--again, established not by the masses, but the Third World following the oil billionaires of the poor-rich "Fourth World."

In any case, the Arab Middle East was preoccupied with but one thing--proposing the expulsion of Israel from the UN, for which they were

- 4 -

sure they had a "majority" when Amin convened the Organization of African Unity and asked them to follow their Arab brethren who had already voted for it. But they were temporarily stopped by Egypt, that first wants to get Sinai back. The latest Arab rhetoric (8-29-75) at Peru is that Israel should never have been created--so the UN is equally at fault and "they" will set it right. The maneuvering will no doubt continue.

The UN Assembly this year will surely be an interesting circus to observe. Unfortunately, the so-called "New Left" will likewise "participate" without ever asking itself what, exactly, is the UN? Has it ever been anything other than a version of the League of Nations which Lenin had long ago characterized as a "thieves' kitchen"? Will the Middle East kingdoms and/or Palestinian terrorists change its class nature? Is that decided on whether Amin is granted along with the kingdoms, emirates, sultanates, the Shah of Iran, and the PLO, the "vote" to expel Israel from that body, as they had read it out from UNESCO which led to the denunciation by many scientists and intellectuals from the Left, including Jean-Paul Sartre? More importantly, again and again, what is its class nature--and its philosophy?

That must be the ground for analyzing and acting upon every subject. Who but us, in 1960, during the UN's imperialist intervention in the Congo and Mobutu's (who was then the darling of the CIA) murder of Patrice Lumumba, had written the following in Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions:

"Rooted in this United Nations intervention was a new form of struggle between the two nuclear titans, the Soviet Union and the United States. Lumumba had asked for UN aid because he thought he could use both Russia and the United States to maintain independence. But before he could make use, he was used..."

"At a time when the weary American intellectual has been so brain-washed both by the Cold War and the threat of nuclear war between America and Russia, that he declaims 'The End of Ideology,' the world that is fighting for its freedom at the cost of its very life--Africa--is charged with the dynamism of ideas..."

"At a time when the African revolutions are redrawing the map of the world, the arrogance of white civilization shows itself not only in the ruling class but amongst many Western socialists..."

"We cannot know in which direction these African leaders will turn in the critical 1960s. We do know that their serious concern with the theoretical foundations for the building of a new society has no parallel in the intellectual leaders of 'the West.' Our epoch is a 'birth-time of history' and the contribution of the Africans to thought as well as to revolutions is an integral part of the reconstruction of society on new beginnings."

- 5 -

What a distance backward the New Left has travelled when, in place of that birth-time of history, it is now playing up everyone from the Middle East oil barons to Arafat\* and Amin. And don't, dear New Left, try to cover that up by quoting Mao rather than Amin. If even we dared forget that Mao has just called out 10,000 troops to put down rebellious workers in Hangchow who have such "bourgeois (!) habits" as wanting to improve their conditions of labor and their miserly wages; and if even we took the side of China as if it really were "revolutionary"--in any case, when compared to Russia's state-capitalism--we would still have to answer the question, what new is Mao now bringing into the struggle against the West and for the world revolutionary movement anywhere--be it Angola, where Black is killing Black depending where they stand on the Sino-Soviet conflict in Africa\*\*, or Portugal or NATO, not excluding the still-favored-in-China Nixon?

People have forgotten that Mao's famous expression, "the East Wind is prevailing over the West Wind," meant not so much China as Russia; Russia was winning the battle over U.S. imperialism and over its technology with its own Sputnik. It was said in 1957. It was said in Moscow. It was said in celebration of Russia's Revolution. It was said after Mao convinced Khrushchev (who didn't need much convincing) to send the tanks to put down the Hungarian Revolution. And it was said when Khrushchev had given Mao the impression that he would share the atomic secret with him, for which he got Mao's "undying friendship." So the Sputnik that made so great an impact on the Middle East that it quickly forgot what Fanon didn't forget--the counter-revolutionary act of destroying a proletarian revolution in East Europe--was not the main attraction for Mao.

\* The Portuguese Minister of Economy, Vasco Almeida (who has come to Lisbon for instructions to hold him until Nov. 11 when full independence is achieved in Angola) reported that (1) the Maoist "National Liberation Front" in Angola has this week (8-24-75) acquired Mirage jets and Chinese pilots to fly them; the planes are already at the Portuguese air base at Negage, south of Carmona. Clearly, (2) the "Balkanization" is already going on. As against Luanda, controlled by the Communist-backed liberation front, orders from Luanda are no longer obeyed. He also reported that proceeds of coffee sales no longer go to the Central Bank; trading is done directly with neighboring countries; food has been cut off from Luanda. Getting involved also in Namibia whither white refugees are fleeing, strengthening South Africa!

The tragedy is that it is not the Sino-Soviet conflict that is suffering from this, but the Africans. This will by no means be resolved as of Nov. 11. How long, how long will such murderous Sino-Soviet "factionalisms" go on at the expense of that rich African homeland which has suffered 500 years of Portuguese colonialism!

\*\* Anyone who thinks that today's (8-26-75) so-called "non-aligned nations" embrace of Arafat changes the picture should remember the Rabat conference. And please don't forget that the so-called "Arab solidarity" among oil barons has never extended to revenue sharing.



But once Khrushchev didn't offer Mao the atomic secret on a silver platter and, at the same time, did not consider Mao's "Great Leap Forward" as the way to skip socialism directly into Communism, then, and only then, did the ground begin to be laid for what soon became the Sino-Soviet conflict. It is this Sino-Soviet conflict that is also giving West Europe illusions, illusions that China is feeding, as if both economic crises can be resolved and freedom from the two super-powers can be gained by aligning with it.

None of these capitalist crises, when they are "resolved" capitalistically, do more than postpone the dateline of new revolutions, at which time the capitalists hurry to engineer new counter-revolutions. At the moment, none are more worried than the very ones who pressured the U.S. to go to Helsinki by having accepted Brezhnev's call for a European security council at a time when America was still resisting the siren call. Now that they--France and Germany--"won" and realized that the only difference between this "victory" and the Yalta defeat is that they were present this time, whereas at Yalta they weren't, the critical post-World War II junctures and dependence on the U.S. are showing up glaringly.

Thus: (1) West Europe in NATO is interfering more directly and vigorously against the Communists in Portugal than is the U.S. It is not for detente's purposes that Brezhnev did not directly attack the U.S. Instead, it singled out China, on the one hand, and West Europe and NATO on the other. It was not "Defense" Secretary Schlesinger, but Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany who had openly called for using "any means" to assure that Portugal does not go Communist and must become a reliable NATO member. For different reasons both West Germany and France know that NATO remains Europe's only guarantee against Russia.

Thus: (2) France is, at one and the same time, playing two tunes: It is depending totally on the Social Democrats to put pressure, through support of the Socialist Party in Portugal, to fight against the Communists. At the same time, it is sending out trial balloons as to whether it couldn't make a more or less clean break with the U.S.

To this end, Le Monde has given a whole page to an article by the former Minister of Housing, Albin Chaladon, to expound his position on "Europe Without a Rudder" (Le Monde in the Manchester Guardian, 8-16-75). First, he tries to show that the U.S. "seems psychologically debilitated" and that nothing exists for it but "the Big-Two-Power balance. Everything is subordinated to this end, including the two Powers' behavior towards Western Europe." Then he plays up the emergence of "Third World nationalists who passed from the defensive to the offensive" after the October 1973 Middle East war during the 1974 Western hysteria over OPEC's quadrupling of oil prices.

The grand conclusion is "regionalism," which evidently becomes global by preceding it with the word, "world." Thus we get the emergence of "world regions." These "world regions" are open, new contacts with Europe's former empires! "The world needs Europe to define a new power balance," says Le Monde, as even China recognizes. Then follows another clincher:



"Latin America is finding in its European past a counterweight to the ubiquitous Americans." In a word, Europe without a rudder could allegedly gain a rudder now that supposedly even Africa and the Arab countries are "turning towards Europe. Affirmation of its European relationship and its solidarity with its Arab neighbors is perhaps the only way to escape Big Power influence."

Whatever grand illusions inhere in this concept of Europe (read: France) gaining a rudder through "world regions" and shaking off the super powers by itself becoming one, the point is the crises are so all-pervasive that everyone is trying to shake loose from old alliances in every which way. But are they really? And, what is more important, can new alignments among capitalists, even when they are dubbed by Mao as "Second World," resolve contradictions, feed the masses, much less let destiny get back into their hands? The truth, the fact that never, never changes except in a proletarian revolution, is the continued production by workers and appropriation by those who control production, whether that be the newly-dubbed "Second World" or even in "revolutionary" China.

Let's see if anything, anything at all has changed this year. The 400 million who were either starving or severely malnourished in the poor-poor Third World and Fourth--Asia, and Africa, and the Middle East--that were reported on at the UN conference in Rome, are where they were last year--starving and severely malnourished.

Let's move from the poorest lands to the richest--the USA. It is here we wish to stay, for the class enemy is always at home. It is here where the revolutionary force is also, but we cannot move forward unless we know the counter-revolutionary force we must face, the biggest in the world, the most militaristic, the most nuclearly-armed, the mightiest.

We're supposed to be "bottoming out" of the recession. The brainless head of the brainless Brain Trust, Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve Board, claims that the recovery is so "broad based" that we need not worry overly much of any double-digit inflation. And, of course, he always has "figures" to prove his point. As a pragmatic spets of facts, facts, facts, he has been collecting figures ever since the Depression for the greatest bourgeois theorist of cyclical depression, Wesley Mitchell, who has been studying the crisis of capitalism ever since World War I.

The latest recession started back in November of 1973 and supposedly "touched bottom" in May, 1975. From a peak of 127.5--taking 1967 as 100--industrial production slid to 109.6, i.e., 14.1 percent. Or, if you wish to talk about industrial production in dollar terms (and then it is measured against 1958 dollars), then the GNP in the fourth quarter of 1973 fell from a peak of \$845.7 billion to \$779.4 billion in June 1975, a drop of 7.8 percent. (I'm sure they will have more figures to show why one set shows a 14.1 percent drop and the other a 7.8 percent drop.) But since that does not concern the workers, who do the work of producing, let's get to the crucial point--unemployment.

Now that we have supposedly bottomed out, these spets don't even bother to claim that unemployment will be reduced more than a mere one percent from the present "average" of 8.4 percent. Even this miserly difference doesn't end the Braintrusters' confusions. It turns out that the Labor Department survey of households was supposed to show that there has been a rise from March to July of 1.2 million workers employed. However, businessmen have their own (and naturally, more accurate) way of showing how many are employed--the payroll. And they have shown that there has been no such increase since March of 1.2 million. In fact, the increase is so trifling that it's well below March. Where are those 1.2 million increased in the employed? We'll never get an answer from them. We know. We are the ones still unemployed.

What some economists--those who work for unions--must know is what they get from union dues keeps getting smaller and smaller. The AFL-CIO has not only been releasing quite different figures of unemployment, but also of corporate growth (NY Times, 8-22-75). These show: (1) that the 50 biggest banks control more than half of all bank assets and hold controlling stocks in more than 5,200 companies. (2) That the top 119 manufacturing corporations hold more than half of all assets and get more than half of all profits in manufacturing. And (3) that the 500 biggest U.S. corporations hold more than two-thirds of all business income.

And, should you think that if you are not a production worker, you are not all that exploited, the Federal Trade Commission has admitted that consumers have been bilked out of \$80 billion in total purchases of \$900 billion--to which Nader adds the allegation that corporate tax payments declined from 33.6 percent in 1944 to 14.6 percent in 1974.

No "jaws" are needed to show who uses up all that production for ever more production--and for their luxuries, and again for more production. What is ironic in this age of state-capitalism when it is the government that does everything it can, with the help of the brainless Brain Trust to keep up corporate profits--and declaim instead against those who supposedly "cheat" and "rip off," as Treasury Secretary Simon puts it, with food stamps--is that 200 of the most powerful corporations in the country recently refused to divulge the names of 30 of their largest stockholders to the Committee on Government Operations.

Not only that. The global reach of these companies (which is also the name of a work on multinational corporations by Richard Barnett and Ronald E. Muller) is the major cause for the decline of the U.S. trade position and for the loss of jobs, as they are always running away to produce where labor is cheapest, be that in the South USA or South Africa, Europe or Asia.

Still, President Ford continues to talk about "bottoming out," pointing to the "great jump" there has been in housing construction--14 percent, which means 1,238,000. First, they don't tell you that this is 6 percent below the earlier year's figure of 1,314,111, which is no less than a whopping 50 percent below the rate of 2,472,000 at the start of 1973. Another figure they keep talking about is the 4 percent rise in retail sales,

- 9 -

and especially how great are the retail sales in auto from the March low.

Again, they fail to add that the rise followed the federal tax rebate, and that all rises are always in relationship to the abysmal low levels achieved. Indeed, they have to admit with all those rises, auto and housing, there continue to be drags on this "recovery." Add to that the rash of price rises and climbing interest rates. And that is without taking into consideration what will happen after President Ford's greatest brainstorm--removing price controls from oil. Worst of all, of course, is always unemployment, and that awful percentage of nine as an "average," does not take into account the fact that it's always double among Blacks, and women, and they have simply stopped counting youth, Black youth especially.

Clearly, whether we examine the home front or the world situation, we have reached an abysmal point of such crisis and retrogression\* that this exploitative, racist, sexist, imperialist, alienating society must be torn up by its roots. Under the whip of counter-revolution, we are being forced to see that nothing short of revolution can uproot this decrepit society. We cannot once again, as in 1968 and 1970, abort. That is one thing neither Cambodia nor the Kent dead and living martyrs will tolerate. Staring us in the face as the imperative task is the working out of the dialectics of liberation and dialectics of organization. It is to this we now turn.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* I should add also that, even when it isn't piecemeal, it can be a minimal change that still leaves everything fundamental exactly where it was, as we recently were given proofs all over again, from three very distant and different spots: (1) India was the very first country to gain its independence and with a mass movement and militancy at that, but not as social revolution. Indira Gandhi has managed to create instant totalitarianism 30 years after. (2) In the Philippines, the counter-revolution was successful from the start (though the Hukbalapas were the first guerrilla army and so close to revolution, that we all dared dream of revolution.) As soon as the U.S. was fully defeated in South Vietnam, the neo-fascist ruler Marcos was off to China. Not only did Mao roll out the carpet as he had for Nixon, but went on to say that he desires bases there, and that that did not necessarily mean U.S. bases should be driven out. But since Russia must under no circumstances reach there, it is best that both the U.S. and China assure Philippine "sovereignty". (3) Timor was about to be granted independence by Portugal, with the Marxist movement (Fretolini) calling for "immediate" independence, whereupon another faction, no doubt in collusion with Indonesia who imperialistically controls the other half of Timor, unilaterally declared its "independence."

5158

PART II: DIALECTICS OF ORGANIZATION AND DIALECTICS OF LIBERATION

Prefatory Note: Why the word, Organization, precedes the word, Liberation; Dialectics directing both as Development of Movement

No doubt the structure of the title of Part II, "Dialectics of Organization and Dialectics of Liberation," has surprised all who have heard us declaim against party elitism. Though structure is naturally not used in the Althusserian-Levi Straus anthropological sense but in the Hegelian-Marxian sense of organization of thought, it does call for explanation. Therefore, I hurry to make clear that (1) it does not refer to our organization (although at the end I will, of course, draw that into Perspectives for we too are part of objective reality.) Organization refers to totality, organization of thought as well as of masses. (2) Dialectics signifies the unity of opposites, which here means spontaneity and organization, which is why Marx articulated it as self-organization of the proletariat. (3) Historically, both philosophy, i.e. organization of thought, and Subject, i.e. the revolutionary forces, are inseparable from the objective world, constitute objective reality.

When Marx, in discovering his new continent of thought, declared that the philosophers have interpreted the world, but the need was to change it, he did not exclude thought. Rather, in his new continent of thought, thought and revolution were synonymous; the objective world could not be otherwise totally transformed. It is what Hegel had defined as Absolute Idea, that is to say, an objective world whose "inner ground and actual persistence is the subjectivity of the Notion."

The concretization of that--the dialectics of liberation--is what Marx called the unity of the ideal and the material. It is the new banner of Humanism he raised. He saw himself as part of that objective reality; it certainly was no accident that Historical Materialism emerged when the proletariat's "birth-time of history" was revolution--proletarian, social revolution.

Dialectics of Liberation calls forth both the organization of thought and action that make freedom a reality. Let us, in turning back to a concrete revolutionary event, Portugal, hold in mind this time not just empiric facts but philosophic ground--Fact, Ground, Condition--history and revolution-in-the-making on the road to total freedom.

\* \* \* \* \*

- 11 -

1) "Fact Emerges Out of Ground": New Passions and New Forces

Piling up facts upon facts, "as such," is not going to make us see the direction of the absolute opposite of these counter-revolutions we have been tracing. What will make us perceive, and not only perceive but develop actions against that counter current and for the forward movement, is the dialectical-philosophic analysis which considers facts, too, not empirically, but in the way Hegel described facts: "Fact emerges out of ground."

Let us begin there, focusing on the depth of that analysis which holds: "When all the conditions of Fact are present, it enters into existence. The Fact is before it exists." Strange as that expression may sound, it is a historic truth. What it involves is the relationship, the dialectical relationship, between what is immediately before you, and what appears and is its opposite, mediation, development, relationship to all the other facts--a totality of conditions that has brought about the facts we see.

We have often said, beware of taking your opponent's ground, or you will have lost even if you are right and he/she is wrong, for you will have lost the principle in which the facts were grounded. In the case of present-day Portugal, we witnessed first, the overthrow of fascism under the head of a neo-fascist General Spinoza. Revolutions do often begin as reform, but move on, and Portugal's did move ahead when 1974 became 1975 and Spinoza was overthrown--ran. Now what forms of organization expressed the first movement? Wasn't it just a half-way house? Hegel said the transformation of Ground externalizes itself, that is, appears. The release of social forces--masses in motion--emerged, were born anew. Clearly the new immediate was the result of a mediating process.

Put differently, the transformation of Ground into Conditions, that is to say, its becoming history, is precisely what has caused both the immediate and the mediation to unite in a new way, so that instead of looking at one single fact in isolation, you were seeing facts coalescing and moving on, that is to say, the Subject who is seeing these facts moving on to change what is. The Armed Forces Movement shows itself, but so do political parties and Women's Liberationists, and a lot, a lot of dialogue--self-development of the Idea, and of the masses.

Hegel repeats over and over again relentlessly, "Fact emerges out of Ground." Which is why he saw it before it appeared, before it existed, when it was just the single fact that empiricists stop at.

If we add to this question of Fact the whole of the objective world, and see that it, too, is one-sided unless we see that objective world with its ingrained subjectivity, we will not see both what is meant about totality and how, at this critical juncture, counter-revolution is not only an outside enemy, but comes from within. There is never a simply one-to-one relationship and there is no "direct translation of Hegel." Instead, let us work out, by watching the actualities of a path to revolution, and what we projected in Philosophy and Revolution, what is at stake in the dialectic:

5160

- 12 -

of liberation and the dialectics of organization.

In Philosophy and Revolution, we were counterposing what was happening in Cuba when it succeeded in its revolution against Batista and U.S. imperialism, to what Marx had called "new passions and new forces." Philosophy and Revolution showed what happened when Castro attempted to make a Universal of military focos as if that were the whole of the "new passions and new forces" which would keep the Cuban Revolution from "ever" falling into the trap of the Party-to-lead--only to get swallowed up in the CP which had done nothing whatever in the actual revolution.

The same chapter concerned itself with other forces which had not yet made the revolution, but theirs--Women's Liberation--was definitely an idea whose time has come. Rightly disgusted with elitism and monolithism, it, unfortunately, also wished to throw out theory. As we saw most recently with NAM, some of that movement is being swallowed up as surely by the "organization"--only this time it is Maoism instead of the Russian CP--and Mao is surely very far from being Woman--I mean accepting Woman as Thinker as well as Force.

The point of Philosophy and Revolution--it is not "yesterday's book" but today's ground--was to bring into the open all four forces of revolution--Black, worker, women, youth. And while history in the USA shows Black to be vanguard, it is vanguard as masses, not unrooted intellectuals; it surely is not when those leaders declare themselves instant Marxists. To be able to dig deeper, we must then again return to history, from the start of Marx's discovery of that new continent of thought, Historical Materialism. He at once ran to see what the proletariat--the organized proletariat--had to say, and it is with the League of the Just voting to become the Communist League, that he wrote the Communist Manifesto. And when there was no organization, he still referred to himself and Engels as "the Party." Why? Action demands organization. Together they achieve second negation, i.e., total freedom.

## 2) Theories of Revolution and of Organization:

### Lenin, Luxemburg, Marxist-Humanism

Once now we have revolution up front center, we would get a very different view of Russia and Germany, Lenin and Luxemburg. We have no time to develop this fully, but it is high time a few fundamentals, especially on organization, weren't evaded because Luxemburg was a great revolutionary martyr.

Rosa Luxemburg, the most-often-quoted theoretician of spontaneity against Lenin, did not (NOT) break at once with the Second International, although she at once broke with its policy; then she didn't at once break with ISD. Though Spartaacists surely had a different theory, a revolutionary one, they remained a faction. The overestimation of unity of

- 13 -

organization then led her to oppose also the creation of the Third International, although she surely was for the Russian Revolution and worked and died in trying to achieve it in Germany. Philosophically, too, she remained abstract, so that theory equalled "politics" rather than total re-organization.

Now let me jump to today. (I'm doing a lot of jumping but it is not for lack of organization of thought or historic continuity, but to focus on dialectics, methodology.) And in jumping to 1975, we go to so seemingly unrelated a matter as high school education. It seems the Organization of American Historians, at its conference this month, were complaining against educators who, instead of offering courses on general American history, were going in for "specialized courses, such as women in history" (that isn't American history?) and, according to them, worse yet was that they were replacing the study of facts, dates, chronology with concepts!

The educators, though defending themselves, seemed to fear they will be accused of being abstract, being philosophers, so they said that they weren't leaving out the study of the "facts" of history, but "just packaging it differently." That's what their trouble is--just packaging it differently. But what was great was the high school students' passion for philosophy, for concepts, that had forced conceptual thinking in place of laundry lists of "facts" upon these educators whom Marx, 150 years ago, noted first themselves needed to be educated.

In a word, whether we take so world-shaking an event as Portugal, now in the throes of its own development as well as in the throes of the Sino-Soviet conflict\*; or so secondary a matter as high school education\*\*; or whether we examine the guerrillas that may emerge in Panama; whether we concentrate on the Middle East shuttle as "success," or look at the PLO being left out in the cold; whether we look "regionally" at West Europe, or globally at the nuclear bombs that threaten the very survival of civilization as we have known it--there is no way, absolutely no way to leave aside philosophy as "abstract."

The very opposite is the case. It is crucial both in the dialectic of liberation and dialectics of organization. This is why I was so impressed with Will's contribution to the discussion. I quote: "But the question remains for us: do we see organization as a static triplicity of workers,

\*\* Incidentally, when busing was in the South, not only liberal educators but even an Eisenhower called it obeying the "law of the land," meriting sending in troops to enforce. But now that busing to schools has moved North, it suddenly is not only dubbed as "forced busing," but "dear old" ghetto neighborhoods are equated with "quality education."

\* Anyone who thinks that South USA, or Mozambique, taxicab drivers or high school students "aren't interested" in the Sino-Soviet conflict, hasn't got the slightest conception of the political-philosophical maturity of this age and how the individual, the most personal indeed, is tied up in knots with the Universal, and that both as revolution and counter-revolution.



- 14 -

plus theory, plus organization--with organization as the Mediator? Or do we as Marx did see ourselves as part of the unity of a theoretical movement and an actual movement for freedom? A self-organization of the proletariat and a self-organization of philosophy--a two-fold movement--that will unite in a particular revolution?"

Lenin's theoretic preparation for revolution didn't wait for the eve of 1917; that's when it had to be re-organized. It began in 1902, indeed the decade before then, but its fusion into an organizational concept did take shape in 1902-03. It took Trotsky his defeat by Stalin in the late 1920s for him to recognize that Lenin alone was indispensable to 1917. He then took lock, stock and barrel the 1902 concept of vanguardism, thereby assuring the continuance of the theoretical void left with Lenin's death.

Once we picked up the link in the historic continuum with the theory of state-capitalism in 1941, we were on the way both to reconsideration of the role of labor and new beginnings, but these remained both philosophically and organizationally quite blurred until there was that new great quality in the objective reality of 1953 with its compulsion to see philosophically, in the Absolute Idea itself a movement from practice, and in an actual movement from practice a form of theory itself, both of which demanded organizational expression, the Committee form of organization inseparable from philosophy.

This year we might say Mao himself "helped" us establish that unity by his volitional vulgar revision of Marxism, denying both Hegel and Engels for their articulation of any such truth as negation of the negation since, according to The Chairman, "basically there is no negation of the negation."

The Draft Perspectives quotes Hegel: "The alienated type of mind, driven to the acme of its opposition, where pure volition and the pure volitional agent are still kept distinct, reduces the opposition to a transparent form, and therein finds itself...Absolute freedom has thus squared and balanced the self-opposition of universal and single will...(and become) absolute terror," (Phenomenology, p.610) having reduced 'absolute freedom' to a single 'faction.' Hegel did not, after all, fully know Mao who had reduced this 'absolute freedom' just to one. But the philosophy of revolution that will give the new actions their direction cannot be fenced in by a faction or a Party, or One. Social storms from under the whip of the counter-revolution will not be stilled; they are already brewing underground. We must, therefore, start there--on the new level of movement from practice," the objective reality of bringing out the subjective forces of Reason and revolution.

When the organization was born on that level of movement from practice with both News & Letters and the "assignment" for Marxism and Freedom, the membership knew it must never again separate theory from practice, thought from action--the activities we were at once involved in at the point of production, the Black struggles, and with the youth (when the youth was still called the "boat generation") they as well as women were singled

- 15 -

out as those four forces of revolution that would never let Reason get separated from Force.

Objective reality, a few years later, also brought about another form of expression--Political Letters. (I remember travelling through Fresno and hearing JFK announce on TV the Bay of Pigs and its demise, and at once hurrying back to Los Angeles and air-mailing a Political Letter--a single typing--and then it grew and grew.) Political Letters stopped after my return from Africa because as great as the new international relations were (after trips to Europe, Hong Kong, Japan--anywhere and everywhere there was a movement), none would "write" for us what was imperative for those revolutions not to get aborted--the unity of Philosophy and Revolution.

### 3) A Few Concrete Tasks

Next year we will again start with Political Letters, weekly we hope. While we are a long way off from being able to "afford" a weekly News & Letters--either financially or in numbers of members--we cannot circumscribe analyzing the onrushing events on a world scale in the objective world to a monthly format.

Here again we must point to the Draft Perspectives Report which remains part of this, whether we are concerned with the general economic crisis of capitalism and its militarization, or the politics of double-cross, from the Middle East to Helsinki as well as the Balkanization in Africa and not just Finlandization (forced neutrality) but the attempted self-Finlandization, as witness mighty France as the cultural heart of West Europe, on the one hand, and the "New Left" grown old, on the other hand.

And, of course, we also stand by the concrete tasks listed in Part III of the Draft Perspectives, whether that be the three projected new pamphlets, and Black, Brown, Red in a new edition with a totally new section on Native Americans by a Marxist-Humanist Native American. They are all by rank-and-file members. I do wish to say a word on the pamphlet on the first American Hegelians. Ever since Marxism and Freedom I have hinted, in footnotes, that not only are the American roots of Marxism unknown, but even that of Hegelians. But it is only in the actual process of working it out by the new research embarked on that we discovered Women as Philosophers. Hegelian philosophers--as well as Marxists in the same city, St. Louis, in the first General Strike, 1877, and that the International Workingmen's Association had not, after all, died with the Paris Commune. So each concretization of Philosophy and Revolution is likewise a deepening.

The proof of this, as of all the other pamphlets, will be after publication which will first test us and the outside will have their say as to whether it does offer ground for liberation and therefore they wish to join us. Just as revolutions are not "made" but erupt spontaneously,

5164

- 16 -

so organizational growth comes not just from our hard labor, but whether our hard labor, and I mean in activities and in theory, meets the challenge from objective reality and from below.

To meet the challenge and to meet it under the whip of counter-revolution, we have traced here, whether it be in the relations of U.S.-Russia, or China, alone or in Sino-Soviet conflict. Bangladesh, Islamic or otherwise, Latin America, or Africa or India. Moreover, that whip of counter-revolution is present not only where it is obvious, but where it resulted in "peace"--the Middle East shuttle. The press that yesterday attacked Kissinger when his "Vietnam peace" turned out to be continued war and defeat, and those who continued to taunt him for his phrase "we're near a national nervous breakdown," will now once again sing paeans of praise to him for the success of the Middle East shuttle, or at least gaining an interim Israeli-Egyptian "peace."

Let us then, first, call attention to the fact that there will, evidently, now be an "American presence" in the Sinai--and those 200 American "civilians" who will man the electronic monitoring of the early warning signal means that from now on the "incidents" will not just be of Arab-Israeli concern, but will become a global matter, specifically U.S., and thus may very well be the world conflagration of the superpowers. (As a minor reminder, please reread the old Political Letter when, in the early 1960s, not Nixon, not Kissinger, not Johnson, but "Camelot" JFK sent "civilians" to Vietnam and we entitled that analysis: "The Vietnam War To Come"!)

Secondly, the U.S. "presence" has already surrounded itself not only with massive economic aid--actually military hardware--but Kissinger is "putting together" (as the Christian Science Monitor, 8-25-75, puts it) a European and Japanese group which, together with the Middle East's major oil producers, would put up \$1.5 billion in addition to the \$450 million the U.S. promised Egypt, and very nearly \$3 billion to Israel.

Third, and above all, there will be no peace in the Middle East so long as the Palestinian masses are not given their rights. I do not mean necessarily Arafat. Those who identify the Palestinian masses' desire for freedom with Arafat, please remember both his bourgeois, theocratic self and the fact that the masses have yet to be asked who, how, what they want. Nor can we disregard the "rejectionist front", much less exclude the possibility that should ever a mini-Palestine be established with Arafat as head, the first person who will work to assassinate him is Dr. Habash. Each of the Palestinians is working not only against Israel but not for the freedom of the Palestinian masses, even as Israeli rulers are only concerned with their state power, and not with "socialism" for the Israeli masses.

But where I do not mean Arafat, I do mean self-determination for the Palestinian masses as for the Israelis, and the Israelis must be reminded that they cannot claim "socialism" and use that and their admission that their land is capitalistic as absolving them from working class

5165

- 17 -

solidarity with the Palestincans. It is not a question of forgetting the national hatreds and fears and the fact that the rulers have always used "divide and rule" as their principle.

World revolution, too, starts at home. Every word has gotten to mean its opposite, whether we limit ourselves to local matters like "forced busing" and "quality education" or nothing short of "a new world economic order." Heretofore, a new world economic order has meant the end of capitalism and its replacement, through proletarian revolution, by socialism. But suddenly everyone from Mao to Arafat, not to mention the Shah of Iran and President Echeverria of Mexico are saying world "reorganization" means a supposedly "pure" Third World which includes both the famished of Ethiopia and feudal oil barons of Saudi Arabia where they still cut off a poor man's hand for stealing a loaf of bread.

Into this Tower of Babble enter intellectuals like the top professorial economist Geoffrey Barraclough whose article, "The Coming Depression," was featured in New York Review of Books (6-27-74). It was called "Part I" but, evidently, that "coming" didn't mean next week, but a full six months hence before "Part II" (1-23-75) appeared. "World Crisis" its new name, declaimed against ruling ideologues from Keynes to Kissinger, but still we did not get his mighty conclusion, for which we had to wait another six months, until finally it came this month (8-7-75).

And what do we get as the solution? Who will become the grave-digger of capitalism in its death-throes? From Barraclough we get as proof a statement as the 80 allegedly-non aligned nations meeting in Peru who are calling for "a new world economic order" but meanwhile passing motions about the expulsion of Israel from the UN. "It is the OPEC-Third World alliance with its demand for a new world order, that threatens to push the tottering structure of neo-capitalism over the brink." Really? And what is their class nature?

Capitalism is in economic crisis for sure, and politically has been in its death throes for all too long, but it is not OPEC--that is not exactly in a hurry to "share the wealth" with its "Arab brothers," much less with all the poor of the Third World, and at the same time "overthrow" capitalism which it is busy trying to "batch up with"--that will topple "the tottering structure of neo-capitalism."

It is the workers, the Blacks, the women, and the youth--all the creative, oppressed, revolutionary forces--who will do so. And because of the totality of the crisis and the nuclear threats that are hanging over the very survival of humanity, it becomes imperative not to rush away from the colossal tasks just because we are so small.

Millions upon million have the same desire as we for a new social order and new human relations. The vision--philosophy and revolution as a unity--can shake up this mightiest of all capitalistic empires. The first step in that transforming of the counter-revolution into its opposite--actual social revolution--is being set here in activities, manual

5166

and mental.

Yes, world revolution starts at home. Anything and everything done here that would indeed shake the U.S. will shake up the world, undermining the old. It may be just one step, but it can become the longest of all steps to making freedom a reality.

August 30, 1975

Raya Dunayevskaya, National Chairwoman  
News & Letters Committees

\* \* \* \* \*