

PERSPECTIVES REPORT TO NEWS & LETTERS CONVENTION  
BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA, NATIONAL CHAIRWOMAN,  
SEPTEMBER 4, 1982

---

WHAT TO DO FACING THE DEPTH OF  
RECESSION AND THE MYRIAD GLOBAL POLITICAL  
CRISES AS WELL AS THE PHILOSOPHIC VOID

("As well as" does not mean a third or subordinate point, a sort of "also ran." Rather, philosophy expresses, dialectically, the meaning of the other two points -- economics and politics -- as both their ground of being and path for the resolution of their contradictions, subjectively and objectively -- FREEDOM.)

INTRODUCTION: Why Being Against "What is" Is Incomplete  
Without the Corollary, What One Is For

- I. ISRAEL'S GENOCIDAL INVASION OF LEBANON: Opposition also Needed Against Building Any Half-Way Houses
  - II. THE DEEP GLOBAL ECONOMIC RECESSION; Anchored to Ronald Reagan's Retrogression, Religion Included
  - III. U.S. IMPERIALISM'S WORLD OUTREACH, Especially to Latin America, and the Shakiness of NATO, Including Projected Nuclear War
  - IV. THE CREATIVE NATURE OF MARX'S MIND AND THE TASKS OF MARXIST-HUMANISTS TODAY
    - 1) The Methodology of the Perspectives
    - 2) The Activities and the Philosophy of What to Do
- 

"It is my desire that this history of Philosophy should contain for you a summons to grasp the spirit of the time which is present in us by nature ..."

Hegel, Lectures on the History of Philosophy

"The intellectual movement now taking place in Russia testifies to the fact that fermentation is going on deep below the surface. Minds are always connected by invisible threads with the body of the people..."

Marx to Siegfried Meyer in New York, Jan. 21, 1871

---

POST-CONVENTION BULLETIN NUMBER ONE

SEPTEMBER 1982

News & Letters, 2832 E. Grand Blvd., Detroit, MI 48211

75¢

7515

PERSPECTIVES REPORT to the  
NEWS & LETTERS CONVENTION by  
the National Chairwoman,  
RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA, Sept. 4, 1982

WHAT TO DO FACING THE DEPTH OF RECESSION AND THE MYRIAD GLOBAL  
POLITICAL CRISES AS WELL AS THE PHILOSOPHIC VOID

("As well as" does not mean a third or subordinate point, a  
sort of "also ran." Rather, philosophy expresses, dialectically,  
the meaning of the other two points -- economics and politics --  
as both their ground of being and path for the resolution  
of their contradictions, subjectively and objectively -- Freedom.)

INTRODUCTION: WHY BEING AGAINST "WHAT IS" IS INCOMPLETE WITHOUT  
THE COROLLARY, WHAT ONE IS FOR

Because the economic and political crises wrecking the  
capitalist-imperialist world are so horrendous -- whether we look  
at the acknowledged, official 10 percent unemployment (which is not  
10 percent but 17 percent in industrial centers, and fully 50 per-  
cent among Black youth -- and which characterizes not only the U.S.  
but circles the world with 30 million now unemployed in the industri-  
alized nations!), or whether we look at the many recently ongoing  
wars, from Iran-Iraq to the Falklands/Malvinas to Israel's genocidal  
invasion of Lebanon -- it is all too tempting to express oneself  
solely in opposition to what is, without ever specifying what one is  
for, so weighted down does one become by all these crises crying out  
for an end.

History, however, warns us of other critical periods --  
whether that be World War I, or the Hitler-Stalin Pact that set off  
World War II, or the barbarous Israeli invasion of Lebanon -- which  
give us historic proof that mere opposition to such monstrous degene-  
ration does not lead to new societies. On the contrary. It only  
assures the transformation of that type of bare opposition into one  
form or another of half-way house. That is true both when we look  
at the failure of bourgeois democracy and when we look at fascism.  
Both brought on World War II. Such a victory over fascism only laid  
the ground for the restoration of state-capitalism -- Gaullism as  
well as Stalinism. Indeed, state-capitalism became a universal.

As we know from WWI, even the magnificent opposition that  
was successful -- the Russian Revolution -- once it didn't spread

beyond national borders, ended in the transformation of the first workers' state into its opposite, state-capitalism.

Today, we cannot evade asking: What Now? Is the PLO the absolute opposite of Israel, or just one more narrow nationalism? In our age, when a nuclear war threatens civilization as we have known it, we cannot, must not, accept half-way houses as the answer. Nor do I mean only outright nuclear holocaust. Rather, the immediate crises of today are both in the "Love Canals" of the world and at the point of production. (See Ned's article in the Pre-Convention Discussion Youth Bulletin, and my letter to the Youth in Pre-Convention Bulletin No. 4.)

We cannot satisfy ourselves with detailing only what we are against or with enlarging atrocity stories. They surely abound in Israel's invasion of Lebanon.\* Many atrocity stories, I'm sure, can also be told of the PLO and its fantastic covenant "to drive the Israelis into the sea." Nor should our support of the Palestinians for self-determination and the PLO as a bargaining agent lead us away from re-examining what happens to aborted revolutions -- in this case, specifically Lebanon and specifically as aided by the PLO in the 1975-76 Civil War there. Which is why we correctly entitled our Philosophic-Political Letter #6 (August 6, 1976): "The Test Not Only of the PLO But of the Whole Left."

Because the Left did not meet that challenge but followed the PLO is one substantial reason for the totality of the crisis today. Just at the point when there was a near-success by the indigenous Lebanese Left, and the outcome of the 1975-76 Civil War hung in the balance, the PLO insisted that the concentration must be, not on the native ruler-oppressors represented by the so-called Christian, i.e. neo-fascist, Phalangists, but on Israel alone, though at the moment Israel was nowhere present in Lebanon and Syria was all ready to invade. It is Syria the PLO had dubbed "liberators" instead of a new imperialist force. The great tragedy was that the whole Left -- indigenous Lebanese under Jumblatt, Stalinists, Trot-

\* In her interview with that neo-fascist, so-called Defense Minister of Israel, Ariel Sharon, Oriana Fallaci reveals his insane, nightmarish vision: "Israeli strategic interests... must be broadened to include countries such as Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, regions such as the Persian Gulf and Africa, particularly the countries of north and central Africa...."

skyists -- followed the PLO lead. Here is what we wrote in that Political-Philosophic Letter #6:

"...the New Left, born in the 1960s, so disdainful of theory (which it forever thinks it can pick up 'en route'), has a strange attitude toward imperialism. It is as if imperialism were not the natural outgrowth of monopoly capitalism, but was a 'conspiracy, organized by a single imaginary center, rather as the Nazis used to refer to the Judea-Catholic-Masonic Alliance, or Communists under Stalin to the conspiracy of the Trotskyists and Rightists in league with the imperialist secret service' ....

[And even, it should now be added, as Khomeini now refers to the U.S. and Israel as the Great Satan.]

"Evidently nationalism of the so-called Third World is of itself revolutionary even when it is under the banner of a king, a shah, or the emirates, or the Syrian Army. Thereby they canonize nationalism, even when it is void of working class character, as national liberation.

"It is not that class is the sole characteristic of national liberation movements that revolutionaries can support. It is that the working class nature is its essence and it is that the revolutionary and international impact emerges from masses in motion ...

"This does not mean that we give up the struggle for self-determination, Palestinian especially. It is that we do not narrow our vision of the revolutionary struggle for a totally different world, on truly new Humanist foundations, the first necessity of which is the unity of philosophy and revolution."

Presently, the main leader of that indigenous neo-fascist counter-revolution, Bashir Gemayel, whose savage attack on Tel Zaatar Palestinian Refugee Camp slaughtered 10,000 there and another 1,200 in the slums in what is known as the "Quarantine Massacre", is President, now that Israel has performed an even more massive slaughter. But what about the son of the Left leader, Walid Jumblatt? Can he think he gained from Syria's "liberation"? Let's examine still other "half-way houses" of not unfurling new freedom banners.

## I. ISRAEL'S GENOCIDAL INVASION OF LEBANON: OPPOSITION NEEDED AGAINST BUILDING OTHER HALF-WAY HOUSES

Nothing but horror and utter disgust characterizes the world's reaction to Israel's gruesome invasion of Lebanon. Each day of the endless string of Israel's lying excuses for the destruction of that land -- from the claim of securing a "25 mile security zone" for Israel and empty talk of the PLO as "terrorists" at a moment when, not the PLO, but Begin-Sharon's Israel was the one committing the atrocities; to the claim of being for Lebanon's "integrity" as a nation, freed of Syria's and the PLO's invasions -- only heightened and widened the world's opposition to Israel's ghoulsh attack. History will not forget such barbarism. Opposition, and even putting an end, to these uncivilized acts, cannot, however, be sufficient unto the day without, at one and the same time, showing how it had resulted from a transformation into opposite of what Israel was at birth in 1947-48, and what it is today, 1982-83.

It is necessary to begin with the present, to focus on the group that just extended its vote to the Likud government on July 25. That neo-fascist, Guela Cohen, who heads the extreme Right party, Teh'ya, thus expressed her confidence in Begin. Its three votes assured Begin's majority. In exchange for this vote, Tehiya got: 1) several thousand new homes in the occupied region; 2) seven new settlements on the West Bank; 3) General Sharon's sponsorship of the whole idea of settling the West Bank as if it were part of Israel. (See The Nation , August 7 - 14, 1982.)

As Flora Lewis rightly pointed out in "The Moral Void" (New York Times, Aug. 5, 1982), the so-called "Operation Peace in Galilee" has as its real objective making the West Bank part of Israel -- indeed, killing the very idea of Palestinian nationality.

How quickly forgotten (if, indeed, Begin or Irgun ever knew them) are the true origins of the idea of an "Israeli nationality." The Nazi holocaust, which they invoke today for reactionary purposes, is the fact of history that changed the position of Marxists who had always been for cultural assimilation to the point where nothing

of the reactionary Irgun, whose leader was the terrorist, Begin.\* What a transformation into opposite of the Israel of "Exodus," 1947-48, into the imperialistic state-capitalist Israel of 1982-83!

It is good that a peace movement has arisen in Israel, demanding an end to Israel's invasion of Lebanon at once. It is even better that some of that Left has raised the question of self-determination for Palestinians in Israel -- or, rather, the part Israel occupies illegally. (Indeed, what Israel is now trying to annex is Palestine.) But that, too, will hardly solve much if, at the same time, a new banner of genuine liberation is not unfolded.

The immediate, urgent question now is: What kind of regime in Lebanon? Does anyone doubt that Begin-Sharon wanted that small-time, neo-fascist, Bashir Gemayel to become its President? What is needed is to see to it that genuine national liberation is the predominant demand and that none will stand for any colonization anywhere -- be it by Britain in the Malvinas/Falklands or Israel in Lebanon and the West Bank and the Golan Heights. Let's keep in mind that precisely because Thatcher thought she could revive British chauvinistic patriotism -- especially when it had U.S. support and is so militarily dominant over technologically backward lands like Argentina -- she thought a military victory would assure her holding onto the Falklands/Malvinas. Nothing could be further from the truth. The reason that even militaristic neo-fascist Argentina could threaten Britain with transformation of her military victory into a defeat, and Argentina's military defeat into a victory, is the Third World's implacable opposition to neo-colonialism; it

---

\* I was in Paris in 1947, where I met German refugees who had originally escaped to Palestine only to find that it was impossible to work there for a new society of Arabs and Jews. The main obstacle was the Irgun, headed by Begin. It became so impossible to work for a truly new society that they had left Palestine. The stories they told me of the Irgun showed that the greatest contradiction was already present in the fight for a Jewish homeland. I, in turn, cabled an objection to CLR James and Grace Lee, who were then writing Invading Socialist Society, which had declared Palestine to be the "point of world revolution."

will not allow Britain to keep its war booty.\*

Here, too, philosophy is no abstraction. Its concretization, as politicalization, warns the whole New Left not to stop at half-way houses, not even when that manifests deep sensitivity to Third World desires for freedom unless they are willing to transform that desire into an outright revolution. I'm referring to that part of the New Left which uncritically accepts the unfinished Latin American revolutions as if that is the answer -- i.e. what will destroy imperialist capitalism. There was a special issue of Contemporary Marxism (Winter, 1980), edited by Immanuel Wallerstein, in which Samir Amin, in an essay on Nicaragua, concluded that the primary task is "revitalization of the economy." No one needs a reminder that the counter-revolution in Poland, headed by General Jaruzelski, is using precisely that excuse for destroying Solidarity.

## II. THE DEEP GLOBAL ECONOMIC RECESSION, ANCHORED TO RONALD REAGAN'S RETROGRESSIONISM, RELIGION INCLUDED

The latest (August 1, 1982) unemployment figures are the highest ever since the start of WWII -- and this is true not only of the U.S., but also of Europe where British unemployment is 13 percent. And Japan, too, is sinking to the lower depths. Its GNP production, which is the highest of all industrial nations, has a rate of increase of only three percent. Even when the talk is of so-called "rebound," as it was in Britain after the Falkland crisis, it is not expected to reach more than two percent with continuous inflation sapping that. All this is said with full knowledge that

\* One thing that's interesting about rulers is that the moment they are not in power, they do tell the truth. In 1948, when Great Britain was struggling against Argentina, the Washington Post carried a column by Sumner Welles which stated that Britain really had no right to the Falklands; that, in fact, whenever a colony gained its freedom, as Argentina did from Spain, the holdings of the former rulers reverted to the new republic. He added, "prophetically," what Reagan had better keep in mind now: "The Argentinians have not forgotten that Britain's seizure of these islands in 1833 was facilitated by the U.S." And they certainly won't forget Haig-Reagan's global imperialism in 1982-83.

there are to be no more booms, that production will continue to stagnate, unemployment will continue to be high, and discontent will be endless, and therefore must burst open.

An article entitled "Red Ink Engulfs Europe, Too"\* shows that everything from unemployment -- 10.6 million are now jobless -- to the structural deficits are equally bad. The U.S. deficit by 1984 will be \$150 billion, four percent of the GNP! "Government spending among the ten EC countries, for instance," it shows, "now accounts for about 49 percent of the GNP, up from 32 percent in 1960. And state and federal taxes have risen to 45 percent of the GNP from 32 percent in 1960."

These details are not for purposes of merely piling up statistics, but for purposes of focusing on what Marx designated as capitalism's General Absolute Crisis. Thus:

1) Business Week (August 16, 1982) had a special report on "The Built-In Deficit." Deficits despite ever-mounting capitalist profits certainly aren't new. This special report shows that there have been 10 in the last decade, 19 in the past 20 years, 32 since WWII, and 45 since 1932. But it is the "first time in history that the U.S. is suffering from a built-in deficit." Furthermore, from 1982 to 1985 the U.S. will add almost \$500 billion to the national debt, more than it had in the preceding 30 years. When Marx stated profoundly that the national debt is the sole "possession" the masses are burdened with, he could not have imagined any such figure!

The report is forced to disclose the structural nature of this deficit. And this will be so despite the Budget Control Act of 1974, despite the regression with Reagan, and despite the latest attempt to pretend to solve the problem, the proposed amendment to the Constitution. To further show how structurally built-in that is, they show what stagnation and actual de-industrialization -- the worst since the Depression -- is now besetting the economy, so that the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 is having the opposite effect. That is, it begins to depend on consumption instead of production to get out of the crisis and its shrinking export market as well as

\*Business Week, Aug. 16, 1982, p. 91



high interest rates. "As a percent of GNP, the deficit will rise to an historic high of four percent the coming fiscal year," we are told.

2) Even the so-called great "solution" of the supply-siders -- all the tax breaks for the rich, which are supposed to mean so much more goes into savings, the kind of savings that would then go into investments -- has been shown not to mean a thing because the deficits are so high that they absorb 70 percent of the savings -- \$140 billion. "Despite all the talk about increasing saving and investment, it looks as if net capital formation from 1981 to 1985 will be a smaller share of the GNP than in any previous period since WW II," says Harvard University economics professor, Benjamin M. Friedman. "It is strictly due to the big deficits."

3) Worst of all is that the government investment has likewise shifted away from the nation's infrastructure -- highways, bridges, sewers, schools and hospitals. As if that deterioration isn't bad enough, instead of cutting any part of the Behemoth's military budget, all Reagan can think of is slashing the so-called "entitlements program" -- that is, they want to do away with Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, civil service pensions and disability insurance, and programs like Headstart. Reagan's retrogressionism protrudes everywhere, whether we look at education or at the type of "workers" employed in the military industry -- a great many engineers and very few of those industrial workers most hit by unemployment, especially young Black women workers of whom 40.8 percent, according to the appendix of Reagan's Economic Report issued in February 1982 (with which we will deal more later) were unemployed in December 1981. In a review of that Report (New York Review of Books, April 15, 1982), Emma Rothchild shows that Reagan's "philosophy" considers "that while national defense is a 'true' public good, education is a good that 'could be private' and indeed that the public monopoly of subsidized education should perhaps be ended in the interest of 'more efficient schools.'"

4) So it isn't only "higher education" the Reagan Administration wishes to limit to rich hands, but education very nearly from birth, specifically pre-kindergarden. I take back the expression,

"from birth." It is, indeed, before birth, as he is pushing the clock backward also in all matters of women's rights by taking away the right of women to decide when to experience child-birth. That rolling of the clock backward doesn't stop there, as its main thrust is against labor, especially Black, both in lowering wages and worsening the conditions of labor and creating ever greater unemployment. The latest "get tough with labor" policy comes from the steel industry, out for a "confrontation strategy." (See Business Week, Aug. 30, 1982.)

Finally, 5) -- moving also against Black civil rights legislation, Reagan is engaged in a love feast with the immoral minority that calls itself the "Moral Majority" and is driving hard for "school prayers." He is regressing to Louis XVI and the fetishizing that brought about the French Revolution's attempt to do away with the abstractions of religion and advance to the concreteness and creativity of a dialectical freedom philosophy.

It is that concreteness that illuminates the totality of the present myriad crises as it originally illuminated the fetishes of the feudalistic "old time religion." In Philosophy of Mind, Hegel, without admitting he was replacing religion's abstract Absolutes, built into a "system," with philosophy's Absolutes of humanity's striving for freedom, writes:

"They are most accurately called systems which apprehend the Absolute only as substance. Of the oriental, especially the Mohammedan, modes of envisaging God, we may rather say that they represent the Absolute as the utterly universal genus which dwells in the species or existences, but dwells so potently that these existences have no actual reality." (Para. 573, p. 310; Oxford, 1971 edition)

Hegel's attempt to exclude Christianity, especially Lutheranism, from his critique of religions was thwarted first by Feuerbach and most totally by Marx. That our regressive President, in this technologically advanced age, attempts to bestow actual life on fetishistic existence speaks volumes of the state of degeneracy of capitalism. In turning to its imperialist outreach, let's also keep in mind the most interesting review-essay by Emma Rothschild, referred to earlier. Her review of Reagan's February Economic Report was en-

titled "The Philosophy of Reaganism." The analyst spends most of the article exposing what the Report (which called itself "historic") expounded as Reagan's "philosophic beliefs and economic judgments," as contained in 8 pages by Reagan and 344 pages by the Council of Economic Advisors. Reagan's report is so anxious to place everything at the doors of the Democrats -- from stagflation to high unemployment -- that it calls even the 1974 quadrupling of oil prices just "conjunctural," a "small part of the decline."

Presidents' Economic Councils seem always ready for yet another rationalization. Thus, Reagan's Economic Council insists that, despite the estimate that in 1983 the deficit will amount to no less than \$545 billion over the next six years, this staggering sum "will add marginally to the burden of the (federal) debt." Because everything in the February Report has become a great deal worse by August, it is necessary to tarry a bit longer, especially on the stratospheric military expenditures, which are nevertheless the only ones they show: military purchases will increase 16 percent a year from 1981 to 1985. In relating military expenditures to employment, Rothschild concludes:

"The Report defines 'purchases of defense durables' as 'research and development and procurement of major weapons systems'. This bizarre identification does not correspond to conventional usage. With its procurement and research outlays, the Defense Department makes purchases from industries other than 'durable goods industries' including business services and chemicals; it buys durable goods with other parts of its budget, notably 'operations and maintenance.' The difference between the two measures is substantial. Actual 'defense purchases of durable goods' amounted to \$37.3 billion in the 1981 fiscal year (according to the authoritative series, based on actual commodities purchases, which is published monthly by the Commerce Department in its Survey of Current Business). But military outlays for procurement and research amounted to \$50.5 billion in that year."

The Draft Perspectives went into detail on the militarization and there is no need here to repeat that, except to ask you never to forget the Pentagon's fantastic, secret 125-page document that did nothing short of projecting a strategy for the next five years, preparing for a prolonged nuclear war and madly concluding: "The U.S.

must never emerge from a nuclear war without nuclear weapons..." All the more reason to keep up pressures like the phenomenal New York and world anti-nuke / anti-war protests and, with those demonstrations, unfurl the banner of a philosophy of revolution.

III. U.S. IMPERIALISM'S WORLD OUTREACH, ESPECIALLY TO LATIN AMERICA, AND THE SHAKINESS OF NATO, INCLUDING A PROJECTED NUCLEAR WAR

Inherent in this degenerate capitalism is its imperialistic outreach. Topping it at the moment is Reagan's certification, on July 28, of the murderous El Salvador rulers, headed by that death squad commander, Roberto D'Aubissant, who is now President, as a regime that displays -- believe it or not! -- "progress in human rights " and "land redistribution. "

Nor is this the only country where the Administration is conducting a counter-revolution. It is holding all of Latin America imprisoned as its "sphere of influence. " At the present moment, it is conducting a venomous military adventure against Nicaragua.

Its insatiable, imperialist appetite doesn't stop at Latin America. Despite the rhetoric against Carter by the much-praised communicator, Reagan, he did not in any way depart from Carter's declaration that anyone who dared to enter the Gulf region to take sides in the Iranian Revolution would be challenging "the national interests" (sic!) of the U.S. Quite the contrary. Reagan has strengthened that, as is most evident in the manner in which he listens to countries like Saudi Arabia, which sided with Iraq in the present Iran-Iraq war. Despite Reagan's pretended neutrality in that war, just as in his pretended neutrality in the war between Britain and Argentina, it is only pretense. The truth is that he does side with anyone against Iran, and this is because Iran had a genuine revolution.

Though Khomeini has conducted a counter-revolution against the very forces that overthrew the Shah and thus put him in power; despite the fact that Khomeini has conjured up Pan-Islam (actually only the old Persia) rather than revolution as the "unifying force,"

it doesn't satisfy U.S. imperialism. And rightly so, since it isn't true that the revolution is yet dead. The many tendencies that may have arisen with the first breath of freedom will revive; many of those who made that revolution are laboring underground to rise again.

In a word -- be it the Gulf region and its oil; or Lebanon and its defeated revolution that may arise again; or Namibia -- when capitalists unite it is for the purposes of being against any revolution, whether an outright social revolution or a national liberation movement. Let us, instead, look at the freedom struggles from below that always arise from the ashes, no matter how often destroyed.

Recently, a most interesting article, "Inside Namibia" by Joseph Lelyveld (NYT Magazine, Aug. 1, 1982), mentioned the Hereros' revolt of 1904. Both their heroism and the dehumanized behavior of the German General von Trotha we know from Rosa Luxemburg's moving description, which became also the ground for her struggle against imperialism as she referred to General von Trotha's assassination-order; "Within the German boundaries, every Herero, whether fully armed or unarmed, with or without cattle, shall be shot." Of the 70,000 Hereros only 25,000 were left alive. These Hereros were called "Hottentots" by the whites who were ignorant of these people and their language and culture. That revolt was followed by the last revolt of the Namas, led by their great chieftain, Hendrick Wittooi. They met the same deadly fate as that meted out to the Hereros.

What is exciting today is that his great-great-grandson is the present head, who is appealing for unity with the Hereros with the very same slogan as that of the old chief who had called for unity of "all Africans against the Germans." What is even more exciting for us in this year of "three books, not one"\* is our constant reference to the 1950s as the beginning of a new age of the movement from practice to theory which is itself a form of theory. Heretofore, we have concentrated on either U.S. automation or the East European revolts. Now it turns out that this age's struggles for freedom in Namibia also began in 1951.

That is when the Hereros sent their first petition to the UN, which passionately exposed white Africa's claims to what they called

\* Humanities Press in the U.S. and Harvester in Britain just brought out new editions of Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution and will have the newest work off the press by October.

"the natives," trying to make the Namibians the "fifth province of South Africa." It took the UN until 1966 before they finally revoked South Africa's "mandate." It was in the period between 1950 and 1970 that revolutionaries like Mandela and Hendrick Witthoof and Sam Nujoma united in their fight against Western imperialism. The revolt gained its height directly after the Angolan revolution in 1974, with the emergence of SWAPO. Angola is where the present leader of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, lives now.

I have something else exciting to show you. We did add to the East European revolts the first of this age's revolutions in Latin America -- that in Bolivia in 1952; it was a very new type, indeed, as it united both the peasantry and the proletariat. Well, on August 10 of this year, in La Paz, there surfaced the great Aymara Indian labor leader, Genaro Flores Santos, head of the Unique Labor Confederation of Peasant Workers of Bolivia, representing no less than three million of the country's five and a half million people. It is true he was in a wheel chair. The military had gunned him down in one of the many murderous attacks on revolutionary leaders, would not allow him medical aid; he ended up paralyzed from the waist down after the attack a year ago. Just returned from medical treatment and exile in France, he was hardly welcomed back by the present military, who had agreed to meet with the current labor leader, Juan Lechin Oquenda, but called it off as soon as Lechin announced he was bringing Companero Flores along. As we can see, it is not only impossible to kill the Idea and the struggles for freedom; sometimes it is impossible physically to destroy the living person!

As against this exciting chapter of freedom, look at the shilly-shallying Reagan is playing with Namibia's future now, and take a second look at his certification of El Salvador's murderous regime -- which certification couldn't have been achieved without Democratic Party help, as is seen also in their present embrace of the tax increase, which is actually directed mainly against the masses. This should make even liberals recognize that their supposed near-victory on the nuclear freeze, not accidentally, in the end fell by the wayside.

Reagan's victory against nuclear freeze shows once again that there is no difference between the two capitalist parties. The near victory of those for nuclear freeze was not due to the demands of the capitalist ideologues for it, but to the phenomenal mass anti-nuclear demonstrations in the U.S., in Europe, in Japan, throughout the world.

Lest anyone have any illusions that Reagan's "pressuring" Begin to back away from the dehumanized continuation of the war in Lebanon meant opposition to Israel's invasion of Lebanon or the present attempt by Israel to saddle Lebanon with a fascist regime, it is necessary to remind them that that was precisely the U.S. position for Lebanon ever since the 1975-76 Civil War there. It isn't Reagan who stopped Begin. What actually stopped Begin is the totality of the world opposition and the emergence of an opposition within Israel that has appeared there, for the first time ever during an ongoing war. Weinberger is presently in deep sympathetic consultation with that other neo-fascist, Bashir Gemayel.

Israel is not, however, the only ally with whom U.S. imperialism has some differences. More serious than Israel is the fact that NATO itself has never been shakier. There is nothing short of an economic warfare going on between the U.S. and Japan, between the U.S. and West Europe, especially West Germany. Nor is it only what brought everything to a climax -- the Siberian pipeline. That certainly is important, but it is not the whole. You must remember that it means a great deal of economic aid to all of West Europe. And none more so than West Germany. We must not forget that no less than 47 percent of West Germany's trade is with East Europe as compared to only 14 percent with the European Economic Community and only 7 percent with the U.S., whereas no less than \$11 billion is involved in West Germany's involvement with the Siberian pipeline.

Generally speaking, inter-imperialist rivalry is not of any great interest to Marxists, even though looking for the weakest link in this rivalry does have importance for revolutionaries. In this case, however, it is not alone because it points to where its weakest link is, and thus creates possible new ways for revolutionaries to function. Rather, it is because we can not exclude the possibility

of yet another type of Hitler-Stalin Pact between Russia-Germany, any more than Mao was stopped from flirting with U.S. imperialism, even if it meant getting rid of Lin Biao and his Peoples' War concept -- i.e., surrounding the world with villages as the cities in China were surrounded by the peasantry in its civil war.

Presently, China is both looking at Hong Kong and carrying on a slight flirtation with Russia.\* As the Sino-Soviet Conflict has long revealed, the differences there were great enough for China to roll out the red carpet for Nixon, even if that meant breaking with the very leader who had been declared in the Constitution itself to be Mao's "closet-comrade-in-arms." It's not our business, as we have said, to be too concerned with inter-capitalist rivalries, state-capitalist, or private capitalist, or mixed economy. What is of the essence is that we keep our eyes glued to the movements from below, rather than the inter-imperialist rivalries.

And today nothing is more relevant than the ongoing revolt in Poland. Naturally, this has nothing to do with the way in which Reagan is carrying on his pretense of being for "freedom", but with the actual movement from below. And let us not for a second forget that this is occurring in the face of nothing short of martial law, and against the advice of the Catholic Church hierarchy. Moreover, that freedom struggle is characteristic of Poland not just now, nor even at the very start of the new age of the 1950s when East Europe began its struggle against Communist totalitarianism. Nor even as far back as when we alone hailed the Resistance Movement against fascism, as it reached its two highest points -- in 1943 when the Jewish ghetto rose up against Nazis; and in 1944 when all of Warsaw rose up against fascism and the Red Army allowed it to bleed to death but we declared: "All Roads Lead to Warsaw."

No, I'm referring to the fact that Marx -- at the very birth of his new continent of thought in 1844, which was also the year of the Silesian weavers' uprising -- had declared Poland the homeland that would be able to uproot Russian Tsarism. Rosa Luxemburg's.

---

\* Recently, Deng Xiaoping, in an interview with some leftwingers from Hong Kong, reminded Britain that the so-called Treaty of 1842, which had granted Hong Kong to Britain "in perpetuity," expired in 1977, and that China might very well want it back. (See Manchester Guardian, "Peking Aims to Regain Control of Hong Kong," Aug. 7, 1982.)



greatest error was to think that Marx's favoring national self-determination was due only to the fact that Poland, in his period, did not yet have a revolutionary Marxist movement, but that in her age, when it did, they could skip over that period of "nationalism" and proceed to an immediate proletarian revolution, and that as part of the Russian Revolution. At no time throughout his life had Marx diverted from supporting Poland's struggle, both as a genuine national liberation and as the homeland of 20 thousand heroes who fought in the Paris Commune in 1871. It is this type of nationalism that signifies the global mass struggles for freedom, which Frantz Fanon hailed as the signal for a "new Humanist world."

#### IV. THE CREATIVE NATURE OF MARX'S MIND AND THE TASKS OF MARXIST-HUMANISTS TODAY

"It is my desire that this history of Philosophy should contain for you a summons to grasp the spirit of the time which is present in us by nature..."

Hegel, Lectures on the History of Philosophy

"The intellectual movement now taking place in Russia testifies to the fact that fermentation is going on deep below the surface. Minds are always connected by invisible threads with the body of the people..."

Marx to Siegfried Meyer in New York, Jan. 21, 1871

##### 1. The Methodology of the Perspectives

Now then, what has philosophy, concretely, to do with the economic recession, the myriad political crises (of which we could take up only a few) and our tasks today? You, no doubt, noted that, instead of starting with the myriad objective crises, including wars, as we usually do, the Introduction barely touched them, using the references only as point of departure for posing the philosophic need for articulating not alone what one is against, but what one is for, whereupon I returned to the Political-Philosophic Letter on the 1975-76 Civil War in Lebanon as the test not only which the PLO failed to meet, but which the whole Left failed, thus leaving loopholes for the 1982 Israeli genocidal war in Lebanon.

Again, Section I, on that war and the opposition against all half-way houses, did not satisfy us just with descriptions and analy-

ses of "what is," but proceeded to the concretization of philosophy, its politicalization, which revealed the transformation into opposite, not in the usual way we project that as the transformation of the first workers' state, Russia, into a state-capitalist society, but this time as it was manifested in the difference between Palestine/Israel 1947-48 and Israel, 1982-83. At the same time, we warned the capitalist-imperialist ideologues not to forget the presence of a Third World and delude their masters into thinking they could continue to practice neo-colonialism just because, militarily, Britain won over Argentina in the Falklands/Malvinas.

Sections II and III, of course, did analyse the deep global economic recession anchored in Ronald Reagan's retrogressionist recession, including religion, as well as its imperialist outreach -- and did it so dialectically that you never saw it separate from the revolutionary opposition against it, whether that be Namibia <sup>today or in</sup> /1904. This Luxemburg had sensed that early both as Black dimension and as that new degenerate stage of capitalism -- imperialism -- which not only Blacks fought against, but so should Marxists. If the German Social-Democracy had not tried to avert their eyes and thereby disclosed their own opportunism, they would not have missed Luxemburg's flash of genius on imperialism. It certainly allowed us to know Namibia long before 1982 or 1951. Without directly mentioning the new book, we here got a whiff of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution -- and, at the same time, rejected Luxemburg's position on Poland and gained from Marx's position when revolutionary nationalism is internationalism. We could also trace the movement from practice in Bolivia, 1952/1982. Again, the objective situation made us also remember the "subjective" Marxism and Freedom, which first projected that original, dramatic, new category -- movement from practice to theory -- / when we broke through on the seemingly stratospheric Absolute Idea, integrating it with the actual movement from the 1950s as those three new pages of freedom opened in the U.S., East Europe/Vorkuta, and Montgomery, Alabama.

Altogether too many crises and wars abound and there is no way to know which one will be the next to erupt, which will have repercussions to which we will have to turn at once. But if we do practice our dialectics we should not have to ask: 1) how does the hiero-

glyphic "three books, not one" illuminate these crises? 2) how does the challenge to post-Marx Marxists affect our facing the objective situation now? In a word, Marx's philosophy is no abstraction and because that philosophy is concrete, it expresses the methodology needed for both analyzing serious crises and acting to uproot the system that created them.

First and foremost, we should keep in mind that every production crisis (as our age with its movement from practice has proved) produces also the crisis in theory --whether it is automation, which made workers ask the questions: what kind of labor should men and women do? why should there be this gap between mental and manual labor? -- or whether it is the peasantry, and not only the Bolivians just referred to, but in India. Even the World Bank (no radical it), in its World Economic Report this year, while admitting that "800 million live in absolute poverty," also had to say: "Far from being tradition-bound, the peasant farmers have shown that they share a rationality that far outweighs the differences in their social and ecological conditions." That is a great deal more to the point than Trotsky's great theory in nothing less important than the Manifesto for the Fourth International, where he speaks only of the backwardness of the peasantry, and Mao is not mentioned once.

At the same time, the non-Hegelian, non-Marxist concept of contradiction that Mao expounded with his "Bloc of Four Classes" has only proved that that type of alternative half-way house, even when it reaches its height in the Cultural Revolution, leads to still one more half-way house. More precisely put, it misleads. That is to say, instead of making a philosophy of revolution the alternative to the party-to-lead, Mao simply asked for "new" leaders like himself. As we showed in the Afro-Asian pamphlet, that type of non-alternative, that type of voluntarism, adventurism and administrative mentality has offered itself as leader of the Third World -- and left it in a half-way house.

Which is why Philosophy and Revolution exposed and abandoned so-called revolutionary Alternative Marxisms, whether Trotskyist or Maoist, both politically and philosophically by diving deep into Hegelian dialectics "in and for itself." Even Lenin, who did return

to Marx's origins in Hegel and thus created ground for us, had not carried through, in his reorganization, to the party-to-lead which our age demanded be ended, and to WL. What was needed was to recognize that Marx alone could transcend the Hegelian dialectic because he had not satisfied himself when he "translated" the Hegelian contradiction as class struggle, but had dived further into it after his 1844 discovery of a new continent of thought and of revolution -- not only in the Grundrisse but in Capital. In a word, Marx never departed from the Hegelian negativity as "the creative principle." That's how, after the defeat of revolutions as in victory, Marx called for "revolution in permanence." This is what Marx developed both in theory and in practice, in organization and in a philosophy -- a global philosophy. He went so far with his new moments in the last years of his life that he concluded that what we would now call the Third World need not follow the West's "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation."

If you read my new Introduction to the reprint of Philosophy and Revolution you noticed that I took issue both with Hegelians who disregarded Chapter 9 and with the Youth -- indeed, the pragmatic whole new generation of revolutionaries, including new Women's Liberationists -- who wished to skip Chapter 1 and go directly to Chapter 9; "The particular chapter that the activist youth were anxious to read first because they identified with those 'New Passions and New Forces' -- not only the Black dimension and anti-Vietnam War movement, but also WL and the challenge from the Left in China called Sheng Wu-lien-- was deceptively simple precisely because the struggles were so familiar to them. The truth, however, is that philosophy was as present there as it was in Chapter 1." At which point I quoted Frantz Fanon's articulation of African freedom struggles as being "not a treatise on the universal but the untidy affirmation of an original idea propounded as an absolute." He didn't leave it to others to concretize, but worked out a philosophy of liberation which he called "a new Humanism."

## 2) The Activities and the Philosophy of What To Do

At this final moment in outlining Perspectives, what concerns us, of course, is neither Trotsky, nor Mao, nor even the one we do follow, Marx, who is, unfortunately not physically alive. What we

must finally get down to are specific activities, both those specifically Marxist-Humanist (that is to say, those we take organizational responsibility for as Marxist-Humanism) and those activities with others in which we participate, but not uncritically. I'm referring to all coalition activities -- from Black dimension to Women's Liberation, from youth to Latino and anti-nuke and ecological movements. Let's spell out what "not uncritically" means by focusing on the force which has become an important political element in West Germany -- the Greens.

Even a John Vinocur, as New York Times correspondent, in summing up his five years in West Germany ("Germany's Season of Discontent," NYT Magazine, Aug. 8, 1982), sensed that for them "the pull of historical gravity doesn't seem to count." It is not a matter of not understanding the bourgeois reporter's venom in what he is saying, when he attributes to all the "Greens" such slanderous conduct as to hold that "Soviet behavior in East Europe must always be ignored if East and West Germany are to come together." Rather, it is a fact that some of the youth think so, that the very fact that some can attribute the division of Germany to a "plot" of the superpowers, U.S. especially, does manifest a failure to understand that "pull of historical gravity." And it is history that we are concerned with -- history of the past as it affects the present.

One of the frightening results this leads to is the appearance, in the same book, of essays by neo-Nazis like Helmut Diwald and by the left Social-Democrat, Peter Brandt. Another publication combines the extreme Right-winger, Peter Bender, and the left Social-Democrat, Oscar Lafontaine. It doesn't seem to dawn on them that it is this type of behaviour in some anti-nuke participants which makes Helmut Schmidt also want to jump on their bandwagon. West Germany's trade, we must remember, is mainly with East Europe, and Russia is a good "customer", too.

The anti-nuke movement is crucial in the anti-war movement and calls for our active participation, but at no time should active participation mean abandonment of the responsibility for principle, for projecting what philosophy must underpin the activity to assure it will not fall into the trap of amalgams which would, once again, force us to witness some sort of Hitler-Stalin type of pact.

No such outlandish possibility exists in the WIM. There, too, however, we must criticize some socialist feminists who satisfied themselves by proving that "tactically" the male comrades were ready to oppose the "immediate" demands of WL. As a matter of fact, as we showed in the letter to our WL-N&L Committees of Aug. 20, we had to stress -- after proving historically how much was lost by not following through WL as revolutionary force and Reason -- that "to achieve success in the revolution, it has to show, from the start, how total the uprooting of the old will be."

We must realize that answering the immediate questions likewise requires getting down to Marx's dialectical methodology. What is present in "three books, not one" is the presence of the creative nature of Marx's mind, manifested in the discovery of a whole new continent of thought and of revolution. The advantage of our age is that, at one and the same time, a movement from practice that was itself a form of theory was born with the objective situation of revolt, and that movement was caught as the immediate through the breakthrough on the Absolute Idea. It was proven in Marxism and Freedom where it could be carried through not alone for our age but for the age of revolutions -- industrial, political, philosophic -- which had begun with the French Revolution and Hegelian dialectic, and was recreated by Marx. The ground was laid for us to reveal its American roots as well as the world Humanist ramifications. As it happens, the link of continuity to the 42 years of Marx's creative discoveries, 1841 - 1882, separated by 100 years, was caught by us, 1941 - 1982.

The new work, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, rounds out that work -- not as Archives, but philosophy as action -- or more precisely put, as theoretic preparation for revolution. Our unique contributions are concretized this year, first, in "Have Thumb, Will Travel," both as a National Tour for the Chairwoman, and for each of us, nationally and internationally, to take organizational responsibility for projecting Marxist-Humanism. Concretely it focuses on the Black dimension, and has started already with Denby's trip to Alabama. You will hear his report tomorrow which will show that having Mike Connolly, the National

Co-Organizer, with him means that 1982-83 can continue what started with Indignant Heart, was carried on with the Montgomery Bus Boycott, and was never let go. It is seen also in the move of Lou Turner to the Center; it was already seen, as well, in Raymond McKay's participation in the Alabama March to Washington D.C. this summer; and in interviews with the head of the "Tchula 7," and Diane's correspondence with a Black feminist intellectual in New England.

The Draft Perspectives has spelled this out in the section on "New Moments in Marx and Today's New Challenges" -- and here I wish to draw your attention especially to the final paragraph of column 1, p. 12 of the July N&L, where the post-Marx Marxists are challenged; and the final paragraph of column 3 -- that is, the final paragraph of the whole Draft Perspectives, where we conclude: "...it is on this basis that we are asking those who agree with our principles to join us and take organizational responsibility for projecting Marxist-Humanism because, in truth, philosophy itself does not reach its full articulation until it has discovered the right organizational form. Philosophy, far from being an ego trip, is the result, the summation, of the epochal striving of the masses for freedom."

Finally, as always with us, criticism doesn't stop with criticizing others, but includes ourselves. The fact that I can no longer add paragraphs to Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, since it is now locked in print, has not stopped me from suggesting you add one more paragraph to the final page. Here then, is what we would have added -- if we were the publishers -- to the final chapter XII of the new book. It would come after the last sentence of the penultimate paragraph, which reads:

It is not a question only of meeting the challenge from practice, but of being able to meet the challenge from the self-development of the Idea, and of deepening theory to the point where it reaches Marx's concept of the philosophy of "revolution in permanence."

At this point add:

This is the further challenge to the form of organization which we have worked out as the committee-form rather than the "party-to-lead." But, though committee-form and "party-to-lead" are opposites, they are not absolute opposites. At the point when the theoretic-form reaches philosophy, the challenge demands that we synthesize not only the new relations of theory to practice, and all the forces of revolution, but philosophy's "suffering, patience and labor of the negative," i.e., experiencing absolute negativity. Then and only then will we succeed in a revolution that will achieve a class-less, non-racist, non-sexist, truly human, truly new society. That which Hegel judged to be the synthesis of the "Self-Thinking Idea" and the "Self-Bringing-Forth of Liberty," Marxist-Humanism holds, is what Marx had called the new society. The many paths to get there are not easy to work out.

We have entitled the Perspectives "What To Do" -- and we didn't mean by that only when facing objective crises, but in the need to single out the new moments in Marx and the "trail to the 1980s" which we discovered there. Put differently, that "discovery" was possible because: 1) finally we had all the writings of Marx as a totality; 2) we had lived through a 30-year-long movement from practice; and 3) our unique contributions to those three decades were inseparable from the objective movement. It becomes necessary now to spell out the hieroglyphic "three books, not one", which has created the ground for the challenge to all post-Marx Marxists, and to develop the moment the masses have reached in their search for a philosophy of revolution which would enable them to succeed in an actual revolution.

(The last paragraph of the book remains, as is:)

What is needed is a new unifying principle, on Marx's ground of humanism, that truly alters both human thought and human experience. Marx's Ethnological Notebooks are a historic happening that proves, one hundred years after he wrote them, that Marx's legacy is no mere heirloom, but a live body of ideas and perspectives that is in need of concretization. Every moment of Marx's development, as well as the totality of his works, spells out the need for "revolution in permanence." This is the absolute challenge to our age.

\* \* \*