

PERSPECTIVES REPORT TO THE
NATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD MEETING
OF NEWS & LETTERS COMMITTEES,
SEPTEMBER 4, 1971

NIXON AND MAO
AIM TO THROTTLE
SOCIAL REVOLUTION

by *Raya Dunayevskaya*
Chairman, News & Letters Committees

- I - By Way of Introduction
- II - World Crises (Real and Induced) : the Ground for
the Nixon-Mao Meeting
- III - Nixon's Greatest Hoax, "Jobs Development Act of
1971", is Same as Move Against Black Dimension
- IV - What to Do

POST-PLENUM BULLETIN NO.1, October 1971

PRICE 35¢

NEWS & LETTERS

1900 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. 49207

4472

PERSPECTIVES REPORT by National Chairman, News & Letters Committees
to full National Editorial Board Meeting
September 4, 1971

NIXON THE STUNT MAN, AND MAO THE ARTIFICER AIM FOR GLOBAL
CHANGE IN STATE-CAPITALISM AS "NEW" SYSTEM TO THROTTLE
SOCIAL REVOLUTIONS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

The artificer, therefore, combines the darkness of thought mated with the clearness of expression -- these break out into the language of a wisdom that is darkly deep and difficult to understand. -- Hegel, Phenomenology of Mind, p. 707.

...philosophy appears as subjective cognition, of which liberty is the aim and which is itself the way to produce it. But it is the nature of the fact, the notion, which causes the movement and development, yet this same movement is equally the action of cognition.

-- Hegel, Philosophy of Mind, pars. 576 7

The freedom in this field (material production) cannot consist of anything else but of the fact that socialized men, the associated producers, regulate their interchange with nature rationally, bring it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it ... Beyond it begins that development of human power, which is its own end..."

-- Karl Marx, Capital Vol. III
p. 954

I - By Way of Introduction

II - World Crises (Real and Induced): the Ground for the Nixon-Mao Meeting

III - Nixon's Greatest Hoax, "Jobs Development Act of 1971", is Same as Move Against Black Dimension

IV- What to Do

Perspectives Report by National Chairman, NEWS & LETTERS COMMITTEES
to the full National Editorial Board Meeting, Sept. 4, 1971

NIXON, THE STUNT MAN, AND MAO, THE ARTIFICER, AIM
FOR GLOBAL CHANGE IN STATE-CAPITALISM AS "NEW"
SYSTEM TO THROTTLE SOCIAL REVOLUTIONS --

by Raya Dunayevskaya

I BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION

By way of introduction, I'd like to say that, similarity of form notwithstanding, the quotations that head this Report have not been put there for the same reason as the philosophical quotations that head the Draft Perspectives Thesis. When the latter was discussed in the REB, it was felt that, since this was the year of the completion of Philosophy and Revolution, we should at once begin with practicing dialectics. In a word, the reason for using the Marx and Lenin quotations (and also Hegel) was "subjective."

For today's report, on the other hand, I felt that, since we were spending the afternoon as well as some time tomorrow to discuss the whole book, I should, instead, go straight toward an analysis of the objective situation. However, I no sooner began gathering the latest news items with that in mind, when what hit me was that the journalists who were fully committed to pragmatism, not to mention the view that nothing is deader than yesterday's newspaper, were suddenly all spouting philosophy. They had discovered the year, 1920, as the year that best illuminated the problems of the day in the Orient.

Indeed, one (Sulzberger) referred to Lenin's "brilliant prognostication" on Iceland, another (Chester Bowles) wrote that if we really wish to understand West Pakistan (though no such country existed in Lenin's day) it would be best to ponder over Lenin's insistence that the pivot of the world had moved from West to East, from white to the color that represented the overwhelming majority of the world. A third (James Reston) brought the whole question of philosophy into the interview with Chou En-lai. Not that anyone was expounding Lenin's concept of world revolution. The absolute opposite was the case, of course. Brazenly, like Mao, they denuded revolutionary concepts of their class nature, set up nationalistic, geographic designations in their stead, and off they all went into the wild blue yonder with their philosophy. Nevertheless, clearly, philosophy is objectively in the air -- not for the reasons they cite, however. Rather it is the objective hunger of the age for theoretic expression that is there manifested. Indirectly, that is what James Reston admitted to: "In my own country there are great changes taking place, philosophical and political." (NYT 8/10/71)

It isn't that they were discussing revolutionary philosophy; it is that they felt compulsion to discuss philosophy as if in response to big movements from below for change rather than merely to set the stage for the Big Power realignments.

For that matter, the dispatch from Washington also kept up the philosophical pretence. "Conceptually," Tad Szulc wrote (NYT 8/11/71), "Premier Chou's statements were encouraging because they appear to have been made in a spirit

3

-2-

similar to that underlying President Nixon's assessment of the situation."

We don't doubt that at all.

Conceptually or otherwise, the kinship of Mao and Nixon is that of state-capitalism. Shocking as that may sound for a cold war warrior of the private capitalist variety to find himself in, it is Nixon himself who took the initiative in this enterprise. Such is the nature of our state-capitalist age. Such is the compulsion that drives rulers looking for new ways to throttle emerging social revolutions.

There could, however, be no greater underestimation of the task of revolutionaries in these startling reversals of foreign policies, than to think that all that is needed now is to point to the "good old saying" that politics makes strange bedfellows, as we saw when Khrushchev-Eisenhower bedded down at Camp David in 1959 and thus laid a basis for the Sino-Soviet orbit to turn into the Sino-Soviet conflict.

It is true that Mao-Nixon are only planning an Eastern version of the post-war attempts at realignment of ruling powers. Ever since Yalta, when Roosevelt-Stalin decided the fate of Europe without its presence, and repeated the same decision-making process for China, that has become a standard that hardly fools the masses.

It is not true that Mao has no more going for him than either Stalin or Khrushchev had. The "little red book" may not be quite the fetish the Black Stone of Mecca was, but, even as the artificer that Hegel described (in the preceding quotation), Mao knows well how to mate "clearness of expression" with the "darkness of thought". As disastrous as Mao's Cultural Revolution ended for the Chinese masses, it continues to exert a pull on the Left abroad. A little Marxism goes a long way, and Mao, the poet, knows well how to dress retrogressionism in revolutionary rhetoric.

Therein lies the danger for revolutionaries in general, and for the anti-Vietnam War movement in particular.

Let us now test the philosophy of liberation against the objective world crisis demanding solution.

4475

II WORLD CRISES (REAL AND INDUCED)
THE GROUND FOR THE NIXON-MAO MEETING

So real are the world crises that in this period of "peace", a quarter century after World War II has ended, the world is spending no less than \$220 billion annually on militarization! Indeed, the only reason we have thus far had only "little wars" instead of another world war is that this time a world war would be nuclear, and this would spell the end of civilization as we have known it.

So real have the world crises continued to be at the end of that holocaust, that even the one victor who remained standing on its feet, the unchallenged Goliath the world over -- the U.S. -- has been incapable of establishing any Pax Americana. The absolute opposite is the case.

So real are the world crises, including those in the industrial-military-nuclear complex, that this Behemoth has not been able to win even over little Vietnam.

Nor is it a question of a defeat rather than a victory. Rather, the totality of the crisis -- both abroad and at home -- is such that the lifeline of capitalism itself is at stake. Thus, not since the end of the Korean War has the U.S. been faced with so much unemployment and inflation and such a stagnant economy, automated production and flights to the moon notwithstanding. "Affluence" only places racism on as taut, as shaky a foundation as the U.S. has not been subjected to since the Civil War.

Were we, even for the moment, to exclude the possibility of a social revolution -- and it is such fears which transformed the President into a stunt man -- were we even to exclude the new passions and new forces hungering to uproot capitalism, and keep the view of the crisis confined to inter-capitalist relations, it would still be a fact that not only is the U.S. being challenged by the other nuclear titan, Russia, that has moved into the Middle East with a sweep the Tsars only dreamed about, but the U.S. is also being challenged by its private capitalistic allies -- West Europe and Japan whom it has put on their economic feet after very nearly total destruction in World War II. It isn't that these countries aren't undergoing crises. The truth is -- as the reappearance of neo-fascism in Italy has reminded us -- that not a single fundamental problem was solved by World War II.

As I wrote in News & Letters on the Nixon-Mao visit (and N&L this issue is part of our Perspectives Thesis): A generalized global state of economic stagnation keeps the world in social crisis moving in a circle of perpetual economic recessions, phenomenal militarization, actual wars, and back again down the same path of crisis... Not only has it been impossible to industrialize the technologically underdeveloped countries that are in chronic crises, but the Big Powers themselves, be they nuclearly armed like the U.S. and Russia, or in a forced state of non-militarization and experiencing "miraculous" rates of growth, like West Germany and Japan, can nevertheless not reach "full automation", much less full employment, not to mention that, without militarization, they do not carry weight in this imperialist world.

Japan is finding out the hard way. Japan has made the greatest strides

in economic growth (and it wasn't only via U.S. aid). It has been true ever since it entered the path of industrialization via governmental hothouse -- the State Plan. (Back in 1937 when Russia claimed nationalized property = workers' state = greatest production growth, I pointed out that, with its so-called "Co-Prosperity Sphere", Japan achieved as much and more. You should restudy that chapter of comparative growth on a global scale during the Depression and preparations for World War II in Marxism and Freedom to know the nature of this stage of capitalism.)

Japan did have a much greater rate of growth than the U.S. in this decade of the 1960's. That mattered little to Nixon. Japan had to be taught a lesson even if Nixon had to induce an economic and political crisis. The stunt man went to town -- a town in the sense in which Lin Piao had used in his famous 1965 speech on war, i.e. the town was the whole globe.

Nixon no sooner pulled the political shock of the postwar era in announcing his trip to Peking than he followed through with global economic changes -- and this time inside the American economy package.

First came the induced gold crisis. In any case, lowering his voice and keeping it brittle, "our Hero" came to the rescue of the poor little dollar held captive by "speculators": "I am determined that the American dollar must never be a hostage in the hands of the international speculators." So until they learn to behave, out the window went the attached gold standard! So much for Gaullian holiness about gold.

What a bluff. What the dollar is hostage of is the American military. What Nixon has to do is stop that Vietnam war to take the inflation out of the gold-backed dollar. Once capital would be not for destruction, that is, unrealizable values, it could go into production instead. But who is there to tell him, when shaking the American economy might impair the whole structure of world capitalism? West Germany? Israel? Japan? After they have just been thrown that curve -- possible U.S. alignment with China?

Next, Nixon slapped a 10% tax on imports. Aimed both at West Germany and Japan, it hit Japan hardest, since no less than 30% of its trade is with the U.S. Not only that. Most of Japan's Asian trade is based on the Asian rulers' belief that Japan will be the political power in the Pacific as it is its economic giant. Japan itself had every capitalistic right to believe that, as it set about to implement the Nixon Doctrine. The Draft Thesis, you'll recall, made reference to the fools'paradise that all the reactionary Asian rulers built as they set about planning for after 1975 when a "residual force" of no less than 25,000 Americans would help assure them a cheap and docile labor force.

Now that all old alliances are up for grabs, will that, too, have to be scrapped? Even Russia, after decades of procrastination, has spurred forward to conclude a Berlin agreement.

Yet, yet, yet...

Not only is everything still very tenuous. Not only can much happen that will once again reverse all sides. Not only are there things that are not Mao's to give, as the Vietcong-North Vietnamese have shown by insisting that Paris, not

-5-

Peking, is the place to bargain. Without a way to get out of Vietnam in what Nixon calls an "honorable" way, the U.S. anti-Vietnam War movement will see to it that the 1972 election will surely not be Nixon's.

But, above, all, what about China? Surely, it hasn't invited Nixon just to assure Nixon his 1972 victory! To China, Japan isn't the mere arrogant competitor Nixon wishes to discipline. Japan is the industrial giant of Asia. It started World War II against China two years in advance of WWII. Then there is that other giant, Russia, the contiguous and ideological Enemy No. One, i.e. state-capitalist and worldly as China herself.

And, first and foremost, is that internal crisis. Recently Chou was practicing the English understatement as he admitted (interview with Edgar Snow, published in Epoch, 2/71) that the Cultural Revolution had caused chaos and "una certa diminuzione" in production. No figures were given to show just "how little". He claimed all plans had been fulfilled, but without giving figures, this time not even about population, though on all other occasions, 700 millions is always thrown about to show that China is one-fourth of the world's population. In any case, he did admit it was "technologically backward" (indeed, he said also culturally backward!), and that it was a "poor country", not to mention what a very poor standard of living exists for the masses!

It is clear that the economic crisis is every bit as crucial as any foreign crisis. Of Reston, Chou asked many questions about the billions sunk into the Marshall Plan (and were they ever paid back? asked Chou). That interview was before Nixon threw out the magic figure of \$143 billion* (without ever specifying what was for military and what for economic aid), but it was not without Chou knowing that the Marshall Plan, even as economic aid, was for throttling emerging revolutions! *for aid to Europe and Asia since WWII

Ever since 1968, when the "Cultural Revolution" had disclosed a genuine opposition from the Left to Mao's rule -- the Sheng-wu-lien among others whom they called "ultra left", who wanted changes from below, not from the top, changes of a class character; ^{whom} who transcended facticalism like that between Mao and Liu within leadership the Left designated as "Red Bourgeoisie" indistinguishable from "revisionism" -- who wanted revolutionary changes that would transform state-capitalism and make China a genuine "Commune" such as Marx described in the Paris Commune -- Mao's China used the military to destroy this Opposition, and began retreating also by "rebuilding the Party." In a word, establishing "law and order" at home and class-collaborationism abroad.

By 1969 they had drawn up a New Constitution which, at one and the same time, cited Russia by name as Enemy No. One and designated General Lin Piao as the one to replace Mao should the latter die. They had begun sending out feelers to Nixon very nearly as soon as he gained the Presidency, and like W.C. Field's Barkley, Nixon "was willing." But Nixon's invasion, first of Cambodia and then Laos, made the Big Power play then impossible. But there were ways to rebuild foreign fences broken down during the Cultural Revolution.

There is hardly a place on earth that Mao's China isn't playing power politics, be it with the fascistic generals in West Pakistan actually practicing genocide on East Pakistanis, or trading with South Africa as well as the military junta in Greece; be it with "left" Palestinian "Liberation Front" and the sudden

: 4478

love they discovered for Czechoslovakia whom they had previously declared to be the worst of the revisionists, or paying court to the Shah of Iran; and now it is, at one and the same time, talking about being all out for the Vietcong and North Vietnam while choosing Yayah Kahn to be the intermediary to arrange for the secret meeting with Nixon, whom they now find "less bad".

If this is not a super-power play for world "mastery", it is playing global politics and not just "nationalism" vs. Russia, whom they now declare to be "storm-troopers of the world." That, indeed, was the key point of the so-called Cultural Revolution --teaching Mao's own leadership that, not the U.S., but Russia, was Enemy No. One. As they love to talk of "four firsts", they can, should the U.S. deal fall through, have a place for it. Meanwhile, Japan will do as "second" first. And they never forget, as any capitalist, private or state, never forgets, that the "enemy" is at home: their own masses. Whether India will be the "fourth first", or whether they will leave a lot of blank spaces for all sorts of possible changes, as of now Nixon is not only "less bad", but they are toying even with the idea of selling ^{U.S.} the fraternal ally, North Vietnam.

That surely is a fundamental reason for Nixon's trip to Peking -- to see whether Mao cannot save the 1972 election for him, and after, by allowing what Nixon calls an "honorable" way out of the disastrous war which he has lost not only militarily, but also politically. And not only the world over, but especially in the U.S., where the indigenous anti-Vietnam war movement has helped create a whole new generation of revolutionaries. The immediate and long term enemy for Nixon is the American masses.

The stagnating economy is a primary reason. So is what has rightfully been called "competitive decadence", that is to say, the struggle for world mastery be it against Russia, or China, or whomever U.S. capitalism will choose "suddenly" to declare "the enemy", East or West, North or South. The endless "little wars" -- whether like the Korean war and the Dominican invasion which they dub "police actions", or the Vietnam war and the Congo which they never bother to declare at all -- as the U.S. continues with its ceaseless preparations for the Big War tomorrow -- cannot but lead to war against the American masses yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

The price Mao is asking for attempting that betrayal is alliance with, or at least "understanding of" the thesis that Russia is Enemy No. One. Along with it, it would be good to break up Japan's economic and military preponderance in Asia. But Russia is Enemy No. One.

III NIXON'S GREATEST HOAX, "JOBS DEVELOPMENT ACT"
IS SAME AS MOVE AGAINST BLACK DIMENSION

Nothing, absolutely nothing, not even the Nixon-Mao meeting that may very well reshuffle all world relations among the rulers of the world, is as fundamental, internationally as well as nationally, as Nixon's economic strait-jacket sprung on the American people on Sunday, August 15. The greatest of all stunts -- and Nixon as stunt man carries a great deal more weight than any of P.T. Barnum's stunt men -- was the wage-freeze/capital-boost, ^{the} Fort Knox-shutdown and imports-lockout. was subordinate to that, and the no-freeze-on-profits predominated over all.

All were pegged to ^{the} incentive-hopped-up Automated technology which Nixon euphemistically called "Job Development Act of 1971". It is the state-capitalist, economist counter-part to the infamous Taft-Hartley anti-labor Act.

Now that the "Labor Leadership" has found its tongue to shout its opposition to "inequities", point to the all-too obvious attack against labor, and the bonanza for Big Business, they're busy "threatening" actions after the wage-freeze deadline, as if that deadline wasn't extended before ever the 90 day freeze was announced. The bureaucrats are making it appear that they will initiate mammoth actions against the Government. The masses are ready, of that there is no doubt. But nothing could be further from the truth than to think that the labor bureaucracy will actually engage in serious anti-Government actions, much less a general strike.

Not a single labor leader -- not even the most militant and independent Myra Wolfgang, who has called for a one-day general strike -- has criticized the state-capitalist concept of "labor productivity" that is the very soul, or more precisely put, the motive force of capitalistic production: extraction of ever higher amounts of unpaid pours of labor through ever more automated speed demons called machines.

A careful look at the infamous package deal shows, however, that not only has Nixon frozen wages without freezing profits; not only has he given an extra bonanza to Big Business by moving into protectionism for it as against foreign business; not only has he invented something totally new which, for once, he does correctly call "the strongest incentive in our history", but he tells Big Business what to use that so-called "job development credit" for. It is not for jobs. It is neither to cut unemployment nor to assure workers on jobs that they will keep them. Quite the contrary. The little word that tells the real story is "competitive." What Nixon calls "competitive spirit" is actually the way not only to bind the worker to the automated machine by speedup, but also to keep him competing with cheap labor anywhere in the world.

In a word, labor productivity, exploitation of Labor by Capital. Capital is getting a 10% investment incentive (as if it didn't already get all those unpaid hours of labor from the working men and women) which is earmarked, not for jobs, not for people, but for "new machinery and equipment."

At the same time, added to this bonanza, is the money due labor that the capitalist keeps though he finally was compelled to grant wage increases in labor contracts. Labor in all the basic industries struck and did without wages to win the little they were granted by long -- too long -- negotiations. The cost-of-living increases always follow, never lead, inflation.

-8-

This isn't all, but this is so raw that I saw that Business Week (8/28/71) advised such inequities be "corrected". Otherwise, the Administration, "would surely throw the country in turmoil."

Nixon spoke as if the closing of the doors of Fort Knox would not decrease the workers' wage, would hurt only those bad "international speculators" (without mentioning how many of these are not "foreigners", but American Big Business betting against the Government). It is supposed further to help the "consumers" since the auto manufacturers are gaining from the 10% import tax on foreign autos as well as removal of the excise tax. But in truth, the consumer gained from being able to buy cheaper autos or shoes or toys, whereas now he will be confronted with a more total monopoly than in the early industrialism when the State kindly hot-housed capital growth by protectionism.

But it is not the consumer, but the producer, i.e. labor, that will lose out on all fronts. For the only way some jobs will finally trickle down is the raise in labor productivity. As Nixon put it, "make our goods more competitive in the years ahead." (my emphasis, rd)

To the word, competitive, has now been added the time element -- not 90 days, but "years". The shock treatment was for the workers; from capital he expected no 90 day miracles. For them he assures -- as if it was his to give -- labor as cheap as Japan's in the years to come. The 10% investment incentive this year will be followed by a 5% incentive for constantly automating production at the cheapest going rate anywhere on the world market.

The putrescence of the package is tied with a red, white and blue ribbon of patriotism. He tells you that if you "buy American-made products in America your dollar will be worth just as much tomorrow as it is today." And that is the biggest lie of all, as phony as a \$3 bill, except a great deal more is involved than three dollars. Just how much more can be seen from the war expenditures -- no less than \$80 billion is being asked for the military, though not only is the Vietnam War supposedly being ended, but we are being promised nothing short of a "generation of peace."

It is no accident that while Nixon is ready to give something -- to Mao, he gives nothing, nothing at all, to the Blacks. On the contrary, he is winding the clock totally backwards on even so small a matter as school bussing, which even his Supreme Court had to approve. Racism has ever been the touchstone of so-called American civilization. To get that 1972 election in the still unenfranchised South, Nixon must out-Wallace Wallace.

On the other hand, if white labor is to win any battles against Nixon, it will be via recognition of the vanguard role of the Black masses, both historically and right now. Thus, 1) Black union chiefs have already announced they will hold companies to honoring their contracts. Thus, 2) the proletarian nature of Black Women's Liberation makes it possible for the struggle to move to new political levels if Shirley Chisholm could be run for President, independently.

In any case, whether or not Black politicians will move, there is no doubt about the hunger for a synthesis of theory and practice in Black women. Just as the Black masses will struggle to free Angela Davis, not because she is a Communist, but because she is Black, a woman, an intellectual whom Nixon-Reagan is anxious to destroy, so they admire the Black Panthers as an "equalizer" to racism. But neither

4481

support limits their search for a philosophy so comprehensive that it contains a new synthesis of theory and practice, philosophy and revolution, thought and action inseparable from organization. Such an organization they will "join" en masse because it will be their creation that will put an end to the separation of leader and mass, mental and manual labor, the struggle for the new society inseparable from the destruction of the old.

As one Black woman wrote us: "I'm not thoroughly convinced that Black Liberation the way it's being spelled out, will really and truly mean my liberation. I'm not so sure that when it comes time 'to put down my gun', that I won't have a broom shoved in my hands, as so many of my Cuban sisters have."

We'll be discussing the Black dimension at length tomorrow, when we hear John Alan's report on the new Black pamphlet. Here we limited ourselves to tracing the dialectics of that dimension as the Transition Point to the projection of Marxist-Humanism into all our activities. Let us, in conclusion, turn to the dialectics of development in just the two brief months between the Draft Perspectives and this, its final version, as we have to work out what to do during the year ahead.

-10-

IV WHAT TO DO

"Individualism which lets nothing interfere with its Universalism, i.e. freedom." -- Hegel

Not since Stalin's death have so many new points of departure opened up as Nixon moved against Labor as well as against Black. When the Draft Thesis was completed the first week in July, the Pentagon Papers seemed to open a new stage of activity for the anti-Vietnam war movement. Though we knew nothing of Kissinger's secret trip to Peking that was to take Nixon off the hot seat, we warned against letting the publication of those secret papers divert us from 1) the class nature of war; and 2) the work needed to show that peace will come only through social revolution.

Moreover, War and Revolution continued, without a philosophy as well as the principle of social revolution, even revolutionaries end by tailing one or the other pole of state-capitalism, as the Trotskyists did both during WWII and again during the Korean War. Therefore, to really work for social revolution meant never to let go of the unity of theory and practice as the ground for action.

Then came Nixon's 100 percent turn in foreign policy. The reason we could proceed to an immediate analysis, not just of what was immediate, but point to its integrality to Perspectives was due not only to our theoretic preparation on the specific question of Maoism but also, and above all, to the concept of philosophy as determinant of organization.

Again, though we knew nothing at all about that cold war warrior's practice of shock treatment following upon shock treatment, this time the turn in China policy to be followed by his economics package against labor, we again -- by sticking to the dialectics of liberation, beginning with native passions and forces for reconstruction of society -- wrote the section "The Answer is at Home" so that we needed to do nothing when final shock came, and the paper was already locked up, other than to add a bare announcement of an analysis next issue of Nixon's economist version of the Taft-Hartley anti-Labor Law.

What the dialectic of July-August manifests is that the unity of theory and practice which begins with theory becomes the ground for activity, that is, spells out: What to do.

Why, indeed, should the theoretic power of philosophy be only theoretical? Why shouldn't we exercise that power in class struggles, in Black struggles, in the anti-Vietnam War movement, in youth and Women's Liberation struggles? Why, in a word, not project Marxist-Humanist philosophy organizationally as the power that it is both as the form for eliciting from the masses their thoughts and projecting Marxist-Humanist Perspectives to them? Only in unity will the forward movement of humanity be assured without detours to existing state powers that double up their tongues with revolutionary rhetoric.

Why should the fact that News & Letters Committees make no pretense to being a party, and indeed reject, totally, the concept of the vanguard party to lead, inhibit the projection of a philosophy of liberation as if there is no

-11-

alternative to vanguard partyism? Philosophy is the organization of thought and determines the reason for being, i.e. News & Letters Committees. There is no spontaneous action ever that didn't find a form of organization when it came to be.

Isn't this what the masses have been telling us -- ever since 1950 when miners in the U.S. organized informal committees "to lead" their general strike after the union leadership bowed out? Again, in 1953 when East Germans threw down the statue of Stalin as well as the Party? And again in China in 1968 when an opposition arose against the "Red bourgeoisie" and its Army as well as its Party?

All we have to do is to project that philosophy and that new form of organization -- Committees, the type of Committees, however, that are governed by a body of ideas. Why not act? Why not do it? Why keep the organizational form a "secret"?

Let us look at the tragedy of the death of George Jackson. As against Che who became a martyr while sowing illusions of shortcuts to revolution, this revolutionary was forced by that Devil's prison run by Reagan to his actions. Anyone who heard the warden of that infamous penal colony knows what a dangerously armed moron is like. And to think that so sensitive and profound a man as Jackson had to bow and be brutalized by such a monster makes one's blood boil, and know in his heart of hearts that he or she would have preferred death. Without a shred of doubt that characteristic state institution of Reagan's California harbored the murderers, the political assassins matched only by Nazism. And no one would dare to have told Jackson he should have done this and not that to remain alive.

But for us to really tear down that Bastille, something more -- a great deal more serious than either the Black Panther's gun manual or the Weatherman Underground's bombs -- and even a great deal more than prison rebellion -- is needed. Whether they delude themselves that thereby they "make" the revolution, or not, it is hardly what Jackson -- who discovered Marx in that hell-hole -- would have considered the proper tribute to his aspiration for remaking the world, and not just its prisons.

It isn't because Marx was an intellectual that he defined praxis as "revolutionary, critical-practical activity". Rather, Marx considered critical thought as crucial an activity as the deed itself, because it is the preparation for the deed, the type of preparation which makes theory a power because it assures the revolution's victory. We have had altogether too many defeats! And the half century of defeats since Lenin's death demands we learn the one way, the only way, that defeat in 1905 was transformed into victory in 1917, when in facing defeat rather than deluding oneself with the thought that martyrdom is victory -- and thus reorganizing one's very mode of thought through Hegelian dialectics -- one finally knew how to be there, so that the spontaneous revolutionary elemental outburst had the philosophic anchorage that kept it from detour from within the Movement as well as from the frontal attack of capitalism.

Take Jackson again. Take time again, this very moment, both as present and as filling the void in time itself this past half century, and follow the dialectic of Jackson, the Individual who hungered so to let nothing interfere with his Universalism, freedom, and see whether that doesn't spell out:

-12-

1) the Black Dimension as vanguard, which at this very moment is also expressing itself as Black Caucus out to make sure of battling Nixon's schizophrenic hop-skip-and-jump between quieting Mao and the all-out attack on Labor and Black. We have an urgent task in getting our Black Pamphlet out rapidly.

2) White Labor, which for the first time in many a year is mad enough to want to act. That will no doubt be our most important work over the next year, making sure that the many-sidedness of this work is not only muscle, but Reason. Without waiting for the next issue of N&L, though that will come off the presses long before the end of the wage-freeze, we should next week appear at as many factory gates as possible both with N&L and a leaflet specifically directed to labor, which at the same time not only mentions the new edition of Marxism and Freedom just off the press, but quotes it. May I suggest (p.148 of M&F) the section where Marx is quoted as saying that the U.S. "masses are quicker and have greater political means in their hands to resent the form of progress accomplished at their expense" and my conclusion that "In their attitude to Automation, the American workers are concretizing this (Marxism as liberation) for America" as Lenin had done it for Russia.

3) In the anti-Vietnam War movement the year will be critical both before Nixon goes, as he prepares, when he is there, and when he returns, for it is our crucial task to project the Marxist-Humanist philosophy which says there is no way to peace except through social revolution, and to develop that totally, in differentiation within the Left.

4) Women's Liberation -- why cannot a woman with a Black man like Denby address a letter to Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm saying: you must run for president as woman, as Black, as anti-war in these times when the Jacksons die; but the Reagans meet with that other Californian, Nixon.

Finally, let us return to the beginning. Philosophy being a circle, not a straight line, the going back to the beginning means not retreat, but the return to the concrete, richer, fuller, ready to make of the battle of ideas the battle for a new, a human life. By way of introduction, I started with stressing the objectivity of philosophy, that human activity which no materialist before Marx understood was as objective as production itself.

By way of conclusion, I wish to stress the subjectivity of the acts of cognition that include its organization and therefore committees, be they of workers or intellectuals, youth or adult, WL or Black, in prison or out of it, who are a unified whole because they are all revolutionaries.

That is why, in talking of Jackson, I quoted from Hegel what fitted him like a glove: "Individualism which lets nothing interfere with its Universalism, i.e. freedom." This is the key that will unlock many doors when we get to the philosophy session, and try to work out the last hurdle in breaking down the division between Notion and Reality which, says Hegel, rests in Subjectivity and Subjectivity alone. The Movement is richer than any and all of its political expressions. The hunger of our age for theory is philosophic, i.e. total.

This is your role, our task, each one's responsibility -- each one, that is, who wants to make sure that freedom is not just an Idea, but Reality.

-- Raya Dunayevskaya
Detroit, Mich., Sept. 4, 1971

4485