

4 3 6 5

REB Draft Thesis

1969 PERSPECTIVES

WORLD CRISES AND THE  
NEEDED AMERICAN REVOLU-  
TION

---

Pre-Plenum Bulletin No. 1 -- July, 1969

NEWS & LETTERS

415 Brainard St. Detroit, Mich.

PRICE 25c

4365

REB DRAFT THESIS1 9 6 9 P E R S P E C T I V E S :  
WORLD CRISES AND THE NEEDED AMERICAN REVOLUTIONI. Nixon's Attempts to Roll Back History, and the Opposing Forces

The Nixon Administration has stripped off its sham "bring us together-ness" with unseemly haste. This shows more than the long savage hand of South Carolina's Strom Thurmond collecting his pay for delivering the South to the Republicans. A look at U.S. imperialism will help illuminate the depth of racist reaction the President intends to impose within the country. The demonstrations against Rockefeller's sojourn to Latin America, as Nixon's "special representative" left no doubt that it is not one single party or one single person, who is evoking the opposition to the foreign rulers as well as the class nature of U.S. imperialism. The mass hostility to the U.S. horrors of imperialist exploitation of Latin America is so total that even the military juntas that the U.S. props up had to withdraw their invitations to Rockefeller.

Nixon's tokenism in the "withdrawal" of American troops from South Vietnam fooled no-one, either as a genuine withdrawal of the massive 555,000 troops, or as a withdrawal of support from its puppet -- the Thieu-Ky regime -- much less created any optimism that peace was on the horizon. The shakiness of Wall Street reflects this lack of confidence and points to probable recession in the coming months. Nowhere, indeed, did the double-tongued Nixon stand as starkly naked as on the domestic front where he is trying to roll history's clock backward to the McCarthyite-Goldwater 1950 period. At one and the same time, Nixon is hitting out against the youthful rebels and chipping away at black voting rights, employment openings, desegregated education. At the other pole stand the rebels. Color and youth are the obvious new dimensions, not merely of a refusal to be integrated into this racist, class society, but of the unfolding of a new society-to-be, which doesn't mean that this road will be an easy one to hew out.

Heading the military-industrial complex in the U.S. is Nixon, who obviously considers even the tortoise pace, charted by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954, as too fast for his administration, which is heavily indebted, both to the military-industrial complex and the white backlash for its electoral victory, to follow. The hostility to all labor (and in this case, especially to white skilled labor) on the part of this administration, is due to labor's refusal to abide by wage and price "guidelines" at a time when the really smart millionaires don't even have to pay taxes. Because this is the section of labor that is the more affluent, and the more organized, Nixon is trying to muffle the hostility while throwing out hints all over the place that if labor doesn't "voluntarily" follow these lines, "controls" would have to be imposed by the government. In addition to its racism and hostility to labor, the administration is displaying a willed impotence in fighting run-away inflation. At the same time, reaction deludes itself into thinking that it can forever throttle the American revolution before ever it emerges.

It is impossible, however, to stop the ongoing black and youth revolts. Indeed, there are all sorts of signs on the horizon that we have a developing situation, objectively and subjectively, which could lead to revolutionary developments. The unfortunate part here is that some self-styled leaders are helping to bring about disarray in the movement. It is not, however, by any means only an American development. Rather, it reflects a new hybrid -- mini-Maoism -- prevalent among radicals everywhere, and because it was France, which had in 1968 written the most glorious page in the revolutionary history of a technologically advanced country, it is to that country that we will turn to grasp the full implications, both of the missed revolutionary situation, and the new phenomenon of mini-Maoism.

## II. France and the Mini-Maoists

No event has ever been more voluminously written <sup>about</sup> so soon after the happening as has the near-revolution in France, May 1968. No doubt that is the penalty of the involvement of many intellectuals. The voice of the workers, however, is barely heard in these massive tomes. Even those who wrote about the workers, and stressed that, without them, a revolution cannot succeed, were not letting the workers speak for themselves, much less regard them as Subject who would reconstruct society on totally new foundations. Far from working out a new relationship of theory to practice rooted in that proletarian experience, the intellectuals were too ready to conclude that the missed revolutionary situation was rooted in the workers' alleged reformism.

It would be the sheerest self-delusion to conclude that the French proletariat is "backward", and that it is now up to the "grouplets" and the students youth "to will the revolution" and to ordain, for the masses, "barricades before dialectics." Already, ominous signs emanate from the deep gulf separating France, 1969, saddled with Gaullism without DeGaulle, from France, 1968, when ten million workers and thousands upon thousands of revolutionary students marched together and shook DeGaulle's regime to its foundations. It is true that the aborted revolution shows itself not only in the electoral victory of Pompidou, but also in the resilience of the French Communist Party, the very instrument which throttled the revolutionary situation. But an equally inescapable truth is that the revolutionary leaders had not come up with a philosophy in which the workers figured as anything but "followers." The workers saw nothing fundamentally different in the different "leaderships." Thus, the Trotskyists who fought militantly, and the Communists who sabotaged the proletarian mass movement, equally held on to the concept of a "vanguard party to lead". Thus the Anarchists and Anarcho-Syndicalists who rejected the concept of "vanguard party" nevertheless alleviated "grouplets" to as high a place, without expounding any new philosophy of revolution, leaving theory to be picked up "en route". Thus, the Maoists straddled the fence between the three positions but called upon all "to dare to revolt, to dare to win" as if triumphant counter-revolution had not won without the need to even fire a shot.

This was not the first time in history when theory was incapable of meeting the challenge of the actions of the masses from below. In his day,

Lenin referred to the fact that the world war had not only brought with it the betrayal by the established International, but had "suppressed" the thought of genuine revolutionaries (Bukharin and Pyatakov were mentioned by name) who raised their "leftism" above the "backwardness of the masses." In our day, such intellectualist attitudes are expressed in what can only be called mini-Maoism.

Though there was little enough of Maoism in the actual mass upsurge, the mini-Maoists are making up for it in the "re-thought" about it. The greater the verbiage, the more are the dialectics of liberation reduced to sophisticated contra-positions -- positions not so much of analysis of the actual events as of the preconceptions about this totally unexpected near-revolution, as if it had indeed been "anticipated" either by those who totally accepted the concept of "a party to lead", or by those who totally rejected organization as being synonymous with bureaucratization.

Whether or not the mini-Maoists waived "the little red book", they followed "Maoist Thought" in raising voluntarism "above" both the class analysis and needed theory. Underpinning it all was the fact that these intellectuals had, by no accident whatever, revived the old chestnut -- the backwardness of the proletariat. No matter how elegantly mini-Maoism has papered this capitalistic concept with quotations from Marx on "productive forces", there is no way it could hide the rejection of the proletariat as the revolutionary force.

Thus, Andre Glucksmann\*, in developing what appears to be an abstract dissertation on "productive forces" (duly surrounded by many quotations from Marx, especially the Grundrisse) comes to the amazing conclusion that "the distance between Renault and the faculties decreased with the convergence of their position in the production process." Since, however, student youth are not yet "in" the production process, the concept is stretched to include "a reservoir of the productive forces" -- which doesn't keep the young theoretician from creating a veritable "universal": "Youth or the Revolt of the Productive Forces". And now that <sup>they</sup> are not only "a productive force", but

\* The New Left Review (Nov-Dec. 1968, London), which published Glucksmann's "Strategy and Revolution in France, 1968", calls it nothing short of the "fundamental theoretical document of the younger generation." This is not why the Draft Thesis has bothered to quote it. It does not represent the views of revolutionary youth, French or any other. But the cast of mind is symbolic of mini-Maoism which is diverting would-be revolutionaries attracted to Marxism and revolted by Russian Communism. Glucksmann himself may not be a Maoist, maxi or mini; he may be a Trotskyist or even an "independent" Marxist, and in the U.S. would be considered part of the "New Left". The point is that the sure way never to come to grips with aborted revolutions, or be capable of listening to the voices from below in developing revolutionary situations, is to mistake what Marx had long ago called the "convolutions of his brain" for the objective movement of history.

Daniel Cohn-Bendit's Obsolète Communism should also be consulted to see exactly what obsolete thoughts the new revolutionary youth come up with, when they venture into theory.

are in revolt against the bourgeois relations of production, we are told this is "the sole cause Marx assigned to the European Revolution." Which is what we are told the French youth in May, 1968, was. The dilution of theory into "plans of action" by "specialists capable of defining the most urgent technical tasks of the revolution" follows "logically."

Along with the dialectical language, and the play with the word, revolution, "a people's revolution" at that, we get the "proof" of mini-Maoism's "revolutionary" nature -- the attack on "modern revisionism", in such wild language that it anticipated Mao himself, who didn't equate "Russian revisionism" to "fascism" until the border incidents began. The French "theoretician" took the ultimate step even when he was dealing with mere possibilities, thus: "Nothing excludes the possibility that it (CP) will pride itself ... on the singular honour of being the first legal Communist Party in a fascist State. Then we shall know that, by the intermediary of the CRS, the cossacks will be enforcing the rule of order in the Latin Quarter for the protection of the Kremlin, while the trade union polices the factories to endure respect for Western order."

The upshot of the mini-Maoist "revolutionary" espousal of Mao's dictum, "to dare to revolt, to dare to win", is the corollary that "to make the revolution" there is no need for any "authorization from Moscow".

What needs to be added is that neither is there any need for authorization from Peking. What is needed, and not for "making" the revolution, but for letting it emerge, releasing it, learning from its spontaneity, is "authorization" from history, history not only as past, but as present, history as the accumulated experience of the masses when they did achieve a successful revolution; when a vision of new human relations was opened up before them with such new universals as "population to a man" TO A MAN, would manage the state and production; when the attempt to break down the division between mental and manual labor was concretized as listening to the masses, "the masses as Reason"; and when, therefore, the upsurge from below was made the Subject for the reconstruction of society on new foundations, on a world scale, East and West, North and South.

Without such a concept of the philosophy of revolution, of spontaneity and organization, of rootedness in "the masses as Reason", "Leninism" would indeed be nothing more than Maoist retrogressionism, clothed in Marxist language, as witness the Sino-centered concept of "internationalism". It hardly prepares one to meet the double-crosses that are in store at turning points in history that will be new variants of the Hitler-Stalin Pact which is what "socialism in one country" led to in Stalin's day.

This, and not Leninism, is what Maoism is a continuation of. We have analyzed Mao's development for many years. What gives it an added urgency today is that the attraction that Maoism has had for would-be revolutionaries in countries other than China -- the revolutionary verbiage which made it appear as if it alone would carry through to the end the struggle against U.S. imperialism as "Enemy No. 1" -- is being totally reversed. What makes it so ominous is that, while Maoism has changed the world direction of its "revolutionary" activities ever since it refused any united front action with Russia in the struggle against U.S. imperialism in Vietnam and especially after the collapse of an attempted new world axis -- Peking-Djakarta --

the Maoist fellow-travellers ( including those in the USA, white and black) have not the slightest understanding of the implications of these retrogressive moves. They still live on Mao's generalities about nuclear titans being "paper tigers." They still mistake missed revolutionary situations for on-coming ones.

Therefore, they stand in danger of creating a new variation of the old fatal Stalinist slogan, "after Hitler, us." It becomes necessary therefore, to take still another look at the Sino-Soviet conflict as it has flowered into a new Constitution in China, and a new "world" congress of Communists in Moscow.

### III. Splintered World Communism, and the Tragedy of Biafra

The key feature of the "world" congress of 75 CPs in Moscow in June, as of the Maoist Congress in Peking in April, was this: All talk against USA as "Enemy No. 1" was pure ritual. What really dominated both congresses was that China and Russia consider each other Enemy No. 1.

This may not, at first, appear new to us since we have been predicting the possibility of a war between the two Communist super-powers as far back as 1963, when the Sino-Soviet conflict had the form of an ideological battle. The possibility of war then was projected because the battle was not for the minds of men, but for the "leadership" of the Communist world, especially who would "lead" the new, Third World that came to power without the aid of either Communist orbit. No time bomb was embedded in the conflict which arose out of the non-viability of state-capitalism calling itself Communism.

The "Cultural Revolution", backed up by border incidents, has changed everything in the relationship of the two Communist giants. From teenage "Red Guards" to the new Central Committee, the Chinese people have been hardened to the view that "the road back to capitalism" is internal as the "new Tsars" are crossing China's borders. The new Constitution names Russia as the enemy on par with U.S. imperialism, but closer at hand. And a time bomb is clearly embedded in the diatribes. Russia, on its part, has let its generals flirt with the idea of what can only be called a "preventive war." At the same time she worked hard, without succeeding, to get the "world" CPs to label China as a deviant from "Communism." The fact that the June meeting showed Russia what she already knew -- that its influence extends no further than its Army--did, however, give her the platform. Splintered Communism may not exactly be a "united force against capitalism", but state-capitalism calling itself Communism now considers itself "the new stage" of world development, and each of its orbits is looking for new allies.

Furthermore (and this was grasped only by us at the time it first appeared) the non-viability of state-capitalism as a "world order", and hence its type of nationalist "internationalism", was a disintegrative force,

as became evident when U.S. imperialism chose to make Hanoi, not Peking, the testing ground for future confrontations with Communism. It is precisely because U.S. bombing of North Vietnam did not change by an iota Peking's refusal for any united front action with Russia in support of its fraternal ally, that Mao had to unleash a preventive civil war in his own country. "Bombard the headquarters!" may sound very anti-Party-bureaucrat; the designation of the co-founder of the Chinese Republic, Liu Shao-chi, as "the Khrushchev of China taking the road back to capitalism" may give the appearance of "puritanism" and "uninterrupted revolution" to the youth in distant lands. But these were curtain raisers for the retrogressionism of Mao, not only internally, but also in world strategy.

Outside of the diatribes against each other, however, the two Communist orbits had not a single straight word about the shift in world strategy to tell the world proletariat, much less to the Third World China once designated as "the storm center of the World Revolution." From the Middle East to Biafra, from Czechoslovakia to India, and from West Germany to the USA, the differences between Russia and China show themselves only as immediate policy decisions. The fact that these policies of Communism, "East" and "West", have become sheer nationalist expressions is something everyone can see. What they don't see, and what is a great deal more important, is that it isn't the usual variety, but that characteristic of a new stage of the world economy known as state-capitalism.

That is to say, it is neither what Trotsky had long ago said "socialism in one country" would lead to, that the Communist Parties would capitulate to the bourgeoisie in their respective countries and that even in Russia, it would lead to the breakdown of state property, returning to private property, planless capitalism. Nor is it the Titoist type of escape from Russian overlordship, which in 1948 the bourgeois order welcomed, only to be completely baffled, in 1961, by Tito's "neutralism" turning so pro-Russian that it mobilized everyone from Nasser's Egypt to Toure's Guinea against the other pole of world capitalism, led by the U.S. That the poles of the nuclear one-world have become three, in place of, first, one, then two, only emphasizes that the new type of nationalism characteristic of the age of state-capitalism is world-centered.

The only way to destroy aspirants for world power is (1) never to forget the class nature of state rulers; (2) never to forget that the first revolutionary challenge by the Hungarian proletariat and its Workers' Councils against totalitarianism was, with Khrushchevite-Maoist malice aforethought, labelled "revisionist" when, in truth, it was Marxist-Humanist; (3) always to remember that U.S. imperialism joins these rulers in that crucial sphere of philosophy by considering Marxist-Humanism the real enemy of all existing state powers.

Splintered Communism, along with Anglo-American imperialism, has made such a shambles of the African revolutions that are caught at one and the same time, in the vortex of the world market, and in the deterioration of the idea of self-determination, that the tragedy of Biafra has never looked more stark.

Everybody knows the obvious human tragedy -- death by starvation, literally of millions, mainly children; death by bombing from Russian planes piloted by Egyptians; death by armies officered by neo-colonialist Britain that

has its eye on oil. In words, in any case, Biafra seems to be supported by the U.S., China and France that likewise eyes the oil potential. What is not as well known are the evasions of the OAU.

Nobody looks at the why the Biafrans are dying for life -- not only its fear of genocide but its hunger for self-determination that is as intense as its hunger for food. Jules Nyerere is about the only African leader who has come out in support of Biafra not only for "humanitarian" purposes, but for the self-determination of the idea, the idea of freedom. Most other African leaders hide behind the nationalist abstraction "integrity of Nigeria" as if that weren't an imperialist creation which had made a conglomerate of the feudal North, with its Emirs intact, the cultured Yoruba West, and the more industrialized and more proletarian (though also merchant) Ibo East so that British imperialism could dominate the more easily.

The very Left which, when Nigeria first gained its political independence from Great Britain, attacked it as "neocolonialist" are now mouthing phrases about "nationalism vs. tribalism" as if self-determination wasn't the only proof of national independence. Consider a revolutionary like Modibo Keita (before his own downfall) who, when he was President, found he had to break from Senegal to be able to go his own independent path away from DeGaulle domination. Yet, once it came to Biafra actually facing genocide, speaking on everything from Moslemism to the "wholeness" of an African country without once listening to the voice of the people. Or consider Arabic Sudan, while actually conducting a civil war against black Africans, yet finding a common ground at the organization of African states to uphold "the integrity of Nigeria." Think of the standstill of the African revolutions which opened a whole new epoch less than a decade ago, but now wavering on the one and only way they could achieve victories against the superior forces of imperialism -- freedom, freedom, freedom.

The tragedy of Biafra is pure African and until it openly, daringly, unitedly, with freedom banners unfurled, speaks for itself, allowing no prompters from any of the contending aspirants for world power, it will, along with splintered Communism, bring only confusion to the black revolution in the United States, which is first now facing decisive battles.

IV. The Needed American Revolution: Philosophy and Reality

With the sole exceptions of Marx and Engels, the possibilities of a social revolution in the U.S. have always been greatly under-rated, if not totally disregarded. Presently the anti-Vietnam war movement is so total in its admiration of the daring life-and-death struggle the Vietnamese have and are carrying on against American imperialism, that its own achievements are looked upon as aids of a very minor significance. There is no doubt, of course, that the greatest blow to American imperialism has been and is being administered by the Vietnamese. But, while the anti-Vietnam war movement here is not the decisive force, there should be no doubt about its achievements. First is the expression of solidarity with the Vietnamese and against our own government. Secondly, comes the compulsion of LBJ to take himself out of the presidential race, and the decision of Nixon to present himself as a veritable opponent of that war in order to be able to win the presidency. Thirdly, is the refusal to consider the tokenism Nixon has decreed of "withdrawal" as anything but a fraud and the continuing pressure for the withdrawal



-8-

of all American troops.

Above all these concrete achievements stands the birth, as result of this struggle and its participation in the black revolution, of a whole new generation of radicals. The youth may have neither the force nor the proletarian cast of the black rebels, but the 1960's have made it as different from the McCarthy-Godwater youth of the 1950's as earth is from the moon, though we are now landing on it.

Black mass revolt, which has been a continuous phenomenon in America, has assumed an intensity in many new forms since its spontaneous modern rebirth in the Montgomery Bus Boycott, 1955-56, and youth sit-ins in 1960, and in organizations as varied as SCLC and Panthers. In the ghetto upheavals from Harlem to Oakland, from Watts to the entire length and breadth of the U.S. the revolt goes on. By the present intensity as well as by its historic nature, it has disclosed the Achilles heel of corporate America. Thus, there is no Establishment claim, from affluence to democracy, from non-colonialism to education, much less from labor to housing, that blacks have not been able to give the lie to -- and gotten the world's ear for the truth. Nor is it a question only of showing poverty amidst plenty. No one is going begging. Rather it is a matter of displaying mass self-activity, mass creativity, and revolutionary will and daring even when allies from the majority whites are rare enough to come by.

Whether it be the black revolution, the youth revolt, woman's liberation or the anti-war Vietnam movement, there is no doubt about the revolutionary forces actively working to uproot the old, the imperialist, the existing exploitative society. Even the white working class that is supposed to be "integrated" into the "system", and surely is racist all too often -- nevertheless even it has shown new activity not only in strikes, but also in voting for blacks, especially to union posts in those factories where black caucuses were active. In a word, even white labor, skilled and unskilled, associated itself with blacks as the genuine force against the labor bureaucracy.

We're not trying to say that America is on the eve of a social revolution. What we are saying is that the American economy is not free from crises, its politics is fought internally as well as externally by Third World liberation forces: Objectively, everything, from the nuclear arms economy to the runaway inflation; from the imperialist misadventures, both as far away as Vietnam and as near as Latin America, to the Vietnam war which the majority of the American people oppose; and from the erratic behavior of the stock market and creeping unemployment -- not so creeping among blacks where there is no less than 20% unemployment among black ghetto youth -- speaks of a ripening objective situation of crisis.

At the same time, though the movement of revolt is always played down as a "tiny minority", even such journals as Fortune have had to admit that the same surveys that show that the SDS can count its members only in a few thousand, show it influences close to a million in all youth rebellions. And when it comes to the black revolution, far from being able to attribute it all to "outside agitators", there is no doubt in any one's mind that, despite the fact that the black militant organizations hardly have mass memberships, there is no concrete event in the ghetto that doesn't, in its spontaneity, involve the blacks as a people.

4373

No, the weakness of what is referred to as the "New Left" is not so much in numbers as in lack of a total philosophy. Just when the masses are in motion, the leaderships are in disarray. The recent split in the SDS (which is by no means all negative, since many, in disgust, are moving to genuine Marxism) has shown them behaving in as unprincipled and, in thought, as retrogressionist a manner, as the PL'ers they were expelling. The positive, even in that, could be gleaned from the desire for "confrontations" with the Establishment. If they have nevertheless fallen under the spell of Maoist sloganizing -- whether that be "power comes from the barrel of a gun", or the abstractions of "to dare to struggle, to dare to win", under the fatal illusion that all nuclear giants are "paper tigers" and therefore "to will revolution" was sufficient to have it -- let us never forget that all these myth-makers, headed by Mao Tse-tung, may cast a seemingly unbreakable spell on the youth. But, even where unbreakable, a spell is only a spell, and cannot replace reality. What can break the spell is revolutionary philosophy that meets the challenge of reality.

Never was the task of philosophy more urgent. Never was the dialectics of liberation in reality so in need of a dialectical philosophy. Never was the break between theory and practice more ominous, and the need for a unity of philosophy and revolution more indispensable to the freedom struggles the world over. The needed American revolution is the one force that can unlock world revolution and not only because USA is the mightiest imperialism and its disintegration frees the forward movement of humanity, but because the revolutionary forces here are not merely subordinate to the Third World. Rather, they are facing a developing revolutionary situation and philosophic release.

"Why Hegel?" (that is, why dialectics?) "Why Now?" (that is, why is it presently impermissible to separate philosophy and revolution) reveals the need for philosophy if we are to achieve a revolution that will not sour, as every revolution, from the Russian through the Chinese to the African, has soured. Philosophy and Revolution discloses the obstacles that lie on the path to revolution: not only the dominance and militarization of American imperialism, but also empiric thought that satisfies itself by naming a single imperialism as "Enemy No.1", refuses to look at the totality of the world crises, insists on seeing only the external enemies, thereby failing to discern the internal revolutionary forces in each country.

No one can seriously speak of American revolution unless it centers around the color black. The failure to do so previously is precisely why the possibilities of American revolution were discounted. Even when radicals finally got to writing "theses" on the question of American revolution, they were invariably abstract. It wasn't necessarily due only to U.S. might, financial and military, and now nuclear as well. Rather, it was due to two very different types of subjective factors. One was the blindness to the vanguard character of the black masses in any developing revolutionary situation. The other was the self-declared vanguard party's lack of a total philosophy.

Thus, during World War II when there was no doubt at all about the militancy of Negro revolt, when their mass outburst, in 1943, right in the midst of war, was equalled by only one section of the white proletariat, the miners, who went out on general strike, we had to fight, and fight hard, against the concept that the 1943 upheaval was but a variant of the defensive struggles against the KKK at the end of World War I. And when, in 1947, the SWP decided finally to write a thesis called nothing short of "The Coming

American Revolution", the Negro is not even mentioned as a revolutionary force. And when News & Letters started, and so did the Montgomery Bus Boycott, it was considered a "joke" that Marxism and Freedom had placed that event on the level of the Hungarian Revolution. The fact that the SWP now goes to the other extreme, and, as against a refusal to consider the Negro as a National Question, behaves as if Malcolm X had been a combination of Lenin and Trotsky, only shows that dialectics remains as strange to them in 1969 as in 1943 when, on the one hand, they failed to see the blacks as Subject, and, on the other hand, saw neither the Stalinist break with the dialectical structure of Capital, nor the transformation into opposite of the Russian workers' state into a state-capitalist society.

Empiricism characterizes the American Left, from the SDS to the Black Panthers, however, not because that is central to "Anglo-Saxonism", but because it is a world retrograde step in the new world stage of capitalism -- state-capitalism, and the administrative mentality this produces even among revolutionaries. Not only do they think they can solve with "plans" what can only be solved by mass actions, and not only do they cling to elitist concepts in relationship to the proletariat whom they will "lead", but, though youth, they also look down at youth who haven't "signed up" -- hence, SDS's rapid reversal from its origins as a spontaneist, anti-vanguardist movement to its present elitism on ever narrower foundations. When we referred to retrogressionism appearing in thought, even among revolutionaries, at sharp turning points in history, we quoted Lenin on the horrors of war "suppressing thought", which is the way the existing capitalism keeps its hold on the opponent movements, and not merely its own decayed ideology. Moreover, though under 30, they aren't as "new" as they think. The fatal flaw in all American radicalism, old and new, was the lack of dialectical thought accompanying the lack of comprehension of the revolutionary forces at hand for the American revolution.

In a word, if the American Revolution, so needed to unlock the World Revolution, is to move from the possible, to the probable, to reality, we must know how to find new beginnings that are yet rooted in what Marx himself projected. N&L committees, who first re-established the American and Humanist roots of Marxism, have, from the beginning, been active in the Black Revolution both because it was central to the American revolution and inseparable from the philosophy of revolution. This preparation to meet the challenge from below on both the theoretical and practical levels makes it now imperative that it be developed, in all its ramifications. This is why the REB has put a deadline on the completion of Philosophy and Revolution in 1970. Along with it continues our immediate activities, again both in the class, black and youth struggles themselves as well as on the philosophical level.

Thus, the projection of a pamphlet on Black Caucuses, such as the one at Mahwah.

Thus, the growth of Marxist-Humanism, organizationally among the youth, has already made it possible to present a resolution on "Race and Class" at the SDS convention, which clearly separated itself from both caucuses. In the future months the youth will no doubt continue to function both on the

4 3 7 6

-11-

student level and in alliance with the proletariat, as well as part of the anti-Vietnam war movement.

Thus, the REB has decided upon a \$4000 Fund as a minimum to assure the regular issuance of News & Letters, with its unique Marxist Humanist class character, in the year ahead.

The discussion on these concrete proposals will take place at the respective sessions. Here they are mentioned only in order to exemplify the type of tasks Marxist-Humanists set themselves on the immediate level and which yet show that, far from being "the small coin of concrete questions", concreteness is used in the full Hegelian-Marxian sense of comprehensive, total dimension that has gained reality.

-- July, 1969

4376