

DRAFT RESOLUTION

FACING THE
CHALLENGE:
Nationally and Internationally

BULLETIN No. 1

JULY, 1963

3251

3 2 5 7

DRAFT RESOLUTION — JULY, 1963

FACING THE CHALLENGE: Nationally and Internationally

I

The Cold War and the Negro Freedom Struggles

Those intent on clinging to mirages may wish to point to surface appearances "to prove" that the past year has seen a total change in world relations: where, last year, Kennedy and Khrushchev confronted each other at the edge of a thermonuclear war, today the US and USSR are nearing an agreement on ending nuclear testing. The truth is that the two differing situations, far from signifying a move from war to peace, signify only different types of preparation for the final confrontation. The year since our convention (Sept. 1962) is overcrowded with capitalist crises and mass challenges. When we're counterposing the positive features of the working class struggles against the negative features of capitalist society in decay and disarray, we will see that the pause in the Cold War on the world arena means an intensification of the hot war at home.

No matter which point of departure we shall take, the basic class contradiction within each country easily predominates over the feud between the capitalists, East or West. Thus, if we begin with the glory-road chosen by De Gaulle to cause still one more fission in the camp of "the West", his imperious exclusion of Great Britain from the Common Market is mere shadow-boxing when contrasted to the only force that was capable of bringing De Gaulle down to size — the French miners on general strike. If we turn, instead, to the Sino-Indian war following upon all those "peaceful co-existence" resolutions between Chou En-lai and Pandit Nehru, what is really outstanding is the sudden, spontaneous emergence of a unity of the Indian masses against the Chinese invaders that neither Pandit nor Mao imagined. Should we wish to take a second look at the Sino-Soviet conflict as it rises to the crescendo of an open near-split within that state-capitalist world calling itself Communist, we must needs counter-balance to it the undercurrent of revolt which, since the 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the 1957 Blooming of "100 Flowers", includes also a humanist philosophic challenge to both Communist totalitarians.

Were we to concentrate only on that fateful moment when the whole world held its breath as the two nuclear titans bargained over missiles in and out of Cuba, and the world nuclear holocaust, again the total opposition to both came from the world's freedom fighters. And, indeed, for the first time in five and a half years even the Gallup Poll reports, the race question predominates over all other questions in the nation's (and the world's) consciousness. Before Birmingham — in April of this year — only 4% thought that the racial question was the major world crisis; after Birmingham the percentage jumped to 49%, while those who thought the war threat was the main question dropped from 63% to 35%. Moreover, this had nothing to do with the near-truce in nuclear testing which had not yet begun.

In a word, as the momentum of the Negro freedom struggles has thrust itself into the world's consciousness above all other concerns, on earth or in space, it is abundantly clear that the quintessential, predominant, all-pervasive, concrete point of departure, and point of return, this crucial year, is the totality of opposition, not between the nuclear titans or feuding subordinates, but between the means and aims of capitalism -- private or state -- on the one hand, and, on the other hand, those of the world's working class freedom fighters.

Two dates will indeed go down in history to cover the span, October 1962 - July 1963, but it will not be JFK vs. NK, whether growling or smiling at each other, but JFK and N K, on October 22, 1962, ready to push the button that would destroy civilization. The contrast to that insane gesture of the world's leaders will be May 3, 1963 when human passions and forces, specifically those of Southern Negroes, especially the youth -- facing the gushing charge-up hoses and unleashed police hounds in a massive, daring, all-rounded resistance. The massiveness of the resistance reflected also the development of the Negro struggle against segregation -- whether in education, transportation, at lunch counters or in voting -- to the crucial sphere of employment and unemployment. Thereby the struggle against Southern barbarism expanded to include also Northern capitalists and the trade union bureaucracy.

Finally, the development in the struggle meant also a development in the Negro leadership. The philosophic implications of the Negro struggle against "the power structure" can be seen in Rev. Martin Luther King's "Letter from a Birmingham City Jail" written on the eve of the May 3rd confrontation: "To use the words of Martin Buber, the great Jewish philosopher, segregation substitutes an 'I-it' relationship for the 'I-thou' relationship and ends up relegating persons to the status of things." IF fully developed this could become a turning point also for a unified struggle with white labor. This forward movement of the Negro struggle, however, stands in danger of confinement at the present time. (See Political Letter of July 14, 1963 : "The Challenge of the March on Washington")

* The first and greatest danger is the pressure of the White House. To see that the full ramifications of the present stage of the Negro struggle does not become irresistible also to white labor in total opposition to the capitalist system, which does indeed reduce men in the factory to the status of things, the more far-seeing capitalist leaders, with President JFK at their head, must harness the Negro mass movement to fight for and be satisfied with his civil rights bill.

To achieve this end, he has moved front "to head" the March on Washington; that is to say, to transform it from a March on Washington to a tour of the White House and Congress. Consequently, the sudden appearance of a "unified" Negro leadership, despite the multiplicity of organizations and without a unifying philosophy, portends a danger, rather than a victory to a further development of the Negro mass struggle. JFK aims to get the Negro leadership to channelize the Freedom NOW movement for him. If he succeeds, he will have tamed, he hopes, the Negro mass movement to where he will have unhampered space and

time to deal with the De Gaulle opposition in NATO.

The bright young man in the White House wants to see if he cannot use, to his own advantage, the Sino-Soviet Rift, and to do this not merely by a detente with Russia, but, above all, by incorporating the most industrialized country in Asia — Japan — into the "Western camp" .

Thus, the compulsion — from many different directions, and for varied reasons, some of which are apparent, even transparent, but others are not — is for a pause in the Cold War. It is as well that in analyzing this pause, we stop to look at what is new in the objective world situation that has allowed, and/or compelled, a detente in the relations of the two nuclear titans, which each intends to use to curb opposition within their respective orbits.

II

The New Sino-Soviet Conflict

What is new on the world scene is, of course, the rupture between Russia and China. It may not appear to us to be new since we dealt with it no less than 20 months ago (Special Supplement of News & Letters, Jan. 1962) and to this day, some of what we have written is still not openly admitted, and may never be. For one thing, neither camp yet admits that the division began over the Great Leap Forward in 1958 and not, as both claim, after the 1960 Statement of 81 Communist Parties, which both signed. Nevertheless, a qualitative change in the Sino-Soviet conflict has taken place since we last analyzed Mao's China. This is by no means due only to the difference between an admission and non-admission of conflict. Rather it is that the fig-leaf of Marxist terminology is no longer adequate to cover up the non-viability of state-capitalism as a "new" social order. The insatiable imperialist appetites of Mao's "new order" will be seen best against the background of the first split in the Communist state-capitalist world -- that of Yugoslavia in 1948 -- so let's begin by contrasting the two:

Where, in 1958-61, the new split within the state-capitalist orbit seemed to be a variation of Yugoslavia's 1948 break from Russia, that is to say, the appearance of nationally independent state-capitalism, the 1962-63 development is a challenge for international leadership. The new, the qualitative change is proclaimed, in bold red lettering, in the very title of the "letter" (June 14, 1963) of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party (CC of the CPC) to its Russian counterpart: "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement".

Where the Tito break from Stalin did not depart from class terminology, the geographic area from which the Mao challenge originates predominates over the class generalities: "The Wind of the East prevails over the Wind of the West." Should anyone be so naive as either to think that "the West" means the West of private capitalism, or the East means "only" the Orient, the Chinese racist policy was spelled out in practice at the Tanganyika Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference where the Chinese told the Russians "whites have nothing to do here."

Where the tiny state power of Yugoslavia, fighting the giant Russian state power, could not allow itself any new glory roads a la DeGaulle in the Western camp, Mao's delusions are as vast as the Chinese continent -- and not only as it is now constituted, but as it was at the height of its imperial glory under the Yuan and Ming Dynasties when China conquered Burma, Thailand, Indochina Peninsula, debarked troops to Indonesia, imprisoned the king of Ceylon and once even imposed annual tribute from the Moslem world or at least from the Holy City of Mecca. Up to 1962 only Nehru had questioned the map included in "A Manual of

History" which was published in Peking in 1954*, and which shows a great part of the Soviet Far East as well as the Republic of Outer Mongolia, North and South Korea, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaya, Burma, Assam (about 50,000 miles of Indian territory, in fact), Butan, Sikkim, Nepal, the island of Sakhalin as well as some islands in the Philippines, as having been part of China.

When, however, Khrushchev dared to quip at Mao's phrase about "cowardice in the face of the imperialists" by saying it ill-behooves Mao to speak so when he is doing nothing presently to drive the imperialists from "his own territory — Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macao", the People's Daily and Red Flag hit back with: "Certain persons would like us to raise the questions of unequal treaties here and now ... Have they realized what the consequences of this might be?" Whereupon the Chinese began explaining "the imperialist encroachments on Chinese territory (1840-1919). Period of the Early Democratic Revolution." And, in expanding themselves on what Tsarist Russia took from "old China", the present Chinese rulers included territories taken from Emirs and Khans who most assuredly did not consider themselves vassals of the Emperor of China. (Nor, for that matter, did Mao's dream of China's past glories stop itself from designating as an "imperialist encroachment" Thailand's becoming independent; that too "belonged" to China of the Emperor and he means "to redress" some day the borders of what the CC-CPC designates only as "old China.")

Mao opts for nothing short of mastery of the world — of the Communist world to begin with. Though, for tactical reasons, and because of the withdrawal of Russian technical aid, China had to fall back on a variation of "the theory of socialism in one country" ("Every socialist country must rely mainly on itself for its construction." p. 45**), the CC-CPC challenges not only Russia but the majority of the presently constituted Communist world. It warns that "one should not emphasize 'who is in the majority' or 'who is in the minority' and bank on a so-called majority..." (p. 47). In the place of following majority rule, he proposes the rule of "unanimity", that is to say, China's right of veto over policies formulated by Russia and the majority of other Communist Parties!

Thus, the Sino-Soviet conflict differs fundamentally not only from Yugoslavia's conflict with Stalin, but also from Mao's own differences both in 1957 when he willingly — because of "solidarity" with Russia in crushing the Hungarian Revolution and because of the tremendous economic aid Russia poured into China — recognized Russia's priority in the socialist world, and, in 1960, when the conflict had grown and he unwillingly was pressured by the overwhelming majority to affix his signature to the Statement of the 81 Communist Parties.

* This map is reproduced in the New Republic of 4/20/63 in an article, "China's Borders", the third of a series of articles by J. Jacques-Francillon. The other articles appear in the issues of 3/16/63 and 3/23/63. (See also B. Shiva Rao's article in the National Observer of 7/23/63.)

** All page references are to "A Proposal Concerning The General Line of the International Communist Movement", the June 14 letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in reply to the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of March 30, 1963 (published by Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1963).

The new in the Sino-Soviet conflict is the culmination of the crises within China following upon the collapse of the 1958 "Great Leap Forward", the 1959 opposition to the Camp David spirit between Khrushchev and Eisenhower, and the unilateral 1962 Sino-Indian war. The power politics now engulfing Russian and China began when China proposed to "skip over socialism" and go "directly to Communism".

Khrushchev challenged Mao's claim to be able to achieve in a single decade what it took Russia four decades to attain -- industrialization. He opposed any "skipping of stages" which would lose Russia its priority in the "socialist world." And he feared "Mao's Thought" might become a new polarizing force for the whole Afro-Asian-Latin-American world which would certainly be attracted to a scheme like the Communes with the simplistic slogan, "One day equals 20 years." Though such hallucinations, far from bringing the millenium, brought the Chinese masses to near-starvation, Khrushchev would no longer be moved to continue with any massive aid to China.

Mao then turned to what he can do best -- plan armed attacks. It is not that the imperialist features of state-capitalism are anything new either to Russia or China, though it is certainly new for one "socialist" leader to lay the foundation for claiming a good part of the Soviet Socialist Republic in the Far East as "belonging" to China! It is Mao's total disregard of the fact that since "little wars" may bring on a world nuclear holocaust, Russia must be consulted before China embarks on these adventures with all the fanfare of "the cause of world socialism." Mao is banking on the fact that "in the end", that is to say, when the USSR will have to face the USA, the "socialist camp" will need to be united, and he means now (by which he means not tomorrow, but yesterday) to establish China's claim to "world leadership", read: dominance.

China's industrial development may lack everything from steel to dams and atomic energy. Its Army, however, has everything from overwhelming numbers to military equipment. In the first instance, it is the largest land army in the whole world, and in the second instance it is the most modern equipment on the Asian continent. In any case, after the collapse of "The Great Leap Forward" and the withdrawal of Russian technical aid, there was nothing to fall back on but military adventures. The Russian "underground" humour may have pinpointed Mao's historic image when it says history will record him "as an athletic failure in the broad jump." But he was no failure in the Sino-Indian War.

And, as "Mao's Thought" thrives on military engagements, it has given birth to yet a new crop of "theories." These are developed with much subterfuge and great wordiness in the 61 page June 14th "letter." They add up to a single and total ambition for world "leadership", i.e. mastery.

First comes a substitute for judging what "the touchstone of internationalism" is. (p.10) "Now that there is a socialist camp of 13 countries," says the CC-CPG, it should no longer be the defense of Russia.

Secondly, building on what the state-capitalist world, calling itself Communist, wants the proletariat to believe -- that the class struggle in any country must be subordinated to the division of the world into two camps -- "the

socialist countries" and "the capitalist countries". This having become the overriding consideration of "Communism", whether in Russian, Chinese, or any other national dress, Mao now proclaims: "If anybody ... helps capitalist countries attack fraternal socialist countries, then he is betraying the interests of the entire international proletariat and the people of the world." (p.10)

Thirdly, following the accusation of "betrayal" -- unspecified, but all too clearly a reference to Russia and its failure to support China's invasion of India -- there is a reference to "a step back in the course of historic development", which is tantamount to "doing a service to the restoration of capitalism", which names Yugoslavia as the culprit but, clearly, instead, means Russia.*

Fourthly, and despite the fact that Mao built his second and third theses on the Communist conception of "two camps" -- "Socialism" and capitalism -- he moves away from this premise to return to his old "four class policy", broadening his concept of the people to include "also the patriotic national bourgeoisie, and even certain kings, princes, and aristocrats who are patriotic." (p. 15) All this for the purpose of concluding that "since" the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are "the storm centres of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism", therefore "the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggle of the people in these areas" (p.13)

No doubt, Khrushchev has a point when he says that thereby "the Chinese comrades wish to win the easiest way to popularity among the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America." The far greater truth is that the setting of policies for the colonial world was precisely what Mao demanded on the very first day of his conquest of power in mainland China as his due as well as his price for allowing Russia to remain head of the Communist world in "the West." Now that Mao is out for mastery of the world, he adorns his espousal of colonial and semi-colonial struggles with a quotation from Lenin at the Second Congress of the Communist International. Thus, the imperative duty of the proletariat of the technologically advanced countries to unite with the colonial masses struggling against imperialism, is reduced by Mao to a matter of competition with Khrushchev as to who will be master not only over which "sphere", but over the entire world.

Fifthly, and finally, among the many theses Mao expounds in the June 14th diatribe, which he has published in about 20 languages and which is, in fact, his international manifesto, is this one: "for a very long historic period after the proletariat takes power" (p.36), "for decades or even longer after socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization" (p.37) have been achieved, "the class struggle continues as an objective law independent of man's will".(p.36) This holds true in all "socialist countries." Now whatever the subjective impulse for concocting this -- all too transparently it is meant to lay the foundation for opposition to the 22nd Russian Communist Party Congress which enunciated that Russia

*As Khrushchev, of course, sharply pointed out when he got around to answering the June 14th letter on July 15. Tass distributed the English translation which appeared in The New York Times of Monday, July 15, 1963.

was on the road to Communism* -- it is the most serious of all theories of retrogression. We now have not only the retrogression of capitalism to fascism, but the retrogression of socialism, that is to say, a classless society, to one in which "there are classes and class struggles in all socialist countries without exception." (p.40) Surely no more deadly deviation has ever been proclaimed "a principle of Marxism--Leninism."

The objective compulsion for such "theories" flow, of course, from the most brutal form of state capitalism characteristic of China. Just as the bankruptcy of capitalism in general was accompanied by the bankruptcy of its thought, so the bankruptcy of the misnamed "Communes" is accompanied by "Mao's Thought", the true end of any philosophic method. Where Stalin, when admitting that the operation of the law of value in his "socialist land", felt compelled to force a separation between the law of value and the law of surplus value in order to try to deny the existence of classes under socialism, Mao proclaims it loudly as "A principle". And yet, despite this totally capitalistic concept of socialism; despite the concrete and total exploitation of the Chinese masses; despite the concrete Chinese invasions against other lands, Mao's abstract revolutionary thunder gets the support of militants, especially intellectuals, in and outside of the Communist Parties. It is a sad commentary on our times and exposes how totally lacking in any confidence in the self-activity of the masses are today's claimants to the title, "Marxist-Leninist"; their militancy gains momentum only where there is a state power to back it up. It is the mark of our state-capitalist age that our "revolutionary" petty bourgeoisie can not act without the State Plan and fears the self-mobilizing proletarian masses even more than do the powers that be.

Adept in the use of Marxist terminology to clothe his territorial and other ambitions, Mao is counting on bringing about splits in the CPs of the East and "the West." From Ceylon to Italy, and from France to the US, Mao indeed has support of "left" splits. And he has also captured the non-existent imagination of the Trotskyists who, despite LP's historic and theoretic fight against Mao, have all become "Maoists" to an embarrassing degree.

Whatever further brainwashing may be needed for Communists, "left" independents and Trotskyists begging to be intellectually raped, the reality of Mao's abstract revolutionary thunder will be a rash of little wars -- from Laos, Korea, Viet Nam, to a third edition of the Sino-Indian war, not to mention subversion in Indonesia and Latin America. Naturally what concerns American imperialism most is Mao's influence in Latin America where he is indeed making headway. The high price Khrushchev had to pay to win Cuba to his side in the dispute will not stop "the natural" inclinations for easy victories through terrorism and guerrilla adventures. No doubt some of these will be to aid genuine revolutionaries, say, in Portugal's Africa or South Africa. But anyone who willingly blinds himself to Mao's purposes sets himself up for self-destruction.

* We didn't need Mao's "revelations" of course, to see the 22nd Russian Communist Party Congress for the state-capitalist manifesto it was. See the three letters on the RCP Program (August 2, 9, and 14, 1961 Weekly Political Letters, Series 1)

Russia hopes to put some limitation to Mao's ambitions and conceit. To have the time to do it, not to mention the time he needs to "solve" Russia's own agricultural crisis, Khrushchev is willing to undertake a pause in the Cold War. And while Kennedy and Khrushchev pause, the world's working class can expect greater glows from both poles of capital as well as a lot of balderdash from Mao's China. To see that the latter cancer does not get into the bloodstream of "the Left", especially the youth, Marxist-Humanism must unfold itself not only as theory, but as organization.

Please Note: On page 5, Mao's phrase "cowardice in the face of the imperialists" referred to his estimation of Russia's behavior in withdrawing missiles from Cuba under Kennedy's threat of nuclear war.

III

The Uniqueness of the Marxist-Humanist Movement

1) Practically and Nationally

Uniqueness here does not refer either to the many "firsts" in the theoretic contributions of Marxist-Humanist, or to the practical activities Before Birmingham. The uniqueness presently refers to the fact that we are the only ones, right here and now, After Birmingham, who, Before Birmingham, concretized Marxism and Freedom as American Civilization on Trial, and, at the same time, unfurled a Young Marxist-Humanist banner. The second still needs to make its way. But the first achievement, three short months after publication, has exhausted a first edition of 5000. The need now is to spell out the ending of American Civilization on Trial -- "Facing the Challenge, 1943-63" -- as News & Letters Committees, 1964. The way we expressed it in American Civilization on Trial was: "... the turning point for the reconstruction of society occurs when theory and practice finally evolve a unified organizational form". Naturally, this referred to a spontaneous, mass organization. But it is now clear that unless News & Letters Committees can grow sufficiently to influence the existing mass organizations of the Negro struggle, the latter stand in danger of diversion, and of confronting us with yet one more "unfinished revolution." It becomes imperative to express our uniqueness in a manner that many more than ourselves will recognize.

1) Only Marxist-Humanism could have planned a "mere" historic celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation and come up with a historic pamphlet that is at the same time so totally a part of today's developments that it reads like a headline of tomorrow's paper.

2) The methodology which made this possible is the dialectic in the present in which is inherent "the pull of the future".

3) Theory, of course, is gray. Life, of course, is ever greener than theory. But unless a certain method -- Marxist-Humanism -- has trained one to elicit the tomorrow in the today, one is likely once again to settle for the yesterday.

4) The live historic stage, by presenting those opposites -- the Freedom NOW movement as against the play of power politics of capitalist states -- at a critical juncture makes it imperative that the "unified organizational form" be not a "unified leadership" sans a unifying philosophy, but Marxist-Humanist philosophy embodied in an organization. Without it, the existing Negro leadership may yield to the overwhelming pressures that will divert the movement into "voting for" the status quo.

We do not deny that we had, from the start, meant the News & Letters Committee to be the core of "a unified organizational form" of the unity of theory and practice. But we thought this was something "for the long run." However, the combination of seemingly unrelated and surely opposite facts have changed also our

role. On the one hand, After Birmingham, JFK could no longer continue with legalisms. He therefore quickly changed attitudes toward the Freedom NOW movement by trying to take it under his wing (with the long view as well of the 1964 elections). On the other hand, the objective situation on the international scene has brought a detente between Russia and the US. Our changed role means, concretely, that our activities in other organizations cannot just be "in and for themselves". We must also point out the following:

1) Because the Freedom NOW movement has combined reason as activity only to the extent of the immediate demands of desegregation, and not to the ultimate of total freedom from class society, the Negro leadership is listening more to the author of the limited civil rights measure than to the full aspirations of the mass movement which compelled the President to undertake some form of civil rights legislation. (Witness the change in the planned March on Washington from one of demands for full freedom to one for "redress of grievances.")

2) Because the labor bureaucracy, as a whole and with "left" Reuther, have, on their own, tried to head off the movement for an end to discrimination in the unions through tokenisms, money contributions to the movement in the South, and now will also have the aid of the Administration to confine it (as witness his "election" to community projects of management and labor whom Reuther is officially "educating"), it becomes imperative to develop on the shop level, through caucuses as well as individual "leafleteering", a continuous dialogue with white rank and file labor for united action from below to end lily white departments, to upgrade Negroes, to fight Automation and unemployment.

3) Because the TUIC (Trade Union Leadership Council, outlet of NAACP in Detroit) clearly will not act independently -- since their opposition is proscribed by the AFL-CIO leadership of which they themselves are a part -- and because the Muslimites who already have a sufficiently fascist tinge (as witness the open collaboration with the Nazis here and the not-so-open collaboration with Southern racists who provide part of the money), it becomes imperative that we both concretize our trade union activity along lines of fighting for trade union and racial equality (See quotations from proposed leaflet in Political Letter of July 14), and generalize it to where it is clear to all we can reach that it is an integral part of Marxist-Humanism.

4) The youth, which is the sparkplug not only in the Freedom NOW movement in the US, but throughout the world, has everywhere searched for a total philosophy. We alone published The Young Marxist-Humanist, which combined the concrete experience with the total philosophy. We must openly admit that thus far its impact internationally has been greater than its impact nationally. Nevertheless, there are significant harbingers here, too, like the requests for the Young Marxist-Humanist from the few whites who work in the South and who are dissatisfied with the limitations set upon the movement by the present leadership, white labor and Negro exponents of total commitment to non-violence and religion. (A letter from Linda was one indication of this which must be pursued. Rifts in the YPSL are another.) Finally, the impact internationally must be developed not only for international purposes, but for the creative influence nationally. The international points a direction for the national. (The Youth will make their own report to the Plenum.)

As we see, the building of an organization on Marxist-Humanist foundations is demanded by the urgency of the tasks created, on the one hand by the fact that the pause in the Cold War will be used to confine the Negro movement; and, on the other hand by the new theories arising from the Sino-Soviet conflict, which, although they will continue to make their appearance in Marxist garb, will act to stifle the thought as well as the spontaneity of the self-mobilization of the proletariat. Let us therefore recapitulate the immediate organizational repercussions flowing from the need to see that neither JFK, nor the pause in the Cold War, nor a significant part of the Negro leadership, succeed in channelizing the Negro mass movement which has reached such momentum with Birmingham:

1) The need is to function in mass organizations not only as participants in activity but as Marxist-Humanist reason. Whether we do this through introducing new subjects on the agenda, other than those officially proposed; or whether we propose concentration on those things that interest the working-class Negro, like employment rather than \$30,000 homes, one thing we can surely do is to talk to individuals as recruiters for Marxist-Humanism.

2) The same organizational sense must pervade the sale of American Civilization on Trial. The second edition now going to press becomes ever more imperative, not just for us, but for the mass movement itself if its momentum is to continue until full freedom is achieved, and its ranks, who will most assuredly refuse to be brainwashed by the Administration's active intervention, are not to leave it in disgust.

3) Articles in News & Letters must not only record all events but draw lessons from it, as does the Editorial on Meany, Reuther, and McDonald in the current issue. Therefore, the paper is not merely to be sold and distributed, but discussed everywhere.

4) Our own local discussions are to be changed accordingly, first in the sense that "business" records activities in a way that does not leave out the underlying philosophy. At the same time, we must begin a continuous, weekly educational on Marxism & Freedom itself. There should also be public meetings, outside of our own meeting hall, whenever a hot national or international event occurs. It is fantastic to continue being sometimes years in advance of events, as presently in the case of Mao, to keep writing Political Letters on every conceivable topic, and yet not to build our organization on these.

Organizational consciousness begins with the realization that none of these analyses, whether in book or pamphlet form, in newspaper or Political letter form are "for themselves." It is conceit to think so. No one can build an organization when they underestimate the reason of the masses to grasp our philosophy organizationally.

5) Finally, but by no means least, we do all this in an international context. Indeed, in many respects, especially theoretically, they are way in advance of us, as witness the paperbacks appearing in other countries where we are yet to have one here.

2) Theoretically and Internationally

We didn't cite Trotskyist tailending of Mao, despite the heritage of Trotsky's opposition to him, in order to waste any tears over this transformation. The living Trotskyists surely are epigones. But they are not very important and do not influence any great mass of people. What is important, and what has had a baleful influence historically, for he was the living link of continuity with Lenin and the great October Revolution, was Leon Trotsky himself.

For too long, the non-Communist left has been gripped in the most terrible of all logics, the logic of empiricism, bouncing from side to side, affirming "theories", dropping them and building ever "new" ones based on the limitless possibilities presented to one whose point of departure is not the objective law of capitalist development in strict relationship to the revolt of the masses, but who, instead, grasps on to this or that single pronouncement which means "all" -- whether that be "collectivization" in Tibet, or China's "Red" Army but not Inner Mongolia's unbridled campaign of Pan-Mongolianism, including the glorification of Genghis Khan, all aimed at Outer Mongolia. The resulting undisciplined verbiage and shifting generalizations based on the headlines of the moment and the inner fights in the "communist world", whether "in opposition" to it or otherwise, is a sickness that has too long sapped "the Left".

History will surely not forgive a third failure to penetrate through to the class nature of established Communism, just because it is clothed in Marxist terminology -- first in Russia, then Yugoslavia, and now China. The pull of state power so clothed is but a reflection of the administrative mentality that is the mark of our state-capitalist age which makes all intellectuals, those who would be revolutionists even as those who are petty-bourgeois, overly eager "to lead the masses" but not at all ready to listen to their cry, not for production targets, but for a human life.

We alone have, ever since the theoretic collapse of the Fourth International during the Hitler-Stalin Pact and outbreak of World War II, built basic new theoretic foundations that met the challenge of the times. In 1941 we began the elaboration of the theory of state-capitalism which accounted not only for the transformation of Soviet Russia into its opposite, but saw it as the new world stage of capitalism.

This was followed by the founding of News & Letters, a bit tardily but not at all accidentally, since our analysis of the new stage of capitalism was never separated from the concrete stage of workers revolt and aspirations. The establishment of a newspaper, not "for" the workers, but where the workers heard themselves speak, and heard themselves speak in a milieu which refused to separate practice from theory, or theory from practice, was, in fact, a step from those who got stuck in the economism of state-capitalism and were unable to move forward to the Humanism inherent in the political maturity of the masses in revolt.

Nor was it an accident that on the eve of the Hungarian Revolution the full elaboration of the Humanism of Marxism for our epoch was completed, and Marxism and Freedom saw publication as the first sputnik whirled in outer space without solving a single problem for the working people who hungered instead for a new society on this earth.

One stage of the nearly two decades of theoretic clarification came to a conclusion in 1958 when — under the whip of the counter-revolution (DeGaulle's accession to power despite a Communist Party of one million)— we appealed to the international groupings who had broken with both capitalism and Communism for a regroupment capable of meeting the challenges of the times. Only partially was this successful. Instead of meeting our contribution to totally new theoretic foundations — Marxism and Freedom — with as comprehensive a contribution of their own IF they didn't accept Marxist-Humanism, the groups agreed only to fight against both poles of world capitalism — Russia and the US. They neither met the philosophic challenge of Marxist-Humanism, nor counterposed to it another philosophy. Once again the international Marxist movement left philosophy on the book shelves.

Times have, however, greatly changed with the Italian publication of Marrismo et Liberta. A significant sign of the contrast of the times is the independent growth of Marxist-Humanist groupings. Editions of Marxism and Freedom are due both in Japan and Argentina — countries that will be most affected by the new split in the state-capitalist camp. It is a sign of the maturity of the mass movement that they feel without such an unfurling of a banner, we would be forced once again to play the tail end to established, that is to say, emasculated Marxism.

The new feature in all of these editions is that a group, an organization, feels the need of Marxist-Humanism as its theoretic foundation. Since the Japanese edition will include as its appendix the study of Mao, it will indeed have not only the theory, but the currency of today's headlines. (Friends will be able further to follow this in the special Introduction to the Japanese edition which we will publish as a special Political Letter just as soon as we hear from the Japanese Marxist-Humanists.)

Here too the imperative need is for a paperback that could serve both US and Great Britain. Whether the special supplement on Mao Tse-tung will need to be published as a special pamphlet by ourselves, or whether we will actually produce it as part of the new book on Marxist-Humanism and the Underdeveloped World which it was intended for, depends on whether the organization can release the chairman from organizational work, and itself work on native grounds toward the achievement of organizational growth. Surely we have never been better equipped for the latter now that we also have a concretization of Marxism and Freedom in American Civilization on Trial. The fact that, objectively, there will be a pause in the rush to nuclear war will create new opportunities for Marxist-Humanism. The decision on the release of the chairman which is up to the plenum is not an "organizational one", but one of total recognition of the uniqueness of Marxist-Humanism, organizationally as well as theoretically.