Dears Friends:

Three of the fantastic occurrences in the three widely-separated parts of the world this month prompt this letter. They exude such abysmal lower depths of ideological coherence as to call into question the very purpose of the old Left. They are: the unreformed revolution, not for revolutionary, developments. It is imperative, therefore, to look at these events, not merely as passing "immediates", but in a historic-philosophic context.

First, let's look at what followed the passing of that UN Resolution which equated Zionism with racism. At the moment the PLO is trying to carry out what it sees as its implications for the Security Council session, but this cannot be viewed in isolation from two other events: 1) the break-up of the OAU meeting in Ethiopia over the question of recognizing the legitimacy of the MPLA government in Angola; and 2) the war in Lebanon which is calling into question the philosophical underpinnings not only of that UN Resolution, but of that whole "thieves' kitchen." This expression of Lenin's for the League of Nations that followed World War I, is succinctly (and fittingly) that followed World War II and also called itself a "peace" establishment. It will help us get to the root of the matter since history, far from being limited to the past, helps illuminate the present.

It may seem foolhardy to try to single out the new in a situation that is so fraught with contradictions which, overnight, transform things into their opposite. It would indeed be an impossible task were it not for the fact that in the Arab Middle East, the unifying force—anti-Israel—cuts across the myriad contradictions. Thus, as if Lebanon wasn't disintegrating in a fratricidal war between Christian and Moslem, Afaraf fevered with the ASLA, and the OAU was burning in a Shi'ite-Arab fire, the thousands of dead bodies, and the rubble, that this all is an Israeli "conspiracy," a war initiated by "international Zionism."

By thus blaming Israel and extending Zionism into an international arena, he has set the tone for the PLO representative, Farouk Kaddoumi at the UN Security Council: Disgusted the actual on-going war in Lebanon. Speaking now for the Moslem Palestinians' right for self-determination. And speak of it as if none of that involved the dissolution of any other state.

All this is said with a straight face regarding the Arab Middle East, where all states are theocratic, and where Lebanon, an artificial state which does have Christians and Moslems, can't escape the class divisions, and is as this very moment steeped in civil war. Those Lebanese Moslems Left, who are fighting a genuine revolutionary class struggle against its rulers, Christians mainly but Moslem, too, are being kept as chmaid. The overriding issue is to reverse the order: the never to ending order, not for the Middle East is: ending the war in Lebanon. Lebanon, 1975, is in danger of replying to the slaughter in Jordan, 1970-71. Will Syria enter, or the PLA under its control? The PLO allows its adherents to fight a revolutionary war except a scant shadow of "within the Arab nation." Whether that will be made "law" by the PLO under Arafat's leadership, or by the PLA under Syria's sponsorship, or by the other Palestinian groups in the umbrella organization PLO, this idea will remain twofold: 1) Israel is Enemy No. 1 and 2) no genuine revolutionary force will be allowed to achieve its goal. In any case, as far as the PLO delegation at the UN is concerned, it had but one aim: deny what is happening in Lebanon; deny the Israeli invasion of the PLO Covenant which defines its goal as the dissolution of Israel and in "its place" the establishment of a "normal state." Farouk Kaddoumi promptly branded the translation "a Zionist falsification."

Rather than concerning ourselves with the UN vote on the Resolution equating Zionism with racism—72 for, 35 against, 32弃—can get more illustration on whether that Resolution is but the latest form of anti-Semitism or a genuine struggle against racism by turning to the second event that followed the vote—the break-up of the OAU meeting in Ethiopia, January 8. This will take us far beyond the question of the Middle East and even beyond the concrete question of the legitimacy of the MPLA to govern Angola which was the immediate cause of the break-up, and on to the more fundamental question of a continuing revolutionary evolution.

Herefore, the one thing that always united independent African nations and those fighting for independence was the total opposition to apartheid South Africa. No matter how wide the division between the African countries, and no matter how deep the division within any one country, including South Africa itself, that is that the left in every country entertained the slightest doubt that, as a continent, Africa will never be fully independent so long as racist South Africa exists. Because that was the unifying force, the unifier was Kenneth Kaunda's attempt at détente with South Africa on the excuse that that could be a step towards freedom for Zimbabwe (Rhodesia). The racist regimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa, read the OAU Resolution of August 1, 1975, "have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole, and have the same racist structure and are organically linked in their policy..." Suddenly, the world was confronted with this spec- culative case of the OAU meeting in January 1976. As against its own Resolution of August, 1975 which the Arab-sponsored Resolution of Nov. 15 quoted in its successful attempt to get the African nations to vote with its Resolution of Feb. 15 as against the very eve of the new January meeting, when even Amin felt an urgency to warn his "African brothers" (referring to Zairei) against having anything to do with racist South Africa, UNITA and FNLA supported it by and as against the fact that no less than 20 African nations had already recognized the MPLA as the legitimate government of Angola, here is what the world became witness to: 1) The U.S.-Zaire-South African(3) supported FNLA and UNITA leaders were seated on the platform.

2) Not one word was spoken against the African's new rich friend, Saudi Arabia, that was funnelling money to these puppets.

3) The 20 African nations that had already recognized the OAU resolution, as the legitimate government of Angola could muster only two others to be with them. With "Amin abstaining without explanation, and Ethiopia abstaining on the excuse that hosts shouldn't take sides," the OAU was reduced to its inner self. Clearly, the global struggle for world domination had entered that cockpit, as it had in Portugal. The counter-revolution intrudes everywhere any revolutionary force emerges.

Before the revolution in Portugal, U.S. imperialists showed little interest in its colonies; indeed, so long as the overthrow of the Caetano fascist regime was in the hands of a neo-fascist, it had nothing to say against Portugal. Once that was done, it was the U.S. allies that demanded support for the counter-revolution. It was not only as the revolution in Portugal was developing along proletarian lines, and Portugal declared it would be no port of call either for NATO or U.S. ships bound for war in the Middle East that the U.S. began clandestine

To support the "pro-Western" factions, i.e., those supported by apartheid South Africa (feeding also Zaire's ambitions for oil at Cabinda), and discovered that Russia was out to make a "satellite of Angola. Suddenly, nothing short of détente or no détente depended upon what happened in Angola. In fact, détente no détente, there is nowhere, as Kissinger's latest trip to Casablanca on the SALT agreement proves once again. Which doesn't, however, mean that the U.S.'s impec-
the independent African nations, that affinity surely lies elsewhere. The ideological disarray is, rather, like the one that pervades much of the Left who, knowing well the factual existence of the Arab threocracies, hungering for a socialist alternative to the capitalist structure of Israel rather than any relapse to feudalism, much more mistaking Israel and apartheid South Africa as one and the same, nevertheless parrot the UN Resolution on Zionism.

Take, for instance, L.F. Stone. On the one hand, he says that to equate Zionism with racism, when racism in our times means Nazism, "is the overstatement of the case."

"Neither in Israel nor in the occupied territories is the lot of the Arabs under the Star of David the lot of the Jews under the swastika. The Arabs still have more freedom of expression than Ukrainians in the Soviet Union, better treatment than Asians are having as parts of liberated Africa, and they are not terrorized like the Jews in Iraq or Syria." (6)

One obvious consequence of the UN Resolution that L.F. Stone does recognize is that it was a victory not just for its sponsors, but also a victory for the Zionist hardliners. What greater boon could right-wing Zionists have wished for than the fact that revulsion against anti-Semitism that independents saw in the UN Resolution led thousands of non-Zionists (and, indeed, many were Jews) throughout the world to wear buttons proclaiming "I am a Zionist." What more could they have wished for than that the Israelis of their own free will — despite the problems they were engaged in class struggles and in fights against their country's foreign policy, especially to Israel's non-recognition of the Palestinians as a national entity entitled to self-determination — would suddenly, with eagles, with worry over whether at the other end of the spectrum lurks that perennial manifestation of degeneracy, anti-Semitism.

Despite all this, Stone, using the ground of the UN Resolution for argument, states that 1), since the Palestinians in Israel are treated as second-class citi- zens, the UN Resolution has "an element of truth"; 2) talking about it is always the best place to get an "answer to the Sinai disengagement." He acts as if there were only one way to be for a "defiant Arab state," and there were no rich history from Marx through Lenin to Trotsky on the question of self-determination, and as if Marx's humanism wasn't precisely what had been taken out of the "archives" and made into an on-going historic revolution in our day, precisely in East Europe, fighting against Stalinism and against this new kind of racism i.e. anti-Semitism, as witness Czechoslovakia in 1968. (6)

Not that racism is only anti-Semitism, or only against Blacks, be that in South Africa or the USA, or just a Middle East phenomenon. Racism, after all, arose in the heart of West Europe. Because racism is integral to all class exploitative societies and reaches its most vitriolic expression during hard times, it is imperative to look at it comparatively. Focusing why at any time it takes this or that specific form. Why is it that, where in the turbulent near-revolutions of the 1960's, even so reactionary a Council as the Vatican felt compelled to call a "Dialogue with Jews," proclaming "a new era of interfaith dialogue is not removing some root causes of anti-Semitism, whereas, in the 1970's, the "New Left" aligns in a visible "jihad" against "Zionist" imperialism. For whatever reasons the UN's eyes presently are turned only to Israel, racism is in fact reaching a most virulent phase in France where one million French workers and 100,000 immigrant workers have been thrown into the unemployed army. In the case of the immigrant workers, whom the French government has lured there and confined to the dirtiest work at the lowest pay, as well as herding them into the most barbaric living quarters (7), their racism and their ugly head that France tried to hew them out of the country, whether they came from the Middle East or Portugal, from Algeria or Black Africa.

Clearly, above everything else hangs the world economic recession. At a time when decisive events, such as those surrounding the question of the New World War II, brought out the worst, be it apartheid South Africa mercenaries fighting in Angola — and bringing disarray into the OAU— or France expelling invading labor and bringing disarray into the OAU with France expelling, on the one hand, the most left-wing orientations of the 1960's, or the New World War II, which revealed how national revolutions can aid the undermining of imperialism, with the Irish Revolution against British imperialism right in the midst of wars, when warlike countries, navigating, to their own mutual advantage, other across national boundaries, the "National Question" assumed an urgency and impetus to proletarian revolution which brought a schism within Bolshevikism. Lenin alone, while the most profound as well as concrete analysis of the revolutionary aspects of the "National Question" (9). Moreover, these continued beyond the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia with the accession to power of the Bolsheviks. By the time of the defeat of the 1919 German Revolution, upon which both the extension of the Russian revolution was still possible and the very life of the Russian Revolution depended (no one thought of any mirage as "socialism in one country"), Lenin raised a totally new aspect to the relationship of the National Question to the world revolution: "If not through Berlin perhaps through Peking."

Whatever changes had in the meantime occurred in Zionism's projection of a "Jewish homeland" (10) seemed to be of no concern to revolutionary Marxists since "there were still confident the world revolution would win."

"Everything totally changed with the Great Depression and the rise of Nazism, accompanied by such manifestation of anti-Semitism also in the "degenerated workers' state" that Trotsky changed his position on the Jewish Question. The density of today's Trotskyism would be difficult to explain, having the slightest conception of what is the dialectical relationship of the objective to the subjective 'situation'—what is the dialectics of liberation for more non-Jewish society, without which there can be no universal human emancipation." (9) So that this principle underlined all Marxist revolutions struggling for the social and political emancipation of the Jews and for a "universal human emancipation" the Jewish Question was not dealt with as a separate issue.

During Tsarism, however, when the persecution of the Jews reached the pogrom stage after the assassination of tsar Alexander II by a than Asiatic and European parts of liberated Russia, or cultured France, Where anti-Semitism reared its ugly head in the Dreyfus case many Jews began to reject "Western civilization." The pogrom on top of the ghettoism, economic, political and social persecution of the Jews, gave rise to Zionism at the end of the 19th century. As a national movement, revolutionary internationalists rejected it. On the whole, Stalinist theory, at least at the time that the Jews began to say that they were a "cultural" one, felt sure that socialism would solve all questions of racial or religious persecution, and therefore urged total assimilation. What changed the attitude on the "National Question" within the party of the great Soviet revolution was the outbreak of World War II, which revealed how national revolutions can aid the undermining of imperialism. With the Irish Revolution against British imperialism right in the midst of wars, when warlike countries, navigating, to their own mutual advantage, other across national boundaries, the "National Question" assumed an urgency and impetus to proletarian revolution which brought a schism within Bolshevikism. Lenin alone, while the most profound as well as concrete analysis of the revolutionary aspects of the "National Question" (9). Moreover, these continued beyond the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia with the accession to power of the Bolsheviks. By the time of the defeat of the 1919 German Revolution, upon which both the extension of the Russian revolution was still possible and the very life of the Russian Revolution depended (no one thought of any mirage as "socialism in one country"), Lenin raised a totally new aspect to the relationship of the National Question to the world revolution: "If not through Berlin perhaps through Peking."
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he called upon the Jews to join the Fourth International, which had been the first to warn about fascism.

World War II had totally changed the objective situation. The creation of the state of Israel changed it still further for the Middle East. Two realities, thenceforth, were new: the existence of Israel, and with that success, the creation of another national consciousness—the Palestinian people. Their right to self-determination can no more be decided from above, be it by the many Arab kingdoms and emirates, or the PLO claiming sole spokespersonship—much less through a UN command. Let the Palestinian people speak for themselves. Naturally, Zionism in power, like the ideology of all ruling classes, be they Jewish or Moslem or Christian—or the big powers themselves, West and East, is exploitative. Which is why, precisely why, the main enemy is always in one's own country. The Israeli masses will fight that battle. Far from encouraging such action—the UN Resolution equating Zionism with racism—while the PLO representative shouts: Zionism differs "in no way from apartheid in South Africa" (52), cannot but remind one of the Big Lie.

Unfortunately, even that is not the worst of it. The worst of it is that it does, indeed, reflect the actual state of the disarray of the world, not only in the economy and politics, but also in the void in its thought.

Clearly, the Arab-Israeli question is not just Arab-Israeli; the Middle East is not just the Middle East—Saudi Arabia is not just oil-rich kingdom underwriting PLO actions against Israel, but also South African white mercenaries and its Black puppets in Angola. Nor is it just Africa that is being torn apart—the Portuguese revolution is also being put under the whip of counter-revolution. Once again, the global struggle for single world domination, between the U.S. and Russia, with China intervening, and the U.S. and China considering Russia Enemy No. 1. Omnipresent everything. And through it all, racism and anti-Semitism is at its height also at the heart of "Western civilisation"—France. In a word, the euphemism of "Zionism" for anti-Semitism cannot but recall the degeneracy Western civilisation reached in 400 B.C. with the collapse of France without a fight: "Paris is not for burning." For the Left to counterintuitively, but to aid in such ideological obscuration cannot but smooth the way for the counter-revolution. A necessary first step to turn matters around is to clear up our heads so that the history of revolutions, the dialectics of liberation becomes the path for their actualization.

Yours,
Raya

NOTES
1. There was a great deal of opposition to that Resolution outside of the UN hall by no means, limited to Jews. Indeed, one of the most interesting came from Black intellectuals, which stated: "The prospect of a concerted United Nations drive against African apartheid has been effectually thwarted by an amendment which introduces an extraneous issue to a worthy United Nations undertaking." The appeal was signed by 28, including Drs. Charles H. Wesley, author of the first and most original works on Black labor and director of the Afro-American Museum in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Dr. Luther Foster, president of Tuskegee Institute in Tuskegee, Alabama; and C. Clyde Ferguson Jr. of Harvard Law School.
2. Mubarak of Egypt has been an especially welcome guest in Mao's China, whose RussianClinton has been trying to legalize with the Angolan factions apartied South Africa supports, though that type of open collaboration has forced China to announce it would withdraw its support. Yes, no one need have any illusions about South Africa's "withdrawal" of its mercenaries in Angola. Not only does it operate from its apartheid regime, but it can now hide behind U.S. imperialism since its open support boomeranged.
3. Ethiopia has since recognized the MPLA. What it worried about most is what it said least about, and that was "Saudi Arabia's intervention" since it is Saudi Arabia that is financing a good part of Eritrea's rebels. Where Eritrea's fight for self-determination started as a revolutionary opposition to the Emperor's Ethiopia, the Arab kingdom choosing Muslim factions to support is counteracting freedom movements.
5. At the time of Russia's imperialist invasion of Czechoslovakia, August 1968, the still defiant Czechoslovak radio broadcast this broadcast on August 26: "We have learned at long last who is responsible for the non-existent Czechoslovak counterrevolution. "International Zionism" (euphemism for the Jews). Apparently our East German friends have been experts on this subject ever since World War II... Allegedly two million people are involved... Why cannot these two million Zionists be found if the Soviet army commands, or perhaps even Neues Deutschland wishes to find them? Anyhow, the Germans today are the only real experts able to distinguish with absolute accuracy between Aryans and inferiors or races. This broadcast is reproduced in Philosophy and Revolution, p. 354. See especially Chapter 8, "State-Capitalism and the East European Revolutions" where many of the East European revolutionaries speak for themselves.
6. The Paris correspondent (Walter Schwarz) of the Guardian (December 28 1970) in his article, "France to send home 'unemployed' immigrants" describes these horrid living quarters, including the illegal but operative "x & y equals 24 principle" (three people using a bed in shifts of eight hours each). The quotation from Albert Levy of the Movement Against Racism and anti-Semitism and for Peace is likewise from that article.
7. Marx's "On the Jewish Question" is included in Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Science edited by Easton and Guattari.
8. Up to March 1917, Lenin's articles on the National Question are included in his Collected Works, Vol. XXIV, the 1920 Theses on the National and Colonial Questions in Selected Works, Vol. X.
9. The question of a bi-national state was not only the aim of...