

Themes

- 3 *Herbert Marcuse* The Question of Revolution
- 8 NLR The Marxism of Régis Debray
- 13 *Régis Debray* Problems of Revolutionary
Strategy in Latin America
- 43 PMcG WORK
Steelman
- 53 *Eric Rouleau* The Syrian Enigma: What is the
Baath?
- 67 *Anouar Abdel-Malek* The Crisis in Nasser's Egypt
- 83 Introduction to Malawi
- 85 *Andrew Ross* White Africa's Black Ally
- 95 REVIEWS

Editor
Managing Editor
Editorial Committee

Perry Anderson
Quintin Hoare
Anthony Barnett, Robin Blackburn, Ben Brewster,
Alexander Cockburn, Ronald Fraser, Jon Halliday,
Nicolas Krassó, Branka Magas, Juliet Mitchell,
Roger Murray, Tom Naim, Lucien Rey,
Bob Rowthorn, Gareth Stedman Jones,
Tom Wengraf

Advertising Manager
Designer
Annual Subscription

Arthur Boyars
Derek Birdsall
Inland: 27/- post paid 6 issues
Overseas: 39/-, \$5.50 post paid 6 issues

Single Copies

Inland: 5/- post paid
Overseas: 7/6, \$1.10 post paid

Back numbers

Inland: 7/6 post free
Overseas: 10/-, \$1.50 post free

American Distributor
Communications to

B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, New Jersey
New Left Review, 7 Carlisle St, London W1
Regent 8839

Office Hours

10.00 am-2.00 pm

The news of Isaac Deutscher's death came too late for us to pay him the tribute he deserves. We can only express our dismay and grief. Deutscher's work as a historian of Soviet Russia was a decisive intellectual experience for our generation. His influence was much wider and deeper than that of a simple historian. Of all the great socialist intellectuals of our time, Deutscher was the only one who spoke the language of Marxism so naturally and classically that he could communicate with virtually any audience. This effortless control of a philosophy which is usually conquered at such painful costs over normal habits of thought and speech gave his work its distinctive universality. Much of modern Marxism has been a difficult discourse on method. Deutscher, by contrast, was unremittingly concerned with the central, substantive problem of 20th-century socialism: the destiny of the revolution. There was no accident in this. For those who knew him personally, it was always evident that as a man he was, before any thing else, a revolutionary. He represented in his person a continuity with the Bolshevik tradition. In Britain, during the post-war decades, nothing was more unfamiliar or more exemplary. 'New Left Review' had the melancholy honour of publishing his last text before he died—an analysis of the Middle Eastern crisis that was salutary and clairvoyant, amid so much confusion on the Left. The approach of the fiftieth anniversary of October reminds us of the socialist we no longer have.

Two years ago exactly, we published an essay entitled 'Latin America: The Long March', by a young Frenchman called Régis Debray. At the time, he was an unknown philosophy student, who had travelled and studied widely in Latin America. The essay, however, was so exceptional in its political intelligence and urgency that we had no hesitation in accord- ing the better part of an issue (No. 33) to it. Since then, Debray has become

internationally famous. Author of 'Revolution in the Revolution?', a systematic theoretical statement of the lessons of the Cuban Revolution which has sold over 200,000 copies in Cuba, Debray was invited by Che Guevara to be the first writer to whom he would grant an interview since his disappearance two years ago. Debray went to Bolivia, saw Guevara as a journalist, and was arrested and imprisoned by the Bolivian military for 'assassination' and 'rebellion'. As we go to press, he is awaiting a fabricated trial in Camiri. A world-wide campaign for his release is necessary: our solidarity with him should be unfaltering. The reason for the farce in Bolivia is evident. Imperialism is mortally afraid of his ideas. Debray has renewed the Leninist tradition of political and strategic analysis immediately geared to the problem of the conquest of power. The brilliance of his writings is now admitted even by those who fear them most. The recent OLAS Conference in Havana has lent them a continental significance. In this issue, we publish a key essay on revolutionary strategy in Latin America.

Herbert Marcuse's most recent work, 'One Dimensional Man,' made a very great impact on the Left in both the United States and Germany. Marcuse's influence has grown steadily over the years. A Spartakist in 1918, he has always remained faithful to the ideals of his youth. 'One-Dimensional Man,' however, has often been thought to be a despairing analysis of US capitalism, as a totally integrated and impregnable system of oppression, which has nullified any potential for radical action within it. In the interview with a West German intellectual which we publish here, Marcuse makes such misunderstandings hence-forward impossible. His answers are a clear reaffirmation of the necessity, and possibility, of revolution in the West. Dismissing the conventional cant about the 'convergence' of the capitalist and communist worlds, he insists on the central importance of Vietnam within the United States itself—as the internal frontier of imperialism. This is an essential text for anyone who wants to become acquainted with Marcuse's thought today.

In our last issue, we published Isaac Deutscher's interview on the Israeli-Arab War, to which we refer above. His diagnosis of the character and crisis of Arab nationalism is confirmed in the two articles on Nasser's Egypt and Baathist Syria, by Anouar Abdel-Malek and Eric Rouleau. Both underline the same point—the need for a genuine entry of the masses into Arab politics, in a context free from mystical chauvinism and bureaucratic manipulation. Until this occurs, the Middle Eastern crisis will not find any solution.

The Question of Revolution

First Question: It is said that Marx's concept of revolution, will not stand up to the new facts of industrial society. It has become an anachronism; it no longer has any constituency. The working class, in Marx's opinion the historical subject of all future social upheavals, has dissolved itself *as a class*; the desire to establish a qualitatively different social order has given way to the need for better working conditions, more leisure time and more material goods. In these circumstances, the old theory of revolution, which articulated the economic misery of one class and taught the oppressed to speak, has become impotent and unrealistic; it has turned its back on reality. Anyone talking of revolution nowadays is surely contributing to a mystification?

Marcuse: The idea of revolution is in fact never a 'mystification'. As a whole the existing situation has always been bad: a force resisting the real possibilities of overcoming misery and inhumanity. The fact that revolution no longer has any identifiable 'constituency' and no organized movement on which it could depend does not remove its necessity. But does it really have no 'constituency' today? Neither the ideological veil of pluralist democracy nor the material veil

of extravagant productivity alters the fact that in the realm of advanced capitalism the fate of man is determined by the aggressive and expansive apparatus of exploitation and the policies interwoven with it. The civic rights that are permitted and administered in this system of domination do not diminish the violence of an oppression which has made the world a hell. At the moment hell is concentrated on the battlefields of Vietnam and the other sacrificial lands of neo-colonialism. Of course humanity is concentrated there too: not immediately, in the guerrilla struggles, which meet the horror of the conqueror with the horror of defence, but, via many mediations, in the opportunity to define the inner limit of the system given to those who in their extreme poverty and weakness have for years now kept the richest and technologically most developed destructive machine of all time in check. I say 'inner' limit because there is no longer any outer limit to the global system of advanced capitalism; because even the development of the socialist countries, despite all the contrast in their relations of production, responds to the pressure of world competition and the needs of coexistence. But any romantic idea of the liberation front is incorrect. Guerrilla struggle as such does not present any mortal threat to the system: in the long run it cannot resist a technological 'Final Solution'. The system reserves for itself the right to decree whether and when it will achieve 'victory' by burning and poisoning everything. The 'Final Solution' in Vietnam would be the final consolidation of the power of capital, which would further extend its interests with the help of dictatorships of the military and of property, and would force the socialist countries into an increasingly debilitating defence (or into powerless neutrality).

This tendency can only be broken if the resistance of the victims of neo-colonialism finds support in the 'affluent society' itself, in the metropolis of advanced capitalism and in the weaker capitalist countries whose independence is threatened by the metropolis. (I will come back to the opposition in the metropolis in my answer to question 4.) In any case, in the capitalist countries of the European continent the precondition for the efficacy of a serious opposition remains the political revitalization of the working-class movement on an international scale.

Second Question: One of the striking aspects of our time is the gradual mutual convergence of capitalism and socialism. In both systems advanced industrialization has altered the social process and the methods of production. To the extent that technology determines the course of things and the social relationships of men, relations of domination can still be defined only in technological terms. Power lies with the apparatus which administers social labour and organizes its adaptation: domination, translated into manipulation, can hardly be recognized any more as political and economic domination. Each person acts in good faith, from his own desire to act in response to general pressures. The conception of freedom, by which revolutionaries and revolutions were inspired, has, so it seems, been taken out of circulation in modern capitalist and socialist states. Has the concept of freedom finally lost its revolutionary force in the 'managed mass society'?

Marcuse: The 'gradual mutual convergence of capitalism and social-

ism' has found its expression in the cliché concept of the 'technological society' or the 'developed industrial society'. The usual indignant criticism of this concept is itself ideological. It should no longer be necessary to emphasize that it is not technique, but the social organization of the productive forces that determines the difference between social systems. But it appears necessary to repeat that the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and collective control of them does not finalize this difference, particularly when this control is exercised by a working class whose needs and aspirations are dominated by imitation of and adaptation to needs engendered by the capitalist system. Coexistence with advanced capitalism is driving the socialist societies into a life and death competition—into a competition in which the development of the productive forces and of social needs is to a large extent subordinated to politico-diplomatic and military exigencies. Thus, here as well as there, technique is becoming a means of oppression built into the process of production. As such, technique, which has not yet been turned into a means of liberation, prescribes definite modes of conduct within and in relation to the apparatus of domination—here as well as there. Nevertheless, it remains the case that the opportunity for liberation lies where the means of production have been socialized. The political economy of the socialist countries needs peace, not aggressive expansion.

But technological and political competition in the development of the forces of production produces yet another tendency which appears still more pernicious for the future. The present international constellation is leading to an opposition of interests between the 'old' stabilized, technologically advanced and industrialized socialist countries on the one hand and the 'new' and poorer ones on the other. The former are moving into the category of possessors; the revolutionary communism of the poor on the other side of the border may well appear to them as a new 'revolution from below' and thus as a danger. Not to them alone, of course. For the 'affluent society' also senses danger here: for a long time the American 'struggle against Communism' has become a struggle against the Communism of the poorest.

If it is the case that the 'conception of freedom, by which revolutionaries and revolutions were inspired', is suppressed in the developed industrial countries with their rising standard of living, then it is all the more acute and open where the suppressed are rebelling against the system. It is here that the revolutionary concept of freedom coincides with the necessity to defend naked existence: in Vietnam as much as in the slums and ghettos of the rich countries.

Third Question: In contemporary industrial society the economy is no longer the basis of political decisions, but is itself a function of politics. Economic processes are more obviously under political control now than 50 years ago. In this a new, and long unfamiliar, form of totalitarianism is emerging. Social theory seems not to have adapted to this state of affairs: it slavishly adheres to its own categories and leaves the facts to themselves. It seems that practice has broken with ideas. Can the contemporary development of society still be interpreted with

concepts like 'alienation', 'reification', 'exploitation', 'minimum subsistence level' and 'pauperization'?

Marcuse: It is not correct to say that 'in contemporary industrial society the economy is *no longer* the basis of political decisions, but is itself a function of politics'. In the *narrow* 'economic' sense, the economy was never the basis. Today too it is 'political economy': the process of production and distribution is largely determined by politics and is itself a determinant of a politics which is dominated by the great oligopolistic interests (they are by no means always in harmony). And the political opinion and position of producers and consumers is more than ever an economic factor: it is an element in the process of exchange, in the buying and selling of labour power, in the marketing of commodities. One must be 'all right' politically to be able to compete in business, in the office and in the factory. Political propaganda and commercial advertisements coincide. The political economy of advanced capitalism is also a 'psychological economy': it produces and administers the needs demanded by the system—even the instinctive needs. It is this introjection of domination combined with the increasing satisfaction of needs that casts doubt on concepts like alienation, reification and exploitation. Is the beneficiary of the 'affluent society' not in fact 'fulfilling' himself in his alienated being? Does he not, in fact, find himself again in his gadgets, his car and television set? But on the other hand, does false subjectivity dispose of the objective state of affairs?

Fourth Question: In an essay in 1965 you put forward the thesis that capitalism has succeeded in bringing its contradictions into a 'manipulable form'; it has absorbed the 'revolutionary potential'. Does this mean that under the given conditions it is impossible to combine critical theory and political practice? In other words, what does 'revolutionary' mean in the context of a society that has, without violence, suppressed the thought of revolution and the need for it?

Marcuse: The manipulation of the contradictions of advanced capitalism has its own dynamic, whose explosive force is today active in the escalation of the war in Vietnam and in the expansion of American capital into Europe, South America and Asia. It is senseless to see in this tendency the seeds of an armed conflict between the capitalist powers: common interest *vis-à-vis* the common enemy forces the rivals together. But within the nations particular interests are insisting on resistance to American capital; national independence is again becoming a progressive factor. A retreat by American capital—combined with the unemployment created by increasing automation—could lead to serious shocks; it would undermine the unification of antagonistic forces in the USA. It is possible that neo-fascist tendencies would then triumph and that the majority of the organized workers would follow them or remain neutral; it is, however, also possible that opposition would grow and organize itself.

In this situation the opposition of American youth could have a political effect. This opposition is free from ideology or permeated with a deep distrust of all ideology (including socialist ideology); it is sexual, moral, intellectual and political rebellion all in one. In this sense it is

total, directed against the system as a whole: it is disgust at the 'affluent society', it is the vital need to break the rules of a deceitful and bloody game—to stop co-operating any more. If these young people detest the prevailing system of needs and its ever increasing mass of goods, this is because they observe and know how much sacrifice, how much cruelty and stupidity contribute every day to the reproduction of the system. These young people no longer share the repressive need for the blessings and security of domination—in them perhaps a new consciousness is appearing, a new type of person with another instinct for reality, life and happiness; they have a feeling for a freedom that has nothing to do with, and wants nothing to do with, the freedom practised in senile society. In short, here is the 'determinate negation' of the prevailing system, but it is without effective organization and is in itself incapable of exercising decisive political pressure. Only in alliance with the forces who are resisting the system 'from without' can such an opposition become a new *avant-garde*; if it remains isolated it runs the risk of falling victim to inoculation and thus to the system itself.

Interview by *Günter Busch*.

Acknowledgement

Günter Busch's interview with Herbert Marcuse was originally published *Kursbuch 9*, Suhrkamp Verlag.