

Revolution: 'Only Logical Conclusion'

By Lincoln Malik

On April 18 at the Frost Amphitheater, Gil Diaz asked "...the various and assorted liberation fronts a question, in their great zeal to liberate people, why don't you first ask them whether they want to be liberated?"

Those of you who were there heard my angry response to the question and remember my closing remark in calling it a stupid question. It is naturally a stupid question from my point of view as I have lived the reality of my country, which is representative of that in the Third World. Given this reality, the question of liberation becomes synonymous with life and to ask us whether we want liberty is asking us if we want to live.

This is all very clear and logical to me, but I have come to appreciate the problem of American students trying to materialize in their mind a picture totally foreign to their experience. They are constantly confronted with pictures of Viet Nam and Santo Domingo and other places where the revolution has already erupted and the U.S. is actively engaged in putting it down. At this stage of the game with the deluge of U.S. government propaganda drawing a picture of an inhuman and savage communist terrorist gang for the liberation movement, it is not surprising to see the resulting confusion, where liberation is confused with the freedom of choice between communism and capitalism, and counter-insurgency is confused with some totally unrelated problem such as the defense of democracy or maintaining the security of the U.S.

Nevertheless, if the same person were to study any country in the Third World that is still dormant and its issues not yet clouded with propaganda, would

realize immediately that far from communist subversion or any other awful, sinister thing, the revolution is the only logical conclusion to the present order of things in the Third World.

Abstractions

One reason I hate to use words such as the Third World, exploitation, counter-insurgency, etc., is because they become abstractions almost immediately after they are first used and are totally useless in conveying a clear and vivid picture of the reality they are to represent.

What is it that we mean when we say the Third World? These are countries in this world where people live. These are also countries that are rich in resources but poor in what they own, underpopulated in comparison with the industrialized countries but without enough food to feed their population; these are also countries where the raw materials are collected but none of the final products are enjoyed.

This is what the Third World is, a paradox of countries and people that are rich in what they have, yet poor in what they own, strong in their potential, yet weak in their present reality, defeated and subjugated, yet resisting and optimistic of a brighter future.

This brings us directly to another term that has also ended in the realm of abstractions, revolution. Revolution in the Third World is the condition where after long years of non-violent struggle to solve the paradox just described, people have been forced to the use of violence as the only alternative left to effect meaningful change. Revolutions do not happen overnight nor are they imported, exported, bought, sold, or instigated. Revolutions are the natural conclusion of political struggle in the Third World.

It takes years of petitioning,

demonstrating, getting killed and jailed and tortured before the people finally decide that the only way out is to confront force with force and oppression with revolution.

U.S.'s Role

The question now is, where does the U.S. fit in all of this? I could write about imperialism and exploitation, but I am confronted with those same evil forces that were responsible for emptying all those other words of their meaning and shoving them in the dictionary of abstract notions. Hence, let us once more fall back on the use of more descriptive terminology.

The question that should pop up immediately is: how is it possible for these governments to contain and repress such a vast majority of the population? This is a valid question, especially if we realize that these governments are in fact weak governments with rather flimsy institutions and a corrupt apparatus. They fully represent in this manner the backward reality of the countries they rule.

In this context these governments could not possibly survive for very long in the face of a rebellious population were it not for as strong an ally as the U.S. I would be rather absurd to think that Papa "Doc" Duvalier could survive in Haiti were it not for the help of the U.S. The same is true in dozens of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Were we to ask why does the U.S. assume this role of supporting these bullies and thugs in the Third World, I would say because enough people who effect policy in the U.S. find it in their interest to do so. It is beyond question that the U.S. is actively supporting and helping perpetuate these repressive governments in the Third World. This is done through financial and military aid

as well as through none other than that other member of the fraternity of abstracted words: counter-insurgency.

Counter-insurgency can take a many forms as there are situations. It can take the form of training Cubans for the Bay of Pigs invasion, rounding up mercenaries to fight against the republicans in Yemen, transferring thousands of peasants in Viet Nam from their villages to controlled hamlets as well as careful sociological studies in a country to be used in fomenting religious differences to shatter national unity and engaging the people in religious wars against each other keep them from consolidating against the government or the U.S. interest in that country.

In all these cases the thing common is that a high degree of expertise and science are used against people who have absolutely no means of protecting themselves. We have to realize that for every clever land reform drawn up at SRI for use in counter-insurgency, it takes yet for the peasants to realize that was actually a phony reform designed to contain their rebellion and defuse the situation for the many years. The same is true in every scheme of infiltration unions, drawing up of phony constitutions, initiating superficial reforms and all the rest of the clever things that the scientists in places such as SRI, Rand and CIA do.

It is such that the Third World is pillaged, manipulated, repressed; and this is what everyone in the world is called upon to rise up in outrage to defend of "the wretched of earth"—the people of the Third World.

(Lincoln Malik is from Iraq, a grad in Civil Engineering—E)