

July 28, 1986

Suggestions for Terry's Report

Though I didn't have a chance to raise the question about the form for your report, the point about form is the reason I'm making these notes now. Because it is that which would directly give me ground for my insistence that everything stems from the new, the new, the new. It is that which gets one to look at history not as past, but the presence of future in the present.

Thus, you are absolutely correct to start your report with the new communications from the international scene, but you lost something there when you at once jumped back to 1969 and my writings. No matter how priscient they may have been, you should, instead, have continued to develop what flows from that new which in turn had made them write not only that they realize the significance of why we call ourselves Marxist-Humanist and not just Marxist so that by this moment they have sent in no less than four African views on N&L and its proposal for a bi-weekly, which we saw in the RV's in N&L. It's that which would bring you back to U.S.A., specifically Chicago and even more specifically for your report the WL page of N&L. That would have led you to critique of the WL Page and immediately, not rest on that but go to what your perspectives are for 1987.

Take the question of Women <sup>would wide</sup> Write-on. That column is weak not just because the writers are away from the exchanges; on the contrary, the year 1987 requires more than ever that comrades learn how to be editors in the field; they will certainly have greater responsibility and shorter time in which to do it and that will be true also of the Center.

Or take the question of the local at the Center. The lack of discussion on theory/practice is a serious characteristic of the

11187

2

Center as the locals in the field. A critique is not just of criticizing others or yourself; a critique is a question of relating the objective and the subjective philosophically in such a way that you reveal what a so-called after-thought means and that is not merely forgetfulness, but only when you have it all written out in black and white can you first know the conclusion that was just implicit at first. Process, process, process.

WL meeting in LA??

Oh yes, when you talk about responsibilities in the field you could refer to how Peter's report about In the Field--and it is the first time we've had such a report--which by <sup>no</sup> accident had a report of who often volunteered to do leads and such--covered not only local but Mexico and international reports. In a word, if locals considered themselves part of the globe and feel that way which they should, then the self-discipline will indeed be born from their own experiences.

The fact, for example, that I mentioned there must be two meetings of the WL Committee before the Conference. . . looks now as if two are not possible, but you . . . need to put a must to have one before the conference no matter how little time is given to the past things, there is no doubt that what you should come with is <sup>1)</sup> proposals for an agenda: 2) what reports are to be given from the center and what reports from the local; i.e., subjects that flow from the Draft Perspectives or the WL, and that the WL in turn includes the report to the N&L Convention; 3) whether Neda brings news from India, or Laurie from NY, each local should have a report of this meeting of yours at the Center before Aug. 29. Finally, re Rowbotham "is there an organizational answer?" was the title of my question, not Rowbotham's. She had an answer, she never asked any questions. Her answer <sup>was to</sup> raise organizing to a principle in the place of either a "man's" party or philosophy or, well I supposee. she meant that was theory,

11188

page 3

mk

That was the substitute for philosophy, for theory and for the return not only to a "new" elitism AND the return to pre-Marxism which was led not by women but by men. I don't have to tell you that that is vanguardism ~~whatever~~ no matter whether the men or women are doing it. What she was talking about was a re-statement, if not outright plagiarism, of Lenin's 1903 ~~principles~~ tactic for organization under Tsarism which he tried valiantly for 12 long years to modify and definitively put it down as a particular, not as a Universal and by 1917 when he accepted the Soviets as a most original form of organization and that was born out of spontaneity, we had a right to think that he was through with the concept. Well it would take me way long into dialectics of organization.

Yours,

Raya

11189