

REB

November 30, 1986

Dear I. and G .,

Because this year the expansion of the REB does not focus on the NEB, but on the local at the Center, I am addressing this letter to you two as the proletarians whose views I especially want this year on those inseparables that seem to be hard to see as inseparables--organizational growth and the bi-weekly to which it is integral.

The integrality of organizational growth with the bi-weekly, as the integrality of the Archives with the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism is "taken for granted" in the belief that since we are all Marxist-Humanists, no concretization is needed for either the Archives or the Dialectic. It is no accident--and Marx thought it was no accident; for actually ~~never~~ never let go of the Hegelian Dialectic not even after he transformed it from a revolution in philosophy to a philosophy of revolution--that Hegel called the ~~methodology~~ methodology of taking something for granted to be "barbarous". That is to say, that here was someone who was so close to the Absolute Method as to be on the threshold of the Absolute and, instead of going forward, fell back.

Let me cite to you just one example that happened but three days ago, as Mike was typing the Editorial I was dictating on the bizarre liason of the U.S.-Iran arms deal--we used to call them marchants of death and I think we will return to that characterization. But Mike was laughing as I dictated the footnote to him, which was the Lebanese paper Ash-Shira'a. It turned out that Mike is so much the Archivist on the event of the day that he said, when you wrote the 11/3 Dear Colleagues Letter was the day the Lebanese Syrian-controlled paper published the news of the ~~secret~~ secret deal. I laughed too because the same thing had happened when I had declared the Gulf of Sidra (soon followed by the bombing of Tripoli) as a "changed world" which many handled as if; what else do you expect from Reagan? In fact, it was a new global rulers' type of stage which recognized no national boundaries, i.e., independence of any country that was not ~~directly~~ directly the other nuclear Behemoth. That NATO began recognizing that gesture of Reagan's is still shrouded because ~~not~~ NATO power dared to leave that nuclear embrace.

That may be a circuitous way of getting back to the first paragraph which is trying to get your views before the Jan. 3 expanded REB sum-up of the period following the Convention. But I felt it necessary to take that path

11580

In order to show what things are inseparable, though it appears to the practical person to be separable, that is to say, the immediate of the bi-weekly and the Universals of Marxist-Humanism: History as past and history-in-the-making. Archives as paper increasing its frequency so as to meet the challenge of the objective situation. The voices from below sound louder when they are published in the context of a Marxist-Humanist paper.

What do you think? Do you agree with what I'm driving at? Or do you think that that's exactly what you ~~was~~ believed before you ever read any of this? For example, do you see that what is urgent for us now as the last monthly has gone to press and before we come out with the first bi-weekly is precisely why I'm appealing to you two proletarians? Among other reasons for this step, the significance lies in the fact that this year, instead of the expanded REB concentrating on the NEB, it is an expanded REB by virtue of including the whole local at the Center because it is the one upon whose shoulders of necessity most of the so-called technical work falls.

It came as a shock to me to suddenly realize, as I was working on the Dialectic of Philosophy on the same level as the Dialectic of Organization (the book-to-be), that the phrase "organizational growth" had very nearly disappeared from our vocabulary. And yet, that is precisely why I was so anxious in proposing the transformation of N&L into a bi-weekly more than a year ago. Once the Convention voted for the bi-weekly that becomes the concrete both as an immediate ~~and~~ and as a Universal. No one has a right to make his/her individual opposition to it the subject whenever they speak, as if the Convention had not voted for the bi-weekly, the Archives Classes, with the REB concretizing the preparatory work for the 1st appearance of the bi-weekly, Jan. 1987. ~~is~~ is diversionary. Proletarians have a right to say: Let's go on with the Perspectives voted for at the Convention. They will be further concretized when we take stock of the four months since then.

Anything else

Tomorrow the REB will meet. In addition to raising some of these questions there I will give a whiff of the book-to-be. I hope that that, too, will help you in writing your own reply to this. As you will see when the paper comes off the press next week, time was unavailable for a bi-weekly; I had to act as if News & Letters was not only a bi-weekly but a daily, but at the same time to analyze that bizarre event of U.S./Iran not just from the left in general, but most concretely as a Marxist-Humanist theoretician, that is to say, taking it up philosophically and in its international setting. At the same time, there was no way of not informing the public--and that too not merely as a technical announcement of a bi-weekly's frequency and subscription price--but exactly what brevity, frequency, i.e., the time element, mean historically and philosophically.

Yours, Raya

11581