

Personal

Dear Kevin:

Whether or not you meant it as a way of diplomatically calming Anne, the way she reported your telling her since nothing is definitive yet, you really don't know whether it is NY or Chi. you are "assigned 30", the point is to know most definitively the reason for a decision, and know it philosophically, globally, and individually as unseparated from a universal, and yes, you must definitely, must necessarily for your own self-development at this stage of "trilogy of revolution" live at center in Chicago.

Which is why--I do not mean the why re you alone but all of us--in giving my abbreviated report to REB 12/20 I began it not with the organization move but, 1st and foremost, that trilogy of revolution even when the centerpoint is M&F so that both as embryo and process as well as practicing dialectics in a way that new objective situations, each one of us can analyse the latest--that I began my talk with new classes. At the same time I gave history

of Chicago labor from time Eleanor Marx, 1884-86, developed both

labor and WL in Chicago, and asked Terry to place it in framework of 1984-86. It is very hard for pragmatic Americans to face dialectically any year, much/a span of 100 yrs.

I'm not writing to Anne both because she is evidently on way to vacation and more importantly I must have 2-3 days off to work out all the ramifications I can for Jan. 1, and because I'm taking advantage of the fact that it is with Mike that she had the outburst and will be in a very different framework here. I would however wish you talk with John and Inez because we will want to seriously consider NY. The hope that each and every local and even members-at-large get through those 8 classes before embarking on each one's universality as well as self-development.

Eugene will probably begin his journey to Chicago early Spring and I hope others can intersperse at same time. Individual reorganization is always hardest, not only, say, because you like NY and already have a periphery, but philosophically, exactly how Hegel long ago concretised dialectic: "All revolutions, in the sciences no less than in general history, originate only in this, that the spirit of man, for the understanding and comprehension of himself, for the possessing of himself, has now altered his categories, uniting himself in a truer, deeper, more intrinsic relation with himself."

Yours, hurriedly.

Handwritten note from RD to AJ, to be hand-delivered before Jan. 1

Personal

12/18/83 3:30 AM

Dear Anne --

Since I cannot sleep -- and in any case I cannot reach you; You've probably left for a much needed vacation -- I decided to write you this most political-philosophic note in a personal way, which please do not share with anyone.

To grapple seriously in a deeply dialectical (way) the imperativeness of the center's move to Chicago, you need to be globally aware of the fact that I will not live forever. That sounds so blasé that you may wonder why make a category of it.

The truth is the usual disdain for its all-too-familiar nature which keeps one from its concretization. I cannot afford such over-familiarity with the facts of nature.

It is my responsibility as U.S. founder to M-H, both as philosopher and organizer to create that philosophy of permanent revolution as ground and "personification" of locales in so solid a manner that no void will result when I am no longer around. (I am in great health and there is no physical weakness pointing to another physical state.)

But it is the responsibility of leadership to take the worst possible alternative as jumping off point for leaps ahead and not to wait for surprises that force upon 1st reaction instead of 2nd negativity.

For the last 3 years I've thought of Chicago as that home for NAL, paper and committees. But CD's poor health made it impossible to make into a motion. Everything from Lou's moving to center to present very different type of reason for Kenin's need for his self-development to locate where center was to-be-Chi. was nevertheless embarked upon -- and CD knew all about and approved.

All other matters are secondary tho each local must be sub-center and not just local. Trust you will rise up to that type of national and individual re-organization and aim --

Yours

Raya

16237

Mar. 26, 1964

Dear Dave:

This is the 1st day I've had "free" since meeting my column deadline and all other tasks of clearing the decks for working out the Convention Call to which Chicago is so central. Since it is also the eve of the last of the classes here, one sentence from the last Convention Call struck me suddenly as if it were something new when, in fact, it relates to Part III of RLWLKM which is over 2 years old. Nevertheless, the reason it struck me as if it were new is that I wished to concretize it in the context of Chicago. The sentence itself expressed the fact that in order to understand the book fully it was imperative to realize that not only does Part III, "Karl Marx--From a Critic of Marx to the author of Capital to the theorist of the revolution in permanence" inform the whole of the book--i.e., Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation--but it also disclosed the process which caused the birth of Marxist-Humanism in the US which, in turn, helped make Marx's Humanism so today-ish.

The reason I'd like to concretize this in the context of Chicago is when something becomes a result it doesn't reveal the process. Take, for ex., such a simple thing as the ~~summary~~ heading of Terry's essay on "Eleanor Marx in America". I wish it had been titled "Eleanor Marx in Chicago." It isn't due to it being the eve of our ~~meeting~~ there, though that surely helped us wish the title had stressed the name of that city, or even the fact that it is, after ~~pure~~ fact that Eleanor's greatest moment came in Chicago and that it was the period of celebrating Haymarket but the fact that she had also brought in the WL, which was not then the topic, shows there was something in the air in a specific place where ~~historia~~ historic, a great, a lasting event had happened. But it isn't the 19th c. I'm thinking about just now.

Nor does the wish to concretize that sentence in context of Chicago due to the fact that I'm or ever have been a Chicago patriot, or even that I wish to make up for the fact that I voted for that move way back when finally we broke fully with Trotskyism and the intellectualistic elan in NY and decided to move to an industrial city, to the midWest, as was clear enough when the ~~concrete~~ question was a new type of paper and worker-editor I moved and stayed a ~~yo.~~ in Detroit. No, the truth is both objective and 20th c. before ever we were directly involved. The year was 1937, certainly a very revolutionary year --an outright social revolution, Spain, and a revolution in conditions of life as finally we had an industrial union, the CIO, and personally my life had come to a certain climax with becoming Trotsky's Secretary. All this notwithstanding, the event that was Chicago that became national and international in defeat--the Little Steel Strike--was the subject of revolutionaries because it was, not just a strike that was massacred, but that which tests revolutionaries and sets their task, their goal, their immediate need of both practice and theory. I know we as Trotskyists played up Black as int. victory for 4th, and which led to the discussions with IS re CLRJ--but the truth is that that which is not recorded ^{157/101}

16238

historic developments such as CIO or even a single strike when it, like the Little Steel Strike in the year 1937 cannot merit less space in Militant than "Teamster Union" in MPLS because it is our". (I have orally referred to it to show that when deed can in no way be separated from what it means, I mean the imperative relationship to a stage of cognition.) LT did see that a paper that fails to catch objectivity as well as Idea misses uniqueness of a workers' paper that is Marxist. The trouble was, (though I did not then see what I would see in fact that Militant too was not what only Marx's Marxism, not Trotskyism, would mean by "meaning.") the truncated Marxism that Trotskyism itself was couldn't transform that paper to be what NEWS & LETTERS BECAME, IS.

Now then, strictly N&L, strictly new in Chicago as its home. Too much of Detroit is past, what it was rather than new processes it needs to undergo and new openings it would open. I'm talking of Chicago, not 1937, but since, with CD's anticipation once he had completed 2nd Part of IH and sending out "scouts" to Chicago, what it was when you met M-H both as local and as you experienced rejection of ST and were looking for something new, something total, some revolutionary anticipation of what you would do, and it was join. You certainly have wide experience and deep thinking as Chicago, as "have thumb, will travel", as viewing the possibility of sub-center. And, please, don't think only proletarian and leave out "intellectual" for though we concentrate on industrial, on Black, on Latino, we do also recognize Chicago as greater intellectual center than Detroit--and that without some of the handicaps of the intellectual center, New York. In fact, in moving the center to Chicago, Kevin too is moving which means academia will not be totally left out, for the 2 aspects are inseparable, as is N&L as Theory/Practice.

Do please begin thinking of your contributions to the pre-Convention discussion. In fact, I hope you'd comment on this brief letter before waiting for Perspectives.

Yours,



16239

7/30/89

Personal & Completely Informal

Dear Mary:

The "1st-time-ever whenever the 2nd part of top was ever used and it is not for frivolous purposes. Rather it is because the subject I'll raise, though extremely political-philosophic-organization, is raised in so totally an informal way and indeed I not only am showing it to no one, but I don't really have set views. Rather I need your attitude, your advise, your perspective re organizational putlook for as far away a place as New York at a time when it is so tangled and yet so crucial for both the new stage and a certain generalization about the past that I felt, though I am asking you personally as well, that your all-round knowledge of the specific people and place that I then may finally have set views-decisions-perspectives. So, here goes story:

You know that, though I've always put ^{it} top of list, and not only "culturally"; I hardly considered it a success for the people hardly had that all-sided pol-org'l-philosophic that such a difficult place as Manhattan demands. I believe you know it from days of Greeman and, though all too flexible, was not flexible in the sense needed of knowing how, at one & same time, how to listen from the voices from below AND HEAR MARX THINKING which is not to be subordinate to either Mahwah or academia. Whether we sent John & Inez to "discipline" Greeman, or Anne & Ray for WL & Black; or the new Latino voices so great but again no substitute for Marxist-Humanism and if not "substitute" they nevertheless could not be "equal to" but M-H-ists had to be aware of our uniqueness, contributions to Marx's Marxism, as being that BODY OF IDEAS, that trilogy of revolution, as to have the historic right to existence that comes with those who have spelled out Marxism for its own age.)

You also know that difficulties have been aggravated not alone by the fact that the most active in both academia and organization, Kevin, is moving to Chicago with Center. Rather, as the date of convention approaches, it is not that which is preoccupying Anne but something, if not as vulgar as "settling scores", nevertheless it is the moment of present weighted down by past rather than future that preoccupies her. Of course, she wants help. And of course we agree and have been trying to think of it not just quantitatively or even qualitatively, but so total that there is no division of any kind bet. phil., or org., politics or sensitivity; etc.etc.etc.

Your name hasn't stopped surfacing to my mind from way back Chicago was spelled out as center, with the need we need the type of subcenters that is not just a new way of looking at a local, but truly near level of Center. If I asked concretely for such a serious move; if after I hear from you directly I discussed with Alan and Peter how your move from Bay Area would not be felt so heavily as to hurt; if we then discussed NY, first just among a few but then with NY directly--may I have your first and 2nd reactions bet. Call and Perspectives' deadline?

Yours,

I've been waiting. I meant wanting to write after I saw you doing

The tapes -

16240

RA
April 16, 1984

Dear Raya:

What you raised in your letter on perspectives, NY and my involvement therein is of a serious nature though now being raised "informally." Even though I can't reply to you with a fully worked-out response, I didn't want to let yours go unanswered until such a time.

Since getting your letter, what I have tried to consider is 1) the new level for this new period and 2) how that translates to a new life of NY as subcenter. Then the 3rd point is, how can I contribute. My view in the past of what is a subcenter is that its meaning has often been in the eye of the beholder-practitioner. In coming closest to the mark, I think not so much of locals as of the work of individuals, such as what I judge Peter has achieved for W. Coast. Also in viewing NY from afar it has seemed to me that Kevin achieved a certain "interpretation" of NY as a subcenter through his activity on many fronts. But to me the lasting foundations in NY are centrally what your work, in-person and in-other-forms, has established, and what is our history, and our roots, there. That to me is the footing and direction for the individual/collective work.

NY is hardly the same place for Marxist-Humanist development as when I was there. Despite problems of the NY history (where I include myself in the transitional period of 1969-72 though at the time I didn't know anything), it seems a most crucial and propitious time for a new kind of Marxist-Humanist growth in NY. As I think of NY for this period, my view is more of "what is to be done" than of the past including the conflicts and dualities of great achievements but seemingly incommensurate growth. Next to Chicago, NY is the local I have the least sense of, as a local, although what the comrades have done there is unparalleled in many respects. The 2 with whom I have ongoing organizational relationship are Kevin and Anne, but that has never revolved around NY local questions.

Though I may have been concerned about NY "from afar" it is a different matter to try to take in on a far less generalized plane. I am prepared to go anywhere once my bag is packed with some sense of what I can contribute specifically. The only thing that caught me somewhat by surprise in your letter was not the question of different organizational relations, surroundings, responsibilities etc. but the specificity of NY: what I had understood from Jan. 1 discussion was a perspective concerning myself and Detroit, not NY, and after some initial first reactions, that is what I had worked through for myself especially through the experience of the classes.

Be that as it may, I'm ready to go wherever a Marxist-Humanist body of ideas is most needed and at this time that points in the direction of NY. I do not judge that my leaving the Bay Area will make any fundamental difference, because Peter for the W. Coast and Allen for the Bay Area are the key people, and there are a lot of creative, experienced comrades in the Bay Area. So much talent as that will be moving to meet the new level of challenges in the hard, critical period ahead-- as will I.

What's the next step?

Yours,

Mary

16241

April 18, 1984

Dear Mary:

Congratulations! Please compare your attitude many years back when I asked you to move to San Francisco to the attitude you express in your letter of the 16th about a projected move to New York, and you will have to agree with me that, first of all, you have grown ten feet tall, and second you deserve congratulations for self-development.

Now, back from the heights, to the concrete, the serious proposed move to New York, which you rightly call "the new level for this new period" -- there is your Universal; then comes the Particular -- the translation of it into the meaning of N.Y. as sub-center; and finally, the Individualization, not as Ego but as the way you express it -- "How can I contribute?" And that, again, not as any "sacrifice" but as a working out of that international body of ideas called Marxist-Humanism, which you profoundly spell out as "My view is more of 'what is to be done' than of the past, including the conflicts and dualities..."

The real point of New York is to see its history from the moment we decided to re-establish N.Y. as a local. The objective point was that while it was imperative to abandon N.Y.'s factionalism, it was as imperative to re-establish it once we had a serious, theoretical alternative, not just on any single book but on a body of ideas. That was especially important, not only because N.Y. is the cultural center of the country, but also because it, too, has undergone a great transformation, where it is not just either Hollywood or the theater or just "culture" but the internationalism, and much of proletarianization. (What the Latino immigrant workers are subjected to now, and their revolutionary nature, bear a strong resemblance to the immigrant East Europeans of the 1920s, when their revolutionary nature expressed itself both in unionization of everyone from garment workers to miners and in actual revolutionary organizations. So you see it is not just a question of having a sense of N.Y. as a local, nor even as a sub-center, but of the new stage of our organization right now, when we have three books not one, when the new type of classes we are proposing for next year is not on a book but on Perspectives and PFLs -- that is to say, of achieving the politicalization of philosophy so that each of us can confront current events as a Marxist-Humanist analyst. At the same time, I do feel that Kevin has made many important inroads in academia and that he will be able to open doors for you.

I loved your expression, because it is not just expression but essence. "I'm prepared to go anywhere once my bag is packed..." Believe me, I understand just how difficult it is to continue with "Have Thumb, Will Travel" as if it were a permanent state. Moreover, you greatly ~~underestimate~~ under-estimate your presence in the Bay Area. It is something I thought of very seriously. So much so that when I was soliciting views from Peter on how to "solve" the New York problem, as an intellectual was absolutely necessary who was at the same time an organizational person, and he suggested you, I did not respond at once. I want to show you now the fourth page of Peter's letter that we xeroxed to circulate but without that page included. You will see that he had some good suggestions on how to fill the very fundamental loss for Bay Area if you left. I will send him, at the same time, a copy of this letter so you can begin to discuss the whole question between yourselves. By Convention you will no doubt have a more concrete idea of when it would be best to move -- I would imagine it would be by Fall. I would want you, if you do make that definitive decision, to begin writing to Kevin and Anne in summer. I do hope you can come two or three days before the Convention opens, because I will want to discuss in much greater detail as well as in more visionary forms of what the future does hold for Marxist-Humanism in New York.

Yours,

16242

May 1, 1984

To the East Coast NEB:

How good of the calendar to come to my aid by designating that today is May 1. This, "of necessity", signifies "new fundamental epoch of revolutionary social change, and since we do not separate theory from practice, it signifies that I have a unified field in which to operate. All this attempt at humor in which everyone must know what is "hidden" there means simply that I want a compliment from all those who have pressured me to think of New York and thought I never would. This letter is going to prove that the absolute opposite is true, that not only have I thought of New York most concretely and inseparably from Perspectives for 1984-85, but that I have "all the answers." Here are the facts:

1. Beginning with the Marx Centenary tour I took, I let everyone know that since some very new organizational conclusions would flow from our have "three, not one" works with which to project Marxist-Humanism as a body of ideas, I wanted them to think about New York, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

2. Once we had projected so new a perspective as moving to Chicago at the Expanded NEB on Jan. 1, which involved the transfer of Kevin from New York to the new Center, I raised the question of New York again, this time in a more concrete form -- namely, that this could not be done without considering who, in turn, could move to New York. But no-one could come up with any concrete suggestion.

3. Peter's letter of March 14, which dealt with the whole question of the end of the classes and the relationship that would have to the 1949-50 pamphlet as a new stage of our development, may have nothing to do with my concern with New York, on the face of it. But, in fact, it was a jumping off point for both the Perspectives that I was beginning to draft and for what I considered was the complex problem of having someone in New York who was both a New Yorker and a leader.

4. On March 30, I wrote Mary what I called a "Personal and Completely Informal" letter, in which I asked what she ~~THINK~~ would respond if she were asked once again to make a fundamental change of locale, since New York was important as a national cultural center which had experienced such extremes of attitude from us as our first abandoning it when we first established ourselves as News and Letters Committees, and then returning to it once we had completed Marxism and Freedom.

☞ The complexity of the question that had made it necessary to re-establish New York for the projection of Marxist-Humanism revolved about knowing, as I put it in my letter to Mary, "how to, at one and the same time, listen to the voices from below AND HEAR MARX THINKING.... Marxist Humanists had to be aware of our uniqueness, our contributions to Marx's Marxism, as being that BODY

16243

OF IDEAS, that trilogy of revolution, as to have the historic fight to exist that comes with those who have spelled out Marxism for their own age."

5. Mary's April 15 response was so profound, as it signified her willingness to move, that both it and my letter of April 18 in response to it are herewith enclosed, for your study.

I have told Mary that as soon as I had informed the New York NED of this perspective she could begin her own direct correspondence with you. Please have a full discussion of what this means for New York and decide when you will present it to the local. I take for granted that would coincide with your receipt of the Draft Perspectives Thesis which will be sent out with the May issue of NAL on May 10 and presents the ground for all discussion of local perspectives.

Yours,

Raya

Copies of this letter are being sent to the Bay Area and the Los Angeles NEDs for discussion with their locals.

May 25, 1984

Dear Mary Joani

Ever since your magnificent report on the paper to the final class, you showed such a grasp of the whole expanse of 30 years of revolutionary journalism as well as of the integrality of its internationalism, with its philosophic ramifications, that I have been thinking that you would bring to the column, Women World Wide, a new depth. Though at first we were anxious for it to include both Susie and Diane, that is the Black dimension, the fact that Diane will now be in Chicago and has taken responsibility for Black, WL, and Youth, I felt that you are the right Marxist-Humanist for collaborating on that column. I know that in many respects some of our international exchange publications will no longer be available in Detroit. But you are by no means limited to Detroit publications. Whether it is the Christian Science Monitor which is quite comprehensive in its international coverage and to which Jim subscribes, or the Guardian to which Laurie subscribes, the point is that Detroit remains in many ways a true "subcenter". When you add to that your own creative abilities and sensitivity to world events, there is no doubt in my mind that you will fulfil this new responsibility creatively.

Yours,

16245

May 30, 1984

Dear R

I don't know whether the title of my talk at next week's REB on leadership and elections--THE SELF-THINKING IDEA AND THE DIALECTICS OF THE BODY OF IDEAS; WHAT IS NEW IN THE CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP--gives any one an indication of the concrete (concrete in the Hegelian sense of concrete Universal) I intend developing as this year's Perspectives calls for responsibilities of leadership in each local.

You know from P&R on as I kept stressing the Gramscian use, contribution, development of that most fundamental Marxian category of Praxis that that was precisely what we tried practicing, whether it was activity in mass movements, or deciding on a new local in Chi., whether it was developing that whole body of N-H ideas or having a single member-at-large in Cincinnati. The reason I raise it now is that praxis, as against practice, or even outright action, includes an activity, the type of work that unites cognition with action, whether we are talking of the PTC, or local organizer.

Let me give you one very, very serious example of misinterpretation in the old JFT. Because we put so much stress on action and new as we were preparing for 1st convention after we broke with SWP, we sent Grace to LA to be responsible for West Coast. She, however, decided action was activity where the Tendency had nought, and San Pedro at the moment experienced a militant massive strike, she promptly declared that that is where we should really be--indeed we all began laughing at her as it began to sound like "socialism in one single locality and right on the spot--disregarding all that also went into activity and the concrete at that moment for JFT where it, not San Pedro, could produce a new kind of paper like the Correspondence we were preparing for with Detroit as the home because another concrete--worker as editor--was there. So it is not just the immediate concrete, but the concrete Universal that is at stake at each year's Perspectives.

This year's Perspectives when the whole Center is moving to Chicago and not only will Detroit have to fend on its own as local, but both NY and the Bay Area, in different ways--Kevin coming to Chi., and Mary to NY--will need to shoulder new responsibilities for local, organizership cannot be dealt with abstractly but individually, concretely. In the case of the Bay Area, outside of Alan who is great as co-organizer but not the activist,

the way you spell that responsibility out will tell a whole new story for it is not a ~~matter~~ a matter of being ordered--soon far as I have always been concerned, discipline is either self-discipline or it doesn't mean a thing either for the individual or the Universal--but of volunteering.

Do let me hear from you.
Yours

16246

October 30, 1984

To Neda, Chairwoman Chicago WL-N&L
(Copies to all WL-N&L Committees)

Dear Neda:

Let me begin with the most exciting feature that at the same time has the most immediate ramifications in very nearly the same neighborhood as you live, in order to stress the methodology of how to read when one is doing it for concrete & universal purposes, both at the same time. I'm referring to the book Walking With Women Through Chicago History, and its ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ direct relationship to you insofar as the author, Jean S. Hunt, of the section on the "Hyde Park Tour", who is a "Hyde Park resident, teaches U.S. history at Loop College, one of the Chicago City Colleges," and who tells us in a most uncommunicative title, "The First Generation of Academic Women", that we can find two murals about women (p. 66) that "when you get to Lake Park Avenue, walk north one short block. ~~XX~~ There, just west of the Illinois Central Underpass, you will find 'Women's Struggle'. Somewhat deteriorating, this 1975 mural painted by Astrid Fuller expresses the roots of the Women's Liberation Movement... 'The Underground Railroad' depicts Black and white women working together in liberation efforts 190 years ago. The mural then asks us to recall the experiences of Native American Indian women..."

Who would have thought either by the title "Hyde Park" or by the subtitle "The First General of Academic Women," much less by another subtitle "Two Murals About Women" that you would finally get something on Black women, on Indian women, and indeed on revolution, since it then goes on to quote Margaret Anderson's Little Review as being one concerned with "art and revolution" and what she would publish was nothing short of Ulysses? What I'm trying to say is that you can't go by these titles and subtitles regarding the "4 Self-Guided Tours", which were introduced by the editor, Babette Ingelhart, in so bland a manner that I put down the following sharp question-marks: 1-Where the heck is Black? 2- Where is Chicago's revolutionary and international impact? 3- Why is Haymarket and Emma Goldman's participation, not to mention Eleanor Marx, absent? 4- Why is revolution never mentioned? 5- And what about the ethnic and labor history? This city, after all, was a bee-hive for all ghettos of all minorities, and as revolutionary as any city could be from "time immemorial."

Despite all my questions and disgust, I decided to read it. And while none of these questions I raised have been mentioned as a category, and are nowhere listed as the subject, which is always either on business women, or on education, or finance, with a tiny bit on politics, I nevertheless did find all of those topics mentioned "in passing". Which means that we must know how to dig, what to look for, which dates are important in the history of Chicago or any other place, and by being most concrete as well

16247

as universal, to find parallels to our age. For example, I know that if I looked at Hull House and remembered Jane Addams, I would be sure to find something on ~~XXXX~~ anti-war and, though when I was a child I looked down upon this social-service type of work, I would find enough about sweat-shop conditions and strikes and even anarchism (which in this city has a magnificent history) to be able somehow to connect with what we are about today. And sure enough, I did. So now I want to ask our comrades who has seen the marvelous murals "deteriorating" or otherwise, and immediately underlined not only "the Hyde Park resident, Jean S. Hunt", to try to make personal contact or write a letter to regarding a "study" you yourself are involved in, or the new book that will soon be published? But also, Mary Ann Johnson, who is the administrator of the Jane Addams Hull House at the University of Illinois, Chicago, Circle? And Marilyn A. Damer, likewise a Chicago resident "involved in urban history research with a focus on neighborhoods," who: a- has a beautiful picture of Ida B. Wells and describes her fighting the white ~~XXXX~~; b- talks of Lucy Parsons, and we certainly reviewed the book on her; c- finally mentions Emma Goldman.

mobs

My point is that right here in Chicago -- but I'm sure the same could be found in any city -- we can find new openings for us if we had a methodology. My further point is that if we wait for the new book to be off the press, it will be altogether too late to first ~~XXXX~~ try to find places to review it. We have to create ground for it before it ever comes off the press.

Let me give you one other example of how both to ~~XXXXXX~~ praise specific authors on women's history and be critical about what they have done, not in an "obstreperous" way but simply by revealing that we know something that has been kept out of history. Thus, in this particular book, "Walking With Women Through Chicago History", you can say that what is missing is theoreticians, philosophers, and not only because, in a different period, it was not necessarily visible, but because the 1980s view still dealt with it only as narrative and not as interpretation. Thus, on Black great as it is to bring to life Ida B. Wells, there were Black activities that never entered into written books but are available as oral history, whether that concerns Negro history or radical developments from Marx to the IWW, or "educational forums" by independent small groups. Or for that matter, put it in a question: Did they know that some of the events they covered had participants who became leading thinkers? And how "little Bohemia" here crossed over into the famous Village in New York, in the revolutionary 1920s.

Yours,



Raya

P.S. Incidentally, we need not only always limit it to ourselves; such pamphlets as Joyce Maupin's Labor Heroines and Working Women and their Organizations can be referred to.

16248