

Handwritten notes: ① no ~~standard~~ ~~concord~~ ~~192~~ ~~only~~ ~~works~~ ~~vet~~
Edward SFA-8 ~~husky~~
Michelle ~~Journals~~ ~~J.P.P.~~

MINUTES OF REB MEETING OF AUGUST 21, 1984

Present: All except Dave, excused; Jane as sitter-in

- Agenda:** I. Carrying out Convention Decisions and Ramifications:
1. Report by Raya on week of work on New Book; 2. Discussion;
3. Checkup on Bulletins sent out; 4. Proposed calendar for
Classes; 5. Relationship of Convention Perspectives to Local
Work; II. Ongoing Activities; III. G&W

I. Before Raya began her presentation, she welcomed both Kevin who had just arrived to be part of the Center, and Bob, who, while not yet officially moved, was able to be present for this meeting. Raya began by saying she certainly does not want the new book to be called only "WL -- a Collection of Essays" since that does not reflect either the 35 year span or the internationalism, much less what is of the essence, that it is not only a Women's Liberation book but a Marxist-Humanist study of four forces of revolution -- Women, Labor, Black, Youth -- to which philosophy is central. She appealed to all to help her find the title by the end of the month, since that is when the entire manuscript must be sent to the publisher.

Because philosophy will be so central, Raya wanted to have the following quote from Hegel's Phenomenology be considered a "frontispiece": "For the real subject-matter is not exhausted in its purpose, but in working the matter out; nor is the mere result attained through the whole itself, but the result along with the process of arriving at it." (p. 69 Baillie edition)

The four Parts into which the whole was divided are: I. WOMAN, LABOR AND THE BLACK DIMENSION. This may not sound new in the sense that they are categories we have always stressed. What is new, nevertheless, is both the fact that it does not follow in chronological order and Women's Liberation in the sense in which it became popular in the 1960s is only implicit in the story of the miners' wives. That is precisely the point that when it becomes a category over a whole series of articles that span the 35 years, the totality is seen even though it is only implicit. Thus, let me read the first few paragraphs:

"What distinguishes the newness and uniqueness of this age's Women's Liberation Movement is that the 1950s signified, at one and the same time, a new stage of production -- Automation -- and a new movement from practice that was itself a form of theory. It distinguishes this age from that of all others, whether that be the ancient pre-capitalist societies when women like the Iroquois had some freedoms greater than women in the technologically advanced industrial societies; or the 19th century when women, even when only fighting for the vote, nevertheless named their paper "Revolution"; or whether it be the early 20th century when revolution women Marxists fought alongside the men against the whole capitalist system. In a word, that new movement from practice of our age related not only to a new stage of production but to a new stage of cognition...

"The essays collected here cover the whole 35 year span since this movement from practice emerged, but are not presented in a chronological order. Rather, each of the four Parts comprises the whole three decades. Thus, while Part I -- "Women, Labor and the Black Dimension" -- begins with an article written

Handwritten notes on left margin:
H.Q.
Simplic
Can
he Frank
as "C.A.H."

Handwritten note: b/ken

Handwritten note: P.P.

Handwritten note: N2/204

Handwritten note: Use of the...
P. 204

16349

REB, Aug. 21, 1984 -- page 3

I want to interrupt myself here to stress why there is much in this presentation tonight that is tentative, because, in the final version, philosophy will by no means be limited to the single quote from the Phenomenology I have cited. Quite the contrary. I want especially to stress what we have not previously paid much attention to -- the final section of Science of Logic, "The Idea", begins with a chapter called "Life". Heretofore, we have stressed (and correctly so) how, in the section on the Syllogism, Lenin had recognized the breakdown of any division between objective and subjective. What, however, is not true of that section is that subjective did not include Life, Individual Life as well as Universal Life. In fact, it is one of the sections in Hegel that has been quite difficult to explain -- that is, how such a subject as Life got into such an abstract system of logic as Science of Logic. I here wish to call attention to the fact that Lenin greeted that idea jubilantly: "The idea of including Life in logic is comprehensible -- and brilliant -- from the standpoint of the process of the reflection of the objective world in the 'at first individual' consciousness of man and of the testing of this consciousness (reflection) through practice." (Vol. 38, p. 202)

You will recall that Lenin concluded that the whole last part of the Science of Logic on the Idea was, in its very introduction, nearly the very best description of the dialectic. I will use the references and quotations from the Russian translation but would like you to follow it in the Science of Logic (pp. 401-415) (Johnson and Struthers). Lenin makes it easier for himself, and for us, by checking the chapter against Hegel's own shortened version in the Encyclopedia. In this specific case I want to quote para. 219 from Vol. 38, p. 202 again: "Encyclopaedia para. 219: ... 'Inorganic nature which is subdued by the living being suffers this because it is in itself the same as life is for itself.' Invert it = pure materialism. Excellent, profound, correct!! And also NB: shows how extremely correct and apt are the terms 'an sich' and 'fur sich'!!!"

The point is that as Hegel develops Individual to the kind, that is, to other human beings, the whole question of totality is expressed this way: "The Process of Life which is enclosed within the Individual passes over into relation to pre-supposed objectivity as such, because the Individual, in positing itself as subjective totality, becomes also the moment of its determinateness as relation to externality, and so becomes totality." (p. 409, J&S)

And here is the way Lenin summarizes the whole chapter: "Forgotten is the nodal line, the transition into a different plane of natural phenomena. And so on. Schmerz ist 'eine wirkliche Existenz' des Widerspruchs (Pain is 'actual existence' of contradiction) in the living individual."

The reason I include that part on philosophy here and it will be integrated into the final version submitted for publication is that I felt very strongly that one of the reasons we have not grasped philosophy as profoundly as we should is that, in one way or another, there have always been made "private enclaves" and I do not mean only in private life, but science, or organization or some sort of area where suddenly one feels that Absolute Method

because but is private dream, not as for life new. It is an enclosures that is as a procedure that is not subject to "method" refused to submit to method.

Handwritten notes: Kewins, Bell, not edition only, as Sex, as (W), ORB, Rev, etc.

Handwritten notes: The Idea, etc.

Handwritten notes: once the...

Handwritten notes: Miller to...

Handwritten notes: The reason is...

Handwritten notes: More...

may apply to everything else, but not to this enclave. Nothing could be further from the truth. If there is an area where your specialization ~~excludes~~ Absolute Method, it actually means you do not understand the Absolute in Method, and why it is that Absolute Method, rather than system -- and Method not merely as a tool or means to get somewhere -- is what Marxist-Humanists single out and identify with totality. Everything is subject to Absolute Negativity. Indeed, if you will remember, that's what I criticized Hegel for, denying him the privilege of stopping with God. There is no self-development and there is no revolution in permanence free of Absolute Method. And in order to make clear Part III, where I suddenly bring Organization into Sexism, Politics and Revolution, I interrupted myself after Part II.

Now then, III. SEXISM, POLITICS AND REVOLUTION -- Japan; Portugal; Poland; China; the U.S. : IS THERE AN ORGANIZATIONAL ANSWER?

"The whole question of organization as non-elitist and of demanding the practice of new relations right there becomes a reconnection with Marx's philosophy of 'revolution in permanence' as ground for organization. To see this as merely a question of small vs. larger organization, and of decentralization vs. centralization, to consider this only a desire for looseness or for talking of 'personal' rather than political matters, rather than the question of new beginnings, exposes the pragmatism of our age. The essence of an organizing Idea (with a capital I) -- that is to say, the philosophy of revolution -- is that the uprooting needed cannot divide theory from practice nor philosophy from organization. There can be no new society short of abolishing the division of mental and manual labor, thereby creating the conditions needed for the self-development of a whole person...

"Marx's new continent of thought and of revolution, to which 'revolution in permanence' was so central, may seem totally unconnected to the questions of the strategies of revolution, much less to the question of organization. It certainly seemed that unconnected both to the New Left in Japan today and to the revolutionaries of 1905-07 although the phrase was so much in the air that Trotsky's analysis of the 1905 St. Petersburg Soviet was dubbed by others 'the permanent revolution,' and he accepted it. The period of the 1905-07 revolution was when the solidarity of Marxists in Japan and in Russia was firmly established as the Japanese Marxist Sen Kata-yama shook the hand of the Russian Marxist Plekhanov at the International Congress during the 1904-05 Russo-Japanese War.

Why then, did it not sink in as strategy for revolution as well as ground for organization, even though, by 1917, 1905-07 was considered the 'dress rehearsal' for 1917."

Part III not only carries that through very different countries -- be it China and the essays on Chiang Ch'ing's two trials, or Zengakuren and the Japanese situation we know in 1966, or Portugal -- but I bring in the question of Poland through citing Ursula's essay as from 'a Polish dissident.' We do not forget, however, the U.S., ending with the "Where to Now" article in 1977 on the Houston IWY Conference.

1912
1973
1980

Put in
H 15 17
e H 15 17
e H 15 17

When
reluctant
concept
as
it

16350

IV. THE TRAIL TO THE 1980s: THE MISSING LINK -- PHILOSOPHY
-- IN THE RELATIONSHIP OF REVOLUTION TO ORGANIZATION.

First I should tell you that this was actually two parts -- a Part IV, which was originally "Today's Reality and the Relationship of Philosophy to Women's Liberation in Marx's Humanism"; and a Part V, which was "The Trail to the 1980s." I then decided I was doing the same thing in dividing Parts IV and V that I had done in the Perspectives when I divided Parts 3 and 4 -- i.e. the theory of State-Capitalism from "Not by practice alone -- the movements from theory." I decided it was essential to unite "The Trail to the 1980s" with the whole question of Marx's total philosophy, and especially so the missing link of philosophy throughout post-Marx Marxism, which impelled the creation of that category of post-Marx Marxists. I now have a single Part IV as listed above, which begins with the totality of today's crises being so sharp that people look for all sorts of escapism, beginning with turning back to the homilies of the family. It gives me a chance to return to the Communist Manifesto where Marx calls for the abolition of the bourgeois family. We see that post-Marx Marxism did not arise the year after Marx died; and that the Asiatic Mode of Production did not have to wait for 1882 to be found, but was found as early as the Grundrisse. Thus, the emphasis that the Ethnological Notebooks are not a break from but a continuous development of Marx's philosophy of "revolution in permanence" is carried throughout this part. That is so whether we look at the essay on the Grundrisse and WL or the draft chapter on Marx's and Engels' Studies Contrasted. Indeed, this is the Part where I do not only bring in the letters written on the process of RLWLKM, but also include the paragraphs added after RLWLKM was published.

to record up to this point, though I definitely reported it to the REB, is the fact that I was dissatisfied with the way male chauvinism was present not only in men, but in women -- and that I asked the REB to look at p. 91 of RLWLKM, where I write: "There surely was gossip galore surrounding the breakup, and the reasons given for it ranged from a simplistic 'triangle' attribution to slanderous insinuations that the sharp difference between the openness of Luxemburg's activities and the more disciplined behavior of such a consciously organization person as Jogiches led the Okhrana to discover their whereabouts and arrest them. The true reason others shy away from analysis, to this writer, is not so much the personal nature of their relationship as it is the failure to understand their attitudes to the ongoing revolution, insofar as their individual organizational tasks were concerned." (Please note the sentence underlined here, which was not underlined in the book.)

The other point I reported was the emphasis that I put on the fact that though it is true that the WLM's uniqueness was that it arose in the mid-1960s from the Left and directed against the Left, it isn't true that Marxist-Humanists waited for that point to recognize the importance of WL. The fact is that even 1950 is later than what actually began the struggle against the WP leadership at the end of WWII, when I came to the defense of Reva Craine whom I had always opposed politically, but insisted that their attempt to remove her as organizer when the men returned was bourgeois. Peculiarly enough, the support I got from all the women is what I now realize convinced CLRJ to acknowledge the S-C tendency as a JFT. The relationship of philosophy to revolution, to organization, to human relations is what characterizes everything -- and it is crucial

Part IV

to look at p. 91

when

transfer this to 20th Sept enclosure

REB, Aug. 21, 1984 -- page 6
especially to finding the trail to the 1960s.

Handwritten: [scribble] 9/5/84 [scribble]

DISCUSSION: Kevin said it was a new and quite sobering experience to be present with the REB for this kind of meeting. At the Convention we have had the Draft Thesis to study and prepare ourselves, even though the actual Thesis always presents material that is totally new. To discuss a Draft Introduction like this is a real challenge. Kevin pointed out how we had been given a still newer way to read the quote from Goethe on the tree of life being green and theory gray, which opposition Hegel had turned around as Lenin had recognized -- all of which Kevin felt most relevant to the points RD had raised tonight. He was also struck with the stress that had been given to the question of the relationship of philosophy to organization and to revolution, and how that had been taken up in the relationship between RL and ~~Logiches~~. It has proved more difficult to be objective when discussing a woman revolutionary; one can wind up saying it is all "personal" as Nettl does, or seeing it as only a question of sexism that RL faced. It is especially illuminating to look again, as RD did tonight, at the defense of Reva Craine after WWII, which had not been separated from the sharp attack on her politics. It was never a question only of WL but of M-Hism, in embryo, as a whole. As one who came out of the 1960s, Kevin said he could testify that simply having lived through the rise of the WL, there is a tendency to think we know something we really don't. In fact, it is sometimes the hardest to see something precisely when we do know the most "facts" about it. He submitted as a suggestion for a title for the work: Women's Liberation: Essays on the Dialectics of Revolution.

Handwritten: V.2.

Mike considered it a privilege to hear the first presentation of an Introduction given in this kind of context -- that is, so profoundly philosophic that it forced you beyond any first reading of the text. A great deal is involved in "describing" why these particular essays were chosen ~~but~~ it was in working out the actual form for grouping them that something new had emerged. The very first paragraph gives a new view on why this age's WLM is so different from all others. You are made to see that it is the character of this age, ~~not just of this particular movement~~, that we are dealing with. And then in four different ways, the whole movement is traced, for each one of the parts -- that is, we are shown the logic of the movement. The title of Part IV makes a powerful impact, especially when you realize that in 1968 the Perspectives called philosophy the "missing link" right at the highpoint of the 60s that turned out to be the failure of the 60s. The presentation tonight was so sobering because you see all the pitfalls you can fall into -- and when you say that pain is the actual existence of contradiction, it really hits home, because whether we understand the dialectic or not, the truth is that the dialectic is working in us. Like Kevin, I was also struck by the new telling of the story of Reva Craine in relationship to CLRJ suddenly deciding to bring RD into the leadership; on the one hand you can say what a male chauvinist it showed CLRJ to be, ~~but~~ at the same time it shows the pull a new force striving to be born exerts in all sorts of ways. ~~But the most telling of all to me~~ were RD's concluding remarks on the Absolute Method and how fast you can regress once you go outside of that Method and think there is an enclave that isn't affected by it, or for which you don't have to take the Absolute Method into account. That is a most powerful conclusion to this presentation tonight.

Handwritten: [scribble]

Handwritten: Olga: Having had the privilege not just of this presentation which Mike referred to, but of having been present during the whole week while the Introduction was being worked

16352

out, what strikes me as "the understatement of the year" is what RD began with tonight -- how seeing the collection of a full 35 years makes you see a million things you didn't see before. And it is not just the study of these 25 or so essays -- but there were many, many others from which these had to be chosen. To study what was chosen and why would be a whole study in process itself. And it is not just that each category contains the totality; but that each article within that category contains "totality", even if only implicit or in embryo. Which is not to say that there is not a tremendous difference or development between the 1950 article and the 1983 lecture in Part I. The point to me is that it is not just that it is the end of a 35 year span that lets you see new things in what these essays represent, but that it is after RLWLKM that the totality means something very new to us. "Totality" has another meaning to me, as well. It means to me that this Introduction cannot be separated from the Perspectives Thesis we have not yet begun to study (or) from the Classes we will be having in October. In fact, to even begin to catch what is meant by RD saying that the need not to separate her original Part IV and Part V stemmed from the same kind of need she had felt not to separate "state-capitalism" from "Absolute Method" in the Perspectives, it will be important to study the REB minutes of this meeting tonight along with the REB minutes of our very first meeting on the changes RD had introduced into the form of the Perspectives Thesis. There was one question, Olga said, she wanted to raise in the formulation on p. 7 that the whole question of organization as non-elitist... becomes a reconnection with Marx's philosophy of 'revolution in permanence' -- because, whereas RD has made that reconnection, the WIM has not yet done so, and it is that which is at the heart of why the WIM is presented as a "task that remains to be done." It would be more correct to say that it could become a reconnection. Finally, Olga said she felt it important for all to know how much labor Michelle has contributed to this work with a "typing" of the essays that is far from mere typing, tremendous as that alone would be; but it has been the meticulous and creative editing that is not separated from the new breakthroughs with both Hypatia and Off Our Backs that is most important of all. (Rava said that Michelle's contributions had been most evident during the work of the whole week on the Introduction.)

Eugene wanted to start with the very first paragraph of the Draft, which he felt had "situated" the WIM historically and philosophically in a very different way than ever before. There are certain moments when history and philosophy get jammed together. It happened in the 1840s in Marx's time; and in the 1950s in our age. Both we and others have talked before of many of the points the Introduction brings out. But it is not the totality which is being projected in this Introduction. Here we are shown an objective, a real moment in history. Situating the WIM in this way becomes the ground for the whole Introduction. It can then be situated, as it is here, globally, historically, and in relationship to revolution. We often talk of the "1980s view" but here we see that we can have that 1980s view because we have a 1950s view. In trying to understand all that was involved in the way original Parts IV and V were put together as one Part, I keep wondering if it was related to the particular essays selected? What is critical is the way Marx will flow naturally out of that section. Finally, Eugene said he, too, had a suggestion for possible title: "Women's Liberation: Essays on Global, Historic, Philosophic and Revolutionary Roots".

Michelle

Eugene
Hypatia
Off Our Backs

REB, Aug. 21, 1984 -- page 9

I. Carrying out Convention Decisions continued with Mike's report on bulletins already sent out and the third post-Convention bulletin now being prepared by L.A. to include the Organization Report and Report on Black Dimension. Because work on the Convention Summary cannot be finished until after the first issue of N&L from our new quarters is in the mail, that Summary will not be out before Sept. 15.

Olga reported on the proposed calendar for the new classes, which we wanted to start in October and end before the year-end holidays. It is proposed that we have three groups of two classes, with one week between each group. Thus, the first class would be held on Oct. 21 and the second on Oct. 28; 3rd on Nov. 11 and 4th on Nov. 18; 5th on Dec. 2, and last on Dec. 9. Olga's convention report, expanded, would be sent out together with the syllabus for the series at the end of September. Raya noted that she was so determined for us to grapple with philosophy seriously that the syllabus would include not only the new Introduction for the new book but also readings from Dialectics of Liberation, for each class.

II. The first point in Mike's report on Correspondence was the news that the Italian review in Dimensioni had now been translated and is being excerpted immediately for this issue of N&L. Mike felt it was the most serious review by a non-Marxist he had ever read, pointing out that it grapples not only with Chapter 1 of P&R as work that none before RD had ever done before, but with Chapter 12 of RLWLKM, for the same reasons. (A copy is being sent to each local.) The best news from the locals continues to come from Detroit where they had 16 at the last local meeting, and exciting work continues around the work Janet has been doing as well as follow-through work with the Toledo strikers. The letter Diane had sent to the Youth was available for all. And Mike reported that new subs continue to come in even before our drive has officially been launched.

III. G&V

Meeting convened 7 PM
adjourned 9:45 PM

16355

*Adl
Pol/Am*

Part Three: FEMINISM, POLITICS AND REVOLUTION -- Japan; Portugal;
Poland; China; the U.S.: IS THERE AN ORGANIZATIONAL
ANSWER?

- The New Left in Japan (Report in the Activist, 1966)
- Will the Revolution in Portugal Advance? (PPL, Jan. 1976)
- The Revolutionary Activity of Polish Women ,
Report from a Polish dissident (N&L, March 1982)
- Chiang Ch'ing, Hua Kuo-feng in Post-Mao China. (SPR, 1977)
China's "Gang of Four" Trial Charade (N&L 1-2/1981)
- A Hong Kong Interview: Alienation and Revolution (N&L 1966)
- IVY: Where to Now? (N&L Dec. 1977)
** no sub An member of Freedom of Women*

THE TRAIL TO THE 1980s:
Part Four: THE MISSING LINK -- PHILOSOPHY -- IN THE RELATIONSHIP OF
REVOLUTION TO ORGANIZATION

Section I: *Subtitle*
On the Family, Love Relationships, and the New Society
(Radio interview, aired over WBAI March 8, 1984)

- WL and the Grundrisse (Lecture at CUNY 1974; printed in
Detroit Women's Press, Oct. 1974)
- Marx's "New Humanism" and the Dialectics of Women's Liberation
in Primitive and Modern Societies (Lecture at New School
1983; Praxis International, Jan. 1984)

Section II: *Approved by the [unclear]*
Marx's and Engels' Studies Contrasted: The Relationship
of Philosophy and Revolution to Women's Liberation
(Draft chapter for RLWLKM on EN, N&L 1-2/1979)

- 15 Letters on the Process of Writing RLWLKM
- Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of
Revolution (Excerpts from Lecture in Detroit, Dec. 13, 1981)
- Paragraphs added to RLWLKM after publication

August 23, 1984

Dear Friends:

The result of the "week away" with Olga was the completion of an 18 page draft of the Introduction to the new book. Thus, the news of this week begins with one item that even the convention could say nothing about. The unique Marxist-Humanist characteristics of this collection covering a 35-year span of writings on Women's Liberation are: 1. That long before the mid-1960s that gave birth to the WLM; and 2. Even before we called ourselves Marxist-Humanists, at the historic point when a new stage of production and a new stage of cognition appeared, the act of my philosophic exchange of letters occurred during the Miners' Strike. In a word, the concepts I was working out in those letters are implicit in that 1950 article on the miners' wives that is included in this collection; indeed, I make a footnote to the listing of the letters included in our new pamphlet on the historic Miners' General Strike.

Only now have I become conscious of the "coincidence" between the date when the state-capitalist tendency was renamed the Johnson-Forest Tendency, and the date when I suddenly gained adherents among the women who supported my opposition to the WP post-war act of replacing the women organizers with returning men, which I considered completely bourgeois. In a word, it was not the work I had done on Russia as a state-capitalist society or any of the other theoretical work I had been doing, but the fact that I suddenly in 1945-6 had an organized group, that led CLRJ to bother to include my name.

More than the second point about the creation of a JFT is involved in this collection of essays. It is that each of the four parts of the collection -- and in many respects, each of the articles, manifest a totality of Marxist-Humanist philosophy because of the form-mediation in which these articles appear, all of which show that it is not alone Women's Liberation but all four forces of revolution that manifest the Marxist-Humanist philosophy.

Thus, Part I -- "Woman, Labor and the Black Dimension" -- at one and the same time covers the entire period from 1950 to 1983 and includes articles on the Abolitionists as well as the Third World and relates those four forces of revolution.

Thus, Part II -- "Revolutionaries All" -- not only includes both masses in motion and individual woman revolutionaries, but also contains a very new feature, and that is that I include two pieces by Olga under her own name, hoping for no road blocks from Humanities.

Thus, Part III -- "Sexism, Politics and Revolution -- Japan, Portugal, Poland, China, the U.S.: Is there an Organizational Answer?" -- shows the global prevalence of both male chauvinism and its opposite, women's liberation, and is so integrally related to philosophy as well as the todayness of Marxist-Humanism that the last article in this section returns to the U.S. and my

16358

critique of the Houston Conference, "Where to Now?"

Thus, Part IV -- "The Missing Link -- Philosophy -- in the Relationship of Revolution to Organization" -- sets the entire collection in the present as the totality of the crises leads to the retrogression and escapism seen in the homilies on the family, and at the same time focuses on the creative trail from Marx's 'new moments' to the 1980s.

You may think that you have already grasped all the new moments, and of course are aware of the fact that they are not a break from Marx's Marxism but a continuation of his self-development from the moment he discovered a new continent of thought and of revolution. That is true in essence, but the full truth is that this collection not only also incorporates new paragraphs added to RL/LKM since publication but the totally new methodology which shows the way that missing link of philosophy in revolution, in organization, as a tendency is present even before the 1953 breakthrough on Absolute Idea and is what led, in 1973, to have "Why Hegel? Why Now?" in Philosophy and Revolution, so that the 1984-85 Perspectives focus on "Not by Practice Alone, but the Movements from Theory."

Put otherwise, the Absolute Method in this selection is seen to be present everywhere, whether that be revolution in permanence as ground for organization or in Life, itself. Thus, for the first time, I have singled out that chapter on Life from the Science of Logic. Naturally, I cannot include the whole of the presentation here. Instead, you will need to arrange a special educational for discussing my presentation to the REB and their discussion on it at the meeting of August 21. This is a necessity both for knowing the book and the manner in which it influences the classes.

You will see the tentative schedule for the new classes as suggested at the REB. Mike reported on the translation we had just received of the review of P&R and RL/LKM printed in the Italian publication, Dimensioni. What is especially significant about it is that this is the first time that, outside of George Armstrong Kelly's including a critique of Chapter 1 of P&R in his Retreat from Eleusis, that chapter was singled out for serious discussion in a review in a magazine. (Please read the rest of Mike's report on Ongoing Activities in the Minutes.)

Finally, I want to report the REB's concern with the fact that the discussions now going on around Perspectives in most locals be conducted not only as discussion of national perspectives but very tightly related to the local perspectives. Thus, the whole question of our work in Solidarity Committees must be related to the way that is analyzed in the Perspectives themselves.

Yours,
Raya

16359

August 23, 1984

Dear Raya,

I just want to call these notes, or some kind of thinking outloud process, without any thought of driving for any conclusions. In fact I think the hardest thing I face is a wanting of a conclusion, a result, an answer, as an immediacy. After the REB I went first to Lenin's Vol. 38 and found what you had read of his notes on Hegel on the section on life. Then I have gone to the Science of Logic and have been reading through that section.

page 401 "But the anthropological and psychological side of cognition relates only to its appearance, in which the Notion for itself has not yet reached the point of having an Objectivity equal to it, that is, of having itself for Object."

I feel that I am still very much in this appearance stage of cognition. That is, I am perhaps within a psychological explanation of the problem. But what I want to know is whether that appearance is totally wrong, that is when you stop dead there and make it into a universal, or whether since essence does have to appear, that appearance, can become a point of departure for moving toward the Notion? Here is what I mean. I had a "shock of recognition", I know on a very low level, having absolutely nothing do to with the high philosophic shock of recognition that Lenin had, but none the less not just a shock, but I believe a recognition that there was something very contradictory about my practice as a revolutionary if I could have this area of my personal life where I ended up treating other human beings in this way. Not in the sense of not loving them, and being loving to them, but of not actively seeking a reciprocity from them, that is a dialogue with the person one is in love with. Feeling that in a sense I was a private enclave from them. So if one would argue that really the private enclave that you are talking about is the refusal to subject a certain part of one's life to here personal relations, in your talk to the REB you had mentioned science, or organization -- to Absolute Method, then still what comes to mind is what is the pathway whereby one goes about doing that. Can a recognition on a psychological level, if it does not stop there, become a pathway to recognition on a much higher level? For what worries the hell out of me is that I can say yet I can see I had a private enclave not subject to method, except it as conclusion but not really have done the damn labor to get myself there and therefore really not have internalized it. So if my recognition is only on the level of appearance -- it still is one I feel very much in my being, and now can I take that not to stop and say oh how guilty I feel, or oh what a terrible person I have been, but instead to take that shock and make it a pathway for moving toward Absolute?

page 410-411. "The immediate shape is the Idea in its simple Notion, or objectivity which is adequate to the Notion; thus it is good by nature. But since its negative moment realizes itself so as to be objective particularity, that is, since the essential moments of its unity are each realized so as to be totality, therefore the Notion is severed into absolute inequality of itself with itself; and, since just as much it is absolute identity in this severance, the Living Entity is for itself this severance and has the feeling of this contradiction, which is pain. Pain therefore is the privilege of living natures; they are the existing Notion and therefore they are an actuality of infinite force by which they in themselves are their own negativity, and by which their negativity is for them and they preserve themselves in their otherness.--It is said that contradiction cannot even be thought; but in the pain of the living Entity it is even an actual existence."

This internal diremption of the Living Entity is feeling, the diremption being absorbed into the simple universality of the Notion, into sensibility. From pain that need and impulse begin which constitute the transition by which the individual, while it is the negation of itself for itself, is also to become identity for itself--an identity which exists only as the negation of the negation."

I thought that quote you had read of Lenin quoting Hegel on "pain is actual existence of contradiction" was so magnificent. But when you get to Hegel himself what seems to me so crucial is that not only that pain proves the actual existence of contradiction but that "from pain that need and impulse begin which constitute

16360

Order of 50: Ramifications
August 23, 1984

+ multi-dimensions
of Youth
Eugene

Notes on Draft of Introduction to Collection of Essays on Women's Liberation

I won't go over the comments I made at the REB except to say how new a point of departure it was to see this situating Marxist-Humanism's contribution to Women's Liberation arising in the 1950s. It made me again reread your pre-convention Letter to the Youth and see also there how much you had situated the development by Marxist-Humanism of youth as a revolutionary category as well arising out of these

1950s. All this may on the one hand seem obvious, but it made me think once again of the word ramifications, and specifically the multi-dimensional philosophic, organizational, subjects of revolution, ramifications that come when one discovers a whole new continent of thought as Raya did in the 1950s.

On page 7 is where you first begin explicitly to reconnect with Marx. However it seems for concentrated and brief and then dropped in pages 7 through 11, and then again resume in the last third of the introduction that I am wondering whether your reference to it on pages 7 and 8 could either be expanded from material in the last part, or removed to be taken up again in the last part.

I appreciated your discussion of your tour in Japan and how this group was the one to translate the Essays and yet man/woman relations were very far from their consciousness in terms of their own organizational practice. And I know it is hard to deal with Isabel do Carmo on keeping WL and Revolution in separate compartments and then reversing which compartment she will single out, without being forth Marx's concept of revolution before doing so. So it isn't a question of shoving Marx to the last third.

The question I would have is that since each section covers three decades of your writing, and since in fact each selection has at least implicit in it totality, and many have it explicit in an individual piece, then in presenting your introduction, do you have to follow the chronology of presenting parts I, II, III and IV in order or could you discuss it in a different way which might make Marx flow out in a different way?

The section beginning on page 12 centering on Marx strikes me as a quite new way of presenting Marx: 1. the concentration on the Grundresse and Asiatic

16362

Handwritten notes in left margin: "I'm not sure if this is the right way to do it..."

Handwritten notes: "Eugene", "30 of 12", "When", "10/9"

Handwritten note: "p 7"

Handwritten notes: "Now in", "p 12", "Since", "FACT"

Handwritten notes: "is a", "implicit", "Can't", "start", "old", "p 12"

3/19/84 compare with

~~NO~~ NO, concl AN END but

mode of production seems to me very different from how you chose to look at the Grundrisse in P&R. 2. Using the EN the kind of discussion you are having on Marx and conclusions, that no conclusion for Marx was an end, only a new beginning point. I see that connected to the fact that at beginning of section on page 12 you are starting off with quote from Hegel on process.

That question of process extends very much to your decision to include the letters on RIMLKM. I think it is a very new stage for us. Not because you haven't singled out your correspondence before -- the 49-50 Correspondence in the Archives, and you have certainly made lots of references to it in published documents. But this is still the first time that a collection of your letters is actually going to be printed.

On titles, I do think that it should be a title which captures the full sweep of these essays, that is why I had suggested to Olga some version of Women's Liberation: Essays on Global, Historic, Philosophy and Revolutionary Roots.

Do you think it is possible to create an index for these essays. I know Mike is most experienced at that, but I was wondering whether it might include someone from women's liberation if you do decide to do it.

I am sorry these are so brief notes on your labors. If I have some more thoughts I'll try and write a little more in next few days.

then only ~~the~~ ^{vs} ~~the~~ ^{vs} BUT IF above NO concl. an END BUT NEW
+ PPs ^c very rough of H's Dial. & (MTP) RULED OUT completely 2 CAP

August 31, 1984

Dear Simon:

Have you ever felt that you were seeing yourself for the very first time? You must have felt that way when you first met me. I found that not only was it your personal achievement but you were actually creating new open doors for others in the scholarly field--say, in the Israeli academy or Purdue? In any case, that is the way I felt when I was confronted with 400 pages of my writings on Women's Liberation and learned--Olga's yeoman/woman's work "forced" me to realize that, make that encounter with myself--that an early on W II when none were speaking of Rosie the riveter as having a brain, I was not only extolling her reason but pointing to it as being woman reaching for Revolution. Moreover that that was but a small part of all I had written and she cut the 40 years to 35, with heavy emphasis on 1970s, 1980s. Were it not for Olga prodding me and convincing you as well of its relevance for today--ah, well, it is done and Olga has just send it all off to Humanities with letter detailing it all to Judy.

Still to come in a week or so is my Introduction to it all; I did write a Draft which gave me the form in which to put it all in four parts, and that not just chronologically, but how each of the parts is a totality of the entire period, 1950-1984. Please note that I'm including two articles by Olga under her own name, Olga Domanski.

And since it all has a very international flavor, from US to Africa and from Asia to Europe, it is by no accident that I was so impressed with what you published--We Are Bosses Ourselves--on Aboriginal Women that I created a special footnote for it when I quote what Marx had written of the Aborigines in 1882 as "the intelligent black", to say that 100 years later, and on Aborigines woman. . . Indeed I will give you a free ad and have it reviewed in News & Letters in the October issue.

Have you noted that finally women liberationists who are scholars are giving new publicity to Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution--in Italy in Dimensions; in the US both in off our backs and Hypatia; and in Australia in Thesis 11; and in general in two books by men: Marxism and Totality by Martin Jay (UC Press) and Marxism in Italy by Paul Piccone?

Hurriedly, (and you can see Olga is not here today or this would have a more readable, not to mention correctly typographical form)

Yours,

16384