

Nov. 5, 1979 (not to be mailed until 7th)

Dear Andy:

The peculiar dating is due both to the fact that the REB will have plenty to take up without the enclosed letter to Ali (which I'll give it after REB for next week's agenda) and because, whether you will or will not be back from W.Va. you have experienced a tragedy that is best to allow time to put more into the past. Moreover, I also want Olga to find me the original review of TC's Vol. 2 of Lenin where I refer to Vol. I rather than the same as appended to MARK'S CAPITAL TODAY'S GLOBAL CRISIS since by the time I figured out that TC had never read Lenin's NOTEBOOKS ON IMPERIALISM but merely referred to a 3rd rate summation of it with underconsumptionist eyes I might have left out the particular point I'm referring.

The point I have in mind is the fact that I stressed the fact that TC is so vanguardist that even when he comes to the next volume which is on 1905 and it is clear that Lenin is himself not following his vanguardist conception of Party but is stressing how much more advanced the r & f is to leadership, and non-party masses as even more advanced to both in The Party, he would finally let go of vanguardism, but no, etc. etc.

As you know, I'm so anxious to continue a discussion, perhaps for a whole year, on the form of the party, and I'm looking forward to what you will produce that will kick that discussion off next month that, when, spontaneously, I received from A. on that same subject from so different a vantage point as Iran and 1844 MS which surely no one had ever connect with organization, that I practically wanted to rush it into print. But on second thought I neither wished to jump the gun on your initiating discussion and asking for more contributions, nor did I wish necessarily to have it all in print. Therefore, on second thought, as you can see from the letter I sent him, I'm suggesting that this be as an internal discussion bill, and asking him (and others, of course) to come up with other things for next Spring. As of now I think that if we have (besides the new ch. on RL book which, though not on that subject, has gone also on organization) discussion going Mar., April., May, then by June when we issue the convention call, and July when we actually have draft of thesis, we should be able to be both creative and historic, both new and old so that we might venture to have something for the Perspective—or we might decide to still wait. But even then it won't be just on a blank, but on quite some new ground. What do you think?

Let me take you into confidence on one other matter. In working on Chapter 2, (the original chapter, much edited, on Ethnological Notebooks will probably be part of Ch. 3) which takes readers from Mass Strike pamphlet through break with Kautsky (1910) and includes the dragging in from nowhere by Kautsky the so-called "strategy of attrition", a total illumination has been shed on my favorite hatred" so-called scholars and their endless footnotes. In 1977 the NEW LEFT REVIEW devoted no less than 73 pp. by their founder-editor, Perry Anderson, the "Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci" who, again out of nowhere, suddenly drew in Luxemburg. (Everyone loves to draw her in because then they can pretend they are for "spontaneity" rather than "centralism") I just could not understand the excuse for it since it was supposedly all on "strategy of attrition" that was supposed to apply to Gramsci, to Luxemburg, to Kautsky who, "without acknowledgment" based himself on a great military scholar who, in turn, had drawn on Napoleon's battles then "applied" it in WWI. But the truth was the Luxemburg debate was 1910 & while Gramsci's was regarding WWI and RR, it was based on Lenin. Anderson had diverted for some 3 pp., citing that writer, and Mehring, and over & over again on how he is bring out something new that Kautsky hadn't truthfully acknowledged.

Well, now I'm in 1910, and Kautsky's military pronouncements and Luxemburg, great Luxemburg does go to source, so, after exposing Kautsky's real deviation from topic at issue—Mass Strike—she shows that to have gone back right to the beginning, being a source of the original but supposed "strategy of attrition" nearly to ruin SO HE WAS REMOVED FROM OFFICE. Now the way this gets us back

15211

the "Party" is that, of course, Luxemburg gets in some digs into leadership.
So much for "scholarship", footnotes, and from TC to Anderson being spots
on the Party and leadership. Let's start something new, something real, and some
proletarian passion for dialectics, Marxian dialectics.

Yours,

PLEASE ALL'S FIRE: WE HAVE NO COPIES OF SO PLEASE AND RETURN TO MIKE ED LATER THAN
NEXT REG.