

November 16, 1983

Dear Friends:

No doubt the fact that the first point on the REB agenda is "Finances: Facts and Needs" has already brought to your attention that we have met a rather critical situation. Indeed, please read right here the presentation that was made to the REB -- and schedule a serious discussion of that plus the REB discussion around it. Note also, for example, that I myself did not give a report on my quite lengthy Lead-Editorial on Grenada, because I felt that it is of the essence never to separate philosophy from revolutionary finances and therefore immediately called attention to the fact that the issue of the paper can be used very advantageously with the anti-nuke movement in order to seek contributions from that force.

Here is the title and the sub-headings of that Lead, which even in such an abbreviated form will show you that not only is this article a unique Marxist-Humanist analysis, different from all other articles on Grenada which have appeared, but that it relates directly both to the Black dimension and to the question of War and Peace:

Reagan's Imperial Invasion and Conquest of Grenada

THE THREE-WAY DRIVE TO WAR: GRENADA, ENDLESS MILITARIZATION,  
RETROGRESSION ON BLACK RIGHTS

The Lies Begin

The Lies Multiply

The Reagan Style of the Brezhnev Doctrine  
Reveals its Anti-Black Nature

Ramifications: Revolutionary Perspectives vs. Global War

This issue of N&L will have a real scoop -- an in-person report of the last day of the Grenadian Revolution and the first day of its counter-revolution. When Eugene was in Windsor, he had a chance to interview a Canadian health-care worker who had been in Grenada that fateful week. This interview will be featured as the 3rd article-page one. The issue will have many other features that, precisely because the objective situation is so filled with Reagan's retrogressionism and people are so anxious to oppose it, will prove the need to keep N&L alive.

There is another feature I'd like to call to your attention, even though it may appear in the paper only as an RV. When I first heard of it I actually thought I would oppose it. But on second re-reading of the report Dale sent on the Rocky Flats demonstration in Colorado, I realized how very unique is a proletarian's attitude. Here is what I mean: Dale was disappointed even on the aspect we all thought was so great -- the human chains surrounding nuclear facilities. I still do not agree with such an extreme expression as likening that to "crowd control", but listen: "What better form of crowd control is there <sup>than</sup> to spread the participants thinly over miles and miles of highway?" In my defense, I want to call to your attention that the first time I was impressed with the revolu-

16077

tionary dimension of a human chain was 1960 when the Japanese youth had their snake-dances and kept Eisenhower from coming to Japan. Moreover, the fact that by holding hands you are more than a single individual definitely holds the cops at bay because they know what they are dealing with. Nevertheless, I was so impressed with Dale's attitude that it sent me back to thinking of Denby and what it means to have a worker-editor, who always brings in to the paper something that comes naturally to a worker, but not to an intellectual.

I assume that Sheila has sent copies of her letter to all the locals, in which she describes the content of the latest issue of E&A. This is another distinguishing characteristic of N&L, particularly at this period. There is hardly a single place on my tour where an Iranian wasn't present in the audience, and we must really use our deep relationship with the Iranian Revolution in every one of our activities, including the contacting for financial support.

Now that I have completed the Lead on Grenada, I will be able finally to get to the PPL. However, I was rather surprised to get the feeling that some comrades think that only when the PPL is completed will they have the full analysis. First of all, I never separate philosophy from description, and there is plenty of analysis in the Lead, including the fact that it is absolutely impossible to have any activity against American capitalism and all its imperialistic outreaches without making sure that our readers know we are not only against what is, but that we have a philosophy of revolution that shows what we are for. What I couldn't deal with was the precise ideological debates within the Grenadian revolution that, directly or indirectly following Stalinism, have so degenerated the "battle of ideas" that disagreements are resolved by shooting. And since that has become a feature of the Movement ever since the rise of Stalinism, I mean to take it up not just as it developed in Grenada but as it is expressed in all the worst of the counter-revolutions within the revolution, including Khomeini and Pol Pot. It is this which I will try to find time to develop next week.

Andy has turned in his manuscript for the pamphlet on the Miners General Strike of 1949-50. Unfortunately, I have had so many deadlines that I will not be in a position to write my essay until after the PPL has been completed. And meanwhile, as you saw from the REB minutes, we are so short of money that there is no way to get it off during the Marx centenary year, as we had hoped.

Finally, N&L will carry an advertisement that will urge the readers to take advantage of the holiday season to get the trilogy of revolution for only \$25. This, too, you can discuss in your visiting with the Appeal.

Yours,

RAYA

P.S. (Jan. 7, 1984) -- After I completed this Political-Philosophic Letter on Grenada on Nov. 28, 1983, new material came out in the Left press which revealed that October 1982, as the date of the Central Committee meeting to which I referred in footnote 1, was, indeed, the correct date. This had been thoroughly inconceivable to me, since it meant that it had not been a matter of a few days, or even a month, between the events of October 1983 and the time when the Central Committee of the New Jewel Movement had first broached the question of what they called "the quality of leadership" -- at a meeting which had included both a criticism of Bishop and the resignation by Coard of one of the top positions he had held. Rather, it meant that during the entire year from October 1982 to October 1983 nobody outside of the Central Committee knew anything about the deep divisions within it. Worst of all -- because it is so lacking both in any philosophy of revolution and in any discussion of the direction the actual revolution was taking -- was the reduction of both of those questions to the question of which specific leader was to be chairman, all the while both Bishop and Coard never stopped praising each other during the meeting.

16079