

April 20, 1982

To Be Read and Discussed at all Locals & England

Dear Friends:

I wish to engage you in a theoretical discussion that, *far* from being abstract, will be so concrete and practical as to relate to our present organizational and financial problems, from the "slogen", "3 books, not one" both in some view of content and immediate sales, to "typographical" errors in book or N&L and these not being merely technical but philosophic and each individual's political responsibility.

In taking yet another glance at Afterword to Ch. XI, "Trotsky's Theory of Permanent Revolution", I noted an omission in Ftn. 8 which refers to VII's "Selected Works, p. 515" without stating what volume. Since there are 12 volumes, which volume is the reader supposed to look up? Not to have caught that error just because it was not an easy one like a misspelling only proves that footnotes seems nowhere as serious to us as I have always tried to stress. In this specific case, moreover, it is not a question only of importance of "footnotes in general", but specifically nothing short of everything from 1905-07 revolution as dialectics of revolution and "organizational question" in a sense hardly ever discussed. I am referring to the fact that in Vol. III of VII's Selected Works, the specific article, "The Historical Meaning of the Internal Party Struggle in Russia" (pp. 499-518 & incl. in this case Ftns, pp. 627-630) VII says something he hardly ever said--and all after him would even deny that it was 1905, not 1902-03, where Bolshevism was born as a tendency: "Bolshevism as a tendency took definite shape in the spring and summer of 1905..." In a word, not when "organization question" was discussed at the 1903 congress but when, in the period between Jan. 1905 and before October, theories for actual revolution were projected ~~and~~ from which strategies for Oct.-Dec. flowed.

The article wasn't then just an "article", much less merely a polemic with LT, from which the latter could chose one item--conciliation--which was, by 1917, not 1910 or 1905-07,--finally accepted by LT after he reduced it to narrow organizational job of "joining". No, the 1910 "article" (which had been submitted but never accepted by Kautsky's Neue Zeit that had published Trotsky's and Martov's articles which Lenin criticized) is a historic-philosophic-political-dialectical analysis that relates to the peasantry as well as the proletariat, to theory as well as organization, and relationship of the intellectual to the objective demands and nature of revolution. Please do study and return to a much more elaborate discussion of it sometime in the future when you discuss the new book as it relates both to Chs. XI and XII, especially the very final section, "A 1980s View", whose last 2 sentences read, "Every moment of Marx's development, as well as the totality of his works, spells out the need for "revolution in permanence. That is the absolute challenge of our age."

last regular DE letter of the week, which Jim has written this week because ~~this~~ week's anti-nuke meeting which we sponsored, i.e., N&L youth on WSU campus, had worked out a brochure for the meeting that he had suggested and I thought deserved being made into a category, that is to say, anti-nuke activities not only not having been limited to anti-militarist meetings, but made into such a Universal as the totality of Marxist-Humanism which calls for the total uprooting of this exploitative, racist, sexist capitalistic society and

15337

creation of totally new human relations. The way the weekly activity, and it certainly will continue as one of the most urgent activities for the entire year, ties in with both the theoretical "technical" question I raised as well as with the issue of the N&L now going to press with its focus both on the new editions of M&F and P&R and their sales is this:

Just as typographical errors are treated all too often as minor questions and not philosophical-political matters, so I fear that the attitude to M&F and P&R sales will be treated as "old, familiar works we already know." Take M&F which has no special chapter on anti-nuclear movement though it certainly was philosophically and politically rooted there and in which I was most active in England when I first, in the 1950s, connected with that movement is seen best in its ramification, and it is that type I would hope we'll develop right now. My tour was related to the then new publication of M&F, and I did speak, among many other places and platforms and the actual establishment of a Marxist-Humanist group in Scotland, at the Cambridge University Labor Club. No matter what has happened to Peter Cadogan since then, the point was that at that time it was his very intense anti-nuke activities got him to see way beyond and declare M&F to be the type of work that "From time to time a book appears that alters human experience by making explicit the possibilities of new relationships....Dunayevskaya has located the trail...to make history." ~~the book is...~~ This continued to 1961 when he saw the ~~book~~ Afro-Asian pamphlet as directly relevant also to England and reprinted it there. The fact that 1982 sees The Left Academy (or at least Marx Wartofsky in that work of essays) acknowledging finally that RD as being "among the first" (who exactly, I might ask, were others then or now?) "to point to the importance of Hegelian elements in Lenin's understanding of Marx's Capital and of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks" after which he mentions both M&F (1958) P&R (1973) and the Telos essay by myself on "Hegelian Leninism" surely proves something they ("Left Academy" and "Left" in general) don't mean but we do: THE TODAYNESS OF THESE WORKS AS WELL AS THE NEWNESS OF THE SPECIAL INTRODUCTIONS I WROTE FOR THEM, BOTH IN SENSE OF "updatedness" and in answering the criticisms by bourgeoisie and Marxist ACADEMICS.

There is no <sup>other</sup> way to make the type of financial drive needed both by NEWS & LETTERS continuance and sales of books as pre-condition for both RLWALKM becoming that catching of historic continuity with Marx and its concretisation for our age that is the objective demand for a way out of the myriad crises and economic-political repression that the 2 nuclear titans--Russia and US--are engaged in their drive to nuclear holocaust. In a word, there is no way to prepare for revolution only through activity; inseparable from it is the "Self-determination ~~of the Idea~~ in which alone the Idea is, is to hear itself speak."

Yours,

RAYA

15338