

Dear Neda:

Jan. 20, 1983

I agree with you that there is no necessity for you to send in an outline for a report to give to the M.E. conf. or to give a report since both I and Azadkar and Cyrus are giving other reports. It would be much better if you considered your main work to talk to people individually as each gets a certain response. Follow-through has always been our weakest point, and getting names and addresses that could actually mean we know who to write to and on what topic to single out to write on is the task this year when we are so anxious to follow up on the ground of RL, WL, LM should be your task, don't you think?

Another way to relieve you of some of the pressure is not to put a deadline on the 2 tasks I suggested: making a discussion bulletin of your full report, and a very much abbreviated review of WOMEN & REV. (Sargeant had gall to give so wonderful a title to such an undeserving work that has not a single revolutionary to talk on, much less any dialectics of revolution as a topic.) Neither needs to have an immediate deadline since for the Mar. issue it will be Diane who will be writing on the Black Dimension, so that your review of Sargeant could be thought of as for May issue. For that it would mean it could be discussed in June is when we announce opening of discussion even before we have REB Draft Thesis for convention. In any case here is what I suggest:

1) While you need not begin till p.4, you do need a par. on Sargeant's editing, quite critical, but not too sharp a one, that is you say, while you'd like to compliment the editor for the title, you can't say that the contents deserve such a title since there is not a single revolutionary that is analysed in that series, nor is there any discussion of what she would call "strategy" and what you feel is discussed as dialectics of revolution in RL WL KM. But, as a review of her book as containing various essays that should be contrasted to RD's work, you first need to single out what Sargeant considers the main ground, Heidi Hartman and 2 others, one on Black by a Black writer and one on Middle East/ After which you can sharpen & shorten pp.4-8. (Incidentally, on p.6, note I change "only Eco." to "solely Eco." since I'm anxious for them not to skip over economics altogether.

2) As for Gloria Joseph, you need to be conscious she is Black and therefore you should soften critique. For example, please do cut out word, "ignorance" on Marx. Perhaps, on p. 10, instead any such word, add something like this at the end of the par. before ever you think of "ignorance", say something like this, right after words "most peculiar legacy of scars": Thus, instead of grappling seriously with Marx's concept of the revolutionary nature of the Black Dimension wither as he collaborated with Abolitionists in fighting for the North and going so far as having the very International established toward that end and indeed writing about the need to transform the civil war into one, not just of "unity" of North and South, but of FREEDOM, she quoting his expression on how great an effect on the Civil War would be sending down a single Negro regiment, and then including in his greatest work, CAPITAL, the famous question of white labor never being free until labor in Black skin is totally free, Gloria Josephson is so totally absorbed in psychological aspects, etc.etc.(p.10)

3) After you tighten and sharpen pp.10-11, go to p.12 on Al Hibri where you need to cut even more (but leave all that in in the actual bulletin of your speech on reciprocity, you, in the review,

16833

simply mention PHENOMENOLOGY, the stress of which is in bondsman gaining "a mind of his own", and in Marx singling out the question of labor and contradiction as the class struggle, after which he goes, not to "reciprocity", but to the end of division between mental and manual labor which is the mark of all class societies, the worst being capitalism, and Frantz Fanon, for our age, showing that Hegel is wrong on reciprocity since Black is not even regarded as "human" at all, so that all moved to a "new Humanism", Neda skip that all par. of Al Hibri's arguments, going at once to the very end of p.12 on domination which is, to her, "moving principle of history" instead of creativity of Subject, etc.etc.

SO that all you would then need is a very brief par., which would say that you advise people to read the South End publication only in order to see ~~xxxx~~ how they very nearly failed for the 1980s, no matter how active the late 1960s and early 1970s the WIM was, that, once they became so eclectic, as not to see the totality of either ~~xxxx~~ Marx's last works, were, or finishing the tasks the WIM began, they failed to find the philosophy of revolution of Marx the trail for the 1980s that RL WL KM is pointing to.

As for the photographer, Have Turnley of Free Press, he sure was very much attracted to the little photograph of you I have, and wanted to know who the "beautiful woman" was; I said Neda was Iranian who translated my works, etc. and I thought she would be to the Windsor talk on IWD. I didn't feel like giving him N&L address until I actually see the interview & picture in the press, but he did seem extremely interested in all 3 books which he bought at once, and he had been as photographer in Lebanon during the Israeli invasion, so we might have a friend in that Welshman radical.

Finally, here is the other book you asked for on IRAN: BETWEEN TWO REVOLUTIONS. That and the one on SU and the M.E. you can keep till mid-Feb. but I will then need them all to prepare for lectures.

Yours, hurriedly,

16834

Jan 18, 83

Dear Raya:

I am sending you both my talk and the abstract for the CIRA conference.

First my apologies for not giving you a clean copy of my talk, since I had no time to retype it. In the first section, I have several times used the material that was presented in the introduction of the book by Lydia Sargeant (although giving a MH analysis) - ~~and so I~~ and so I should probably try to think of a format to give her credit for some of the ideas. ^{Also} Mike told me that in ~~one~~ one of your talks you had dealt with from Hegel to Marx to Fanon, but he could not remember which article. Do you possibly remember? Also what was the name of that book which was such a great expose of Sartre on his sexism?

As for my abstract, the main idea on my mind when writing it was that because I will be so taken by my studies for my preliminary exams that I better speak on something I have already ^{worked} spoken on, at which point I decided to take up Shariati and Arab Socialism. By the way Batatu had an article in this issue of Merip in which he mentions Al Sibal, the Syrian thinker and leader of Moslem Brotherhood, that I did some studies on)

However, since writing my abstract, I have spoken with my teacher, Prof. M (History) who encouraged me very much to continue my research on "the failure of the Left in the Middle East!", and so my readings in the next months other than the books I got from you on Russia and the Eastern question, will include ~~works~~ works, by Abrahamian (Between two Revolutions) and Batatu, as well as Maxime Rodinson, Fouad Ajami ~~and my others~~.

I should add that I am very worried about my exams, ~~and~~ and afraid that if I do spend time working on a paper for the conference I will miss my exams. Also maybe with Sheila, and Azadkar, and of course yourself, I can ask to be a discussant for the W1 talk, or simply help organize some things.

Yours,

P.S. May I please borrow your copy of Abrahamian's book "Between two Revolutions" for a day, ^{Neda} I gave my copy to Sheila.

Shaker 7/10, cut and yessame
pk. Staley
ALHAW

Beginning with p 4
after one 11. Introd.