

November 2, 1984

Dear B

*(Please share this with
Mary as co-organizer.)*

Though the present moment -- that is, from the moment of the New York local elections when Mary and you became local co-organizers until today -- is what preoccupies me, I want to begin by talking of December 30, which will be the date for the Expanded REB that I intend to propose to the REB this Monday. I know how difficult it is for you to get away that day (that weekend) and that is why I am beginning this way, because I consider it urgent for you to attend

especially, because of the objective situation in India, which coincides very much with what may sound like a very opposite point -- the anniversary of the very first Afro-Asian Conference between Nehru, Chou En-lai, and... The whole question of so-called Popular Frontism was there involved, plus the whole question of what would become the Sino-Soviet conflict as Russia was considered West (or white?); and a further plus, when I refused to accept Mao as the new and "greater revolutionary".

Let me begin with co-organizership, both because of the pivotal nature of the meaning of that little prefix "co", and because collectivity is involved in it. What I mean is that when I use the expression that "there is wisdom in the council of many" it sounds as if it is an exaggeration if not a cliché in describing what is, so let me make it even more strange by saying two opposites -- that even when it isn't, it is. That is to say, the reason it is correct philosophically even when it is not meant complementarily, is this: Supposing the collectivity consists of very nearly a bunch of idiots. It still has helped the one who has called for it because he/she begins to to him/herself, and recognizes the result as the proof that he/she was right in the first place and that couldn't have been perceived without testing it with all other views. That's why setting priorities becomes so crucial and why making co-organizership/priority number one. Have you done so? Why haven't we heard from you? What is new in New York, since co-organizership was set as principle not alone because Mary was new to New York, nor because it showed our principle of man/woman, but because it also was concrete in relationship to the work New York had been doing in its focus on Latino?

When it comes to Latino work, I wonder how we could start concretizing that section on "revolution in permanence" as organizational expression ~~in~~ News and Letters Committees, when

16308

new continent of thought, Marx's Marxism and "therefore" thanked him in an M&P footnote .
What I discovered was that what he meant was that Sociology took over.

we begin practicing that last section of the 1984-85 Perspectives titled: "Not by Practice Alone."

"Not by Practice Alone" is the concrete when what becomes the determinant all rests on that little word "not". The whole discussion I'm now having regarding Bukharin's vulgar materialism on the question of the Plans and "higher mathematics" in a certain sense relates to our critique of our Latino work. The greatest shock Peter experienced ^{was} ~~not~~ because there had to be a total re-organization in Latino writings, but because even he had fallen into a trap. He was right, ~~at~~ at the convention itself and the work since then, but, frankly, I do not feel the same confidence in the work in New York. It is so easy to love friends and consider co-activists* as doing what you are doing motivated by the same philosophic vision; and it is so easy to assign that co-activist's "confusion" to language difficulties; and it is so hard to keep digging beyond all appearances and desires to the objective and philosophic, that it becomes imperative to begin a sentence with that little negative "not". "Not by practice alone" became imperative for us not alone because it is correct, but above all because it was we who made the category, and again very correctly, of the opposite phrase "from practice." It's the latter we stress, not merely by underlining it, but proving it through 30 long years. Though correct and proven it led us to treat as "taking for granted" its corollary "not by practice alone". In these reactionary times, nothing is more urgently imperative than "not by practice alone." It became imperative to Lenin when the Second International betrayed; it did not become imperative to Luxemburg. On the contrary, it was first then -- that is to say, after WWI broke out and the betrayal occurred; and even after the Russian Revolution was already successful and an attempt was made to make it an international "order" -- that she, all over again, talked of imperialism in the old way, against self-determination as if that were merely nationalism vs. internationalism; and while revolution was always with her, theory certainly wasn't.

The Dec. 30th Expanded REB becomes triply important, i.e. as a new look at India (for which please re-read the old Dec. 8, 1962 Political Letter on "The China-India War in a New State-Capitalist Age", especially ftns. 1 and 6 on page 7) and as it affects our work in the Third World in general; as it relates to the philosophic question of abstract and concrete; and as it relates to new NEB members who have yet to participate in an Expanded REB. I wish to end with the statement that ~~the~~ "revolution in permanence" and "absolute movement of becoming" are, in a very specific way, synonymous.

Yours, *Rays*

* The same holds true for "co-philosophers". I'm referring to the fact that I was so happy that Marcuse had agreed to write the Introduction to M&P; so glad way back in the early 40s, when Reason and Revolution came out and at that dark moment I read the Chapter on Marx's 1844 Essays that when Marcuse wrote that Hegelian dialectics went neither to the Right or to the "Left Hegelians", that I interpreted it to mean that it went to that