

NOTES by RD

1) I have been worried about the inadequacy, if I may say so, of our understanding of RLWLKM, as a totality which is such, not by any fiat but because it truly is -- and by truly is, I'm referring to ^{The importance of} Parts I and II ^(which, when) -- ^{led to} ~~what~~ developed to the fullest extent that Part III, which all of you understand very well. I believe that ^{Others considered} because I kept fearing that those parts, I and II, ^{they did} if ~~we~~ actually contain some "opportunist element", surely depends ^{on} on our reading into it what isn't there, just because it needed our working through it to see it. This must be the reason that I kept mentioning: "You must include EN" when in fact I didn't mean at all it's being so included mechanically in that amendment paragraph. What I really meant was the last decade literally does not speak for itself. It must be worked out. It must be related. It is incomplete outside of ^{Marx's} ~~EN~~/letters of the same period. In a word, it simply means nothing when we put it in by name. Just as I objected to Hegel's works being listed, (though I surely believe in all of his works) because it simply is absolutely illegible without a Marxist interpretation, and for that you need a book, not a paragraph in a constitution, so the same is true of the EN. That is to say, what exactly would anyone get by listing a bunch of imperialist writers and Marx talking to himself. Marx understands everything he said to himself, but no one else can understand it.

- 2) Let me try to be concrete by showing: a) the Statement of Who We Are as published after January-February, which really is "the paragraph" for the Constitution. Thus -- and it's one of the reasons I liked Terry's letter -- where the new that comes with the book is seen both in the paper, in the books, and what could be easily incorporated in the Constitution. For example, the 2nd para. about N&L being "created ... philosophy of liberation", could actually be included in the para. for the Constitution. At any rate, Terry was right on the nose.
- b) Terry again was right by the next para. wanting the sentence "by tracing and paralleling...has...". On the one hand, I thought this was great and gives us a chance even to include the 25 Years pamphlet and to concretize it on the American scene as ACOT. On the other hand, please note I stopped before the end of that sentence, because the very next word is what I object to in the sense that it closes the doors for people to join us by telling them we've already met all the ~~challenges~~ challenges. The word I objected to was "met the challenge of the new moments ". I would much rather want to make it passive tense , such as "This challenge to post-Marx Marxism must be worked out by this generation."
- c) In fact, it is this half of the paragraph that needs complete rewriting for a Constitution, and that would become "it."

3) Here is how I tried the rewriting, first, by including the 2 sentences I liked, the one on N&L and the one on "tracing and paralleling," which included, in my mind, the listing of 25 Years and ACOT. Here is what followed: "We also proceeded to dig in, at one and the same time, the thought of the great revolutionary Marxists like Lenin and Luxemburg, which, even though, RL was 1/2 -way dialectic on the National Question, and Lenin 1/2 way dialectic on the Party Question, we couldn't have reached the new stage we have achieved without them -- the dialectics of revolution from Lenin; and the spontaneity as well as the hidden dimension in RL. Moreover, ^{we} must be absolved from blame in one respect: the unavailability to them of the many works of Marx that are available to us. That is especially true of the "new moments" of Marx, precisely because, when ~~ENY~~ ^{some elements} exist separately, as is the case with the 1882 edition of the CM, it simply cannot mean what is easy to see when you have the Grundrisse and the EN and above all, live in a different age where the Third World is a reality.

4) The philosophic, theoretic, and even practical, catching link of the/historic continuity with Marx's Marxism and the maturity of our age, i.e. the actual movement from practice that is itself a form of theory, is the center-point of RLWLKM. And it is the adding up of ~~the~~ theory, philosophy, historic period and that movement from practice which makes clear the inseparability of Organization from Marx's concept of revolution in permanence.

5) On the other hand, I'm absolutely "scared" of the way we've been using "revolution in permanence" as if, a) it answers all questions; b) it can be interpreted in one way and only one way when it comes to organization -- our way-- as if Marx had actually not ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ written specifically on Lassalle rather than making ~~XXXX~~ a universal of it for all eternity. Don't misunderstand me. I think no one is greater; I think we have interpreted it not just correctly, but recreated it in a way that it is the answer to our age. But we simply *cannot* say such things without sounding elitist. It is best, both because it helps gaining new members, *to pose the need for* to work out such an historic task, and because it is true we really couldn't prove it. We have yet to make a revolution, which would entitle us to claim to have answered the question of organization. BUT IT IS CORRECT TO INSIST THAT IT IS HIGH TIME TO ISSUE THE CHALLENGE, TO BE ABSOLUTELY CONFIDENT THAT WE ARE SO NEW, WE HAVE MADE SO MANY CONTRIBUTIONS THEORETICALLY, MARXIST-HUMANISM IS SO UNIQUE, AS TO ~~XXXX~~ ATTRACT A NEW GENERATION OF MARXISTS. IT IS ONLY THEN THAT WE CAN SPEAK OF A TRILOGY OF REVOLUTION, AND GO HAMMER AND TONGS TOWARD ORGANIZATIONAL GROWTH.

I have reread both all the paragraphs submitted, including my own, and don't like any. But perhaps 2 things will help:

1. on ~~XXXX~~ the subject of spontaneity and organization, I said that RL "could not do it *(rework out a new relationship between the 2)*" because she had not penetrated the newness of the NQ that had arisen ever since the Easter Uprising." It not only is not true that it is only because of the NQ*, but the more correct expression

would have been if I then added: Not only ^{were} spontaneity and organization not absolute opposites and also not a totality, but above all, what was missing was the philosophic method ~~which~~ -- that ~~dialectic~~ dialectic of development both of objective and subjective-- which alone ~~unites~~ unites the two and does so by itself being the element that gives action direction and a form of development.

2. In re-reading the July 25 "In Lieu" of REB minutes on O's report, I scribbled in some comments that I believe can help her develop her own report for the convention,

*(on previous page of notes) Perhaps I should blame myself for the absolutely ^fantastic wrong, nationalistic, development by Neda, which so shocked me that I wrote a sharp enough critique and she just dropped the whole matter. I had no idea that I ever said anything that faintly resembled her paper. Her paper claimed (and in very haughty terms) that Lenin would have been able to shake off his elitist concept of party if he ever worked out the NQ as Subject. I said, migod, first of all, how can you jump from NQ to having the answers to elitist party; 2ndly, if ever a man developed the NQ, it was surely Lenin, from the Easter uprising all the way to "if not Berlin, then Peking", and to the Blacks in the U.S. at the 2nd CI Congress, this man was a genius, and at no time did he ever lower National Liberation to where it was a theory without a Subject. And on and on and on. And here I reread (in the 3 pages I had dictated to O) -- and O. read them out at the REB, and this must have emboldened her to carry it out to its most absurd. (O. just told me her paper was written long before this was read out...)