

Jan. 19, 1981

Dear Richard:

We crossed in the mail, with you explaining Humanities Press to me and I already on another planet, by which I mean I have moved far away from a difference of view between Simon and me, and gone back to Marx.

I assume Olga has sent you the chapter of Part II of "Luxemburg book" so you know that this work is more total still (if that isn't gilding the lily) on Marx. Let me explain. Not only is my work, insofar as Luxemburg is concerned, more comprehensive and, if I may say so, more profound than any written -- well, let me back off a little before I finish the "not only" with the "but also." Nettl's is more comprehensive but even he failed to see both the WL aspect; (indeed, he even failed to note in that comprehensive bibliog., that she has given some speeches & thus recommend his readers to search for more, etc.) and the philosophic lag as he himself was probably a Kantian and dialectic seems to have been hardly more than a word. In any case, of the modern 2 books on RL they are NOT more than introductory essays to a very selected part of her writings. That is why even the German who has written several books "about RL" was very interested in mine and the Frenchman who has expended himself to the point of 900 pp., very much limited himself to "Journalism." THERE ARE NO WOMEN, except as very limited "prefacers" & that only in France. But you think these "experts" would recommend me? Then you know little of the knifing that goes on, even if you do know, I'm sure, of the Moscow Frame-Up Trials.*

Now comes the "but also" it is another "not only" ~~xxx~~ as the "RL book" also WL, and in her time and ours, BUT ALSO IT IS THE ONLY ONE ON MARX'S PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION. (Philosophy and Revolution I naturally think was great; but please note the difference between "of revolution" and "and revolution." That is to say I was relating Marx's concept of revolution to "all" philosophies, be it Hegel, Sartre, Mao, etc; now I am concentrating on Marx.) In a word, whether Marxists were dividing the young and mature Marx, or seeing they are one; whether they were arguing on the basis of the direct break with the bourgeoisie in 1843 or wishing to start only with Capital, the point was none knew Marx's Ethnological Notebooks, i.e., the return of Marx's to his very first but now famous 1844 Humanist Essays, & ~~back~~ on basis of Morgan's Ancient Society "just published", asking all over again: where is humanity going? (Incidentally, Humanities, I'm glad to say, brought Krader's transcription of Marx's Notebooks out.) And answering it, not either on basis of 1844, or 1880 BUT BY PROJECTING THAT THE REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA MAY COME IN ADVANCE OF THE ADVANCED LANDS. So, I return to Marx before he broke with the bourgeoisie, and show that in his doctoral thesis he was already a revolutionary, and extending it to the totality that is Marx contra Engels as well.

Ah, well, when everyone from women to Luxemburgites to the monopolists of "marxism" sharpen their knives; surely Simon will have company, lots of it. Yours, *J. G. G.*

*Incidentally I received "from the underground" a very nice greetings on Luxemburg from the one expert in the world, from her homeland!

15264