

Lukacs History and Class Consciousness

(In going over the parts in relation to Luxemburg I knew that Lukacs would be wrong on party, but in the article "Towards a methodology in the problem of organization" he quotes Marx as follows from "Class Struggles in France": "The present generation resembles the Jews whom Moses led through the wilderness. It must not only conquer a new world, it must also perish in order to make room for people who will be equal to a new world.")

No (NOT) "let's" what he relayed to W.I.V. while his paper...

Lukacs has 2 articles on RL, the first "The Marxism of RL" pp 27-45. In an attempt to prove that RL's Acc. of Cap. is the equiv. of Lenin's State and Rev "both use the approach adopted by the young Marx... They provide what is substantially a literary-historical account of the genesis." (p. 35) The whole development of totality though he covers his flanks on p.28 by using the phrase "but also the subject" is actually only the object and even that is limited to the objective as "reality" vs. Marx's "abstractions". Though I did not know this essay when I wrote the piece on appearance and reality in M&F, my piece actually answers this, and answers it dialectically whereas there is such a wide gulf in what Lukacs says on dialectics when he speaks of it "as dialectics" and when he suddenly begins applying to Luxemburg that it really is unbridgeable and shows how very difficult it is to understand the simple little word, concrete, especially when concrete relates to the masses, to the subject, to the movement from practice. All his talk of unity of th. and pr., where it isn't totally abstract repeats that wide gulf, that is to say in this case, RL is a rev'y and therefore her pr. is rev'y & supposedly ~~therefore~~ therefore her "theory" is rev'y.

No del Hart we are... his acc... I saw... of his one

"Critical Observations on RL's 'Critique of the RR'" pp 272-294 (Jan. 1922) Since this one he definitely had to criticize and not only on the basis of the fact that she, herself, came closer to the RR, but also what is definitely wrong, which appears in the Junius pamphlet -- "In the era of rampant imperialism, there can no longer be any national wars." He nevertheless again continues with RL as "the unsurpassed prophet, the unforgettable teacher and leader of rev'y Marxism".