

November 14, 1980

Dear Dave:

Much as I hate to ask you to do this (you were absolutely right when you said I would hate to read it), I do need RL's piece on "Lassalle and the Revolution". (pp.420-421) CW I, 2nd half, March 1904. I am very interested in the years 1903-1904 since that was the period when a good deal of new from Marx was published, which she reviewed, not very profcundly. (Nettle says she actually collaborated with Mehring in sorting out these early works.) Since it also contained the late works, Theories of Surplus Value, which really was on the eve of the 1905 Revolution, what revolution is RL talking about regarding Lassalle? 1848?

Here is the problem, Dave: Not a single Marxist has any appreciation or even interest in Hegel; they all are busy proving Marx was not an "idealist" and they reduce materialism to economics in very much the narrowest sense. So on the one hand it is no surprise that Hegel is discounted. But why in all hell should Marx's position on Lassalle be not only discounted but actually fought to the death, so to speak, and here was Lassalle, the true "unmaterialized" Hegelian?

Luxemburg was not on the scene in 1891 at the birth of the GSD, but she must have known something about the fact that it took the GSD even before it was born some 16 years to publish Marx's Critique of the Gotha Program and then did it only after Engels threatened to publish it elsewhere, and as if that were not enough, it was introduced by saying that they -- the Neue Zeit -- did not share KM's view, that KM and Lassalle were equally their predecessors, etc., etc. Obviously they are thinking of only thing and that is organization. And it seems to me on that point that RL's spontaneity would find a great deal more affinity to Marx than to Lassalle. In any case, the important question about the relationship to the publication of Marx's heritage, as seen in "Stagnation and Progress in Marxism" (I have that, so don't bother translating that one) is quite ambivalent. What I was trying to break down was what was happening on the objective scene in 1903-1904. As for 1905, that would also be ambivalent on the relationship of theory to revolution. In any case, by the time Kautsky got through translating the final volume, it was 1910 and by that time RL was totally separating from KK; did that affect Marx too?

Was the article on Karl Marx (3/14/1903) Band I, 2nd half, pp. 369-377, in any way related either to the article on stagnation of Marxism or to all the new of the young Marx she was reviewing in November 1902? Incidentally, the 1903

15248

*Handwritten notes:*  
Typical GPs - Next in line of review of Karl Marx's Neue Zeit on March 7, 14, 21, 1903: The Neue Zeit of Stuttgart to Ch. of A.C. Economy, and Neue Zeit of Neue Zeit of Neue Zeit (Miss Neue Zeit Aug 23, 1857)

article on stagnation and the one on Karl Marx are in the very same issue of Vorwärts. Is it possible to look up that issue and see what was so special about it? Was it related to the birth of Marx, which would first come in May, or was it pure "coincidence"? They were always so preoccupied with what Luxemburg calls "worn, copper small coin of makeshift daily slogans and salutations..." that the only impulse to all that writing was simply the fact that, in the case of stagnation a current person had so accused them and George Bernard Shaw was sniggering at them? I honestly don't think that I want you to translate in toto the 8 pages of the article on Marx. What I want you to do is read the article, see whether there is any reference to the newest material that had just been reviewed, and if so, that's the paragraph I would want translated.

Now that I'm in Part II of the book, it becomes ever harder to see in anything except politics, revolutionary politics, but politics nevertheless, a profound relationship of RL's "cultural view" with Marx's philosophy, when it is strictly philosophic. When do you think you can have those two matters for me? Thanks.

Yours,

aps-

15249