

THE DISCUSSION ON THE HISTORY OF
OF 1841 BY RYAN B. June 11, 81

Dear Ranga - just as with "Why Hegel?"
I then asked you why not Spinoza, or
better I should have asked, why not
Descartes? - read Hegel's lectures on history
of Philosophy, especially the parts headed
"Descartes" and "Spinoza" and especially
"Jocely" - you are wrong about
1841 instead of 1843. In the
Doctor-thesis he did not "derive" from
Hegel at least not from the Young -
Hegelian - at least from Hegel's word
on "Heinrichs charakteristische of
Spinoza as 'dead dog' - only in 1843
he made as he expressly said: "the
jump" you ^{are} just confusing
the "urgency to oppose the status
quo" which at that time all Young
Hegelian (strongest Hoes Hess) had,
with the letters to Ruge, i.e., "reckless"
critique of all the existing - reckless
in the sense that the critique is not
afraid of its results and likewise not
afraid of a ~~series~~ of conflicts with the
existing powers." (The English
translation, by the way, which you
are forced to use, is especially
bad when it comes to Marx on
philosophy - "reckless" = heedless
of danger, not "reckless" = having
no comparison, i.e. is the real

copy of the paper by the Young Hegelians
in 1841. I have many letters about the Young Hegelians
in 1841.

word Marx was!)

I never doubt about your
"good intentions", but Marx liked
several times to quote Baudelaire of an
"good intentions". So also your
doubtless good intentions on
Rosa Luxemburg, but I for once
see in her what Marx saw in
Blancqui - the heart and brain of
the proletariat, but in all questions
of theory, including political theory, she
was wrong! I am afraid that the
Solidarity - movement is too much
influenced by followers of R.L. in
Poland - don't countries this as if
would they say: "They shouldn't have
taken to the weapons" (I believe
in Marx and Lenin on the Paris
Commune 100%). And your cracks
on Engels are very confusing and
harmful. Marx knew that the
Vulgarism of Engels, but he was
the best of the best and no one who
followed Marx has ever been better.
I could mention a lot of cases where
Engels just did not grasp what
Marx said and wanted. Worse that
he didn't know the features
of the "Communist Manifesto" for
example that he prevented

vehemently publication of
 "Wages, Prices and Profit" which no
 doubt has a greater impact
 for class struggle than the whole
 "Kapital" -- it was the greatest
 service of the Avulungs to publish
 "W, P + P"; they knew what it meant
 because they were moved more
 than Engels involved in practical
 participation of the workers
 movement.

Sorry, but remember in writing
 here I have no intention
 to enlighten you, I am a very
 tolerant man, but in 1847
 Marx quoted Engels: "Lumpen
 is no excuse" ^{I close of the} ^{but another quote}
 Marx used at the end of his
 critique of the Gotta programme
 from the great Florentine. And
 one more: "Moi je ne suis pas
 marxiste". Marx said it several
 times and very seriously meant
 it!

All very best

P. D.

*) I don't blame you for your bad
 translations of Hegel and Marx. The great
 linguist Engels made worse and damaging
 translations (especially of the Communist
 Manifesto) as Lenin in quoting the

most fundamental sentence ~~of~~
~~of~~ the letter to Ruge - still
Spinoza was right and there
is no excuse for bothering your
readers about "1841 rather than
1842" - and as with "Why Hegel?"
I ask: Who cares? And one
more: Qui bono? The College
students who go to your lectures
are confused enough without
you! Herbert Marcuse had made
more progress in doing it than
you ~~can~~ ^{will} ever have. Schlegel
you are a revolutionary which
he has never, never been.
And do not spit at Engels (or
Clara) bad enough that you spit
at Trotsky (whose greatest sin
was to confuse).

~~LETTER~~
~~ON MARX'S DIALECTIC OF 1841~~

6/11/81

by Peter B.

Dear Raya,

Just as with "Why Hegel?" (I then asked you "why not Spinoza", or better I should have asked: "why not Descartes"-- read Hegel's Lectures on History of Philosophy, the parts on "Descartes" and "Spinoza" and especially "Jacobi" --) you are wrong about 1841 instead of 1843. (~~By~~ By the way, why not look at 1835, when we can "see Marx as a revolutionary" in the paper he wrote in High School? Surely, not much less "revolutionary" than about the lumber-theft in #1841.) In the doctoral theses he did not deviate from Hegel, at least not from the Young Hegelians. He only mentions Hegel's marvelous characterization of Spinoza as a "dead dog" in 1843... You are just confusing the "urgency to oppose the status quo", which at that time all Young Hegelians had, with the letters to Ruge, i.e. "reckless critique of all the existing..." Reckless in the sense that the critique is not afraid of its results and likewise not afraid of conflicts with the existing powers. (The English translation, by the way, which you are forced to use, is especially bad when it comes to Marx on philosophy. "Reckless", which is the word Marx uses, means heedless of danger. It has not comparison with "ruthless".

I never doubted your "good intentions", but Marx several times quoted Dante on "good intentions". So also your doubtless good intentions on Rosa. I for one see in her what Marx saw in Blanqui-- the heart and brain of the proletariat, but on all questions of theory, including political theory, she was wrong! I am afraid that the Solidarity movement in Poland is * influenced too much by followers of Rosa Luxemburg. But don't construe this as if I would say: "They shouldn't have taken to the weapons". (I believe in Marx and Lenin on the Paris Commune 100 percent.)

~~XX~~
Your cracks on Engels are very confusing and ~~harmful~~ harmful. Marx knew the vulgarism ~~XX~~ of Engels, but he was the best of the best and no one who followed Marx has ever been better. I could mention a lot of cases where Engels just did not grasp what

15276

22222

Marx said and wanted. Worse than the fact that he didn't know the greatness of the Grundrisse was, for example, that he vehemently prevented the publication of Value, Price and Profit which no doubt has a greater impact for class struggle than the whole of Capital. It was the greatest service of the Avelings to publish Value, Price and Profit. They knew what it meant because they were more involved than Engels in practical participation with the workers movement.

Sorry, but remember in writing this I have no intention to enlighten you. I am a very tolerant man, but in 1841 Marx quoted Spinoza: "Ignorance is no excuse".†.

Yours,

P.B.

* I don't blame you for your bad translations of Hegel and Marx. The great linguist Engels made worse and damaging translations (especially of the Communist Manifesto). And Lenin, in quoting the most fundamental sentence from the letters to Buga, quoted incorrectly. Still Spinoza was right, and there is no excuse for bothering your readers about "1841 rather than 1843". And as for why "Why Hegel?" I ask, who cares? The college students who go to your lectures are confused enough without you! Herbert Marcuse had much more success in doing it than you ~~will~~ will ever have, since you are a revolutionary, which he has never, never been. And do not spit at Engels (or Clara Zetkin). ~~It~~ Bad enough that you spit at Trotsky (whose greatest sin was to confuse).

15277