

Sep. 11, 1979

Dear Olga: (Copy to Mike and Eugene)

I understand you called while I was walking and since I will return the call in a couple of hours, I'll leave the question of what books not to forget, especially re Black women (be sure to take not only Toni Cade in which Grace was included, but what Diane reviewed for, no matter how much they do not do what I am waiting for, what they do does have something new that either I didn't see or if I did thought quite unimportant); and in fact I'll also have you call Susan and arrange for us to give her 1/2 day either eve, or morning because I decided what she wanted "to sit in on" may help if she prepares herself for it by seeing whether what interests her--native Americans--has any relationship to certain dates: the 1880s when Morgan wrote and Marx read; did either she or Scape have heard it discussed among Indians; 1905-10 when both the PR and rise of imperialism in Rosa's mind over the Morocco incident meant anything in the history of American Indians; and the period since the 1960s. (O, yes, I also asked Mary to call you and find out whether the few days we have before leaving is most convenient if I want to work with her.)

But, actually, the walk was for purposes of what I think everyone thinks "wrongly" about the book, that it will have some 3 part like P&R and the 3 parts seem to speak out in the title. In fact, nothing could be furthest from the truth. Marx's Phil. of Rev. is not only the most important "part" of the 3 in the title and will by no means come last, but IT IS THE WHOLE. Put differently, everything and everybody has to be weighed against Marx, not by telling separate tales, with each in his historic period, but by a critique and self-critique as if Marx was alive in all these periods. Thus, while I start with Rosa, it will be exactly when she reaches the highest point--break with KK and sensitivity to oncoming imperialism, is when she also breaks down because she sees the "historic" as just new that Marx didn't ~~see~~ live to see so that he has to be "supplemented". In a word, whereas at the beginning she is so great precisely because both dialectic and revolution are precisely the reference points in Marx--and it is why I need not do any critical "measuring"--1910 because there is no SUBJECT, SUBJECT, SUBJECT except the proletariat who is rather abstract besides, and transformation into opposite, much less the absolute.

Or the question of WL as I once before wrote you it will not only permit us to go way beyond her both because she "kept away" and was not aware of just how very much it did gnaw at her, but it brings us to the one point WLM did bring on the stage, though not a one penetrated anything either of revolution they could have learned from Rosa or Subject,--compel the Left to face this subject. I believe this is what did bring us around, once we took AI as New Beginning seriously, to dig out something so new that even Marx's philosophy of revolution became concrete, that is to say, we could see more than all others. That, indeed, is the superiority, genius of philosophy, that the genius who does the discovery so grasps movement that he sees its logic as concrete long before it has proven itself, and until it has proven itself, none can see what he is talking about. Enuf for the present.

Yours,

W

15197