



is directly related to this new reality as well as to my original contributions on the very concept of theory/practice. This, too, I will point out page by page.

Here I will move directly to what you call, on page 19, subsection 4, but which will now be a new section 3, to be titled: HOW DUNAYEVSKAYA COMBINES THE UNFINISHED REVOLUTIONS OF THE 1960s WITH HEGEL'S ABSOLUTE IDEA AS "ABSOLUTE IDEA AS NEW BEGINNING" FOR HER PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION.

Surely, Luxemburg deserves a heading, rather than be subordinated either to this age's unfinished revolutions, or only to post-Marx Marxism as a perjorative. Page 19, which is your section 5 will now be section 4. I suggest it be titled: THE UNKNOWN FEMINIST DIMENSION AND PROFOUND ANTI-IMPERIALISM AS WELL AS SPONTANEITY IN ROSA LUXEMBURG, WOMEN'S LIBERATION AND MARX'S PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION.

Except that section 6 will now be 5, that title can remain as is.

Now then, p. 1, para. 1: If you add the following 2 sentences at the end of the 1st para. you will have achieved something unusual both in your comprehension and in telling your audience more than a hint of the whole, thus:

historic That message impressed me by the/inter-twinning of our revolutionary nationalism with internationalism. The brief message of solidarity referred to the fact that Iran, back in 1906-11 revolution, had established the first women's soviet (anjuman) in the world, and related it not only to our present demonstrations but also to Ting Ling's 1937 essay in China called "Thoughts on March 8", but to the Black American Abolitionist, Sojourner Truth's "Ain't I a Woman?"

(no, it would be better to put ST before TL)

Neda, These additional two sentences in the first para. will allow you to cut out the first sentence of the 3rd para. so that, immediately after you speak of my writings that have been translated into Farsi you proceed, in para. 3 with my being the founder of M-H.

I believe that in this way your very first page will arouse the readers' interest to read the rest, and you will show yourself as a scholar trying to let the public know that there really is something new they can learn about your subject, including those who are not interested in learning it. You then continue with your introduction until p. 3, where part 1 begins, with a change in title as I suggested. Continue to the last para. on p.5, which para. 1 should be eliminated.

Here is the problem. Instead of commenting on the commentaries you have just listed (those AER debates as well as the NYT of 10/1/44), even if you do at this point include the two paras. on p. 6 that complete the first section, what is needed is an indication that the elements of RD's concept of Humanism, Marx's Humanism, were already there. In this way, you can bring in not just the events of 1950, but the fact that those events were the basis of a whole new reality. This can be done quite easily by adding -- after the sentence about JAJ and FF each developing a theory of state-capitalism -- the following:

There was a significant difference, however, in what each had done. In Dunayevskaya's study was embedded the theory of Marxist-Humanism from the start. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ That is to say, the part of her thesis on the nature of the Russian economy which she called "Labor and Society" was ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ refused publication, but is now included in her Archives, which I had an opportunity to read. That part quoted from Marx's 1844 Humanist Essays, which had not been published in English, and which she translated as an Appendix to her M&F. When she brought in this ~~XXXXXX~~ whole question in her lecture on March 21, she singled out from those debates ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Stalin's "revision of Marx's law of value", the supreme manifestation of capitalism's exploitation of labor, i.e. of paying the worker a minimum to sustain life and extracting a maximum of unpaid hours of labor" which was her way of referring to profit. She also called attention to the fact that from the first she had included that this revision of value included "the breaking of the dialectic structure of Capital by ordering that the 'study' of Capital cut out Chapter 1." She further stressed that the order to eliminate Chapter 1 of Capital was not just an academic debate. That Chapter 1 included the crucial section on fetishism of commodities, on alienated labor, and was telling the Russian workers that ~~XXXX~~ the law of value operated in what was supposed to be a socialist society. She then raised her voice to say that what was involved was nothing less than Marx's philosophy of liberation, and that Marx from the beginning had transformed Hegel's revolution in philosophy to a philosophy of revolution.

At that point, Neda, you can say it reminded you of the fact that ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Raya's whole outlook was, indeed, rooted in what she saw of the new reality in the 1950 Miners General Strike, why she had already singled out the intergiews with miners' wives, and that these new ~~XXXXXX~~ phenomena is what led her back to reconsider Hegel's Absolute Idea as not an ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ absolute of just ideas but that his Idea was a unity of theory and practice. What needs to be done by revolutionaries, she claimed, was actually to extract practice from being a theory of practice to seeing it in the lives of the masses. It is what she was to call "a movement from practice that is itself a form of theory". ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ had already reviewed her Marxism and Freedom and ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ I questioned her about why, along with her philosophic-political analysis, she had included all sorts of discussions with ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ miners speaking for themselves in that 1950 strike. She replied by quoting from the very Preface to M&F: "No theoretician, today more than ever before, can write out of his own head. Theory requires a constant shaping and reshaping of ideas on the basis

of what the workers themselves are doing and thinking."

I know, Neda, that this requires a lot of work on your part, because I am suggesting that the end of Section I, on p. 6, through p. 9 (your old Section II) be eliminated, except that I would like either as a ftn. or some other way, to keep what you had on p. 9 about my 1953 Letters on the AI.

In a word, ~~XXXX~~ the point I am making about transition point to your Section III, which I want you to make Section II, is that the 1950 strike should not be a description of what happened but a mere reference to that objective event that you must take for granted your audience knows, because what you want to stress is what RD made of it. This leads you directly to M&F and permits you to include in this present thesis a reference to the 1950 article on the miners' wives, which is considerably ahead of where you had first mentioned women (p. 13). At the same time, you will also have a chance to say that that article is included in the fourth book. Indeed, just before you go over to the new Section II, you can include the fact that ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future includes a section called "Revolutionaries All." What I'm trying to drive home is how many ways you can escape strict chronology.

Perhaps you can also eliminate pages 11 & 12, and part of 13 -- and, instead, develop the reference to Herbert Marcuse's Preface to M&F or where you speak of his 1932 essay, ~~XXXX~~ ending at the top of p. 11, you can add that what was unwritten publicly was the different attitudes to the Woman Question, ~~XXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXX~~ in Marcuse's disregarding Marx's page on the Man/Woman concept in those 1844 essays, whereas RD was very anxious that even before there was a Movement called WLM, the question of Women's Liberation should be the practice and not just the Idea. In general, I believe that what follows there could be eliminated not only on pp. 12 and 13, but very much tightened when you develop your new section on p. 14.

On p. 16 you should include, in the last para., not only that I have a "chapter" on African Revolutions in PAR but that I had travelled to Africa and had written a whole series of both Political-Philosophic Letters and reports for Africa Today and Presence Africaine.

The new Section IV on RLWLKM should ~~XXXXXX~~ give Clara Zetkin her due. I'm referring to the fact that Gleichheit, on p. 21, is not a joint work of RL and CZ, but Zetkin's alone. It is true that she depended greatly on RL's theories but it's not true that she was just a "follower"; she had full responsibility, both organizational and theoretical, for that organ. That p. 21 could also be greatly cut, because I think that, whereas it is important to point to the theory of spontaneity and her actual activity in 1905, the Mass Strike could be left out and concentration be on her critique of Lenin.

If you can find a way of tightening the last three pages, it would be very good. And instead of the final paragraph on p. 30 which in essence we have now included long before this, what you

-5-

can do for a final paragraph is:

What RD has focused on in her newest book is that today's Women's Liberation Movement cannot merely rest on ~~XXXXX~~ its uniqueness in having exposed the presence of male-chauvinism also in the Left. The creative activity of WLists, she feels needs to plunge into the dialectics of revolution as one ~~XXXXX~~ road to extend human freedom and thus establish truly new human relations.

-30-

Yours,

P.S. Before ~~XXXXX~~ July 29, when you have to present the preliminary report on WL to the REB, I should try to speak with you, and the only possible few hours I will have are Saturday, July 20 from 2 to 4 PM. Can you make it?