Jan.27,1973

Dear Iring Fetscher:

Thank you very much for your kind letter of the 18th and the serious critique of Philosophy and Revolution. Please forgive me for first turning to a request for the type of critique publisher calls "quotable comments". I did not understand whether you meant the one to me as the one also for publisher, or whether you mean to write one more formal one directly to publisher who, incidentally has just moved:

Mr. Richard Huett, Editor-in-Chief
Dell Publishing Company
1 Dag Hammarskjold Plaza
New York, N.Y.,10017.

I do hope you can write that one (with,I hope, copy to me) by end of February.

Now then your critique. I must be brief since I'm busy going through the copyedited manuscript. Whereas I cannot introduce some changes based on your critique now, I do intend to do so on the galley proofs which will be ready March 13th. First, let me make clear that what you call "departing from" Marx I call restating Marxism for our own age. From the first page of the Introduction to the last page of the text I keep insisting that, no matter how great Hegel, Marx, Lenin, they could not possibly answer the problems of our age; only we can. Naturally I tried to do that, and your appreciation of Chapter 9 regarding"the new passions and new forces " shows that, fundamentally, we do see alike both on Women's Liberation, on Black, and on peasantry as a revolutionary self-developing subject. Where we do not see eye to eye is to think that what is had to be.

Of course, you are right that Stalin's rejection of "negation of the negation" was consequence, not origin, of Russian totalitarianism. But not only is it that it is Stalin who drove the peasantry to total opposition to the state drive to collectivization, not that the peasantry drove Stalin to his crimes. It is that a new stage of world capitalism--state-capitalism--found the perfect "missionary" in Stalin. Perhaps I took for granted that the readers know my past writings on Russia, and I should draw in more of the "material" grounds for my views into this. The whole point was that the Marxists, more even than academicians, have been unable to fill any theoretic void and that unless they take the philosophic ground--the Hegelian-Marxian dialectic and Lenin trying to catch up but remaining ambivalent--as jumping off point they simply will not make it and all that will face us are more unfinished, aborted revolutions and thus counter-revolutions.

Though I cannot develop it here, I should say that while while I do differ in my view on the peasantry as revolutionary I by no means think we can do without proletariat. From the time Marx was advising the Russians that, perhaps, they could shorten the birthpangs of capitalism to Lenin's 2nd CI Congress Thesis on National Question and Colonial, saying if world imperialism could be undermined through Peking if not through Berlin, then even Russia should be willing to subordinate its revolution to an uncoming greater revolution all Marxists knew that socialism could not be in one country, must have, if not world scope, at least a combination of technologically advanced with the more revolutionary"backward" countries. So it isn't peasantry by themselves, and our age does have the advantage of new passions and new forces