

Handwritten notes:
Mick
a more [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]

Handwritten: Terry - Sparwell, Chilwood

Nov. 4, 1982

Dear Sheila:

I'm taking advantage of the presence here of a young English Marxist-Humanist (actually an Australian), Andy, to send you a copy, hot off the press, of, finally, my new work, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution since the British (Harvester) publication will not come off the press till Feb. 1983 ~~xxxx~~ and then only in hardcover with a terrible price.

Despite your greater interest in Women's Liberation as "an organising idea" than in what I keep stressing as a philosophy of revolution in Marx's Marxism (Marx's, not Engels' Origin of the Family), I do hope you will want to review my work. It isn't a question whether one is "for" or "against" my views that concerns me so much as my total opposition to women unconsciously participating in making me an unperson even as not only the capitalists but the Stalinists and Trotskyists have done, lo, these many years. What always excites me is a battle of ideas and it is your initiation of such battle of ideas regarding my work that I'm appealing for, in England. Are you willing?

After all, whether or not you attribute as great importance as I do to part 3 of the work on Marx's philosophy of revolution, the unexplored women's dimension in Luxemburg-- and that from the moment she came to Germany at the turn of the century and denied that she was "interested" in WL. Being, instead interested in the fact that ever since the 1895-Japanese-Chinese War there was a new global division of power i.e., the first whiff of imperialism. Nevertheless, having obtained the editorship of one of the S-D papers, she at once realised that, as woman, editorship didn't mean she would get the privileges that job signified for men. Or, feeling suddenly in the great 1905- of Russian Revolution in Poland that she alone demanded "full social, economic, political equality for men" then and, though her lover, Jogiches, agreed with her on that, he didn't quite mean the same thing regarding relationship of spontaneity to organization. Instead, all those tensions led to the separation of the two and her being able to say, in 1907, "I am I only since I broke with Jogiches." Why didn't writers, biographers, disclose all the dimensions in her at once and at one, even though she hadn't made it easy for them to discover since she, too, was "leaving it" to Clara Zetkin as her preoccupation? In that respect Today's Women's Liberation did compel new probings beyond what Rosa Luxemburg thought as women's domain while remaining an "original" and living a very different life than, even as revolutionary, was "women's domain", that are explored for the first time in my work, within the context of "revolution in permanence" and total uprooting of the old, including old Marx-ism, but not new M-H-ist. Don't you think it deserves discussion even if it means the end of me as unperson?

Handwritten: [unclear] [unclear]

15354