

April 16, 1955

Dear Arthur:

I want to take two minutes out of backlog and finances--the two things which must occupy us without diversion for the next 2 months--to enclose a letter from Marcuse so that you have an idea about the long-term project as well and also because a few areas of my relations with J you might be able to fill in.

You are well acquainted, I am sure, with Marcuse's "Reason and Revolution". What you may not know is that J, G, and I were so impressed with it when it first came out in the early '40s that we tried meeting him but the letter we were to send to him took us no less than some six months to correspond about, and we never got around to actually establishing a relationship until I finally took matters into my own hands as recently as my last tour, met him and left the letters on the Absolute Idea with him. This is his response. He is interested enough also to want to make a trip to Detroit, he told me, in order to meet these workers from whom I told him ~~that~~ I get these impulses. It will be something to see how he talks to a El or Effie or Ruby.

Where you come in is that I'm tracing when it was when serious divergences arose between me and J and 1947 was a big one--we didn't look at the SWP with the same eyes and he was very anxious to tone down all our studies to where they were either private or if offered to the party would end when Lenin died. Thus my book on philosophy was not to go beyond 1923 and made acceptable to JPC and John G. Wright. Just before I left for Europe I dictated some notes to John on how to study the 12 volumes of Lenin's Selected Works. They were supposed to have been published by the youth--maybe that is one of the things you referred to as being too complex in your recent letter--but never were. You were then in charge. Do you recall why it was J and G did not wish "to polish and publish them"?

The¹ came 1950 when I saw no point in staying in the party after SCWR. I believe you were still around. I believe you had some criticisms of your own before you went away and wrote about them, but I never saw them. Have you a copy of that?

Finally of course was the Absolute Idea as full freedom vs. his concept of "error as dynamic of truth". I do not mean "his" concept in the sense that it isn't Hegelian or we don't see the value of that. I mean it is x "his" in the sense that he did not go beyond that except to make himself the only "mediator" between the final truth and freedom and our present world.

No hurry about answering any of this.

Yours,

Rae

12040