1983

On July 28, RD wrote to McLellan from Wallaceburg in order to say that now she is rested and in the Beitish Empire, she is emboldedned to ask whether he had actually reviewed my book and especially noted the challenge to all post-Marx Marxists, beginning with Engels, I have long since read his works and it wasn't just the scholarship but what got me especially interested in him was that he was the first to translate part of the <u>Grundrisse</u> and made a most original comment on the fact that that work had revealed more WMEXX of the totality of Marx than what the economists attribute to Marx. Then RD asked McC. to let her know where and when the review of her book would appear.

15814

UNIVERSITY OF KENT AT CANTERBURY ELIOT COLLEGE THE UNIVERSITY CANTERBURY KENT CT2 7NS DAVID MCLELLAN. OFESSOR OF POLITICAL THEORY. TELEPHONE 66822 1. Ay. 1453 Jean Raya Drucyershaya, I was religned to get your letter - particularly in I am juit reading your latest - Soot at m's Minneul. 1 mich it i very hen en p-it in he coming hunt Lefue to Jacat in flox of Statents Wan interested 1. hear 2 you act vities. Jw are an example to us all and I wish you every free An the best-Dann Mileka

August 18, 1983

Dear David McLellan:

3. () 11 - - - -

Thank you for your kind letter. The fact that you will soon be reviewing my book on Luxemburg makes me feel good not only because I am interested in your commentary but because, frankly, I'm tired of remaining 2/C/2015-person both in Russia and in the U.S. In the present case, I was shocked to find that behind all the compliments to Rosa Luxemburg as a martyr, there was enough of a residue of male-chauvinism in our day, though Wemen's Liberation has moved from being an Idea to being a Movement, that her stature as a theoretician and as an original character in the Mellvillean sense has not been probed with the depth it deserves.

What has also surprised as is that in the anthropology field, where there are quite a few wamen academics, Luxemburg has been disregarded on the ground that she was a revolutienery Marxipt. In this case, I felt that I should really expand rather than nerrow -indeed, sake inseparable Marx's philesophy of revelation from -- the question of the Man/Veman relationship. The enclosed copy of a paper I submitted to the international anthropology conference that is to meet in New York in September shows that I consider it a sort of supplement to <u>Rose Larenburg</u>.

m's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Intion: I thought it might interest but it is not yet a published work "The asademia may have an idea of "owner-" What differs from mine, and you would mere about that than I, please use your judgment in any reference you might wish mike to it. 100 m to 1t. ažo 🛛

when and where will your review appear? May I ask you to send me a copy?

1. A. S.

- 42

. . . .

.

> 12 }:r::∖:r _:

994 (31) (32)

to all sign Yours,

 \sim