

Review of: "Some face posthumous justice too: Lefebvre, Marxism and a debt to Nietzsche"

Rodrigo Fernandes¹

¹ Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Good surprise this article. Above all, a dangerous, audacious – and healthy – essay, since it “dismembers” Nietzsche from Marx and Hegel, who are – broadly sensu – the main support beams of Lefebvrian thought. In fact, Henri Lefebvre is essentially an intellectual of dialectical triads. Both its theoretical frameworks and its concepts and investigative methods are developed and exposed based on three terms – “perceived space, lived space, conceived space”; “form, structure, function” or even “space, time, energy”.

As for the mentioned giants of thought, Lefebvre will decree in *Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche ou lo riyoume de sombres* work of 1975: “The modern world is Hegelian. The modern world is Marxist. The modern world is Nietzschean”. This is a powerful vote of faith, but not unabridged faith: Lefebvre is not guided blindly by the canonical triads of Hegel (thesis-antithesis-synthesis) or Marx (affirmation-negation-negation of negation), on the contrary, as the text points out, he seeks other paths for socio-spatial interpretation, but always, it should be repeated, taking into account Hegel, Marx and Nietzsche – sometimes directly and explicitly, sometimes in a more veiled and diluted way.

That said, it really takes *coragem* to disaggregate and examine Marx and Nietzsche in Lefebvre and in that sense, i consider the text in question satisfactory. Don't settle for easy solutions. As a suggestion, i leave the idea of deepening the poetic-linguistic dimension of Nietzsche. Aspect to which Henri Lefebvre gave capital importance. If he, Lefebvre, manages to outline a theory of language, it is indebted to Nietzsche's influence. Exploring this in the text would enrich it even more, given that the political dimension of Nietzsche and Marx is reasonably well defended. But Nietzsche, for Lefebvre, is more a renovator of language (metaphorical, symbolic) and less a thinker who thinks politically. Its policy is, above all, lexical and semiotic.

I believe that, having addressed this aspect, albeit briefly, the article in question is perfectly suitable for publication.