

December 2, 1955

Dear Raya Dunayevskaya:

I apologize for my long silence: (1) I did not have your address en route, (2) I was so busy with the final rush of the publication of my Freud book that I had to abandon all correspondence. In addition, I was most of the time not in Cambridge and picked up your letters with great delay. However, I have read - at least as a first reading - your notes and I should like to tell you that I must encourage you to go ahead with the elaboration. Your ideas are a real oasis in the desert of Marxist thought - there are many things I have to discuss with you - points of disagreement and points which require clarification, but I am at present just unable to come to New York or even Detroit and also unable to write my comments down. We will have to wait until my schedule and program is a little easier.

Please believe me that this is not laziness - I just have to stick to a rigid intellectual diet if I want to go on. But keep me informed about your progress. And as soon as I see the slightest chance, I shall get in touch with you.

Your notes are enclosed.

Again with apology

and best wishes,

Cordially,

Herbert Marcuse

9900

March 10, 1956

Dear Herbert Marcuse:

Some one ought to invent a day that is twice as long and a night that is half as short. As it is, I am quite dissatisfied with the world and its time habits (including my own). Now that I have registered my protest, here is what I was able to accomplish within the confines of night and day division:

I have returned to the beginning and I enclose herewith the first two chapters of Part I.

New aspects constantly evolve and I now feel the need for some "character sketches"; Proudhon and Lassalle are included; Stalin I will do later. For the time being I am including the first two under some heading as a Theoretic Interlude which would precede the analysis of CAPITAL itself.

What I will do next I do not know—perhaps rest a few days. In any case, the enclosed plus the two sections you already have on The Great Divide in Marxism and State Capitalism should give you a pretty good idea of the book as a whole. Since you are kind enough to want it in draft form, you might also be good enough to let me know your views. There is no doubt in my mind that sometime between the draft and the final writing we will need to spend more than two hours together. Do you suppose that in early summer you would have a whole weekend to spare?

Yours,

9901

Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

May 1, 1956

Dear R. D.

I have no excuse for my silence - except that the thing is still out of my hands. It has been with Beacon Press for quite some time; the first general reaction was favorable, i. e. they are definitely interested in publishing "such a book". As you undoubtedly know: this means that they send it to their readers. Since I do not know the new director, I cannot exert any influence, nor even expedite the process. In a couple of days I shall inquire again. I myself like your approach and the development of the theory very much and am anxious to see the whole book, but I just could not sit down and send you my comments: this is a full time job for me and I don't see how I can manage.

As to the summer: I am leaving for Europe (lectures!) end of June, but hope to get to New York at least for a couple of days end of May. What are your plans?

Mail reaches me better at Brandeis University.
With best wishes and regards,

Yours,

Herbert Marcuse

May 3, 1956

Dear Herbert Marcuse:

Thank you very much for your kind letter. You have no idea how your encouraging words help me proceed with my work. As you no doubt know, my entry into the "intellectual world" was thru very unorthodox ways and you are the first not to make me feel like a fish out of water. I will now even settle down to write the chapter on Hegel and have it with me by the time you get to New York the end of May.

I'm hurrying this note because I do not want you to "escape" to Europe before I have had a few hours undisturbed conference on the book. Therefore please write me immediately the exact days you will be in New York and where I can reach you and I will be there with Russian bells or maybe the Old Man Hegel will accept me and let me enter accompanied by the more melodic German music.

If the worst comes to the worst and Beacon Press refuses, please bring with you the original outline and I will begin a new campaign either with Oxford University Press or Praeger. Norman Mailer suggested the Grove press; do you know anything of that. If this book doesn't get out of my system by the end of this summer and unto the press I'm liable to burst from all these decades of pregnancy. How long will you remain overseas? It has hurt me to see what they have done to poor Marx's grave instead of that simple stone that marked his grave to which I did not feel out of place to bring a single red rose in 1948. I could go with you over every hill in Hapstead Heath too and show you just where he played with his children every Sunday and when they recited Shakespeare to each other. Oh, you don't think I was there!

Yours,

9903

September 6, 1956

Dear Herbert Marcuse:

Your Eros and Civilization has broken down my adamant refusal lasting two decades "to have a position on sex". Because your work is of such an original character it of necessity invalidated the self-defensive gesture of an old politico who feels it necessary not to get embroiled in every question "intellectuals" feels called upon to thrust into a political argument to deflect from the main point.

In the use of the word, original, to describe the character of your book I do not mean to limit it to the contribution of your own philosophic thought (though it is natural that my favorite chapter is the "Philosophical Interlude"). I mean that in the reinterpretation of Freud you rescued him not only from the epigones but from himself, so that anyone can see where he is genius and original and where lie the elements which gave rise to quackery. Although in no fundamental sense is Freud responsible for that, the ambivalence of his theory has of necessity obscured the great critical contribution. You know, I am sure, that there are radicals who consider a reinterpretation of an original doctrine as if it were mere repetition, a carbon copy of the original. I knew one radical who held that Lenin's State and Revolution was a "rewrite" of Marx's Paris Commune (Civil War in France)! Your original contribution lies in your extraction of "Eros" from being in a field by itself and placing it within the historical context of Western civilization without in any way deflecting from the specific field. Quite the contrary. You thereby illuminated the field of psychoanalysis. That is what I meant by the statement that you separated what was genius and original from that which became transformed into revisionism, if not outright quackery. Fromm's answer to you is a good example of the meaning here. Here is a man who dares speak in highly moral tones about "the callousness towards moral qualities in political figures, which was so apparent in Lenin's attitude" while his own moral standards do not stop the man from dragging in Marxism in the hope that its stench will keep readers away from Freud and you. Fromm is a fool!

Belatedly I congratulate you and will see what I can do to get the book in the hands of friends, workers as well as intellectuals; I may try to quote some "easy" parts on alienation in News and Letters, which will reappear soon.

How was your European trip and are you back? I had only one month off for concentrated work but I worked like a Trojan (Did they work 7:30 a.m. to midnight daily?) and finished the draft of the book. I enclose the three chapters you have not yet seen and the new contents page. You will note that I also changed the Appendix, substituting for the section on Crises from the Theories of Surplus Value 2 of the early Essays, Private Property and Communism, and Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic. In a month I will get down to the final revision or writing of text. I have no publisher's signature on the dotted line, yet, but I do have a promise from Praeger that if no publisher will dare undertake this he will "though unwilling as it is a complex and worrisome book and will bring a lot of criticism down my head." If Praeger does publish the publication would be simultaneously American and English; I understand he also has a publishing house in Frankfurt but he said nothing of any German translation. Instead he asked me to keep submitting the outline to other publishers. I wondered whether you knew anyone at Harvard University Press (Russian Research Center) to whom I might submit it.

When do you think you will be ready to write your introduction? Would you require the completely retyped MSS before you do so? Do let me hear from you. Since I'm not sure you are back, I'll register this.

Yours,

9904

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
WALTHAM 54, MASSACHUSETTS

September 21, 56

Dear R.D.

I found your letter and manuscript after my return from Europe - later than I expected and therefore again too late for a stay and meeting in NY. I did not know that Beacon had rejected the book and I do hope that Frager sticks to his promise.

Of the three sections you sent me, I liked most the last chapter of Part I - splendid! The chapter on the Second International is too sketchy and does not justice to the historical problem. You accept - as far as I can see, in toto - Lenin's theory of the corrupted labor aristocracy - a theory which, in my view, is utterly inadequate. Whereas you handle the dialectic so consistently and refuse so valiantly to treat Marxian concepts as dogmas, you do not take this position with regard to the notion (and to the reality) of the proletariat. In the development of late industrial society in the advanced countries, this class qua class has changed its position, structure, consciousness, etc. The full force of a Marxian economic and political analysis has to be applied in the examination of this process - the aristocracy business wouldn't do!

As to the last part: I disagree with your assumption of a complete break between Leninism and Stalinism. I have recently reread Lenin's writings and speeches of 1921-22 and was amazed at the degree of continuity and consistency in basic questions and policies - even formulations! But all these things have to be discussed orally. I expect to be in NY after Christmas, for the meeting of the Philosophical Association - should I get to NY prior to this date, I shall let you know immediately when I know. My study of "Soviet Marxism", in which I try to discuss some of the problems indicated above, is before completion and will be published by Columbia University Press early in 1957. I shall send you the typescript for your comments and your critique before it goes to the printer's.

Thanks, and with very best wishes,

Yours,

H.M.

9905

Nov. 6, 1956

Dear Herbert Marcuse:

To allow me to complete the entire manuscript and give you a few days to read it as a totality I have decided to change date of arrival by a week, using the fact that Friday is a better day for you as the date of my arrival. Please try also to be free Saturday as I simply must arrive at some concrete conclusions by then or there will be no point to the trip to the publisher in New York afterward.

I will arrive in Boston, Friday, November 23rd and stay there through Saturday November 24th so that I hope I can see you both days. I can meet you anywhere you say or you will be able to meet me at my hotel, whichever is more convenient. I will send in for reservations the minute I hear that this meets your approval and we can meet without watching the minute hand on the clock. I'm sorry to be so presumptuous and insistent but without a few solid hours of work together the project could fall through. It is not that I am not sympathetic to the woes of intellectuals and know how hard they labor and that their time too is not their own, (Think how Marx even looked at some of the meetings of the International as time away from Capital) but I'm sure you also/^{see}that MARXISM and FREEDOM gets published and will help me do that. So, holding my breath until I hear from you,

I am, gratefully,

P.S. What has happened to your typescript? I am looking forward to reading your book before it reaches the public. I will create time for a careful criticism. One day I will succeed in creating a day longer than 24 hours minus 6.

9906

C
O
P
Y

December 10, 1956

Dear Herbert Marcuse:

Upon my return to Detroit last week, I found that, while my outline of Capital, was sent you to the university, the brief abstract I made of the Questions of Philosophy Article was not sent you as it was not found. I herewith enclose it. Should you wish it translated in full, I'll be glad to do so.

*Just got it back from Carr.
Will give it
to Rieff
tomorrow*

I do not know whether you did or did not turn over your copy of MARXISM and FREEDOM to Mr. Rieff of Beacon Press. Please answer this point for I know not how to write them otherwise.

The only point of the NY trip that I have not yet reported to you is the meeting with Praeger. He was a wee bit more polite now that I had the manuscript complete in my hands. I informed him that you would not write the introduction until the contract is actually signed. He said he would first have to read the work and it would take him 3 weeks. It was clear enough what bothered him. It was the criticisms I made of the American system for while I was in his office he turned quickly to the last chapter on Automation. I laughed: "If you must read the climax of this novel and see how it all comes out first, why turn to page 365." He then closed the book and said well, nothing is definite yet, and I was still free to submit it to other publishers. I said it was precisely what I was doing and he would not get his copy for a couple of weeks since I wished to proofread and edit the copy. I took the publisher's copy back with me rather than leaving it with him. As I told you in my previous note, if the one with St. Martin's Press in NY and Macmillan in London falls through, then I would prefer Beacon to Praeger.

Will you also be kind enough to tell me whether Mr. Carr has read the manuscript and what were his reactions to the idea of his reading it for Macmillan? Has he heard from them directly? I doubt it since there would have been insufficient time between my meeting with MacKenzie and his writing to London. Understandably, no one is in quite the hurry I am in in trying to get the book published, but I do have more hope now than ever before.

As ever,

yes! I don't know about Macmillan. Ray

*Sorry I am in a terrible rush!
Shall do what I can to impress Beacon, but must wait for their reading the ms.
Carr's reaction was quite favorable.
Good luck to you, as ever*

12/12/56

#117

9907

April 29, 1957

Dear Herbert Marcuse:

I am glad you insisted that I see Humanities Press although I had already signed with Beckman Associates. They were so interested in MANISM AND FREEDOM that they volunteered to do all sorts of work for it, although they were not its publisher. (Mr. Silverman was out of town; I spoke to Richard Hest instead.) For one thing, I had reserved exclusive foreign rights and hence have authority to look for other publishers in other lands, and Humanities promptly offered to see whether they couldn't get Routledge, Kegan and Paul to publish it in Britain; the MS will go forward there this week. For another, the catalogue that they send out to their readers will definitely list my book—I believe their circulation is 20,000—and listings are not to be sneered at in promotional work. A friend of mine is going to Germany and will try to get me a publisher in Hamburg and I have had inquiries both from Italy and France as to translations and publication there. I knew that I could have gotten a bigger publisher in England but I refused to capitulate on the question of needing to go first to England and back to the US by the backdoor. Beckman Associates are interested and will see that the book does get a good promotional. Naturally they are pleased you will preface the book. We will strike a blow at both poles of world capital --US and Russia--that they will not soon forget.

Gratefully yours,

9908

June 5, 1957

Dear H. M.

Finally I have completed the editing and the book was this day sent to the printer. I believe I'll now be in favor of a new law forbidding authors to do their own editing-- I can't look at anything I write without wanting to rewrite, and then begins the footnoting. Although I had made up my mind to have very few because of the working class audience I aim at they now number nearly 300. Just the letters alone for permission to quote has taken nearly a week. The Bibliography, although quite selective, is another 4 pages. The text now is 400 pages; appendices another 95. With your preface it will be over 500 so I suppose the hard-headed businessmen who run the publishing firms were right when they refused to commit themselves to a price until they actually had the manuscript ready for printer in hand.

I wrote Beckman that your Preface will be sent in all typed and ready for printer (I assume you will send it to me in whatever condition you please--I am expert in reading my handwriting, so I can read anyone's--and I will make copies before I send to him) in a couple of weeks, but that he should not delay going to press since your Preface will be numbered differently-- I intend to suggest Roman numerals for it to distinguish it from my introduction and text. The reason I did so is that he had told me from the start that if I want October publishing date it must be at printer in June.

Yours,

I just heard from Humanities Press that the first reaction of Routledge, Kegan and Paul was quite favorable. "It certainly looks like a possible" they wrote of Marxism and Freedom before turning it over to readers. Having had the experience with Macmillan, who had practically signed the contract before they turned and ran, I will not believe Routledge's reaction until that contract is signed.

9909

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
WALTHAM 54, MASSACHUSETTS

June 7, 1957

Dear R.D.

Would you do me a favor? In writing
the Preface, I want to recapitulate
the gist of your book as adequately as
possible in such a small space.

Could you send me a brief statement
on what you consider to be the main
thesis (or theses) and the basic trend
of thought in your book?

This would greatly expedite matters.

Sorry to bother you with additional
work at this important juncture.

freely,

H.M.

June 11, 1957

Dear Herbert Marcuse:

It was good to hear from you. I'm sure that you are well acquainted with the fact that it is much easier to write 100, if not 500, pages than it is to summarize the gist of a book on which one has worked for some 15 years, in a page or two. But I will try.

I. The central point, the pivot around which everything else in MARXISM AND FREEDOM revolves, is, of course, the philosophic foundation of Marxism. As I put it in my introductory note, "The aim of this book is to re-establish the original form of Marxism which Marx called 'thorough-going Naturalism or Humanism.'"

This runs like a red thread throughout the book. Thus Part I begins with the French Revolution and Hegel and ends with Marx's Early Economic-Philosophic Essays: A New Humanism. It constitutes his answer to classical political economy as well as to the utopian socialists and vulgar Communists of his day and establishes a new world outlook, Marxian philosophy, which is distinguished from the Hegelian dialectic and closely knit with it. What is established as the thesis of the young Marx then reappears in Part III, Marxism: the Unity of Theory and Practice, where, in The Dialectical Humanism of Volume I, I show that not only are Marx's economic categories social categories but they are thoroughly permeated with the humanism that came out of the workingclass struggles for the shortening of the working day. As Marx put it, the mere question, when does my day begin and when does it end, was on a higher philosophic level than "the pompous catalogue of the Declaration of the Rights of Man." What is true of Volume I of Capital is true of the Logic and Scope of Volumes II and III, including Theories of Surplus Value, where I show that all of history to Marx was the struggle for freedom, which, as its basis, is the shortening of the working day, and only from there do we go from the realm of necessity to that of freedom.

Lenin learned the critical importance of the philosophic foundations the hard way—when the Second International actually collapsed and, to reconstitute his own reason, had to return to Hegel's Science of Logic. The chapter, A Mind in Action, then traces what the philosophic foundations meant to Lenin and the Russian Revolution and ends with the thought that just as Marxism without its philosophic foundation is meaningless, so is Leninism. Neither is an "economist." Finally when we come to our own age, which I call Automation and the New Humanism, I show the methodology of Marxism and the compulsion of our own age for a total outlook.

✓ II. Subordinate to this main theme of the book, and running parallel with it, is the division between the radical intellectual like Proudhon and the Marxist intellectual. I contend that Marxism is not only the theoretical expression of the workingclass striving to establish a new society on socialist beginnings, but it is that which gave intellectuals a new dimension. That new dimension arose precisely because he did not divide theory from history, including the current class struggles. The relationship of theory to history is seen as a live element that changes the very structure of Marx's greatest theoretical work. In 1863 and 1866 when he fundamentally revised that structure and 1872-75 when he wrote the French edition of Capital—the period from the Civil War in the United States through the Paris Commune—is proof of this relationship of theory to history and at

9911

the same time shows that what the young Marx established in the Early Essays when he held that never again must society be counterposed to the individual and which in 1848 he emblazoned on his Communist Manifesto as the thesis that the development of the individual is the condition for the development of all reappears in his "most economic" work which is preferred by the academic economists--Volume III of Capital.

Again, when I move from Marx's time to that of Lenin's time I show that the contribution of the Second International -- Organization -- was taken over by Lenin in his concept of the so-called Vanguard Theory in 1902-03, but as the actual Russian Revolutions occurred, he threw it overboard--or at least radically revised his theory no less than 6 times so that in 1917 he says the workers on the outside are more revolutionary than the vanguard party and by 1923 says that unless the party work is checked by the non-party masses the bureaucracy will yet bring the workers state down and they will retrogress to capitalism. In any case, our problem is certainly not will there be a revolution; but what will happen after: are we always to be confronted with a Napoleon or a Stalin? In a word, without relating the spontaneous self-organization of the proletariat and its quest for universality in the manner in which Marx did it for his time, we can expect nothing but totalitarianist results.

III. In my introductory note I state that the 3 main strands of thought in the book are: 1) Classical Political Economy, Hegelian Philosophy, and the French Revolutionary doctrines in relationship to the actual social and economic conditions of its time, the Industrial Revolution, the French Revolution and up to the first capitalist crisis. 2) Marxism in relationship to the class struggles of his day, the period of his maturity, 1843-1883, as well as Marxism in the period from 1889-1923; and 3) The methodology of Marxism to our era which I call the period of state capitalism and workers revolt, the analysis of the Five Year Plans of Russia and the revolts in East Germany, and Vorkuta following Stalin's death; finally the analysis of Automation but this is a comparatively free and easy essay. I think this too in a way can be summed up in the introductory note where I explain the method in which this book is written--that research began in 1939 when I broke with Trotsky over the "Russian Question" but that it did not assume the form of MARXISM AND FREEDOM until 1950-53 when the winner's strike on automation and the revolts in Eastern Europe from their separate vantage points led me to present all my ideas to groups of workers who checked and discussed the material. "No theoretician, today more than ever before, can write out of his own head. Theory requires constant shaping and reshaping of ideas on the basis of what the workers themselves are doing and thinking." I return to Hegel (page 73 fn in the Science of Logic) where he shows that those who took Kant's results without the process did so as a "pillow for intellectual sloth" and that if the intellectual sloth which has accumulated in the Marxist movement concerned only Marxists then we wouldn't be confronting the H-bomb threat without ideological backwardness showing. The need is for a new unity of theory and practice which must begin with the new impulses coming from the workingclass, that this, far from being intellectual abdication, would mark the actual fructification of theory. Once the theoretician gets that, his work does not end, but first begins.

In a word, I have no prescriptions or rhetorical conclusions. I show a method at work and appeal to the intellectuals to use that dialectic method as a basis to view the contemporary scene, to get out from under domination of either the Russian totalitarian or the American "democratic"

bomb threats in their thinking. The workers by themselves can do a lot but they too have not achieved a new social order, but if the movement from practice to theory met the movement from theory to practice, then a serious start could be made.

There are naturally other points in the work--from the American roots of Marxism to the Communist perversions both of Marx's Early Works and Capital--since it tries to deal with our machine age since the Industrial Revolution to Automation, but I do not believe anything germane to the book is lost once one grasps the central point, the philosophic foundation.

I know the effect that your Reason and Revolution had in 1941. They could neither treat Hegel as an "old dog" nor Marx's Early Writings as mere humanitarian adjuncts to "the great scientific economic theories." But then it was a philosopher speaking and not "a solid economist" like me. When the two were combined, glory, hallelujah--there was havoc. But the academicians need not think themselves any smarter--they all fell into the "Popular Front"; it is not possible to fight Russian totalitarianism or any other kind without some solid theoretic foundation and social vision.

I naturally cannot say whether I succeeded in doing what I aimed at but if intention were indeed achievement then I could say that what was new in MARXISM AND FREEDOM was 1) the re-establishment of the philosophic foundation of Marxism in Hegel in so concrete a way that the origins of our machine age as well as the latest period of automation came alive; 2) the summation of all three volumes of Marx's CAPITAL in a manner that the reader knows Marxism both as theory and as methodology; and 3) the new dimension Marxism endows the intellectual with became so real to him that he could indeed discern the movement from practice to theory and as eagerly long for the unity of the two as does the worker.

I hope this in some way answers what you wanted me to do in recapitulating the gist of the work. I also enclose the introductory note to the bibliography so that you can see all my problems there.

Looking forward to your Preface very eagerly,

June 27, 1957

Dear H.M.

I'm certainly glad I live other than an academic life-- think of a factory worker forgetting the time clock. It certainly was a discipline for me--now I'll have to be as ingenious in keeping that publisher-wolf from my door with demands for your Preface. He has 400 pages of type to set so I don't know what he is complaining about, and I will insist your professorial word is as good as mine and that the brochure on the book with you listed as writer of preface go out on schedule in July, even if there should be an overlapping of the week it goes out and you send yours in.

I expanded the contents pages to include sub-heads so as to help make the index brief and also because I believe it gives a view of the scope of the book before you delve into it. In any case I include it for you to glance at.

Did I tell you that Professor Carr, when he read the MSS, was gracious enough to write me that it is a contribution to contemporary thought and that especially my work on The Great Divide in Marxism--not its political aspects which he knew, but the philosophic impact of Hegel on Lenin--would compel a reorganization of many previously cherished views, evidently including his own? I wrote the publishers of Hegel--Allen & Unwin-- that I do believe my work will open a new audience for the works of Hegel and that I certainly would, in turn, like to be in "that publisher's stable". Don't know that that will help--but I did receive an inquire about MARXISM AND FREEDOM from Japan!

Yours,

9914

July 22, 1957

Dear Herbert Marcuse:

Your Preface certainly points up some fundamental questions in dispute as well as in illumination. I wouldn't think of discarding it. By pointing directly at what I have called the forever-beating heart of Marxism -- the workers who in their everyday life and struggles have given it a new life and dimension -- you will certainly stirred a polemic that should be going at full blast as soon as the book is published. Sharp disagreements have never disturbed me; monoliths has.

One thing, however, did surprise me in your Preface and that is that your last sentence focuses on the writer of the preface rather than the book. In your place I would have continued with one more sentence along some such line as this: Whether you agree or disagree with Dunayevskaya, her book creates a ^{serious?} solid foundation on a vast scope for the re-examination of Marxism from its roots in Hegelian philosophy until its post-Marxist development of our own day.

It may appear to you that you have said something similar in its proper context but as a reader who will next turn to some 400 pages of RD I felt the need of such a link between preface and body of work. Please let me know at once whether you agree to such an addition, and how you would phrase it so I can hurry it on to the publisher in whatever you state you approve it. The decision is yours, noYonine.

The enclosed brochure has been sent out to 5000 asking advance orders of the book. I hope the fires of dispute have been stirred up and we will not again just lapse into intellectual sloth. Many, many thanks for your contribution and encouragement.

9915

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

October 9, 1957

Dear R. D.

To tell you the truth, I am getting a little uneasy about the publicity with the "American roots of Marxism" and the statement that Marx "completely recreated the structure" of Capital under the impact of the American civil war. I do not remember whether your book actually justifies these formulations - when I read it, I did not have this impression; but then my memory may be at fault. The little and very unsystematic checking I did recently has not been very successful: I did not find any evidence which would corroborate such statement. My friends bombard me with questions, and I myself am naturally rather sensitive about the Americanization of Marx!

You would do me a great favor if you would sum up very briefly your evidence or just jot down the main references - either in Marx' correspondence or elsewhere.

Sorry to bother you - but since you are through with the page proofs and with the index, this may not be too much of an imposition. If it is, please forget about it.

With best wishes,

A. M.

October 11, 1957

Dear H. M.

Thank you very much for your letter of the 9th which gives me the opportunity to trace briefly the American roots of Marxism. Heretofore I have concentrated on the warp and woof of the book--the philosophy, dialectics, Humanism of Marxism. As publication date approaches, it is time to indicate the complementary thesis. I use the structure of CAPITAL to illustrate this. The changes in the structure of this work meant nothing to the Second International, reformist and revolutionary wings alike. Until Rosa Luxemburg, in 1915, began to question what Engels "had made out" of the material left him by Marx, all Marxists treated the changes in the structure as a "literary question." The Communists continued this tradition (cf. Leontiev in Bolshaya Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia). The battle of quotations with which Rosa Luxemburg was attacked, both by the Second and Third Internationals, never went into the structure of CAPITAL until Henryk Grossman, in 1929. His was the first serious analysis of the changes in the structure. However, his interest was primarily economic; it was directed against Luxemburg's underconsumptionism and the reestablishment of the decline in the rate of profit as central to the theory of accumulation in its Marxist form.

Now let us look at these changes in structure during the late 1850s when he worked on the Grundrisse and Critique and in the 1860s when Capital took final shape:

1) As you know, both in his letter to Engels (4/2/58) and in the Preface to Critique, he shows that the first draft of Capital was to have 6 volumes, thus: I. Capital; II. Landed Property; III. Wage labor; IV. State; V. International Trade; VI. World Market."

As he shows in Introduction to the Critique which he did not allow to be published, even here the United States played its role as the illumination for the category of labor: "This state of affairs has found its highest development in the most modern of bourgeois societies, the United States. It is only here that the abstraction of the category "labor", "labor in general", labor sans phrase, the starting point of modern political economy, becomes realized in practice."

2) My Chapter V, The Impact of the Civil War on the Structure of Capital shows that the decade of the 1860's was decisive for the structure of CAPITAL. It was the period of the Civil War in the United States, the great mobilizations of English workers on the side of the North, the Polish insurrection, the unrest in France, and the creation of the First International. Marx himself best describes the newness of this decade when on January 11, 1860 he writes to Engels: "In my opinion, the biggest things that are happening in the world today are on the one hand the movement of the slaves in America started by the death of John Brown and, on the other, the movement of the serfs in Russia. Two years later (7/30/62) he argues with Lassalle as to the contribution of the "Yankees." This is climaxed by

his letter to Engels on August 15, 1863 where he directly involves

the structure of CAPITAL:

9917

"when I look at this compilation and see how I have had to turn everything around and how I had to make even the historical part out of material of which some was quite unknown. then he (Lassalle) does seem funny with 'his' economy already in his pocket."

I show what "turning everything around" was by contrasting the structure of Critique with Capital. I base myself on the letters and the listing of the materials by Engels in the Preface to Capital. There is also in the Archives II(VII), besides the first ending of Capital, the outline of his changes; Leontiev on Capital also lists Notebooks and changes. Also not to be left out is Marx's reporting of the Civil War for the Vienna Presse where he reproduces the speeches of the Abolitionists, especially Wendell Phillips, upon whom he comments "In the present state of affairs Wendell Phillips' speech is of greater importance than a battle bulletin." (This, along with his letter to Abraham Lincoln, and other letters are reproduced in his Civil War in the United States, Int. Pub.) As you know, in contrast to some emigre Marxists in America who avoided any involvement in the Civil War under the abstraction that they were "opposed to all slavery, wage and chattel," he participated actively in the mass movement abroad. This contrasts to the 1850s when he kept away from the emigre circles and their type of activity. As I show at the beginning of that chapter dealing with the impact of the Civil War on structure of Capital, "No one is more blind to the greatness of Marx's contribution than those who praise him to the skies for his genius as if that genius matured outside of the actual struggles of the period in which he lived. As if he gained the impulses from the sheer development of his own thoughts instead of from living workers changing living reality by their action...He who glorifies theory and genius but fails to recognize the limits of theoretical work, fails likewise to recognize the indispensability of the theoretician."

3) After three intensive years--1833-66--of reworking CAPITAL, Marx is still not satisfied. On February 16, 1866, we hear why: "Historically I developed a part about the working day which did not enter into my first plan." After he has finished working out the immense section on Working Day he writes again to Engels and shows how happy he is that the American workers "by correct instinct" came to the same formulation on the eight hour day that he had worked out for the Geneva Congress of the First International. This he brings directly into CAPITAL (end of Ch.X) when he quotes that Baltimore Resolution, ties it in with the First International "Thus the movement of the working class on both sides of the Atlantic..." and further ties in white and black labor "Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded. But out of the death of slavery a new life at once arose. The first fruit of the Civil War was the eight hour agitation..."

4) Finally the American roots are not only in the finished (by himself) Volume I but in the unfinished Volumes II and III. In the Logic and Scope of those volumes I quote from his letter to Danielson (April 10, 1879) where he asks him not to wait for Volume II before translating Volume I because of the mass of material he received from Russia and the United States: "The

United States at present have overtaken England...the masses are quicker and have greater political means in their hands to resent

the form of a progress that is accomplished at their expense." I then say that it is clear that Russia and America were to play r in Volumes II and III that England played in Volume I, that Lenin filled out Volume II for Russia and that I believe American worker are concretizing it for America in their attitude to Automation. In the final chapter on Automation and the New Humanism where I deal with the 1929 crash and the division between Planners and rank and file workers building their own organization--CIO--and in the 1960 when they turn against their labor leaders who have become the bureaucracy that oppresses them even as the managers in the shops-- I approach the final section called "Toward A New Unity of Theory Practice in the Abolitionist and Marxist Tradition".

As I wrote you once before I have no blueprints nor banners which scream "Follow me", but that I sketch out only where to gather new impulses--from the workers: "The American working class has long been a mystery to the European, worker and intellectual. Until the formation of the CIO, Europeans used to "prove the backwardness of the American worker by virtue of the fact that he had not built industrial unions...Because the American worker has built no mass party, he seems apolitical. Because he is largely unacquainted with the doctrines of Karl Marx, he seems non-socialist...It is not Marxists who have compelled society at last to face with sober senses the conditions of workers and relations of men with each other...The seal of bankruptcy of contemporary civilization, including the so-called Vanguard Parties, is the bankruptcy of its thought. The void in the Marxist movement since Lenin's death would have a significance only for Marxists except that Marxism is in the daily lives and aspirations of working people. Marxism is neither in the pathetic little theses gathering dust in small radical organizations, nor in impressively big tomes gathering dust on the shelves of large conservative universities." For my part I explain the method used to write MARXISM AND FREEDOM and I call the American workers and student youth who collaborated on it its true co-authors.

Now, if I may, I would like to add a personal note since although the book has not yet been published the attack on me has already begun. Your friends bombard you on the American roots of Marxism while the Communists are bombarding publisher and distributor with "true stories", that I supposedly escaped from Russia in 1917 because I had "white blood poisoning in her veins. I hope I will not have to return to the cloak and dagger days when I was Trotsky's secretary and had to carry a gun and learn how to shoot it. The American Economic Review had its own kind of experience in 1944 when they published my translation of the Russian revision of Marxism with commentary. Between the Soviet Embassy accusing me of being a fascist and the State Department telling the review that Russia and America were "allies" and publication would not help, the editors needed all the intellectual integrity and courage to proceed with the work. As a good general--philosophers these days must be good strategists--I trust nothing that comes with the publication will surprise you. Your Preface speaks for itself, and I trust my book does well for itself.

Yours,

9919

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

October 15, 1957

Dear R. D.

Thanks for your prompt reply. It seems to me that your references do not corroborate the statement that the structure of Capital was completely recreated under the impact of the American Civil War. It is certainly true that the original plan or plans were thoroughly revised between 1857 and 1866, but I found no evidence that this change was decisively influenced by American developments. In point of fact, going through Marx's letters written during this period, I am struck by the rather casual references to the United States. Or, if you deny the "casual": such references seem to me in no way different from others to contemporary European events. Sorry!

A personal remark on your personal remark: there is no rational ground on which you can associate the questions of my friends with the recollection of attacks on your life and on your carrying a gun! They took your announcement as that of a scholarly (*sit venia verbo!*) interpretation of Marx, subject to intelligent critique. Believe me, they wanted information, not attack and counterattack. You should be the last to resent this or to obliterate the difference between their attitude and the other.

Greetings!

J.M.

Nov. 27, 1956

Dear John:

It is 9 p.m. and this is the first I get to write to you since Marcuse left just this minute. We talked for hours on my book. He was so anxious to reemphasize that he will do everything possible to get it published and to write the introduction that he would not even begin criticizing it, until he made the positive feature of wanting to see it published clear all over again. The introduction will not be written until I actually do have a contract, but it will be done promptly then. It will stress the contribution I make and the dialectical approach--until I reach the "notion" of the proletariat. It will then make 3 criticisms: 1) first that I romanticize the workers instead of seeing that "it" too changed along with capitalism, that is to say, is satisfied instead of revolutionary, 2) it will take some exception to state capitalism as a designation of Russia stemming from Marx's foresight, and 3) question my optimistic perspectives. I told him he could criticize it to his heart's content, I certainly don't want agreement, but he kept saying "You are so excellent in handling the dialectic except when you deal with the proletariat" and "Why do you so berate the intellectual? I do not see the relationship of theory to practice that you do; I think theory should be the guide, what you call the prescription instead of you just waiting on the proletariat". These professors--but he is really remarkable for a professor. We had a magnificent seafood dinner, cocktails and all and I fear he was set back some \$10 or more. Still I have another appointment scheduled with him tomorrow. He promised to go over paragraph for paragraph my translation since I did it from the Russian rather than German and let me know how I stand scholastically on that.

Now on the publisher--he agrees it is worth waiting to see if London will accept it, even if it means a couple of months delay, and that I should stall P meanwhile. O, yes, he also proposed that I go to Germany in his stead to be present at some conference on Marxism this winter. I said I would love to but doubt that I would be quite as acceptable. He already began discussing my next book with me, as he feels he will not write again after the publication of his next, and I should carry on, although he disagrees with me. He also told me one interesting point for Saul (I'll send him a copy of this) since he met Rieff and told him, O, I'm in a hurry to make an appointment with RD, whereupon Rieff said, O, yes, her lit. agt. sent me a letter asking us to reconsider and told us she would be in town. Period. Paragraph. End of conversation. Or, as M, put it "No implications in this at all."

His favorite chapter remains "A New Humanism", to which he also added that although he disagrees with my Automation chapter, my interpretation of the Absolute Idea in that form rather than in the letters is "clearest". He kept saying "What would Father Marx say if he lived now" and his eyes lit up as to the paragraph where Marx stopped in the Philosophy of Mind and where my analysis began. If only he could be around some workers--

Am now ready to storm NY. Love,

Rae

9921

C
O
P
Y

Nov. 28, 1956

9922

Dear John:

Today I was down at Brandeis University where Marcuse arranged a luncheon to which he invited E. H. Carr. Professor Carr is about the only non-Marxist Englishman (I was very surprised to find him in America and just as surprised that one of the reasons was the fact that the Russian material in this country covering the period of the 1920s is superior to that in England) who has specialized in non-factional, objective history of the period of the Russian Revolution and throughout the 1920s. We have his "The Bolshevik Revolution", both the 1917 and 1923 volumes, and you should glance at them to get a concept of the distinguished scholar. He was acquainted with "the value controversy", which shows you how far that little article in AER carried me all these years, and was as surprised to find me there as I him. I don't know exactly Marcuse's point, but I liked the results very much indeed. Carr was not only interested in reading my MSS but I gave Marcuse "permission" to turn the book and address over to him, he said he would write his comments to me. This is a find.

These professors who spend all their lives in books do make me laugh. When they cannot "break a category", to use a Hegelian phrase, they just lapse into the most vulgar political explanation of an event. For example, they see none of what we see in the 1920-1 trade union debate--Carr practically said that Lenin's position was merely that of middleman between Trotsky and Shlyapnikov, that is mediating to bring peace between warring factions! When I opened my mouth with "You intellectuals..." Marcuse interrupted to say "You need not say it--I know what you will call me. But you are a bloody intellectual yourself and you have 12 hours a day to write--or how could you have produced so much in so little time; I would have been dead attempting it--while we with classes, administrative work," etc. etc.

Incidentally 2 tables in that faculty room were filled with ex-Trotskyists led by Howe, whom I disdainfully disregarded; one, however, a woman whose name slips my mind but she led the attack on Reva Craine back in 1944 and we were anything but friends--came up to greet "Freddie" very warmly. I took it as a good sign, although I did no more than smile and turned back to my own guests. No doubt the university will be buzzing for the following week from this visit of mine and all the "theories" on the reason would make a funny drama indeed.

Carr said Macmillan is a "slow" house, but most distinguished if they actually took the MSS which evidently he doubted; he said the atmosphere as to Marxist works was a "little better" than here, but not too much. They will all be waiting for my letter on the meeting with the publishers almost as much as you will.

Tomorrow morning I am off for NY, but will see no one till Fri.

Love,

Write back to me soon. I have some MS to read. I hope you will.

Do not forget to send me the MSS (1917 and 1923 volumes) (Marcuse)