15171 may 4. 2d extanding Dear Kony in the article on that Draper's poluminous nouseun is sais (as always vous) that the first * Southern in the 18 4 Brunnaire between Hagier "remark (" some where) is by the originally that have used it (not quoting the worke in Hagal, probably because he relies on Eugelo remark) Cook at Eugen Charto M. - 3. XII. 1851 About Eugels is unce to say, I were likes him too much, so vist all of Harnens. alongliters - he was an aweful person, in- tolerant in fact. Therewher the Merton beide this is the best work as publisher after Eyet by Eleanor as Aucting (the was usone of a "Meresch" thou Parry history has it). Emply Ferrenbers is untoutively und as precifed on Hour's Really and his remark that their theire was the very one" who president out thegat is correct and general. The last bentence in tener base about the the heir of German philosophy in interior fact by the same House (the his time the thing to be seen The only thing what makes me respect Eugels is when in his terribee

funeral speed where he (how ourful) Compare Mary with Darwin when he Baid: " But above all Harx was an Littlefor revolutionery!" The present sin of Eigels was to promote Kanthay (Hora now him only once and Kuser this Halthersian "Hart Kauhlein" as lowin for for it . But lein pass for Caroaca as for la German (wifeired by Molerings word bea thistory of the German STI). Still Heling was a front (impite of lucary!) and as the our-eyes array the blind; the laura as lafarque Knew why they power the Mary Letters to Melvy as not to Karethy. Not only Turn but the obsertwo daughters dis not like Engels, " the General", & Evan fortuny was the first who presented to the You of Courched Demute on the 1. Congress of the II. Jehren. to Klana Jetterm, I am not misse about the whole story of Harr as father, faricates by the old Eyels of Kantston's first wife. That launder setures the "weste" Marx I have us doubt, she was in comment of the house, but the slept with others put especially liker some Humparian enciprants. Thin all, Munger I shill is End coli ave that humanistic Philosophy Harle with 15172 Hopel - Hapel brinself sail that it started

May 4, 1979 (rec'd June 7, 1979)

Dear Ray:

In the article on Hal Draper's voluntaous nonsense/is said (as always) that the first sentence in the 18th Brusaire entending Regel's remark ("somewhere") is originally by Marx. In fact Engels wrote him just that", and Marx used it (not quoting the source in Hogel, probably because he relied on Engels' remark). Look at Engels' letter to Marx -- 3. XII. 1851.

There is much to say about Engels; I never liked him too much, and neither did any of Marx's daughters — he was an auful person, intolerant in fact. He prevented the publishing of the speech against Citizen Weston while this is the bost work by Marx (written by Marx in English) and published after Engels' death by Eleanor and Aveling (Aveling was more of a "memoch" than Party history : has it).

The greatest sin of Engels was to promote Kauteky (Marx saw him only once and knew this Malthusian "little fool") and Lenin fell for it. But Lenin fell for Issealle as generally for the Germans (inspired by Mehring's hourible History of the German SD). Still Mehring was a giant (in ... spite of the Negelian Lakace") as the one-syed among the blind; and Leura and Lafargue knew why they gave the Merx Letters to Mehring and not to Koutsky. Wet only Tussy but the other two daughters did not like Engels, "the General". Even though Tussy was the first who presented the son of Hellen Desuth ... at the first Congress of the Second International to Clare Zetkin as her brother, I am not sure about the whole story of Marx as "father", fabricated by the old Engels and Katusky's first wife. That Helen seduced the "weak" Marx I have no doubt, she was in "command" of the house, but she slept with others and especially liked some Mungarian emigrant.

I still do <u>not</u> believe that humanistic philosophy started with Hegel - Hegel himself said that it started with Spinosa -- without the Spinosidts, Lossing and <u>Herder</u>, no Hegel. Though you are in company with Lenin, Marx said it clearly why <u>not Hegel -- Now!</u>

All my very best,

P.B.

* Engsls raid: "once as great tragedy, and the second time as lousy farce" (p.381 of Vol. 37 of Marx-Engels-Werke) and gives all the names:

15173

Dear Peter.

I was most happy to get your letter which you sited May 4, which was reserved here June? when I was in Genada, and which I read on June 11. Unless you're as bad at dating latters as I am, I will have to believe the capitalistic post office mark of June 4. Do you suppose that the letter you presided me a year or so ago, a copy of your letter to manas Arendt as to her article on Ross Luxemburg, will finally get to me some day? I really an very andows, and though it will take me another year before I am finished with the Luxemburg book, I greatly appreciate your "inside" knowledge of the Movement.

At least the statement on Hegel, whether taken from Engels' letter or not, was cited by Name as his own. I always did wonder, hower, why Marx said, "screenhers," Do you happen to know where it was? In this case, "origin" is unimportant. What is important is what you say against Engels and I'm happy to find that we agreem on something totally, since I too think that the one thing I can absolutely agree with Engels on is that Mark an "above all, a revolutionary."

You have enlightened me on one other matter. I thought that Fark had not wanted his apsend on Veston published, and I never understood why because it is a very, very great work. All the editions by the Stallnists mention that Mark and Engels hadn't published it and since it was only found after Engels' death, the impression given is not any opposition to its bigalization.

I never said that humanistic philosophy began with Hegel; what I have been strucking since 1953 was that Mark's original expression for his philosophy as " a new Humanism" was by no means just something the young Mark said, but something that permented all his work and was made contemporary by the East European revolts in the 1950s. In fact, it seems to me I remember reading to you parts of Marking and Freedom when it was still in manuscript form, and taking your advice on many aspects of my interpretation, including those Humanist Essays which appear as Appendix:

One thing I'm most anxious to learn, especially now that you reveal that Marx's daughters likewise did not like Engels, is that the impression I get is thatthose letters critical of Engels which were written to his daughters had been destroyed by them. That is the truth on that? Did Mehring do it? I don't happen to be a great ratrict for Mehring either, especially because he was a Lassallean himself as indeed — and in this I do agree with you — all, including Lenin, were Lassallean on organization.

Do let me hear from you.

Xonus / /

* End you get the Jan-Peb issue of NAL, which carried the chapter that continuented Harm and Engels on "the woman question"? I would appreciate your views on that.