

Aug. 30, 1979

Professor Joseph O'Malley
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Dear Prof. O'Malley:

When, first, your magnificent ^{introduction} ~~introduction~~ to Karl Marx's Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right' was published I noticed a very understandable inaccuracy about when Marx's "productive years of research" came to an end, supposedly in 1878. Since Marx's Ethnological Notebooks had not only not been published "in English", but quite incompletely also in Russian, I just let it go, though I did want to call it to your attention so that you could amend it in future editions. The 1977 paperback edition was just brought to my attention, and I noted the same sentence has been repeated (pp. xvii-xviii). Please allow me, therefore, first to call to your attention The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx, transcribed and introduced and edited by Van Gorcum, and distributed here by Humanities Press. Also, may I me to include here my commentary on it.

You may not be interested in all that emphasis on Women's Liberation and Hal Draper's work which comes under criticism, but actually what interests me is the differences, sharp differences, between Marx and Engels on that question as on others. The "orthodox" Russian Marxists (who to me are just state-capitalist theoreticians calling themselves Communist) have been so busy, for their own purposes, to present Marx and Engels as one that I was surprised that the famous scholar who was hardly orthodox made not only the same error when it came to these Notebooks (which he did not publish!), whereupon the Russians in 1941 published only what Marx had noted on Kovalevsky, but otherwise acted as if Marx, if not senile, had in fact "completed" his life with Critique of Gotha Programme in 1875, or whatever "notes" he left for Engels to complete as Volumes II and III. What, on the other hand, to me is so exciting is that, both in 1881 when Marx wrote the Russian Preface to Communist Manifesto, he was projecting a possible revolution for Russia ahead of the advance countries, and, once he discovered Morgan's Ancient Society he busied himself with Ethnological Notebooks which actually returned him to the point of departure from bourgeois society in 1843-44 when he, at the very start of his revolutionary life, began with philosophical anthropology. And your work is so great that I trust you will find a way to include the new fact in a future edition of the work.

Yours,

Whatever has happened to those HSA conferences (which include my paper on Hegel's Absolute Idea) that were to have been public years and years ago? Are we competing with the Russian for inefficiency?

15190

21 September 1979

Dear Raya Dunayevskaya,

I've just received your letter of August 30th with a copy of your article, and I thank you very much for both. First, let me say in answer to your "P.S." that Humanities Press is bringing out the Hegel Society Proceedings. The delay is due in part to complications with the typewriter; but not only due to that - and you may be right in asking whether we are competing with the Russians for efficiency: i.e. in this case our "free enterprise" system has been so "free" that it almost seems like socialist efficiency. In any case, Simon Silverman of Humanities Press has just written me that both the '74 and the '76 volumes of HSP proceedings are now due to appear shortly - perhaps even before the '78 proceedings, which Humanities is also publishing. For up to date information on how the volumes are proceeding you might write directly to Simon Silverman at Humanities Press. As you probably already know, he is an exceptional publisher (and individual) in that he is more interested in ideas (especially ideas of a leftist and Marxist sort) than in profits. Here is his address: Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey 07716.

As you can see from my return address I (and my wife & four children) are in Brazil. We are in our second year here. First year I had sabbatical, and this year we are on our own, spending the additional year here in an attempt (1) to let the kids really get familiar with Brazilian life (their mother is Brazilian, hence they have double citizenship, and could opt to make their lives here), (2) to have my wife try to establish a career here (she is a very fine concert pianist and teacher, who "sacrificed" her career while her husband (me) fought through to the Ph.D. and then got going as a teacher), and (3) to see if perhaps we would all, as a family, really prefer to spend our lives down here rather than in the U.S.

In any case here we are; and I must say that your letter was very good to

15191

* 1.2. "Letter as written, from Steiner & Feuerbach"

have, because recently our lot has been somewhat on the trying side. Your kind remarks about the edition of Marx's Critique of Hegel's Phil. [? Right were good to have, especially since I recognize that you do not offer praise when you do not mean it. You are completely right about the error in my introduction, and I will surely correct it at first opportunity, and say that you were the person who brought the mistake to my attention. Actually, the people at Cambridge Press did not want to get in to serious corrections, or even not so serious ones, when the book went into paperback. So it's accurate to say that the ~~edition~~ ^{book} never really has gone into a second edition. Among other things - including certainly your pointing out that Marx remained quite active beyond the date I indicated - a new edition should include correction of the authorship of the short Anecdota piece (it was not Marx, but Feuerbach, as H.-M. Sauer has established); and there are other things that might also be included. I think that Kader's edition of the ethnological notebooks is absolutely great, and I wish the entire project of publishing Marx's complete literary remains could be wrested away from Moscow and granted somewhere in the West, so that we could all be confident that (1) it would get done, and (2) it would get done well. I don't see any other way (here I agree completely with Maximilien Rubel) that the mythification & distortions of Marx and his thought, by both the doctrinaire left & the doctrinaire right, can be stopped short of producing a complete and critical edition of his writings. Once ^{such an edition is} produced, serious developments of his thoughts can be elaborated; and the various "Marxisms" which have precious little to do with Marx's thought, might be unmasked - or is there really any hope for that: the "orthodox" Russian Marxists" (as you refer to them) may already have succeeded in completely appropriating Marx's name to their cause. What an historical irony!

Well, I should bring this to a close for now. Thank you, again, and most sincerely, for your letter and your article - I am very much interested in "all that emphasis on Women's Liberation" (as you put it in your letter) - I think

③

the movement of women's liberation is one of the most promising things at the moment.
Well, as I said, I should bring this to a close. All best wishes in your
work. I hope we'll have a chance to meet one of these days.

Yours,
Joseph O'Malley
Rua Condé de Borpinio 429/c-02
Tijuca
20520 Rio de Janeiro - RJ.

15193

October 3, 1979

Dear Joseph O'Malley,

What a great letter of your magnificent family to receive! Whereupon, naturally, I want to establish a relationship with your wife (what is her name? Don't you know that to us, woman is Reason as well as force, and an artist, who has double reason for her own name?). Under separate cover, I send you the Spanish edition of my Philosophy and Revolution; Ch. 9 has a considerable amount of the woman's liberation movement of today, and I'm also including here my critique of Chiang Ch'ing, or rather, Witke's book on Chiang.

You're right; I'm not very easy with my pen, but you really deserve it. Yes, you're right also about the perversion: the Russian Communists perpetrate on Marx, and no doubt Maximilian Rubel would produce a much more objective edition. But I do not think that he's exactly perfect either. What I mean is that he's trying to make Marx into a sociologist, and in order to avoid showing his own prejudices against Hegel, he calls Marx's philosophy "social philosophy" which is abstract enough to take in everybody, including Rubel. Long ago, when he first wrote his intellectual essay on Marx, I praised him but showed that there, too, he was not exactly precise on what had motivated the very reconstructions of Marx's Capital by Marx himself. And when I was in France, though he was polite enough to set up a meeting for me, his ambition got so much in the way that if it weren't for his adorable Russian wife, we would have very nearly come to blows. It seems to me that we should at least in the West be able to be better by getting the works of Marx from the Institute of Social History. Kradof tells me that one of his pupils is working with some other manuscripts of Marx's that are on deposit at the Institute. Do you really think that Cambridge is going to issue a new edition of your work? I do consider it the finest of those issued of the Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'. Incidentally and not so incidentally, I believe that the British were the first to propagate the story about Marx having done nothing much after the Paris Commune or, at best, the Critique of the Gotha Program in 1875, but I was shocked that Krasnov (didn't I leave out his name when I wrote you?) acted as if the last Marx did was 1875, and here were those magnificent Ethnological Notebooks leading up to 3 months before Marx's death. I believe that what happens is that if one isn't interested in anthropology, as Krasnov may not have been, then so-called scribbles for one's self (as were Marx's notes) just call for too much on the part of the intellectual who reads them.

I loved Latin America when I lived in Mexico way back when, and many of the other countries since then, but I doubt that I'd be welcome in Brazil, but it is a different civilization for your youngsters to get acquainted with. I would like to know where they will choose to live.

Yours,

15194