

March 19, 1983

Dear Raya:

Here are some brief summaries of the section on the Marx Centenary in Le Monde (3-16-83). For some weird reason, their theme was Marx on science and techniques, but this included social science such as anthropology and history. Fernand Braudel wrote on how as a young historian in the 1930's he was drawn to Marx, against the wishes of his professors, typically of his generation. He criticized Schumpeter for making a "vivisection" of Marx in his History of Economic Analysis. He also talked at length about how many Marxian categories were used by historians such as labor force, surplus value, etc. But he ended on a good note, singling out "praxis" as Marx's most important contribution for historians. He said the new Dictionary Critique du Marxisme I told you about was very good. *Not true*

They also mentioned four different Marx conferences in France, one of them "Marx and Marxism: Problematic of the History of Marxism" at the Sorbonne May 24 to 28, when I intend to be in France. Another one will be held June 3 to 5 at Nanterre, with focus on economic and anthropology but that one will be when I am in Germany. ~~in Paris~~

I did not bother to read the article by the CP mathematician, but did look at all of the anthropological articles on p. 14. Of these, the most interesting was by M. Ab., who I am almost certain is Miguel Abensour, the well-known editor at Payot and writer on Marx. While an earlier article I had seen by Abensour was extremely favorable toward Rubel's editing of Vols II and III of Capital, and did not take issue with ~~Rubel~~ Rubel, this one states "Marx is first of all a philosopher". He treated the anthropologists of his time, especially Morgan, like simple collectors of data". The rest was mainly about his experiences in anthropology field work and Marxism. *vg* The more I think about it, perhaps that article is not by Miguel Abensour but by someone else, as these initials could mean anything.

The anthropology article by Marc Abeles was less important, ~~although it did~~ although it did take a swipe at Engels Origin of the Family. "The Stalinist Vulgate ...eliminated purely and simply all reference to the 'Asiatic mode of production'". But rest was more on how great Godelier and other big French anthropologists are.

None of these writers managed to mention either the ~~EN~~ EN or women, but I guess that is what is to be expected even by the independent post-Marx Marxists. *only*

Kevin

*Please return the article
itself to me
OK
(Kevin called Legar
and O. returned it same day)*

15463