

September 20, 1981

Dear Raya:

For once I was glad not to be in the mass activity since your letter arrived Saturday, and rather than being in Washington, I was able to go immediately to give you a report on what Rubel did with Capital, Volumes II and III. But first let me mention what I noticed a few weeks ago, yet another book which cites you: Bober's Karl Marx's Interpretation of History, a recent Norton paperback. On p. 287 he cites your translation of Marx's Notes on Wagner in the AER articles. I don't remember any more, since I saw this in a bookstore and stood there and read it rather than buying it or reading it later in library. If you can't find there, I'll be happy of course to xerox here and send, or get a copy of the book itself for you.

~~But~~ Rubel in this second volume has his own massive 117 page introduction, preceded by a 10-page preface. The Preface notes that this volume (1920 pages) is devoted only to works Marx did not publish during his lifetime. It includes not only his versions of Vols. II and III of Capital, but the 1844 manuscripts plus material from the Grundrisse and the 1860's notes which led to Capital. In the Preface ~~he~~ he accuses Engels of doing "too much and too little at the same time..." with Capital after Marx's death: 1. Engels included too many texts which simply repeated already published materials in his versions of Vols. II and III. (2. Also erred in not publishing the whole---here he mentions 1844 ~~xx~~ essays and the Grundrisse. Rubel's edition "eliminates materials which were already used in the Critique of 1859 (and Volume I)". He also sometimes adds other materials to replace ~~Engels'~~ selections of materials from the notes for Vols. II and III which Marx left behind "with other texts which seem to us more important for the understanding of the 'Economics'". He does not always tell us when he is doing this, he warns the reader. (All quotes so far from page xii) As you can see, he is not only ~~Engels~~ trying to outdo Engels rather than reproducing it as Marx wrote it, but also is acting as if Marx's concept of Capital never changed from the 1850's on. More on that later.

Then he gives the 1857 list Marx made in his letter mentioning 6 volumes of Capital. He goes through a lot of argument to ~~xx~~ conclude that any claim that this later changed to 4 volumes ~~is~~, "this is to deny the evidence" (xiii). Then he ends his preface by returning to what Lucien Goldmann ~~repeatedly~~ ridiculed him for, Marx's "ethics" as more important than his "science". (xv) He closes by thanking many people for helping with editing and translating, of which I ~~xx~~ recognized the names of Jean Malaquais and Paul Mattick.

In the much longer ~~xxxxxx~~ Introduction (117 pages) it is all wrong from the first word. Section I is entitled "De la Philosophie a L'Economie Politique", where he claims that Capital is both political economy and "a moral condemnation a ~~xxxx~~ gesture of refusal" toward capitalism. (xvii) Then he gives a real vicious summary of Hegel and Marx's break with Hegel, in 1843-44. For example: "For Hegel, the monarch is in a way the ontological proof of the reason of state". We can even see this ~~xxx~~ how he puts the "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" last in his selection of the ~~184~~ 1844 manuscripts. Another way of downplaying Hegel rather than slander is to consider him as one of "many" ~~xxxxxx~~ influences, for example: "Like Hegel, he (Proudhon) had a constant influence, whether of attraction or repulsion." (LIX). He also notes that when ~~Marx~~ Marx calls his method dialectical, as in The Poverty of Philosophy, "he is careful to present it as the 'exact opposite' of Hegel's." (LXXIII).

~~Now~~ Now he moves to his other main attack on the Marxist dialectic: "A Legend--the Change in the Plan of the 'Economics'". Says the idea of (p. XCIV) 4 volumes (not 6) is wrong, and that it was ~~xxxx~~ first used by Kautsky in Net in 1897, although he does not really blame Kautsky. Then he criticizes Grossman's view that 1863 was a turning point. ~~xx~~ Then he gets into how Marx supposedly felt pressured to write 'gros volumes' instead of 'brochures'.

*Wipe  
hell*

*Here the  
mass*  
*of his 1844  
vol II*  
*Q vs  
Rubel*

*p. XXII*

*Marx's  
idea  
3-4  
Grossman*

Says confusion arose because Capital ~~is~~ Volume I is really the same ~~is~~ thing as mentioned in ~~Marx's~~ 1858 (Feb. 22) letter to Lassalle with list of 6 books, but that Vol. I as we know it is simply a combination of Books I and II. He implies that the reason is that the Germans like 'gros volumes' which is what he gives as ~~his~~ his reason why Vol. I is long and as to why in Vol. I of Rubel's Oeuvres, he ~~was~~ he put some parts of the longer chapters as appendices ~~instead of the way Marx wrote it~~. This latter point is not referred to ~~explicitly~~ here. He cites a ~~letter~~ letter to Kugelmann of Oct. 13, ~~1866~~ 1866 to prove that Capital I is simply the old plan of 6 with books 1 and 2 combined into Vol. I. (CXV)

He claims that the ~~period~~ period from 1874 to his death was work on Vols. II and III of Capital. The 1872 letter to Schott which you ~~and~~ quote in new book, Rubel understands to mean something like Stalin's idea of teaching in historical ~~rather than~~ rather than dialectical order: "He intends to edit Capital in the inverse order, the historical part preceding Books III, II...and finally Book I"(CXV)

His last section in his ~~introduction~~ introduction he calls "Engels, Editeur du 'Capital'"(CXVI) He asks why Engels did not include texts from 1844-45, 1857-58 in his version of Vols. II and III: "In originality of style and content, these works are often superior to the manuscripts from the last period"(CXV) He continues: "...Engels preferred to re-edit and publish the works of Marx over spending all his time and efforts only on the rough drafts and manuscripts of Capital". Need to follow Engels by going to the ~~original~~ original manuscripts in Amsterdam, which is what he did. All this 117-page introduction is dated May 5, 1968, without any mention of contemporary events.

(I did not read every word of this introduction, but rather scanned it, taking notes here and there)

He ~~also~~ has short prefaces to each of the main sections of the book. ~~and you can see~~ both these and what he includes from the table des matieres (contents) which I have xeroxed. I did not xerox any of his long introduction, however. He gives pages 175-358 to extracts from the Grundrisse, which he and Malaquis translated, which he entitles "Principes de Critique de L'Economie Politique".

The next big section is "Materiaux pour l'Economie Politique, 1861-1865" which comprises pp. 365-498. Here he includes both previous unpublished ~~the~~ material plus material from Theories of Surplus Value in the section from 1861-1865. Rubel claims that in 1863-65, Marx "seems to have edited a first version of Vol. I" since the original manuscript for this bears the title Erstes Buch, as published in Archiv Marksas i Engelsas Vol. II(VII), Moscow, 1933, pp. 4-266. He laments that the original manuscripts for the period 1861-1865 are ~~not~~ in Amsterdam. Are they in Moscow, he wonders? Apparently, since they gave us a more complete edition of Theories of SV (Berlin, 1956-1962). I have xeroxed the short ~~the~~ Preface to this section for you.

Now we come to Capital, Vol. II. In his short preface (501-504), Rubel tells us: "Whatever the ~~merits~~ merits of Engels' edition...one is obliged to recognize that, in his zeal to enhance Marx's reputation, he committed the serious error of presenting Vol. II as a finished work when in fact, only the form (but not the text--Kevin?) had been revised. He repeated this error nine years later in publishing Vol. III." (pp. 501-502) Therefore, ~~Rubel~~ Rubel will give "a new edition from a choice of materials and we can only speak of a choice --for Volumes II and III"(502). This is based on having had "the privilege of studying the original manuscripts of Vols. II and III of Capital for several years"(in Amsterdam) (502).

*See same  
Marx's letter  
to Lassalle  
1858  
Marx's letter  
to Kugelmann  
1866  
I am  
wondering  
what  
happened  
with  
these  
manuscripts  
in  
Amsterdam  
1872-5  
is an  
idiot  
under-  
stands  
nothing  
what  
Rubel  
is*

*90W  
2/11  
BOW  
ALWAYS  
WANT  
TO  
KNOW  
THE  
TRUTH  
15/2*

3

For "Chapter I-IV chosen by Engels, we have substituted the shorter text of another manuscript, (even though this ~~is~~ is from an earlier work." (502) *MM*  
When you go ~~to~~ to the footnote at the beginning of this text, all you get is the reference to the Notebooks number ix in Amsterdam, so you can't really tell ~~its~~ its origin unless you go to ~~Amstardam~~ Amsterdam yourself!

In addition: "Our most audacious ~~step~~ step was to have dared, in trying to give a greater feeling of coherence, to abridge the text by eliminating repetitions" (redites) (502). He hopes this will help ~~make~~ make Vol. II more popular and lift it out of the obscurity it has been subject to since RL's debates with others over Accumulation earlier. Says he is sorry no one --- Moscow or Amsterdam --- has issued ~~Marx's~~ Marx's manuscripts on Capital as a whole. I have xeroxed not only this short ~~ix~~ 2-page Preface for you, but also you'll see there (503-504), Rubel's list ~~of~~ what changes he has made from Engels ~~xxxxxx~~ version of Vol. II. His table of contents gives a more detailed ~~pe~~ picture of his version, although it is not compared to Engels, so you may want to look at both together.

It's not all for the worse, I don't think. See for example p. 528 which I also xeroxed. This was called to my attention in 1979 by Pierre Lantz (Besancon) book, and has the following beautiful ~~xxx~~ footnote on Hegel, which is not by ~~any~~ means Rubel's emphasis. Marx writes: After referring to Duhring, ~~my~~ relationship with Hegel is quite simple. I am a disciple of Hegel, and the ~~xxxxxx~~ presumptuous prattling of those epigones who believe they've buried this great thinker appear frankly ~~ridiculous~~ ridiculous to me. Nevertheless, I took the liberty of adopting a ~~xxx~~ critical attitude ~~toward~~ toward my master, to rid his dialectic of its ~~xxxxxx~~ mysticism and in this way to make it undergo a deep transformation, etc." Rubel's footnote makes sure to tell us that this is the ~~only~~ time Marx called Hegel his "master". As you can see from the table of contents, he has reduced Vol. II to 358 pages.

(As I told you on the phone, I am hampered by a fact that I have not read Vol. II or III ~~of~~ of Capital, I am sad to say. I hope to remedy this soon, especially Vol. II, which I need to know for Lenin and your new book. But I will of course be happy to translate or summarize ~~a~~ from Rubel's ~~xxxxxx~~ version that you might want)

For Vol. III, Rubel gives us only 609 pages. His short preface states: "...of the four volumes of Capital, it is undoubtedly the third whose elaboration was the longest, but without Marx having ever succeeded in giving it a definitive form." (867) He goes on ~~to~~ to cite the various writings since 1844 on the subject matter of Vol. III.

He continues: "At the end of March, 1865, Marx had signed a contract with the publisher...agreeing to give him the entire work, otherwise called the four books of Capital, in two volumes for the end of the month of May of that same year. The first of these volumes ~~was~~ was to contain Volumes I, II and III of Capital; the second was ~~re~~ reserved for the History of Theory." (867-868)

Marx was delayed and only published Vol. I in 1867. "After this publication, Marx worked especially on Volume II, but did not stop up to his death his work of bringing together new materials for Volume III" (868)

As in ~~xxxx~~ Volume II, Rubel tries in this edition to have the same 'clarity and conciseness' Marx would have wanted (868), as for ~~an~~ example in that Marx ~~xxx~~ would have wanted to have cut many "didactic ~~xx~~ examples". He also claims to have caught some "serious errors in deciphering (handwriting reading--Kevin?), not noticed in the preceding editions" which he has caught and corrected. (868)

He also seems to favor wherever possible Luxemburgist economics, at least judging by the numerous footnotes to her work. Here I am way over my depth, but I simply xeroxed for you one example (pp. 1769-1772).

*Not a book  
just a slip*

15296

Also xeroxed of course is Rubel's own list of what changes he has made from Engels' edition of Vol. III, ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ (pp. 869-873). I would be happy to read further either in Capital according to Rubel or Engels's ~~xxx~~ editions of Vols. II and III. I might also try to hunt down any critiques of Rubel done at the time this book appeared, or since. I did note one reference to the Oeuvres in Dialectical Anthropology (1979) but it was not available to me easily. There is also at least one book ~~x~~ in French of Rubel's essays on Marx. While you yourself would no doubt want to critique ~~xx~~ Rubel either in the new book or a column, or intro to M&F----in sense his whole work is ~~xxxx~~ opposed to the way you have seen Marx's Capital in relationship both to Hegel and to changes in objective scenes----I would also be interested in perhaps writing an essay article on this.

As you know, I had been ~~xxxxxx~~ working on ~~xxxx~~ something on Krader and the Asiatic mode of production vs. Marx, but had lately been thinking I might ~~xxxxxxxx~~ detailed ~~xxxxxx~~ critique of ~~xx~~ Mehring's biography. But perhaps a critique of ~~xx~~ Rubel would be more topical and more helpful to us at this moment in development of new book and approach of 1983 anniversary. ~~xxxx~~ There are, incidentally, in German, a West German edition of Marx's notebooks on Mathematics. I think you are right that this is what the Stalinists might also come out with for 1983.

In 1981 in the U.S.A., ~~xxxx~~ however, their problem is Poland, not only as Poland, but as Marx's Collected Works in English. Mike ~~xxxx~~ Brown a young new left professor who is so "non-sectarian" that he both subscribes to N&L and has ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ friends in the CP, told our Marx seminar that Poland has held up Vol. 15 of Marx's Collected Works for 6 months or more at ~~xxxxxx~~ International Publishers. Apparently there are differences over the translation of some of Marx's writings on Poland. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Mike claims this was from a conversation with one of the editors of International Publishers.

Best,

Kevin

15297

September 28, 1981

Dear Kevin:

Thank you very much for your most informative Sept. 20 letter, regarding Rubel's so-called Vol. II of Marx. I say "so-called" because it certainly isn't Marx. It manages to so absolutely confuse and pervert Marx's Vol. II of Capital, that it's an absolutely perfect way of making sure the reader would not understand what Marx was writing, nor even know what is the difference between Marx in 1844 and Marx in 1879. Rubel's pretense that that will prove Marx never changed his position is intended to show that Marx underwent no development from what Rubel reduces him to and imposes upon him -- "ethics". To write as if 1844 is the first draft of Capital is ~~not~~ not to understand why it was that Marx "wasted" 30 years of his life writing Capital,

Now let's get down to the concrete proof of all this, and thus to ~~the~~ that 1,970 pages that Rubel has truly wasted:

1) As you saw, 117 pages are his stupid Introduction, which were preceded by 10 pages of Preface. (Incidentally, he himself summed up this whole thing -- 10 pages of the first essay in Rubel on Marx.) Perhaps we can discount this since these pages, enumerated by roman numerals, are not included in the 1,970 pages.

2) When you get down to the regular pagination, it's still a fact that you do not get to Vol. II, to page 499 or really p. 503 (since 499 - 503 is again Rubel's analysis). When you get to p. 503 and 504, you find it isn't all that different from Engels; I checked carefully with Vol. II itself, and not just with what he lists as Engels' Vol. II. (Incidentally my copy of Vol. II lists all of the manuscripts, alongside each chapter as Engels had explained in his Preface -- and I didn't have to go to Amsterdam to find out that Marx had worked on it as late as 1878. I do not now recall whether my correspondence with CLR and Grace has a letter concerning these dates; this was done in 1945-46, when I was doing my first outline of "Marxism and State Capitalism".)

3) The real point is that what Engels correctly did not include, because Marx had deliberately, most dialectically and profoundly excluded, i.e., the whole form of dealing with theories of surplus value within Vol. I, Rubel dares to tamper with and reintroduce in Vol. II. In a word, he is not revising Engels, but Marx. He is making me like Engels by now, who did not do that kind of tampering with Marx. And he certainly doesn't understand a single whiff of what dialectic means, what form means, why Marx did what he did, both in Vol. I and Vol. II, and why it is that the debates in the post-Marxist world on Vol. II had nothing whatever to do with what Rubel is doing, but concentrated on the essence -- Part III, "The Reproduction and Circulation of the Aggregate Social Capital, Especially its Final Chapter, Accumulation and Reproduction on an Enlarged Scale."

4) I will not bother with Vol. III, because there is no doubt

15298

that Rubel understands not a word of it, and to this day has not even attempted to grapple with the Ethnological Notebooks; indeed, here it is 1981 and he is still busy explaining that 1968, which is the publication date of his Vol. II and the last date of the essays that O'Malley reproduces, and evidently also Bongiovanni, is 1972. Clearly, he hasn't grown any. Considering that he is so anti-Hegelian and so anxious to make it appear that Marx became a sociologist and not a philosopher, I can just see what he will do with the philosophic volume which will just be coming out in 1982. You can see, in fact, how Proudhonist he remains, at the level of Poverty of Philosophy.

5) The whole nonsense of Rubel's sticking to the number six as the number of volumes for Capital, far from actually showing what Marx left unfinished -- what Marx intended to write on the world market and on the state --, shows that he even mistakes "chapter 6" as if that proves that Marx "seems to have edited the first version of volume I" way back in 1863-1865. In fact ~~that~~ that chapter 6, which was published in the Archives of Marx, Vol. II (VII) is what I translated way back in the early 1940s, and ~~that~~ proves the exact opposite --, that is to say, that Marx, Marx not Engels, changed that structure, decided that, instead of ending simply with that "chapter 6", he would include very nearly all four volumes of Capital in that famous final chapter of Vol. I, "Accumulation of Capital", 1867-1875.

(Interestingly enough, Mandel uses the ~~very~~ same excuse, of not having the manuscripts 1861 - 63, which are supposedly only in Moscow but you sent me the French edition. ~~The real importance of that is that Marx was alive and kicking, and~~ ~~Marx not Engels~~, decided to change the structure, decided to have the fight for the working day, decided that the Civil War in the U.S. followed as it was by the struggle for the eight-hour day, belonged in history and not only the theories of surplus value belonged in "history", which the intellectuals could easily read when they got to Book 4.)

6) To repeat so that we know exactly what pages we must deal with, just as up to page 358 Rubel monkeyed with 1844, Poverty of Philosophy and sections of the Grundrisse, all of which he tried to impose on Capital; and just as pp 365 to 498 dealt with the 1861-65 manuscripts, which Marx himself had put aside; and just as page 501 to 504 are again Rubel's own preface, we finally reach 505 only to find that far from being longer than what Engels published, are both shorter and ~~more~~ meaningless insofar as structure is concerned. And for Vol. III you say he gives us 609 pages and we know that Marx gave us nearly 1000, and for Rubel to return to the Theories of Surplus Value and give that fantastic misinterpretation of that letter to Schott, simply proves all over again that he understands as little of Vol. III as he does of Volumes I and II. (If, however, you can find a copy of Rubel's Vol. II, please buy it for me.)

What does interest me very much is the footnote on page 528, which is evidently something Engels left out, and which shows that as late as 1878 (is that the date of that mss.?) Marx had referred to himself as a "disciple of Hegel", and "the presumptuous prattling of those epigones who believe they have buried this great thinker appear frankly ridiculous to me...." I want to be very precise on when that ftn. was written by Marx. Naturally, that ass. Rubel, would try to say it's the "last time" or rather the "only time" that Marx referred to Hegel as his "master" -- but that's way too easy to disprove. It certainly appears to me as if it would be the 1878 mss. in chapter I, or doesn't Rubel mention the dates the chapters were written, as Engels does.

Yes I would like to see the critiques of Rubel when that Vol. II was published; it seems to me that somewhere I read that Balda has a whole book directed against Rubel, and it may very well be that Dialectic Anthropology 1979 has a review of both of them. 1979 is certainly after Krader published his EN. Do look it up and ~~EN~~ translate the review in that issue of DA.

I don't know whether to encourage you to write an essay on this. For the time being, I seem to prefer an essay on Mehring's biography of Marx, because to this day, Mehring has a very much bigger name in Marxist circles, whereas Rubel is correctly looked on with great suspicion. Always consider what is best also for your particular studies to get the degree. The information your professor has regarding the fact that Poland has held up the publication of a volume of Marx's work on Poland would certainly not surprise me. I am well acquainted with all of Marx's work on Poland. And at this moment I am as worried about the Catholic Church as about the CP in Poland.

Yours,

*Ray*

Also encl. is my latest note to Boyerolann -  
I note that I ~~also~~ actually had  
the 1st book on Anti-Stalinism, which was  
very much unimpressed then (1975?) - But  
perhaps we can get somewhere this time!

15300

October 8, 1981  
2PM

Dear Kevin:

This is in the nature of a postscript to the letter I just wrote to you, at which point I took for granted that in the next letter you would reply most concretely on some questions I posed last week about that magnificent footnote by Marx that Rubel does show on page 528 of his Marx's Economics, Vol II. However, it now seems that I may want a footnote in my new Introduction for P&R, and in that case, I need both a little more than you quoted, and you, in turn, should really be acquainted with more on the question of Anti-Duhring, insofar as Engels' claim is concerned that Marx had read the whole manuscript and approved enthusiastically. Now then:

On that p. 528 in the ftn. please back up and instead of just beginning with Marx saying he's a disciple of Hegel, begin with "Dans un compte...." I had asked you the precise manuscript that Rubel was reproducing since, insofar as I am checking it against Engels', that mss. is one of the last Marx would have done -- 1878, and that naturally would make it even more important. To that question I also want to add that the end of that ftn. has a "8" What is the ftn. to that? Is that something Rubel added? I imagine it is and that it is where he took exception to Marx and tried to have it say that it is the only time ever Marx used the word, "master", in relation to Hegel; I have to know precisely, so please be very precise in that translation as well.

The more important point is the whole relationship of Marx and Engels on the question of Anti-Duhring. There is a magnificent essay by Terrel Carver of the University of Bristol, entitled "Marx, Engels and Dialectics" which appeared in Political Studies, V. 28, n. 3, Sept. 1980. Have you read it? You should study it most carefully. Here is what is important for us. Whereas the correspondence between Marx and Engels on Prof. Duhring begins in Jan. 1868 over Duhring's review of Capital, of which Marx is most critical, but ends with "But, never mind, I must be grateful since he is the first professional who had spoken at all about the book." In the period 1871-75, Prof. Duhring published three works and Engels gets into a rage when he finds that he has quite a "following" in the Party and Leibknecht asks Engels to answer the article which just praised Duhring. (May 16, 1876) It is first in 1877 (March 5) that there is also a letter, this time by Marx, which has a quite sharp critique on Duhring, "Duhringiana", but on the whole Marx is not interested. In fact, the correspondence on that subject ends. Engels, however, goes all out in writing Anti-Duhring; he asks Marx's advice only on the Political Economy, not on the philosophy. In the first edition, 1878, he never mentions that Marx wrote anything for it. It is only after Marx's death that he is suddenly made practically to be co-author, and even then, we do not get the whole of what Marx wrote since Engels acknowledges that he shortened it sharply. Terrell Carver makes out quite a case about the fact that Marx and Engels are two very different people on dialectics.

15301



October 15, 1981

Dear Raya:

I thought it would be a good idea to give you a written version of what I gave you over the phone from the Rubel edition of Vol. II. His footnote on page 528 reads, in my translation of the part you wanted: "In a review of the first volume of Capital, Mr. Duhring notes that, in my zealous devotion to the schema of Hegelian logic, I even discovered the Hegelian forms of the syllogism in the process of circulation. My

At that point in the text, as you know, Rubel has his own footnote, which is what I read over the phone to you. It is a footnote to Marx's footnote: "The first sentence of this footnote represents page 14 (n.14) of manuscript IV. (This is the sentence you were not interested in, as it is on economics only - Kevin). We have joined to it p. 10 of manuscript II (p. 11). Remaining unpublished to this day, it is the only known text where Marx calls Hegel his 'master'. The term is absent from his other statements on his relationship to Hegel, for example, from his letter of March 6, 1868 to Kugelmann and from the 1873 postface to the second edition of Capital. On the critique by Duhring, which appeared in 1868 in a German monthly, see the same letter to Kugelmann." In his Preface to the second edition of Vol. II, Engels gives date of manuscript II as 1870.

Even though you probably have all this already from the phone call, I thought it would be a good idea to get it on paper from me, to make sure there were no misunderstandings, as I no longer trust oral conversations for getting precise wording.

Enclosed is also a xerox of the footnote in French plus a xerox of all the pages of Vol. II up to page 528 which you did not get already, so you can see a bit exactly what Rubel is doing. Now that the Lead is finished---the hardest by far I have ever worked on---I can return to look up some critiques of Rubel for you next week. In the future I'll assume that any request you make must be done immediately, unless you state specifically the contrary, so as to avoid the delay I caused you this time, for which I am very sorry.

By the way, I suggested to Anne that we try to contact Octavio Paz while she is in Mexico, since he is certainly a big name plus does remember you. When I saw him here at a speech he gave a couple years ago, I gave him the Spanish edition of P&R, and he said "ah, Raya Dunayevskaya" or some such thing. She's going to try and find his address now.

Best,

Kevin

*1870*  
*12/70*  
*id p212*  
*MS vol. II ch. 23 before p. 21, after "form of a commodity": whether it is one failure to grasp the dialectics of fetishism, or some other reason, the point is that, in this editing of the MS, one of the footnotes he left out for Vol. II of CM was one you felt a necessary need to restate his rel. to Hegelian dialectic. ~~with many all things in an excellent glossary above P. 100~~*

15303