

Casa La Monda
Via Francini 4
CH 6600 Locarno-Muralto

8th July, 1976

Dear Raya,

I have your letter and I am sorry that you are worried about the Foreword. Originally Mr. Reif had written me that it is time if he had it in September, but in order that you don't worry I wrote it today, and enclose a copy. Please tell me frankly if you don't like something in my Foreword and of course I shall eliminate it, or on the other hand if you wish something to be stressed I shall try to do so. I am sending the Foreword tomorrow to Mr. Reif, about whom I enquired a short time ago, at which time he was still in the States.

With all good wishes,

Affectionately,

cf.

10049

July 15, 1976

Dear EF:

Thank you very much for sending me the Foreword to P&F, and inviting my commentary. Because Mr. Reif informed me that there is an interest on the part of the publisher also to bring out a German edition of Marxism and Freedom (which Marcuse introduced), and because I am working on a new study of Rosa Luxemburg and Today's Women's Liberation Movement, I wondered whether you would be willing to write two brief additions to what you say about me. Could the reference you make to the fact that P&F concerns itself with the Women's Liberation Movement be extended to call attention to the fact of the relationship between Rosa Luxemburg and the Women's Liberation Movement? If I may explain, here is what concerns me:

For years I have carried on polemics with* Rosa Luxemburg on Marx's theory of the accumulation of capital. Nothing has maddened me so much, however, as the complete disregard that today's so-called theoreticians of the women's movement display towards Rosa, as if only that woman who writes on Women (with a capital W) "as such" merits attention. I have also been feeling very strongly on the reason why there has been a lack of camaraderie between Luxemburg, Lenin, Trotsky in the period of the 1905 Revolution in which they were all participants, and after which they did collaborate on an amendment to the Resolution on war at the 1907 International Congress. Could there have been, if not outright male chauvinism, at least some looking down on her theoretical work, because she was woman? In any case, between the Stalinist slanderous misinterpretation of her position, and the new breed of theoreticians among women, who disregard her, I am very anxious to find some way before my study of her is completed to call attention to the interrelationship between great revolutionary theoreticians like Rosa Luxemburg and the present Women's Liberation Movement. I would therefore greatly appreciate it if you could invent some way to single out her name for commentary, either at the point where you speak of Women's Liberation, or wherever you choose. (I enclose what I wrote about her critically in M&F, and excerpts from my recent lecture where I anticipate my next work on Rosa.)

The other question I wondered about was that of Hegel himself in regard to what I consider the overly-praised Frankfurt School Hegelians like Adorno. Last year, when I was asked to speak at the Hegel Society of America, I developed some points that brought about a quite heated discussion. Where you mention that it is impossible to understand Marx without understanding Hegelian philosophy, I wondered whether you couldn't call attention to my contribution to Hegelian dialectics -- that Chapter One on Absolute Negativity as New Beginnings -- as being cogent for a German-speaking public, well-versed in Hegelian dialectics. (Enclosed is that part of the lecture that deals with Adorno.) Thank you warmly for anything you do on either or both of these suggestions.

n Yours,

* I'm forever carrying on dialogues "with" revolutionaries who are no longer alive, since I do not consider anyone dead whose thought remains our heritage to pursue and develop.

10050

Erich Fromm's Preface to forthcoming German edition of 'Philosophy and Revolution'

by Erich Fromm

Few thought systems have been as distorted and sometimes even turned into their opposite as that of Karl Marx. The great conservative political economist Joseph Schumpeter once expressed this distortion with a hypothetical analogy: if one had discovered Europe at the time of the Inquisition, and had surmised from that that the Inquisition reflected the spirit of the Gospels, then one would have behaved as those who see the ideas of Marx expressed in Soviet Communism.

If this distortion were only to be found among opponents of Marxism, that would scarcely be surprising. The amazing thing is that it emanates from his "proponents," who convince the rest of the world that their ideology expresses the ideas of Marx. Thus it has finally come to the point that in North America and Europe, so effective has Soviet propaganda become, that one not only believes that one sees the realization of socialism in the Soviet system, but also that one is dealing with a revolutionary state which aims at world revolution, instead of with a bureaucratic reactionary form of state-capitalism.

Marx's ideas can only be understood if one knows at least the fundamentals of Hegelian philosophy. But only a very few people know them even approximately, and in the best situation take only a couple of slogans as substitutes for genuine knowledge. And what is the situation with the followers of Marx who speak in his name and who make a more serious claim than Stalin, Lenin, Trotsky, Mao, or even the "outsider" Sartre? There is little that will aid an objective understanding of this question; most of what can be read about it is biased according to the political views of the author.

All of this results in the fact that individuals who want to get an idea of the theories which influence a

great part of the world today have great difficulties forming a correct image.

Raya Dunayevskaya is unusually qualified to fill this gap in our knowledge. Not only because of her great knowledge and competence in this area — these qualities alone are rare, but not unique — and not only because of her incorruptible objectivity which is the characteristic of every scholar, or should be. What, however, is far rarer is the fact that within herself she combines this objectivity with a passionate political attitude — a passion which, at the same time, is not irrational and not fanatical. But the important factor is, perhaps, that the author is permeated by the conviction that socialism and freedom are indivisibly united and can only exist together. She is a radical Humanist who deeply believes that the betterment of the welfare of all humanity can be achieved without the loss of individual freedom, through a new Humanism.

This book is much enriched by discussion of the African revolutions, the East European revolts, the youth movement, and the Women's Liberation Movement.

For everyone who is seriously interested in the forces which form — and deform — the present and the future, this book is to be most warmly recommended.

Casa La Monda
Via Franscini 4
CH 8600 Locarno-Muralto

2nd October 1976

Dear R.D.,

I apologise for not having answered your letter of July 15th sooner, but I was away on a long vacation at the time and have a chance to answer only now, after my recent return to Locarno. I have a little time today because I had to take care of a large correspondence which arrived during my absence and besides that, I am leaving in 4 days for a trip to the States.

I am glad to make the additions to the book review which you suggest, and also to your contribution to the Hegelian dialectics. As to Adorno, he was, from personal knowledge and from reading some of his writings, a puffed-up phrase-maker with no conviction and nothing to say. The whole business with the 'critical theory' is a big hoax. It was just a word invented to avoid the words Marxist theory, which was too dangerous for Horkheimer even in the pro-Hitler time.

My new book is out and I shall send it to you, although with some misgivings because I assume that you will not agree with some essential points of what I am writing. But the misgivings are that I would be happy if I had written something of which I could expect warm agreement. I want you to look through it when you have time, and I am grateful for your critique from which I am sure I shall learn, especially since I am not sensitive to criticism at all except when it is ill-intended and dishonest, as for instance most of Marcuse's is.

With warm regards and good wishes,

Yours,

cf

10052

Oct.17,1976

Dear EF:

First, a rather unusual aspect of our relationship as I never before introduced "legal" matters, but presently I have some difficulty with the US Government from whom I cannot pry loose a folder on me, despite the Freedom of Information Act. Hence, the copy of the enclosed letter I wrote Joe Hansen of SWP who had succeeded to get documents my lawyer would like to see since they probably involve me. There is nothing for you to do, but I consider you friend who should know if ramifications suddenly reveal defense needs. Please read and return directly to me since I do not wish these floating about loosely.

Secondly, I was naturally very glad to hear that you did (will?) make additions to your Preface to German edition of P & R. The "structure" of your sentence did not make it clear whether you have already done so, or will do so in the near future. In August Adelbert Reif visited me and told me that upon his return to Germany he would visit you in Switzerland, and carry with him his copy of the Preface. Was he there? Did you expand his copy, or the one directly for Europaverlag? Mr. Reif had also informed me that an announcement of Philosophy and Revolution with your Preface would there (Frankfurt Book Fair) be announced as next year's publication. I am most anxious that there be no delay. My view of the dialectics of liberation never separates thought from act, and Mao's death has given even a greater urgency, I think, to my work as all "Alternatives" are put through the wringer of events.

I will look forward to getting your new book. I always felt total confidence regarding your attitude to criticisms as your whole life is deeply rooted in what, ever since Karl Marx hyphenated critical-revolutionary, serious thinkers have lived by as the essence of their own self-development.

You may laugh, or at least smile, when I tell you that in Spring when I was lecturing at Boston University, Prof. Robert Cohen who had brought me there and had seen Prof. Marcuse the week before, told me of his "message" to me. It said: "Hello." When Cohen kept pressing him, he said, Raya Dunayevskaya will understand; just say, "Hello." And that is about the extent of his relationship to me since the 1960's. What you had said of Adorno and Horkheimer and the whole Frankfurt School is what I always knew, especially since 1943, when my critique of the Stalinist revision of the law of value appeared in American Economic Review and then hit the front page of the NYT. Many of the Frankfurt school then looked for me as they had so low a view of American "erudition", they could not believe any one would know Marx that "eruditely" (a word I absolute abhor). But when I demanded why their collaboration with US State Dep't, it turned out that "you don't understand at all." Then, by the end of World War II, one person I really looked forward to meeting-- Rosdolsky who had headed the Marx-Lenin Institute in Austria and landed in the concentration camps, and now was supposed to help re-establish those Archives. To my shock he still was a Stalinist as there was no other "existing Communism." There are more involved ways of escaping the Humanism of Marxism than "erudition", but I know of none.

Yours,



10053

COPY

Make review
to [unclear]

October 6, 1976

Dear Joe:

Recently a good number of documents have been released to the SWP under the Freedom of Information Act, as a result of your legal battle against the government's political surveillance. I have not been that successful in trying to get files held on me by the FBI, CIA, Attorney General and the NSA. The National Security Administration has acknowledged having a folder on me, but refused to reveal its contents "because it is classified and therefore exempt from access or release pursuant to Title 5 U.S.C. 552 (b) (1). The record has been reviewed and is judged to be currently and properly classified in its entirety under criteria set forth in paragraph 2-303, DoD Regulation 5200.1-R, which implements Executive Order 11652." (Letter from NSA, Serial: N 9325, dated Sept. 7, 1976)

My attorney, Neal Bush (Halpern, Mogill, Bush, Posner, Weiss, and McFadden, 1455 Centre St., Detroit, Mich. 48226) naturally appealed the decision. You know better than I what a tedious, long and bureaucratized road that is to travel. Neal Bush, who is handling all the inquiries, thought his job would be greatly facilitated if you would make available to me any of the documents you obtained which list me.

Here are the periods I thought most likely to include references to me:

1) 1937-38 when I was with Comrade Trotsky in Mexico.

2) In 1943, although I was no longer in the SWP, the Russian Embassy in Washington, D.C. applied pressure upon the American Economic Review to try to stop the publication of my translation of an article from Pod Znaenem Marxizma with an analysis by me called "A New Revision of Marxian Economics." The Embassy wrote the AER that "Raya Dunayevskaya is very obviously a pseudonym, no doubt of a Trotskyist or a fascist, probably both." Since the U.S. and Russia were allies then, this was followed up by our State Department likewise pressuring the AER not to publish. The AER resisted, telling me that "everyone" knew I was a Trotskyist but it was so important an academic contribution they would publish it, and the Russians shouldn't object since they were giving the Russian view 30 pages as contrasted to the 6 pages for my commentary. Naturally, I do not know whether any of this -- and the international controversy that arose from it which hit the front page of the New York Times and lasted for an entire year -- found its way to SWP files.

3) 1947, when I attended the Fourth International Conference in France. I do not know whether you know that on the very day I arrived, at a very cheap hotel on a side street in Paris, I was visited by a man from the American Embassy who had known me in the '30s when I worked for the government. I asked him how he could possibly know I was in Paris and where I was staying when I had no contact with him for years. I believe the name of Irving Brown was cited by this man, after which he proceeded to tell me that the youth section of the Socialist Party which had just been won over by Trotskyism

10054

had openly advertised the conference, and since he was a "specialist on splits," he wanted me to help him get into the adult conference for the sake of "scholarship." I naturally told him off, reported it at once to Pablo, and changed hotels. The harassment continued when I proceeded to England, allegedly because I was carrying the film of Trotsky in 1917 for "public show." (The joke is that the authorities also inquired about me of Gerry Healy, and he evidently assured them that he had never heard of me.) By the time I returned to New York, the Immigration and Naturalization Department confiscated a shorthand notebook of mine which they mistakenly thought contained the minutes of the Fourth International conference, but since they did not bother to acknowledge they absconded with it, I didn't bother to inform them that it was a lecture on Shakespeare. Rowland Watts of the ACTU was then my attorney.

4) After the Johnson-Forest Tendency left the SWP in 1951, it happened that the Militant was carrying some articles written by someone named Adams. At that time I was married to a man by the name of Adams (of the Bicentennial Adamases), who was a Senior Economist for the government and who was being harassed for having married me. Once again, the name of the SWP and the Militant came up. I went to see Comrade Cannon and he assured me that the name Adams would no longer be used in the Militant.

I do not believe that there are any other periods of my life which might enter into the SWP surveillance documents. However, I was in considerable difficulty from both the British and the U.S. governments when I was in Africa in 1962; my passport was lifted on my return to the U.S. Rowland Watts, who was still my lawyer, finally got my passport back, but the Immigration Dept. offered no explanation, claiming it was "all a mistake." But it was the same period when, because of our struggle against the labor bureaucracy in Detroit, a youthful son of a UAW leader informed me that the UAW likewise had a file on me which listed me as "a far-left split-off from the Trotskyists." Finally, just last year, during my lecture tour in Berkeley, "Trotskyism" as a characterization of me was suddenly linked to a Chinese friend, whom I had met when I was in Hong Kong in 1965-66, where I was doing research work for the Mao chapter in Philosophy and Revolution, and when the Mao chapter for Marxism and Freedom was translated into Chinese and smuggled into mainland China.

Besides Raya Dunayevskaya, the names I submitted when I demanded to see my files were: Rae Spiegel, Rae Adams, Freddie Forest. It goes without saying that I would greatly appreciate anything you can do to help me with my fight against the FBI, CIA, NSA and other surveillance agencies.

Comradely yours,

PS: Anne Jaffe, who is delivering this letter to you in person, is both a comrade and an attorney, will know the contents of this letter, and is authorized to receive your reply to me.

10055

Casa La Monda
Via Franscini 4
CH 8600 Locarno-Muralto

25th November 1976

Dear R.D.,

Thank you for your letter of October 17th which I enclose according to your wish. I spoke with Mr. Reif a few days ago. He did not bring a copy of my Foreword but I have a copy here and shall now make changes as you indicated in some previous letters. I shall amend the copy within a few weeks but according to what he indicated, this will be ample time to be useful.

The story you mention about Marcuse's "Helio" is rather funny yet it is sad. Incidentally I never understood why Marcuse stayed at the State Department for several years after the war. For a man with his theoretical ambitions and capacities this seems a strange way to spend time. Not that I have ever taken seriously what some of his enemies said, that he was really something like spying on the radical movement, but still it puzzles me why he did that at all. If Horkheimer had done such a thing it would not puzzle me because he was so trembling with fear that he could be called a Marxist or even a materialist, that he would have done almost anything to wipe out any traces of such ideas. But of course Horkheimer could not have done it because with his pompous and arrogant behavior he would not have been hitting it too well with the people in the State Department. But that does not answer the question why Marcuse did it. I cannot imagine that he had the same purpose of proving that he was not a revolutionary? (If you know the answer let me know.) Incidentally there is quite a bit of renewed interest in the Frankfurt School. I get quite a few questions from various people who study the history of the School. It is really a funny story; Horkheimer is now quoted as the creator of the Critical Theory and people write about the Critical Theory as if it were a new concept discovered by Horkheimer. As far as I know, the whole thing is a hoax because Horkheimer was frightened even before Hitler of speaking about Marxist theory. He used in general Aesopian language and spoke of Critical Theory in order not to say Marxist theory. I believe that is all, behind this great discovery of Critical Theory by Horkheimer and Adorno.

Yours,
E...

P.S. As to the enclosure you mention, I did not see it so far. It is possible that it was put in a wrong file as it sometimes happened. When I find it I shall send it to you.

10056

Nov. 30, 1976

Dear EF:

T0028

Thank you very much for yours of the 25th which speaks of presently enlarging your Preface to P&R in its German edition. You must understand that I need have your popularity, nor even the publisher's view that you will make money for him, so that even tho Mr. Reif said there was lots of time before ever it will be published, you will not wait for other deadlines. As it is, I'm in pieces with all these delays both on Mexican and German editions, but since both have now been heard from as I rushed an Appendix on Mao's death, I hope the currency, if not the Hegelian dialectics, will finally make 1977 the year, early, when it will get off the press. (I enclose a "Letter" I wrote on that, should you be interested in what I think the fighting heirs over Mao's Mantle plus the Mantle itself.)

I doubt I'm the one who could answer the question as to why Marcuse remained with State Dep't. after WWII since I opposed any such collaboration even during and when the vitriolic attacks by the Maoists in America on his years in State Dep't. as if he were a "spy", and I offered to help, he said, they were so far-fetched that they are the recipients of a boomerang. He surely is no coward, and his Reason and Revolution surely did not hide his Marxism, as he understands it. Also, once he was out, and I was in great trouble because at the very height of McCarthyism, I had decided to "discover" Marx's Humanist Essays, that is to publish them in English translation, (I believe, as a matter of fact, that is the first our correspondence likewise began) he helped. What was strange in those years, the 1950s, is that our fights were over my "optimism" and "romanticism" over proletariat and Black; he used to argue that they only want a "piece of the American pie" and while he doesn't oppose that, it couldn't be called "revolutionary", as I insisted. He also opposed my view of the East German Revolt of 1953 as revolution from under totalitarianism, saying it was only because Germans couldn't stand Russians, etc. And I got nowhere with him when I tried to convince him that he shouldn't use "Marxism" when he is speaking of Russian Communism.

What was important and may shed light was that, to my shock, he was so haated a defender of Israel in the 1950s that he even defended Suez war. In a word, could the fact that the end of WWII led also to the creation of Israel lead him to remain with state department? It would seem that his specialty of both Germany and East Europe could have no direct relationship to the other. But then I remember some very contradictory developments. Anyone who had ever heard of the Holocaust, much less knew what was like, to which a pogrom of which I lived through many, was as nothing, did follow "Exodus" with great passion. But so many of the German comrades who had escaped to Palestine found it impossible to function there since neither the Arabs nor the Jews would permit "crossing of the lines", and a socialist state was hardly what resulted. So, in 1947, in France, I met some who had left Israel, and I must have had no less than a dozen different versions of what was occurring there. It is just when such barbarism as Naziism emerges, people very nearly literally go crazy.

Yes, when last year I talked to the Hegel Society of America, and I dared criticize Adorno's Negative Dialectics, it appeared as if the whole Frankfurt School was there in person sharpening their knives at my expense.

Yours,

T0057

Oct. 20, 1977 10059

Dear EF:

Instead of trying to explain the long silence (especially since the German edition of P&R has once again been delayed), may I start right off by asking you whether I may engage in a dialogue with you on Rosa Luxemburg? There is a very specific field that I thought you would be most profound in--the difference between correspondence, especially with women, and the writings (very nearly non-existent) on that very subject, women. I'm not referring to the fact that they were on flowers, cats, or other small talk. Rather I am referring to the very sharp attacks on their reformist husbands, there using many references to mythical or long-ago historical characters--Penthesilea, the queen of the Amazons. The letter I have in mind is the one to Mathilde Wurm on New Year's Day, 1917. I was so surprised at that particular reference that I went to the trouble to look up, which, specifically, event she was referring to and it was Achilles who slew Penthesilea when she took the side of the Trojans--and then praised her bravery, etc. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Russell, in his work on the Oriental Heritage as well as the Greek, mentions that the Greek Urn that Keats wrote that magnificent ode to (which he, Durant, prefers above the urn) may have been the other one where Achilles spears Penthesilea. Now, my question is: what has all this to do with the Second International's betrayal, 1914, and how does it happen that whereas she kept away from the "Woman Question" other than what all Marxists were for--equal wages, suffrage, etc.--would certainly go to mythology and the roles of women as greater than life? Was it common to show that one's interest in literature, in character building, in self-development of idea though one kept strictly to economics-politics in books, pamphlets? Did you by any chance know people who knew her? I remember Marcuse (who was evidently a young Spartacist in Army at the time Rosa was murdered) speaking gloriously of her as orator? There seems a great contradiction between her awareness that there is more to the "Woman Question" than economics in letters as contrasted to books, pamphlets, etc. I would love to get the feeling of the times--Germany, women, intellectuals between WWI and WWII.

How are you? What is new?

Yours,

Enclosed is mini-pamphlet on Sexism, Politics and Revolution in Mao's China which, by cutting off reference to the Huang-Ch'ing battle, may become title of my work on Rosa Luxemburg and Women's Liberation Today.

Casa La Monda
Via Franscini 4
CH 6600 Locarno-Muralto

26th October 1977

Dear R.D.,

Thank you for your letter of October 20th. I am at the moment in hospital as an aftermath of a heart attack and not supposed to write letters, but the topic you write about fascinates me so much that I want to send you a line. I feel that the male Social Democrats never could understand Rosa Luxemburg, nor could she acquire the influence for which she had the potential because she was a woman; and the men could not become full revolutionaries because they did not emancipate themselves from their male, patriarchal, and hence dominating, character structure. After all, the original exploitation is that of women by men and there is no social liberation (as long as) there is no revolution in the sex war ending in full equality, which has never existed since pre-history. I believe she was one of the few fully developed human beings, one who showed what a human being can be in the future. Indeed, as you say, she was not concerned with the woman's question which is, after all, only the human question; in this respect quite the contrary to Klara Zetkin, the bureaucratic leader of the allegedly revolutionary woman's movement. Unfortunately I have known nobody who still knows her personally. What a bad break between the generations.

I hope to get out of the hospital in a few days and take a rest, then I hope to finish a manuscript of an analysis of Freud from the standpoint of his bourgeois prejudices.

I am, with warm wishes,

Yours,

W.L.P.

P.S. Thank you for sending me the article which I shall read very soon.

10060

RD

November 30, 1978

Dear EF:

How are you? I sure miss not hearing from you for so long a time, but I dare say that a good part of it is my fault, since I am so deep in the work on Rosa Luxemburg, and it is moving so slowly that I haven't had any free time whatever. As you can see from the enclosed galley proofs of a chapter in that work, I've suddenly plunged into anthropology as well, which is not what I intended to do. I felt that the discovery of Marx's Ethnological Notebooks (which brings us up to four months before his death) are so very important in the re-consideration of how deep and total a revolution must be to uproot this alien, class society, that we actually should follow Marx's route in returning to that most fundamental relationship, Man/Woman. If you can take time out of your own work and write me a critique of the enclosed, I would greatly appreciate it.

Yours,

P.S. I don't know whether you are aware of the fact that Adelbert Reif is quite a faker. I do believe that Philosophy and Revolution will, after all these delays, finally be published in Spring 1979, but that belief is due only to the fact that I have confidence in the very fine translator, that Oskar Itzinger. But Reif, himself, who showed such great interest that he also got my signature to bring out Marxism and Freedom, sent me a rubber check for confirming the contract. I felt compelled to cut off the agreement. I have not heard from him since, and all this has beclouded the relationship with Europa Verlag.

10061