

Dear Ray - You are a big child. If I would have the time and the brain, I would also study Hegel. It is exciting, sure, but I can not afford it. Do you realize that when I again touch the books I get stuck for several nights and am then for a while unable to attend to my laundry shop.

You ask for a little favor, "only" to "look up" something, but it is more than that. For more than 10 years I am out of it and it is very hard for me even to formulate any thing, but I will try to be of some service.

Hegels translation is not good. I don't know if intentionally. But I am very bad in English and I do not know the exact Marx Terminology in English to do better - I never read Marx in an English translation. I will try to translate word by word.

"Labor [~~not the worker~~] no longer appears so much [so sel here words Hegels leaves out!] as enclosed in the process of production as man himself rather <sup>relates to the process</sup> of production as watchman and regulator. <sup>the worker leaves</sup>

the worker following:] What for machinery is also valid for the combination of human performances and the development of human communication. It is not more the worker who pushes the modified nature object as a middle term between <sup>into</sup> the object and himself, but the natural process ["Naturprozess"] which he converts

in the industrial one he pushes as man between himself and the inorganic nature of which he becomes master. He steps next ["neben"] to the process of production instead of being its principal agent. [No clips!] In this transformation, it is neither the immediate labor, performed

by man himself performed, nor the time, in which he works, but the appropriation of his own universal productivity ["Produktivkraft"], his knowledge of nature and its domination through his existence as social body, in one word, the development of the social individual

which appears as the great basic pillar of the production and the wealth. The theft "alienated" ["fremder"] labor <sup>time</sup> on which the present ["jetzige"] wealth is based appears as miserable basis against this new development, though the big industry itself creates. As soon labor

in its immediate form has ceased to be <sup>the</sup> great force

Handwritten note: "Hegel's translation is not good"

Handwritten note: "Hegels is wrong in saying: 'outside'"

②

of ~~total~~ wealth, labor time ceases at most cease to be its measure and therefore the exchange value (the measure) of the use value? The surplus labor of the masses has ceased to be condition for the development of the general wealth, just as the idleness of the feet for the development of the general forces of the human brain. With this ["darnit" = thereby] collapses the on exchange value based production, and the immediate material process of production strips itself off the form of contrivance and contrivance. The free development of the individuality, and therefore not the reduction of the necessary labor time to create surplus labor, but generally the reduction of the necessary labor of the society to a minimum, which then suits ["entspricht"] the artistic, scientific etc. education of the individuals through the for everybody made to be free time and created means. The capital is itself the processing contradiction (by those means ["dadurch"]) since it disturbs ("stört") the reduction of the labor time to a minimum while it sets on the other side the labor time to be the only measure of need and source of wealth. It reduces therefore the labor time in the form of the necessary, to ["um"] enlarge it [the labor time] in the form of the surplus; sets therefore the surplus [or "superfluous"] as a growing measure as condition - question de la vie et de la mort - for the necessary. On the one side, it is calling thus all powers of the science and nature, and the social combination and the social communication, to life, to make the creation of wealth independent (relative) of the labor time from the used labor time ["auf die augenwärtige Arbeitszeit"]. On the other side wants it these thus created gigantic social forces to be measured in labor time, and ban it in the borders which are required to maintain the produced value as value. The productivity ["Produktivität"] and social relations - both different sides of the development of the social individuals - appear to the capital only as means, and are

*[scribbled out text]*

letter: "superfluous"

Marx says in parenthesis: "relativ"

social: "gesellschaftlich"

(3)

for it only means, to be able to produce on its narrow-minded ["borruerlein"] basis. But in fact are there the material conditions to blow them up in the air. [Marx then quotes the anonymous brochure "The source of misery" and: "Really reach a nation, where instead of 12 hours (6 are worker's wealth (english by Marx) is not commands of surplus labor time" (real wealth) "but disposable time (english by M.) outside of the one used in the immediate production for each individual and the total society"]

So, my dear Ray, you want more?

Marx speaks about the discrepancy ["Widerspruch"] between the basis of bourgeois production (value measure) and her own development. It is the last development of the value relation and of the on the value based production. Its supposition is and continues the measure of direct labor time, the quantity of used labor as the most important factor of production of wealth. But in the proportion as the fiscal industry develops will the creation of real wealth be less dependent from the labor time and the quantity of used labor as from the power of the agencies which are set in movement during the ~~time~~ labor time. [also on page 592].

Generally Marx calls the whole thing: "Die letzte Entwickelung des Wertverhältnisses" and ~~also~~ ~~the~~ ~~to~~ need also ~~den~~ Wertverhältnisse der Produktion". [The last development of the value relation (is "condition") and the on the value based production"]

on page 595/96: "Capital is thus - malgré lui - instrumental in creating the means of social disposable time [english by Marx], to reduce the labor time for the total society on a falling minimum, and thus to make the time of every body for their own development. But his tendency always, on the one side (Marx' english)



(5)

Socialism. But we know that Marx and Engels closed up the whole Hegel by using him, and using him so totally that we really do not know him, except as good exercising (method). Later, in the 70th, when they got read about Wilhelm Weyersbach and his reading fun of Hegel they came back to Hegel en passant. But when Engels wrote to Marx (1873) about Dialectic of Nature they started for a little while again to use in their correspondence the Hegel jargon. But very good the little passage when he speaks about Utilitarian he says "notabene" in contrast to Hegel, ~~that~~ is proved that the necessity ~~not~~ does not include the possibility". Here you have the whole Marx critique on Hegel. Here you have also the class struggle and the question of the Produktivkräfte!

That does not mean I want to treat Hegel as dead dog. If Hegel helps you to understand Marx, o.k. with me. Sure knowledge of Hegel helps very much to understand Capital. I also agree with Lenin. But may be it is an obsession of yours. \* I ask: Why not ~~also~~ Spinoza also? He I think he helped me and Hegel calls Spinoza the beginning of philosophy. Read Hegel, read Lenin, but read Rosa Luxemburg and, again, the Com. Manifesto. Anyway - it is already the 5th page as I cannot say more.

All the best

Peter

Excuse me - I don't even have the energy to read what I wrote.

12424

\* helps very much, but  
 is not the same, you  
 know it, by the way  
 because Marx Hegel and Ricardo  
 are different things, so what?

11/12/64 Peter's translation from Grundriss & letter on HM's translation

Marcuse's translation is not good. I don't know if intentionally. But I myself am very bad in English & I do not know the exact Marx terminology in English to do better--I never read Marx in an English translation. I will try to translate word for word:

"Labor (not human, as HM) no longer appears so much as a self these words HM cut out; as enclosed in the process of production, as man himself, rather (and much more) relates to the process of production as watchman and regulator. He leaves out the following: that for machinery is also valid for the combination of human performances and the dev. of human communication. It is not the worker who pushes the modified nature object as a middle term into the object and himself but the natural process "Naturprozess" which he conveys in industrial one he pushes as man bet. himself and the inorganic nature of which he becomes master. He steps next "Neben"--HM is wrong in saying "outside" to the process of prod. instead of being its principal agent. In this transformation, it is neither the immediate labor, which man himself performs, nor the time in which he

works, but the appropriation of his own universal productivity ("Produktivkraft") his knowledge of nature & domination through his existence as social body--in other word, the dev. of the social individual which appears as the great basic principle of prod. & the wealth. The theft of alienated ("fremder") labor time on which the "fetters" wealth is based appears as miserable basis against this new developed one, through the big industry itself created. As soon as labor in its immediate form has ceased to be the great source of wealth, labor time ceases

and must cease to be its measure and therefore the ex. v. the measure of the use. The surplus labor of the masses has ceased to be condition for the dev. of the general wealth, just as the idleness of the few for the dev. of the general forces of the human brain. With this "damit"--thereby collapses the ex. v. based on prod. & the immediate material process of prod. strips itself the form of constraining and contradiction. The free dev. of the individuality, & therefore not the reduction of the necessary labor time to create surplus labor, but generally the reduction of the necessary labor of the society to a minimum, which then suits the artistic, scientific, etc. education of the individuals (but the for every one made to be free time and created means. The capital is itself the producing contradiction (by those means "dadurch") since it disturbs (stört) the reduction of the labor time to a minimum while it sets on the other side the labor time to be the only measure of and source of wealth. It reduces therefore the

labor time in the form of the necessary to enlarge it (the labor time) in the form of the surplus (superfluous); sets therefore the surplus (or "superfluous") in growing measure as condition for the necessary on the one side it is calling thus all powers of science and nature and the social combination and the social communication, to life, to make the creation of wealth independent (relativ) from the used labor time (von der auf sie augewandten Arbeitszeit). On the other side, these thus created gigantic social forces to be measured in labor time, and ban it in the borders which are required to maintain the produced value as value. The productivity ("Produktivkraft") and social relations ("gesellschaftlichen")--both different sides of the dev. of the social individual appear to be the capital only as means and are for it only means to be able to produce on its narrow-minded basis. But in fact are these

12/26

the material conditions to blow them up in the air. Marx then quotes the anonymous brochure "The source & remedy": "Really <sup>one in every</sup> a nation when instead of 12 hrs. 6 are used. Wealth (English by Marx) is not commands of surplus labor time. "real wealth" but disposable time (English by M) outside of the one used in the immediate prod. for each individual and the total society"

So, my dear Ray, you want more: Marx speaks about discrepancy (Widerspruch) bet. the basis of bourgeois prod. (value measure) and her own dev. <sup>cutted</sup> It is the last dev. of the value rel. out of ~~value-based~~ value-based prod. Its supposition is that it continues the mass of direct labor time; the quantity of used labor as the most imp. factor of prod. of wealth. But in the proportion as the great industry develops will the creation of real wealth be less dependent on the labor time and the quantity of used labor as from the power of the agencies which are set in movement during the labor time. (also on p. 592)

Generally Marx call the whole thing "Die letzte Entwicklung des Wertverhältnisses unter der auf dem Wert Wert beruhtender Produktion" (The last dev. of the value rela. ("condition") and the on the value based prod.)

On pp. 595-6: "Capital is thus—malgré lui—instrumental in creating the means of social disposable time (English by Marx) to reduce the labor time for the total society on a falling minimum, & thus to make the time of everybody for their own dev. But this tendency always, on the one side (Marx's English) disposable time to create, on the other side, to convert it into surplus prod. (Marx's English) Does he succeed too good in the first, to be suffer on surplus labor. then the necessary labor is interrupted because capital cannot use surplus labor. moreover, this contradiction develops—& soon appears the necessary for the masses to appropriate for themselves their surplus labor."

Then Marx says, underlined by him: The most developed machinery forces the worker therefore not longer to work as the primitive div. as he himself with the most simplest, rough tools used to do."

So I don't know what <sup>He</sup> said. If he only speaks of its "explosive prospects" that is by itself no worry. If he means that automat. abolished already the value laws of course he doesn't know what he is talking about and has never understood anything by Marx. Bukharin in his Transition Per. gives expression of the absolute schematic dev. of big ind. and abolition of value. The Anti-Marxian school built their hope on the increase of "productive kräfte" but still we have to say it was their hope that the produktivkräfte will do it. hope. Rosa L. was the only one who did not want to know anything about the "good sides" of capitalism and therefore got mad at Marx! (Wrong she was, but I like more than any of all the others, including the giant Lenin.) She was the only proletarian revolutionary in the sense of the Manifesto; she did not need Hegel, thus she was a real Marxist (who also knew that the Communists are not to be different from the other proletarian parties!)

I don't mind reading Hegel or your fighting for it, but do we really need it? For Lenin it would have done good if he would have read Hegel before he wrote Empiric-criticism. No doubt he studied Hegel because he had to break with Kautsky and also he started to think about method, revolution and socialism. But we know that Marx & Engels closed up the whole Hegel by using him, & using him so totally that we really do need him, except as good exercising (method). Later, in Charva's, when they get mad about Wilhelm Liebknecht or his making fun of Hegel, they lean back to Hegel on passant. And when Engels wrote to Marx (1873) about Dialectic of Nature they started for a little while again to use in their correspondence the Hegel jargon. And very good the little passage when he speaks about McMahon he says "Notabene, in contrast to Hegel, is proved that the necessity does not include the possibility." Here you have the whole Marx critique of Hegel.

Handwritten scribbles and initials on the left margin.

Handwritten scribbles and initials on the left margin.

Handwritten notes and scribbles on the left margin.

Here you have also the class struggle and the question of the Frankfurt school.  
That does not mean I want to beat Hegel as a dead dog.  
If Hegel helps you to understand Marx, ok, wish me. Some knowledge of Hegel is  
very much to understand Capital. (Helps very much but is not the same you know, the  
way Lassalle knew Hegel and Ricardo just as much as Marx, so what?) I don't  
agree with Lenin that may be it is an obsession of yours. I ask: why not Spinoza  
also. I think he helped me and Hegel calls Spinoza the beginning of phil. Read  
Hegel, read according to Lenin, but read RL and again the CM.  
Anyway it is already the 5th p. & I cannot say  
more All the best, Peter

Excuse me I don't even have the energy to read what I write.

12427