

File #27: Paul A. Baran - Paul M. Sweezy Correspondence, January - March, 1963

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

January 3, 1963

Dear Paul,

Happy New year!

I enclose some new pages which I hope meet with your approval. Throw away Ch. 3, p. 14 and substitute the new Section III (pp. 14 to the middle of 18). Then renumber pp. 15 to the end of the chapter so that they become 19, 20, 21, etc. through 37. Also change the roman numerals on Section IV to V (new p. 24) and on Section V to VI (new p. 31).

Ch. 4: substitute new 3 for old 3 and add 23a after 23. Also delete footnote on 35 (this point is now taken care of adequately in the new Section III, Ch. 3).

[personal details omitted]

We leave for S. America via Mexico on the 11th and will be gone until the 6th of Feb. I will send you a full itinerary with hotels after I get it from Leo at the office tomorrow. Meanwhile, I should be able to devote most of the next week to opus (Chs. 6 and 7), so if you have any changes or additions in those chapters to suggest, the sooner you can get them to me the better. (I would normally have to do an RoM at this time, but we must get all copy to the printer this week, and since I have not been able to do that kind of work while my kids have been here, we have decided to run a sort of guest RoM by a guy who writes to us often and who knows Latin America from long first-hand contact. His piece is not about L. America but about where the world stands after 5 billion years -- not particularly brilliant but a lot of our readers will like it, and I like it because it gets me off the hook for a month.) The next RoM, by the way, will probably have to be another look at the China-USSR business. From what I have been able to read so far, I find it very difficult to understand the Chinese position. They claim that their guiding principle is to "slight them (the imperialists) strategically but take full account of them tactically." This means in practice that you can be patient, make compromises and agreements, etc., as China has in fact done. Why then are they so down on Khrush & Co.? What would they have had the Soviet Union do in the case of Cuba? Do they really believe that the US wasn't all set to invade? I can't seem to get hold of the key to their reasoning. Any ideas would be much appreciated.

Must mail this pronto. More soon. Thank Picknick for newspapers (his) and letters. I'll write him some cards from S. A.

Love, /s Paul

PAB-PMS

Palo Alto

Jan. 6th, 1963

Dear Paul,

[personal details omitted]

The pp. which you sent me were placed where they belong. As to the contents of the statement concerning "state-mono-cap," I have slight doubts. If addressed to the general public (incl. economists), it is hardly necessary. If it is meant to allay the worries of Shlomo & Co, it is hardly adequate. For their argument would be -- strange as it may sound coming from them -- that it does not take account at all of the income-and-employment-regulating, manipulating -- "Keynesian" -- function of the state. Although it is fairly certain that Lenin who coined the notion did not have this in mind, it is this meaning which is increasingly given to it in Soviet writings. And our own theory assigning an important role to the state as surplus-absorber suggests that the emphasis on the role of the state is not misplaced. It also surely makes sense stressing it in the development of monopoly capitalism in Italy, France, GB and elsewhere. I agree with you that there is no need to employ the word in the title, but there is no need either to stress that it would be wrong to acknowledge the particular and growing role of the state under monopoly capitalism. The alliance of Big Business, Big Brass, Big Bureaucracy; the "industrial-military complex," or whatever other terms have been used to reflect both an increasing amalgamation of BB [Big Business] and state as well as progress in the direction of some kind of "dirigisme" which needs to be recognized. Your principal point is undoubtedly right: monopoly capitalism is all of this; it is unnecessary to give it any other names -- no more than it would be necessary to speak of large-scale-enterprise-monopoly capitalism or corporation-monopoly capitalism. But the substantive element of the distinction or rather characterization would seem to me to be of some merit.

I am now in the process of completing QoS II, and hope to turn to IS shortly. For the time being, I left your comments on Mass Communications &c. in the file so as to return to all of this when I settle down to make all the revisions. It would simply greatly raise my morale to have the whole damn thing drafted and then feel that the steepest part of the climb is behind us.

Otherwise all is as usual. I am working like a sobaka with very little to show for the amount of input, but this is just the way it goes ... Monday school begins again and on the 11th I am going on the "talkathon" to L.A.. Shall send you MS when you get back.

The man who invited me to Buenos Aires is Professor Gino Germani, Director of Departamento de Sociologia, Facultad de Filosofia y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Florida 656 -2 piso. You may want to pay him a visit, and if you do so, assure him of my respects and tell him that I am very much looking forward to meeting him, to visiting B.A., &c., &c.

This is all for the moment, keep me posted of developments, and if you discover any interesting spots which I could visit when in that part of the world, make suitable propaganda for their inviting me. From August 15th until December 15th I should be reachable through the above mentioned gentleman in B.A. But preferably they should write before then.

All the best,

/s Your Paul

PMS-PAB

Monthly Review, New York

Jan. 7, 1963

Dear Paul,

I send you this stuff in driblets and drablets because I like to get it off my chaotic desk, and because I want both copies to be kept continuously as near identical as possible.

NB that when you throw out Ch. 6, pp. 5-8, and substitute the enclosed, there is one page fewer. On re-reading that bit about the difference between government spending and government absorption of surplus, it struck me as rather silly and possibly misleading, esp. since Joe P's [Phillips'] estimates make no such distinction.. I don't think you will mind its disappearance.

I'll phone sometime Thursday evening to say good-bye and get the latest from you before taking off for points south on Friday.

Love,  
/s Paul

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

January 9, 1963

Dear Paul,

Terrible rush to get things in order before departure, So this will be no more than a line.

I enclose (1) two letters from Jack and the edited version of Ch. 10, all of which arrived in the same envelope; and (2) my reply. All of this is self-explanatory, I think. As to procedure, you should go over the chapter carefully at your leisure and decide what you want to accept and what to reject. My brief impression is that despite his troubles, he has not lost his editorial touch. The whole opus will benefit immensely from this kind of disciplining and streamlining. But be sure he hasn't changed your meaning anywhere.

I think you are right that the explanation of refusal to use "state monopoly capitalism" terminology is not satisfactory. But I also think such an explanation is needed -- naturally for Marxists, not for bourgeois economists who won't understand anyway. Next time you write about such matters, jot down in a few sentences your version of the explanation. I will expand it and substitute it for the present version. Is the part on government regulation of utilities and other forms of monopoly promotion okay with you?

Our experience in the last few weeks has been that L. American mails are very uncertain, so if you do write anywhere along the line, you'd better send it to an address no less than 10 days ahead.

Both Stanley and Saul Landau dropped into the office yesterday and reported having seen you in the flesh in the very recent past. It was good to have such eyewitness accounts: one does tend to get (and feel) all too isolated in this social wilderness.

I have a feeling I've forgotten something, but by definition I can't remember what it is. If it comes to me, I'll write again. And in any case I'll phone tomorrow evening.

Love as ever,

/s Paul

P. S. [omitted]

PMS-PAB

[handwritten]

Hotel Grillon  
Santiago de Chile

January 17, 1963

Dear Paul,

The last 2 days in Mexico we spent a total of nine hours with Chi, Deputy Chairman of the Bank of China and an old friend from prewar days, who has been to Brazil and Mexico on a trade mission -- a very intelligent man who is in the higher CP circles in Peking. From these talks it emerges very clearly that the Chinese position is a very straightforward revolutionary position. Their criticisms of the SU are both internal and foreign-policy -- too much inequality, too much reliance on monetary incentives, too little democracy. Externally, fear of revolution, desire to make a deal with U.S. at too high a price, etc. [\*footnote: Also very important: Chinese insistence on full equality for governing CP's. It was on this principle that they supported Yugo in 1948 and Poland in 1956.] One cannot but agree on most points. Their great weakness is underestimation of the U.S. readiness to fight even it means suicide -- they really don't believe the U.S. will resort to nuclear war. Their curiosity about the U.S. is enormous, however. Chi would like to get our book in draft form mammediately, and I had to convince him that we won't have no drafts until it is ready for press.

The Latin American Left is much more disoriented and weak than one could have feared. We spent last evening at the house of [Salvador] Allende, pres. candidate of the Chilean Popular Front for 1964. Fine chap with a beautiful wife and daughter but unfortunately no Fidel. Both in Mexico and here, we find the left intellectuals longing for a "neutralist socialism" -- they simply won't learn the Cuban lesson that the U.S. ain't not buying that commodity. So far as I've observed on this trip (maybe Argentina and Brazil will change the picture), the "imminence of revolution" in LA [Latin America] is a myth. Alas for dreams.

Also, the real understanding of the structure and dynamics of these societies is still at an elementary level. The attitude, potentialities, etc., etc., of the "masses" -- 3/4ths or more of the population -- are largely terra incognita, dealt with in copious clichés. I have been a sinner in this respect myself but have resolved to reform.

Will write again from B.A [Buenos Aires].

Yrs.,  
/s Paul

P.S. The climate here is very close to that of Palo Alto

PMS-PAB

Hotel Grillon  
Santiago de Chile

Fri. p.m.

Dear Paul,

This is from some Socialist Party Senators with whom we just had a long tea. They think you're a great man (quite right!) And will receive you with open arms -- as will many others -- when you come over from B.A. [Buenos Aires] to visit. It's only 2 hours across the Andes. Will send you all sorts of addresses when we get back to N.Y.

Muy hastily,  
Love, /s Paul

P.S. We go to B.A. tomorrow

PAB-PMS

[Palo Alto]

January 23rd, 1963

Dear Paul,

Many thanks for postcard from Mexico and the two letters from Santiago. Prior to my trip to LA [Los Angeles] I also received the material from Jack, whom I wrote a note of thanks and promised to write more after going over the text with the necessary care.

What you report about your talks with Chi is of the utmost interest and shows that in spite of everything it is possible to learn something from history. Their attitude is understandable, predictable, but nevertheless -- I am afraid -- "wrong." I put the word wrong in quotation marks because it is right by some absolute standards and mistaken in the dialectical sense of leaving out of account the concrete, specific conditions within which matters have to be dealt with. Thus the

Paper Tiger theory is fine if, but only if the tiger is made of paper; similarly more equality, less monetary incentives &c. is a good principle if production does not suffer unduly; and equal rights for all socialist countries &c is unquestionable if, and only if, none of them can drag the entire world (and entire socialist camp) into a thermonuclear war. And so it goes, and so it is inevitable that principles of right, justice, morality &c get continually compromised and violated in hustle and bustle of the dialectic.. And how does one find out at any given moment whether one compromises too much or too little? Accordingly, I am not in 100% agreement with your Sino-Indian RoM. The Chinese are undoubtedly right ( a book of documents which I received from Shlomo proves it beyond question); still the consideration which you express in a fn and kind of reject is paramount: shouldn't they rebus sic stantibus [things being as they are] in the world at large instead of shooting started yelling bloody murder, calling on the USSR to mediate, demand a hearing before the Security Council and so forth and so on?

No less interesting are your impressions in re: Aktualitaet in LA [reality in Latin America]. This comes as more of a surprise, because I too have been apparently over-optimistic on that account ....

My expedition to LA was terribly fatiguing: 7 (!!) appearances in 4 days was too much. There were big crowds (1000 in one case and 1400 in another) but still... Alan and family were very nice to me and I saw quite a lot of them.

Must run now to the Campus: some more lecturing -- it is hard to live by one's muscles, but living by one's tongue particularly when the feeding power of the brain so markedly declines in nothing to envy either...

Give my love to Huby, write more and have a good time.

Yours,  
/s Paul

PS. Thanks for the pamphlet; it is funny to be considered a "great man" when one feels like a miserable pigmy.

PMS-PAB

[handwritten]

Hotel Victoria Plaza  
Montevideo, Uruguay

January 26, 1963

Dear Pavlichek,

Enclosed is result of a press conference arranged without our knowledge -- no trouble for Norteamericanos with "other" views to get publicity around here (somewhat shorter stories appeared in 3 other papers).

No time at the moment -- saw Germani in BA and apparently all is calm on that front for the moment. Will write more fully from Rio for which we leave in a few minutes.

Love, /s Paul

PMS-PAB

[handwritten]

Hotel Trocadero  
Rio de Janeiro

January 28, 1963

Dear Paul,

Make a note that when you come to Rio you must stay at an air-conditioned hotel -- this one at Copacabana (much better in every way, incl. cheaper, than the Excelsior where our travel agent had booked us) or the Gloria nearer the center.

I saw Germani in BA [Buenos Aires]. As you probably know, he is a tired intellectual whose enthusiasms are all in the past, and lives in constant fear for his job. He is resigning as chairman of the dept of sociology and hopes his successor will be Torcuato Di Tella, from one of Argentina's richest families (autos and much else besides), with whom you will probably have to deal in future negotiations. Di Tella is said to be not quite bright and is undoubtedly under Germani's influence. Your appointment is in the nature of a test case. The money is from Ford, with no overt strings attached (except no appointments of socialist-bloc chaps), and Germani seems to think if the Univ. administration (now under control of the Catholics) doesn't intervene to block your coming to BA, then they can do what they like. Meanwhile, the political situation in Argentina is so bad and so confused that almost anything might happen (except something good of course), so you probably ought to be thinking of an alternative for the Aug.-Dec. period in case of a cancellation. I don't say it's probably, but the possibility certainly can't be excluded.

BA is a great city, much more impressive than any other we've seen -- and more than twice as big. I'm sure you'll like it from that point of view. But the situation of the country is sad beyond description. Economic degeneration, speeding up, accompanied by absolute political stalemate from which no one can see any way out. The Left is falling apart, the huge middle strata are cynical and apathetic (Germani says Argentinians are like Americans, by which he means middle-class Argentinians), and the workers are under the spell of Peron. I have always tended to discount Peronism, but an evening with three of the most militant, class-conscious Peronist trade-union leaders was a real revelation. They await the second coming with all the religious fervor of millenarian Christians, and in the meantime are impervious to other ideas and programs. It is hard to imagine a country at once more in need of revolution and at the same time so far from it.

Montevideo was pleasant, a quiet backwater but a good place to observe things around the continent. Marcha, a left-nationalist weekly published there (and strictly banned in Argentina) is probably the best of its kind in LA [Latin America].

We definitely succeeded in our mission to start a Spanish ed'n of MR in BA. Charming young gals (2 of them) will do translating and all business end as well. Everyone tells us the potential

market is excellent. Whether all obstacles can be overcome, and whether the Argentine authorities will permit it -- these are questions no one can answer. We figure we can't lose by trying.

We haven't seen anyone in Rio yet. Everything points to the conclusion that Brazil is the key country -- the only one capable of sustaining a revolution. But more on all that when we've had time to look around and get the feel of the place.

En generale, CP's everywhere seem to be in a sharp swing to the Right -- Khrushchev line. Unless the Chinese influence asserts itself and new leadership of a Sino-Fidelista character emerges, they are going to degenerate and decline. Already, their importance is small except in Chile and (probably) Venezuela. A tremendous popular-front fiasco seems in the making in Chile. I remembered the same kind of higher hopes in Spain and France in '36. History does have a stubborn way of repeating itself.

Saw in Montevideo a review of Italian ed'n of PEOG in Rinascita (July 28, 1962). From what I could make out, it seems to be a vicious attack on both you and me -- probably a foretaste of what to expect for opus from European CP'ers. The reviewer, as I recall, has some such name as Spesso.

Love, /s Paul

P.S. We're collecting names and addresses for you.

PAB-PMS

Palo Alto, California,

February 5th, 1963

Dear Paul,

Welcome home where I hope everything is in as good an order as you would wish to see! I haven't written to you for a long time because I wasn't sure where to dispatch my missives. Did you get the one which I sent to Rio? What you wrote from (and about Buenos Aires) sounded quite disturbing, but I am not certain what to do about it. If those boys cancel me out, I'll be in a bad fix porque I applied for and rec'd leave (minus pay !!) for the Autumn Quarter and would therefore be sitting here with no salary no more.. It is bad enough sitting here cum salary! There might be still time to fix it -- until, say, the end of this month -- but, if not done so forthwith the books will be closed. Your council on that matter would be greatly appreciated. But this is not what I am writing for at the moment. Right now I just want to send you another batch of pp for QoS II. There are some more, and it may well be that the concluding sentence (quotation) should come at the very end, rather than where it is now. But we can see about it later. I'm sure you have plenty of stuff on your desk, am still sending it along so as to have as complete as possible sets at your place & here.

On more later; give me a buzz Saturday night or Sunday night.

Much love,  
/s Yours Paul

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

February 22, 1963

Dear Paul,

Jack has sent back Chs. 2 and 5, along with some 12 pages of penciled notes. Unfortunately, I have been fully preoccupied with the RoM (it came out to be a 25-page piece entitled "Notes on Latin America" [March, 1963 MR]) which I only finished Wednesday, and since then with a mountain of accumulated stuff that I simply must shovel off my desk before I can settle down to anything serious. So I haven't even read the notes yet, and that also goes still for the latest batch of QoS you sent me. But soon, I hope, I'll be back to opus.

I am returning:

(1) Carbon of copy sent to Rio and never rec'd there. I have formulated my latest ruminations on Sino-Soviet matters in a longish letter to Frank Kofsky [missing??], and rather than repeat I ship along the carbon. With it, however, comes a request that you look at it more or less immediately and send it back -- with comments if any occur to you, which I hope they do -- because I must show it to Huby as a sort of basis for an outline of an eventual RoM. Frank, by the way, was most impressed by your LA [Los Angeles] performance(s). He seems to be a bright chip-chap who really understands something, not usual even among the best-intentioned of students.

(2) The above-described carbon of letter to Kofsky.

(3) Page clipped from latest Economic Weekly to reach me, on concentration in Britain. Very interesting. Please return for file.

God, what a lot of time gets wasted on stuff that a Great Man has assistants and secretaries to attend to!

How did you make out with the Biz Wk interview? I am most interested to see what, if anything, they publish. The fact that they are interested at all is a clear indication that opus's time has come. Let us finish it up, and let us not worry too much about whether it is as perfect as we could make it if we spent all the time we could devote to it and still not get zero or negative returns.

More soon. Love,  
/s Paul

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

February 25, 1963

Dear Paul,

The enclosed will not mean too much to you without Jack's notes, relevant page notations, etc., but at least it will keep you more or less posted on where things stand with the earlier chapters. Jack's letters clearly indicate that he is now in an "up" phase, so I am anxious to keep feeding him copy to work on.

It is quite amazing how much better the stuff reads after he has scraped out all the crappy literary tricks with which one tries to impress one's readers. In particular the elimination of italics turns out in all but two or three cases to be an obvious improvement. I guess the moral is that the simpler and more straightforward the form the better the content gets across.

As you see from the last line, I have sent him Ch. 4. There may be some more re-working to do on all these chapters, but it will be no loss to have the basic copy editing finished. In line with this principle, I shall send him 6, 7, and 8 in order after 4 comes back. Meanwhile, my next assignment is to go through the latest batch of QoS which you sent me. I'll get to that in the next day or so. Today I have to go to town to clean up once and for all the backlog left by the Latin American jaunt.

More soon,

Hastily & love,  
/s Paul

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

February 26, 1963

Dear Paul.

I have finally got around to the new QoS material (on mental health), and I have to say immediately that I am not happy about it. It seems to me that here you have become so absorbed in the mental health literature and so involved in the various methodologies and disputes which characterize it that you have almost forgotten what the purpose is. Our opus is surely not the place for discussions of the inadequacies of (obviously inadequate) conceptions of mental health and illness, nor for demonstrations that certain kinds of statistics (like hospital admission rates) prove little if anything. Further, I think there is much too much quotation from the specialist literature. The purpose, presumably, is to convince the reader that we have studied these matters seriously and are not talking through our hats. The effect, I am afraid, is rather to bore and sometimes even confuse him. Finally, I think there is too much emphasis on the inadequacy and inequality in the treatment of mental illness. The point of the section, if I understand the place of these chapters in the whole design correctly, is to bring home to the reader that monopoly capitalism produces a sick society. It is also true that it does a lousy job trying to deal with the consequences of this sickness, but that is a different point, and to play it up blurs the picture: it would be more effective to include such material in the section dealing with income inequality and poverty.

As to positive suggestions, I would be inclined to favor something along the following lines:

1. I have tried my hand at tidying up p. 46 (new version included) , but there is nothing essentially new in the mode of introducing the section.
2. I would begin the real changes right after the end of the paragraph which begins on line 20 of p. 46 and runs over onto 46a. Never mind the additional objections to the clinical empiricist's conception: you have already established the point that it is no good. Next you could very quickly -- in a paragraph, no more -- dispose of the idea that any good index of mental health can be got from hospital admission data. (This brings us through p. 49: in other words nearly 5 pages have been eliminated.)
3. By now you have made two points: that there is no handy definition of mental illness available, and that hospital statistics tell us nothing of interest. Still we find the 1-in-10 figure being quoted at us all the time. What does it mean? We are not told. Can it be plausibly supported by such specialized studies as have been made?
4. No. These studies suggest that a much higher ratio would be nearer the mark. Here summarize the findings of the Army and Midtown studies (I would omit the Rashi Fein thing since it is only persuasive if combined with your guess about the incidence of "more or less severe neuroses": if you want to keep it in, some of the "ample evidence" ought to be cited, but I don't think it's worth the trouble since the Army and Midtown studies are so much better for our purpose). [Leo Srole et al, Mental Health in the Metropolis: The Midtown Manhattan Study, New York, 1962 (the Army study was apparently not used)]
5. These studies do not give us insight into the incidence of mental illness as between classes and races. If we take account of these differentials, the overall picture takes on a much grimmer aspect. Here summarize relevant data from Hollingshead & Redlich, etc., and present the evidence of higher incidence among Negroes. Anything to be said about differential treatment by class and race should be confined to footnotes for reasons suggested in the opening paragraph above. I would bring the mental illness section to a close right here.

Next, I think we should have an entirely separate section on Negroes in US society. It would come logically after the evidence that mental illness is greater among Negroes, but I think it should have a general rather than such a specialized focus. (It doesn't have to be placed here, of course, and perhaps the end of QoS II would be the best place. It certainly wouldn't be a bad climax to have the Baldwin quote now on lines 5-3, from bottom of p. 60, plus your comment, at the very end of the chapter. Didn't Marx say something very similar about emancipation of the Jews? Perhaps that should be quoted too, with a remark that it is much more apposite to the problem of US Negroes than to any other group. Or is it? Maybe in a predominantly colored and socialist world, US Negroes will be emancipated before whites?) The Negro section, if you agree to it, can be written later, and if you like I can try drafting it. At the moment, I am only concerned about the principle.

Let me know what you think about all this.

More on other matters soon.

Love, /s Paul

PAB-PMS

Palo Alto

March 2, 1963

Dear Paul,

A lot of things to write about, and I'm not certain that I'll manage to cover the entire ground in one letter.

1. Attached is a review of St. Joan for AER. I suffered writing it even more than usual and have no idea whether it is any good. It is due immediately, and if you could give it a quick going-over, I would be most obliged. If you think that something entirely different is in order, let me know; I hate to think about it, but I would try a different tack. The trouble only is that I promised to deliver it before March 10th.

2. I was repeatedly asked by the St. on the Left boys [Studies on the Left, left-wing journal published in Madison, Wisconsin and later New York, from 1959 to 1967] to give them an article. Since there is absolutely no time to do one (although there would be no dearth of topics!), it occurred to me that they could publish our Statement for the British Advertising Commission. One could write a short opening paragraph explaining the origin of the thing and let it go at that. I re-read it; it strikes me as (a) perfectly publishable, and (b) containing some stuff which their readers certainly do not know. How do you feel about it?

3. Samuelson is a dishonest bastard, but one thing becomes clearer than it was before: the continuous tendency in Moscow and among the Perloists to twist and bend science and truth according to the requirements of the political strategy or tactics of the moment (however noble, as in the struggle for peace, the aims of that struggle may be) produces nothing but confusion and embarrassment. Since saying that monopoly capitalism cannot manage minus armaments is considered now to be warmongering, they obviously get into the ridiculous position on which Samuelson can so easily pick them up. The popular front philosophy in which you hide your socialist aims and in this way hope to win liberals has something to recommend itself in specific, very concrete constellations of anti-fascist struggle; when it is turned into a general principle of "uniting democratic and progressive forces" it completely undermines all socialist identity and destroys the major asset that socialists have: clarity and sharpness of critique. In this sense, by the way, Radosh's article in Feb MR was very good.

4. The Biz Week man spent 4 hours (!) at my house; he was not a great lumen, and what he has sent to NY God only knows. I asked [him] to show me his write-up, but he told me that this is against the rules of the house. So we'll see. He told me that the man in charge of the whole project is Bill Wolman, who was a grad. student here, and who took some of my courses. I knew him quite well.

5. I am unhappy about your being unhappy about the mental health stuff, but I can well see your points. I am undoubtedly a little subject to "academic cretinism" and was leaning over backward to protect our flanks against professional critique of making unsupported assertions. It is terribly

hard to strike a balance there and I'll have to make another try. I'll write to you about this more in a few days.

6. On Sino-Soviet stuff I am completely d'accord with your letter to the LA chap [Frank Kofsky], except perhaps with regard to the Indian affair. But on this too, later on; it is getting late and I would like this letter to go out in today's mail.

Love,  
/s Yours Paul

PAB-PMS

[handwritten note, undated, probably March 4, 1963]

Dear Paul,

A California mag Frontier has asked me to comment on Ferry's attached article. It so happens that Ferry had sent it to me prior to publication with a request to comment upon it, and I have done so as per also attached letter. Do you think I should let Frontier print that letter?

Your opinion would be greatly appreciated.

Yours faithfully, /s Paul

PAB-PMS

Palo Alto, CA

March 5, 1963

Dear Paul,

In re: opus. I have gone carefully over your comments on the psycho stuff, and I think that your suggestions concerning its shortening and reorganizing are very good. I would feel somewhat uneasy about throwing out all of the material on methodology of measurement etc. because these matters are in the center of the pertinent literature and we should not simply wind up with the "discovery" that ours is a sick society; this is almost universally granted in one form or another with the big debate concerning primarily the question: did it get worse lately or has it always been that way since Adam. If you have noticed my reference to Goldhammer & Marshall (very respected figures in their trade), who, by the way, not accidentally, I suppose, work for the RAND Corp.-- the chief contention of the status quo boys is precisely that all this is simply the "human condition" with nothing much to be done about it. The fact that some of this material is, as you say, plain boring (and I was not unaware of it when putting it together!) is no doubt bad, but what can one do about it. If such comparisons should not in themselves indicate a state of mental disorder (megalomania, in this case), there are quite a few pp. in Capital that ain't as spanned [exciting] as a mystery story... Anyway, I'll try to re-fix it and we'll see how it comes out the next round.

The second question is not whence but whither? There are three topics which I would deal with to conclude QoS II: family, j.d. [juvenile delinquency] & alcoholism. All of this will be pretty short, and should bring up the QoS II Chapter from its present ca 70 pp. (to be reduced in the process of revising) to, say 85 pp. Again, the question, how to deal with all of this so as to not simply repeat the assertive statements on pp. 167-171 of the Summer MR [1962] issue? It immediately involves going into the ifs and buts of the literature -- some of which are worth discussing; others not. Well, I'll see, how it comes out and then we may have to do a revising job. I am sure that most of the trouble is due to my lack of ability; some of it is, however, caused by recalcitrance of the material.

In any case, I would very much like to get this whole stuff out of my way; it is not a very gratifying biz, and do the IS [Irrational System] Chapter where all those things should be brought together, structured and interconnected. That is the thing which I really want to do and, I would hope, could do a little better.

Now, concerning the Negro section. It surely would be most important to have such a discussion included; I only remember that either orally or per correspondence we once decided to state specifically in the Preface or in the Introduction that we are not attempting to deal with everything and therefore among other important topics omit the whole Negro complex. If you think that we have enough to go on to say something substantial on the Negro issue then let us by all means have QoS III on that which would have the clear advantage of protecting us also against a number of critics who would immediately pick on our not paying enough attention to a matter of such tremendous importance. It might call for taking out from preceding sections most references to Negroes and bring them together in that Chapter. What I am only afraid of is that there is such an awful lot of literature in that area that one could easily bog down in it. But if you think that you could compose such a story without too much trouble, you certainly have all my blessings. Attached is by the way an excellent article by Alan Dutscher (do you know who he is? I have come across his name before in connection with something he wrote on American publishing biz.) I also have the (interesting) Fortune article to which he refers. If you want me to, I shall send it to you (would prefer not to clip it out of Fortune, and sending the whole issue requires a truck).

So this is the state of matters. Before the end of this month you should have the end of QoS II; then on the agenda is IS and somewhere in between one has to do the articles for the Lange-Kalecki volumes. I rec'd a letter from Italy saying that apparently our Sino-Soviet pieces have created an uproar with lots of people pro and con. I would be most tempted to do "Some Further Thoughts on the Great Debate," but must control all such emotions and stick to the grindstone. The only joblet which I could not refuse for obvious reasons is a request from JPE to do a review of Milton Friedman's Capitalism and Freedom. A most exasperating book and I must do it just to appear, if only rarely, in the pro journals.

All the bestest  
Con amore,

Paul

P.S. How do you like Stanley's Three Tactics? I have read the MS, and have kind of a peculiarly uncertain feeling about it. It is elegant as everything he does and somewhere it misses, I think, the main point.

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

March 7, 1963

Dear Paul,

I was in Washington Tuesday (giving a lecture at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies), returned Wednesday a.m. and spent the whole day in the city. So the enclosed matters could be attended to sooner, for which I beg your indulgence. This will be a very hasty note and I'll get the whole shebang into the mail for the next collection.

The review of St. Joan is not one of your best efforts, but I think it is harmless and will do for the AER. I would have preferred it if you had said more about what is in the book (I read it myself but have mostly forgotten) and had stressed the good sides rather than the bad, since I think that vis-a-vis "our" professional colleagues St. Joan is to be held up as something of a paragon of virtue and wisdom. But these are matters of personal preference which are of no great moment. As you see, I have tried to edit it a bit, with perhaps negative results. I'm sure that the sentence beginning on line 7 from the bottom of p. 2 is still not right, but I can't seem to think of the correct reformulation. All I can say is, don't let it go in either in the original form, which was too ungainly, or in my corrected form: try again.

The reply to Ping is excellent and what it says needs to be said in public. So by all means let Frontier publish it. I had read the piece; in fact Hubie wanted to publish it in MR, and I must confess I was relieved when we found out, that he had already given it to Frontier. I'm afraid I am becoming almost convinced that the peace movement does more harm than good! Again, I have done a bit of editing, this time in light pencil so that it won't spoil the file copy. You will note that I have fairly consistently suggested that you remove underlinings. Partly the reason is that Jack has convinced me that everyone tends to use this mechanical device too freely. But even more it is because you naturally write in such a way as to make your emphases clear without any mechanical additions so that you need them less than most. I have no doubt whatever that prose with a minimum of italics and quotation marks is much more elegant and effective than prose which is unduly cluttered ...

Yours of the 5th arrived by the morning delivery while I was writing the above words of wisdom. It raises large issues which cannot be settled all at once. But I would like to set down a few reactions while they are fresh in mind.

1. Of course you are right that it is of no use merely repeating that this is a sick society. But it seems to me that what is required is not so much a verbatim debate with the specialists as a brief description in our own words of the chief issues raised by the specialist literature together with a clear indication of where we stand and why. The opus is after all an "essay" and it is important not to let the proportions get out of whack. We deal very summarily with many of the extremely important problems in the economic and politico-economic areas, often not citing any of the relevant specialist literature, and in my judgment we have to do it that way. The alternative would be to try to write a multi-volume treatise with all the paraphernalia of scholarship trained on each and every important question. But that is not what we want to do. We want to push

Marxist thought into some new channels, and that demands that we treat many, many issues within a brief compass. The comparison with Capital, in my humble opinion, is not very relevant. Vol. I, to which I assume you refer, deals with a remarkable narrow range of subjects but aims to do so with maximum intensity. Our whole purpose, if I understand it rightly, is a quite different one..

These are the considerations I would recommend you keep in mind in working over mental health and proceeding to family, j.d. [juvenile delinquency], and alcoholism. As to the Negro problem: I certainly do not want to undertake a whole chapter. I had in mind a relatively brief section, saying the things you say in the relevant sections of the mental health section plus a number of others, mostly things that are obvious and well known to knowledgeable people so that nothing elaborate in the way of documentation would be required. Perhaps what is said elsewhere in the QoS chapters (on Negro income, housing, etc.) should all be removed from their present locations and put together in this section. But in any case, the purpose would be to attempt anything even faintly approaching a full-dress treatment but simply to give convincing evidence that we are fully aware of the decisive importance of the question and of its relationship to the structure of monopoly capitalism.

2. I am fully d'accord in wishing this material completed and in looking forward to your putting the pieces together in the IS chapter. This, as you know, will be in a sense the keystone of the arch.

3. We are publishing Stanley's Three Tactics as a small book. Like you, I was not altogether happy about it, but I think it does a very good job of assembling and summarizing the relevant ideas from the works of the founding fathers. This will be part of its usefulness but not all. It will help to put the present "great debate" in historical perspective, which is badly needed (we found that young people in L. America often know next to nothing about theory or the history of theory, and I suppose it must be the same elsewhere). Perhaps you or I should do a review of the book when it comes out.

On other matters I please return soonest the carbon of my letter to Kofsky [Sweezy archive?]. I must discuss these questions with Hubie, and that can serve as a starting point. Any thoughts you may have will be most welcome, but don't hold up for them.

I have the Fortune referred to in Dutcher's article. What do you know about the magazine Contemporary Issues? I have never heard of it. I will read Dutcher and also Fortune with great interest.

But other matters will have to wait if this is to make the 11:30 collection.

Love, /s Paul

[handwritten P.S.]: Fine to publish the advertising thing in S on the L [Studies on the Left]. But in this case I must insist that my name be omitted. I did not compose it and do not feel entitled to any credit -- a position which you know from experience and I believe are fully sympathetic with. As a memo to the British Commission, I was of course glad to add my name for whatever weight it might possess. But for publication, no. Okay?

PAB-PMS

[Palo Alto]

March 9th, 1963

Dear Paul,

Many thanks for your spec'y and enclosures. I agree with you that the St. Joan piece did not come out too well, but somehow in this case I had even less luck than usual. The comments on Ping I'll send on to The Frontier; I wonder whether they'll have the guts to publish it.

On the advertising piece I must ask for your forgiveness. After having spoken to you over the telephone (on Thursday), I have mailed out the thing to St. on the Left as well as to Soberon of El Trimestre in Mexico. In so doing I substituted for the title per the attached statement as an introduction, and as you can see left both our names in the by-line. Your objections to not being named as a co-author appear to me ill-founded. Whoever did the bulk of the writing, the thoughts presented belong to our joint Gedankengut [brain trust], in fact reflect what is being advanced in the opus. This is quite different from, say, your pamphlet on S.I.R. [Scientific-Industrial Revolution, op. cit. in letter of January 19, 1957], with which I had approximately nothing to do either by the way of thinking it out or composing it. So, while I shouldn't have sent the stuff out as precipitously as I did -- and for this I sincerely apologize -- I do believe that co-authorship in this particular case is wholly warranted. I also hope that you will graciously accept this development, for your withdrawing your name at this stage would suggest that you refuse to be associated with that outpouring -- and for this there is no particular reason since the stuff is pretty innocuous. In general, I do not believe that this is a serious problem; I do not think that the future historian of thought will be overly concerned with the question who precisely wrote what.... And if he should be, figuring it out would add somewhat to the excitement of his occupation.

Letter to Kofsky attached. Having read quite a bit of the pertinent documents, I am more and more inclined to believe that all this is a typical "left-right" tension within the movement, with my own sympathies leaning -- as usual -- towards the left. But I shall write you a longish letter on all of this before too long. Now I must go back to work.

Are you putting the Butenko stuff into the April issue? There may be a few sentences there that ought to be sharpened (not in a combative but in a clarifying way). I made no carbon copy of that thing, so if there is time, send it back to me for a quick reading over. If not, no tragedy.

On more later.

Love, /s Paul

P.S. Do you agree on the whole with my critique of Stanley? If so, I'll be glad to do a review of his book when it comes out. There are other important points which I have written down, but decided not to include in that letter.

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

March 9, 1963

Dear Paul,

I've been thinking more about how to handle the Negro question in opus, and my present tentative inclination is to proceed more or less along the following lines:

1. Keep the Negro material in as is in the QoS chapters, only not making such a special issue of it under mental health as is now the case. In other words, point out under mental health, as under income, housing, etc., that the position of the Negro is much worse than that of the white, but do not try to do anything else in that section.

2. Introduce into The Irrational Society [eventually became "Irrational System"] chapter a special section on the Negro question, the purpose of which would not be to document how badly off Negroes are but rather to explain the status of Negroes in terms of the central theme of the book, i.e. the increasing difficulty of surplus absorption under monopoly capitalism.

3. The explanation, as I see it, could stress the following:

a. It is always in the interests of a capitalist class to have a divided working class, since it facilitates exploitation of both (or all) segments, provides a special "helotry" to do the dirtiest and meanest work (including domestic service), makes more difficult the formation of serious political opposition, etc. A good brief theoretical exposition of these matters would be a valuable contribution in its own right.

b. Taking US history as a whole, probably the chief form of division has been between native workers and immigrants, with the latter being divided not only from the former but also among themselves. As long as slavery lasted, Negroes were confined to one special sector of the economy and were not available for use in the other, much larger wage-labor sector. After emancipation, the nature of the political compromise between Northern and Southern ruling classes (from which both derived great benefits) was such as largely to maintain the statue quo in this regard, with the Negroes remaining a special resource of the Southern plantation economy.

c. World War I seems to have been the turning point. Manpower needs opened up opportunities in industry for Negroes, and the sharp curtailment of immigration created a demand for a continuation of this "internal immigration." In this connection it has specially to be stressed that white immigration from abroad provides the basis for only temporary divisions in the working class. The children of immigrants are natives and cannot be so easily discriminated against, and after two or three more generations the distinctions cease to exist. Not so with Negroes: no matter how many generations pass he cannot change his skin color. From the capitalist point of view, therefore, race is the best basis for discrimination. (Bring in here Mexicans and Puerto Ricans as having similar though not so clear-cut advantages.)

d. The process of replacing the "old" immigrants (who simply evaporated into the native white population) by the "new" colored immigrants was given a big push by two factors: World War II and the agricultural revolution, esp. the cotton picker and other labor-saving devices which drastically reduced the need for Negro field hands in the South.

e. So far we have explained, theoretically and historically, the presence and growing importance of Negroes in the industrial cities. (Incidentally, it would be most interesting to put alongside the by-now well-known figures on the growing Negro populations in Northern cities other not-so-well-known -- in fact not at all known to me -- figures on the declining immigrant populations in the same cities. I wonder if the two together, as a share of the total, wouldn't remain fairly stable?) Next we have to inquire whether there are at work basic forces making for the improvement of the status of Negroes and the reduction in the severity of discrimination. Here it could be shown, I believe, that the only effective force operating in this way would be a persistent excess of demand for labor power over supply. And this could be empirically supported by the experience of the two war periods, which were notoriously the only periods in which the relative position of Negroes improved.

f. The central thesis of opus, however, is that it is the nature of monopoly capitalism to generate the exact opposite of an excess of demand for labor power over supply. In these circ[umstances], the only effective force counteracting the powerful urge of capitalists to discriminate -- a shortage of labor power -- not only is absent but on the contrary a progressively larger labor surplus tends to be generated. Negroes therefore become more and more exploitable, and discrimination tends to increase, not decrease. In the face of this situation, the counteracting power of legislation against discrimination, FEPC's [Fair Employment Practices Commission], etc., etc., is rather small. The net of it is that the relative position of Negroes is actually worsening. The only effective remedy is the overthrow of monopoly capitalism.

4. In a final "looking ahead" section, it could be brought out that Negroes, unlike whites, are likely increasingly to reject white US society and to solidarize with the colored majority of the human race. As the latter goes increasingly socialist, US Negroes will do likewise. They will therefore become not only strangers within the gates but also enemies. And we should of course express 100% approval: it is the natural and healthy result of the Negro's coming, in the words of the Manifesto, "to face with sober senses his real conditions of life and his relations with his kind."

I see many advantages in handling the Negro question along these lines and no disadvantages. It would explain what most Americans don't understand and therefore entertain all sorts of illusions about. And it would remedy a big gap (and fault) in the book as we have conceived it up to now and which cannot really be excused by a disclaimer in the Preface. The only thing I wonder about is whether after all this shouldn't be a chapter by itself. If so, I am inclined to think it ought to come right after the historical Chapter (No.8) and to be entitled something like "Monopoly Capitalism and the Negro Question." If you agree, I would like very much to try writing such a chapter. In any case, let me know what you think of the above outline. If it is not to be used for opus, I will some time make an RoM out of it.

The Alan Dutscher piece, by the way, is excellent and has most quotable material. But like most writings on the subject, it does not display any particular awareness of the underlying reasons why Negroes should be in the plight they're in. In other words, the interest-complex which lies at the bottom of it all and which blocks all ways out is nowhere mentioned.

In re your letter to Stanley about Three Tactics (returned herewith): I do not have the ms. here and so cannot refresh my memory. But I had exactly the same objection as you voice (especially in the P. S.) to his "competing systems" case. Needless to say, I did not succeed in convincing him. Apart from that, I found his summarization of the Marxian literature excellent and, so far as

I can remember the relevant books and passages, accurate. Whether the old boys themselves were without fault is another question: perhaps some of your remarks are directed more at them than at Stanley. But I don't want to get into these things without first having another good look at the opusculum itself. Perhaps a review of the thing when it comes out would be in order. Either you or I could do it, or we could do it jointly, or we could do two notes to follow each other.

I have just finished reading Zagoria [Donald Zagoria, The Sino-Soviet Conflict 1956-1961, Princeton, 1962], goaded on by Stanley who seemed to think it would cure me of my Chinophilia. It had exactly the opposite effect. The long series of quotations marshalled by our researcher seem to indicate that the Chinese are remarkably level-headed and understand the world situation very well indeed (the slander that they are warmongers, want war to promote socialism, etc., is thoroughly disposed of). The Russkis on the other hand evidently entertain the wildest sort of illusions about what can be got out of imperialism by sweetness and light, about the possibilities of reforms under capitalism, about the possibilities of peaceful accession to power, about the revolutionary potentials of national bourgeoisies, etc. (In Latin America, in my opinion, there is not one instance of a national bourgeoisie which has the slightest intention to break with US imperialism.) The Chinese position is not that one should rush headlong into premature revolutions, but it is that one should face realities and cope with them as best you can, with confidence that in the long run a militant revolutionary struggle will pay off much better than finagling and maneuvering. Oh well, I guess I am temperamentally disgusted by reformism, so maybe I am unable to judge these matters on their merits.

Incidentally, the real story of the latest Iraqi coup is truly horrifying and apparently in no small part has its roots in Soviet insistence that the Iraqi CP should play the moderate game [February 1963 overthrow of Iraq's Abd al-Karim Qasim regime]. It seems to be Shanghai, 1927, all over again: a terrible bloodbath, with most of the Communists and progressives already murdered. What the role of the CIA and the oil companies may have been is not clear, but one suspects the worst. And these new butchers are the bosom pal of Nasser who in turn is the recipient of one of the biggest of Soviet aid programs. Now, from the morning's news, it seems that the whole tragic business is about to be repeated in Syria. It is heartbreaking.

Love, /s Paul

PMS-PAB

Monthly Review, New York

March 11, 1963

Dear Paul,

Yrs of the 9th just rec'd. I have no time at the moment but want to hasten to assure you that the matter of the authorship of the advertising thing is of no real importance. I thought that in this case you should be entitled to the credit of authorship, but I have no objection to being overruled.

This raises, by the way, the question of, the jointness of the two pieces for the Poles. I can't even remember what subject I agreed to write on. Can you dig that out of your file? And in order that they should really have a goodly element of jointness, despite entirely separate drafting, I think it

would be good if we could both bat up outlines and exchange notes on same in the fairly near future. What do you think?

The Butenko stuff has already gone to the printer. I edited it pretty carefully and may have taken care of the clarity problems you had in mind. Anyway, Leo thought it was good, so I guess it must at any rate have been quite intelligible. He (quite rightly) refuses to let unclarities and ambiguities get through..

More on other stuff in due course.

Quickissimo,  
/s Paul

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

March 12, 1963

Dear Paul,

Just a note to relay a message from Jack who seems to be in an up phase and writes very long and often brilliant letters. (I have kept his letters over the years: a good enough editor could make a wonderful book out of them.) He was highly impressed, as was I, by an English book we published: Jackson and Marsden, Education and the Working Class: "Please call Paul's attention," he writes, "if it seems relevant and not too late, to the text and footnote 1 at page 224 - all this natch, in relation to Chapter 10. Not knowing the work in the field at all, I can't remember if PAB cites these particular works, or gave any sign of having read them -- but they certainly sound appropriate?" I don't have the book here so can't look into this at the moment. But I've asked the office to send the book along to you, and when it arrives you can have a look. Not that I think you will want to do anything more with 10, but in any case it may be interesting to see what he has in mind.

[personal details omitted]

Love,  
/s Paul

PMS-PAB

[handwritten]

Monthly Review, New York

March 16, 1963

Dear Paul,

Ad yours of 13th [missing?]: From what I know about O'Connor (which isn't much), he's no ball of fire. However, relative to the general run of economists he would seem a paragon of enlightenment and entitled to whatever assistance we can give him. The enclosed clippings from the Guardian show that he's neither a fool nor a crook like Perlo (I don't know which description applies -- maybe both).

Love, /s P

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

March 21, 1963

Dear Paul,

I'm preparing Ch. 6 for sending to Jack and need the data to complete footnote \*\* on p. 17. To save your having to get out the ms.: it refers to the piece by Reginald Isaacs in that CED mimeographed study on the outlook for the US economy. What I need is the exact title, publication place, and date of the volume and the page number on which the statement occurs that the "necessary federal participation expenditures alone will rival those for national security." (This is, of course, in the Isaacs contribution which is only a few pages long. If I am right that you have this volume, will you please take three minutes off immediately to get this info for me? Thanx. Excuse it please: I already have the data about the volume: Committee for Economic Development, Problems of United States Economic Development, Vol. 1, New York, 1958. All I need is the page number of the quotation.

Finished over the week-end an RoM on "The Split in the Capitalist World" [MR, April, 1963]. I'll be interested to know if you think I'm cockeyed. It seems to me like the rejection of the British bid for Common Market entry is the point of no return for de Gaulle and Adenauer and that their successors will not be able to reverse matters -- nor will the other partners in the CM. At the bottom of it all is the inevitable drive of European monopoly capitalism to gain its independence of the US yoke and to go on from there to struggle for supremacy in the "free world." I didn't put it that way, but one could easily say that it is simply another proof of the profundity and generality of Lenin's law of uneven development under capitalism. The implications are of course immense, and I don't do more than open up that aspect. Much more thought needs to be given to it, esp. from the point of view of US monopoly capitalism and US imperialism. By the way, do you ever see Forbes Magazine, a Biz Wk kind of mag for bizmen? Kenny May sends me clips from it from time to time. The publisher (I suppose), Malcolm S. Forbes, has a page called "Fact and Comment" which seems to be about the keenest stuff coming out of any ruling-class think shop these days. The two pieces of March 1 and 15 entitled respectively "Next on de Gaulle's List: NATO, U.N., U.S." and "South America: Economic Chaos" show more real insight than Walter Lippmann. If you are in the library, look them up and also please get the address and sub price of the mag for me. I have only some odd pages with no details on them. (I'd send them along, but at the moment Leo has them.)

More on other matters later.

Love, /s Paul

P.S. Bill Wolman of Biz Wk came in last Friday with questions he wanted to clear up about our position, etc. We talked with him for 2-1/2 hours. He says if all goes well the piece should appear in next week's mag. i.e. March 29th.

PAB-PMS

Palo Alto, California

March 22, 1963

Dear Paul,

I was meaning to write to you much earlier, but the last couple of weeks were indescribably hectic. In my exalted capacity of "Director of Graduate Study," I had to go over 350 (!!!) Applications for Admission to Stanford plus 300 Applications for Financial Aid and select 15 (!!!) worthies... It is beyond me to describe the amount of suffering I went through and to convey to you the feeling of futility that goes with it. All of the applicants obviously apply at other institutions as well; the Devil knows where they actually decide to go. This probably depends to a large extent on the amount of money which they are offered by the individual schools. As a result a tremendous waste of effort: in at least 5 universities 5 individuals pore over the same bloody forms, scratch their heads for hours to decide whom to take only to find out that 2/3 or so of their choices go to the competition. If this is not an insane system, I do not know what is. Not that the students should be taken the freedom of choice of schools, but their decision should be made on the basis of faculty or God knows what rather than on the basis of which school pays them more for coming... Well, anyway, this is now all finished, the admissions are out of my hands, the money distributed among those students who are here already, the quarter is over and all that remains to complete is bluebooks reading. By Monday I shall be 100% at home and working day and night on the MS which begins to cause terrible dreams -- it must be finished at last!! [I remember well helping my father with organizing the graduate student applications on his dining room table...nmb]

Another source of bad dreams is the whole Argentina biz. I rec'd official notification of my being placed on leave minus pay for the autumn, my money is already assigned to a replacement, and if Argentina should fall through I'll be not arbeitslos but erwerbslos. [not unemployed but without income] If it were not for the money end of it, I would not worry much; my enthusiasm for going is kind of cooling off (don't know why?), but to get stuck without 4 salary checks would be an absolute disaster considering that after having repaid Model's loan, I ain't not got no money of any kind no more. I could go to B.G. [British Guiana] but for 4 months?!! Oh, well, we'll see, meanwhile the MS must be finished.

1. Inquiry in re: quotation from Isaacs. It is on p. 339 from the accurately cited document.
2. The attached card from Stanley suggests that he is not very receptive to the objections submitted to him in my earlier letter; I am afraid it will be necessary to "take a stand" against his position. This is facilitated in personal terms by his own invitation.

3. The also attached note from Studies on the Left mildly annoys me. My first reaction to their postponing "decision" by several months was to ask them to return the MS prestissimo. On second thought I decided to turn it over to you for "decision making."

4. The Moscow-Perlo position on the economic feasibility of disarmament looks increasingly mad. Whom do they think are they fooling? A strong and clear piece on this would be most important -- for the theoretical record. Last night I had to go to some peace-nicks; they are now all on the reconversion kick -- set to put "pressure on Big Business to shift to the production of peace-goods." One wonders sometimes where the eclipse of reason is more pronounced: among the maniacs of the establishment or the utopians of the "opposition"?

5. Concerning the pieces for the Poles, the matter was left, if I remember correctly, as follows: you draft a piece for the Kalecki-volume on Imperialism and its mutations with some reference to Rosa to whom he in turn refers in his pre-war essays as being a source of inspiration. I have various and assorted thoughts on that matter which I would be enchante to forward to you at the proper time. I thought of composing something for the Lange-volume, perhaps about the polarization of economics into separate fields (monopoly capitalism vs. socialism). I have some thoughts about it, but would not want to say that they are any good. In fact, I am getting somewhat cold feet in connection with that because there are lots of things in that area which I guess but do not know. If you have some other idea on a possible topic, would be most welcome.

6. The outline of what needs to be said on the Negro question (your letter of March 9th) looks to me fine. The only thing that I would like to add to what you have there is more attention to the social psychology aspect of the matter. It is, no doubt, true that the ruling class likes to have a divided proletariat and does everything possible to promote such divisions. But as usual in such matters "halb zog er sie, halb sank sie hin". [half pulled in, half sunk on her own]. The proletariat is too goddam happy to be divided, in particular on racial lines! Everything that is to be said about nationalism here redoubled. A tremendous solace to people to have someone to be superior to. If I remember right, I wrote to you about this stuff last year from Europe (tidbits, obviously), and now it was interesting to see how the racial relations dominate the BG [British Guiana] situation (Vatuk's, otherwise not too good, pamphlet [Ved Prakash Vatuk, British Guiana, MR Press Pamphlet Series, 1963]). En generale, I think, one ought to stay away from the simple explanation that something is in the interest of the ruling class and therefore it happens. Something's being in the interest of the ruling class is an important but not an exclusive rationale. What is necessary is that this something should meet with some, however generated or developing, propensities of the underlying population. Even if it were now in the interest of the American ruling class to present to the world an American democracy completely free of racial discrimination etc., they could not produce it, because by now they have already a "human nature" to deal with which, to be sure, they themselves created in the course of history. And such deep-seated, phylogenetically analyzable phenomena as revulsion against intermarriage etc. are made use of by the ruling class but cannot be simply treated as having been created by it.

All this, obviously, in no contradiction to what you say but merely in supplementation. When it comes to the question of location of that Chapter, my own preference at this moment and not too strongly would be to make it into QoS (III) especially stressing that the locus of the Negro in this society is something terribly important both for him and for this society, and therefore calls for special treatment, I think this would be more effective than sticking it in after Chapter 8... But I

am not dogmatic on this issue. The IS Chapter could then also more easily refer back to it in an effort to sum up. What do you think?

Just as I finished typing the above, the telephone rang: Arrow. My replacement for the autumn quarter has refused and he would be very happy if I would stay. Without giving it any further thought I decided on the spot to accept. Ergo I shall write to Germani in B.A. that I am willing to take his other option (come for 4-6 weeks from mid-August to end of September). This settles the problem from paragraph 2 above, and actually makes me feel better. Four months is too long, particularly in the light of all the stuff that needs to be written.

Tried to call you last night; no answer. Called Huby on some tax problem.

Love,  
Paul

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

March 25, 1963

Dear Paul,

I can well sympathize with your agony in the matter of the admissions. It's hard to imagine a less attractive assignment. Now that it's over, best to put it forever out of mind.

I think you did right in calling off the Argentine plan as originally conceived. I had a strong feeling when I talked to Germani that they were not taking a really responsible attitude toward the invitation and that they would be quite capable of calling it off in a most casual fashion. In addition, as you say, there is too much to be done to spend long periods out of the country at this stage. In particular, if we are to meet our target of finishing opus before the end of the year, we will not be able to spare much time. The 4-to-6 weeks deal is much more suitable; enough to give you a change and a feel for South America, and that is all to the good. Zirel and I have August free of children and are tentatively thinking of going to Spain. A variety of considerations are involved, the chief being that I want to work on Spanish in a Spanish-speaking country. Z has never been to Europe, and I have more or less promised that we would go as soon as we could manage it, which we can provided we can rent this house for the summer. Editorial Tecnos in Madrid is bringing out a Spanish translation of THE PRESENT AS HISTORY, and their letters are very friendly, so I'm hoping to be able to get help from them in locating, finding a teacher, meeting opposition elements, etc. I was much taken with Spain when I was there in 1936, just before the civil war broke out, and am curious to get some feel for the situation now and the prospects.

Stanley gets more and more rigid. He even insists now on spelling words his own way (labour and favour) instead of according to MR's established style, and he is quite impervious to criticism. In addition, he is going further and further to the Right, his attitude toward China in particular being venomously hostile. I am beginning to think that the best litmus-paper test of Right-Left divisions these days is the Indo-China border dispute, and Stanley comes out of it an

extreme right winger. All of which leads me strongly to favor a critique of the book in MR, and one that, though polite, pulls no punches.

On this general subject -- and related to your feelings about the peaceniks, which I fully share -- Leo and I had lunch last week with Marzani. If this is an example of what Khrushchevism does to normally intelligent people, then it is hard to imagine a greater disaster to the international movement. All theory is simply thrown overboard for the most vulgar kind of mixture of pragmatism and idealism. It makes you want to throw up ....

I will try in the fairly near future to sketch an outline for the Polish piece. At the moment -- i.e. offhand -- I have no useful thoughts, which is not encouraging but can perhaps be overcome.

D'accord on the Negro question. The socio-psychological aspect should certainly not be neglected, just as the interest-complex aspect should not be neglected. Together they make the problem the most intractable of all those faced by monopoly capitalism in this country -- absolutely incapable of being seriously ameliorated, let alone solved, short of a thorough-going social revolution. It is precisely this most unpalatable truth that we must articulate and insist upon. I don't think the location of the chapter really makes much difference. We can judge that better after we have it written.

Have received Chapter 4 back from Jack with 20 pages of pencilled notes accompanying it. No time yet to peruse same. I will be sending him Ch. 6 this week and hope to have 7 ready by the end of next week. I went through 6 again in the last few days, making a few changes and additions to the ms, and I was relieved to find that it stands up quite well after several months on the shelf. There is some, but really not much, repetition of material treated more fully in QoS(1), relating to education, housing, and highways, but I am now fully convinced that this is in no sense a bad thing and that it would be impossible to establish plausibly the thesis of political barriers to rational government spending if one left the whole argument on an abstract level.

Latest RoM, as I wrote, is on "The Split in the Capitalist World." For May I must grasp the nettle and do one on "The Split in the Socialist World." I'm going to avoid all trace of polemics but at the same time leave no doubt that our position is that au fond the Chinese are the true bearers of the Marxist tradition, which is above all a revolutionary tradition and which is now more than ever before relevant to the condition of the vast majority of mankind. That the Soviet party has de facto abandoned the revolutionary position, a fact which I do not think can any longer be seriously disputed, is to be explained, however, not in terms of "errors," bad leaders, etc., but in Marxist terms. Its inevitability is the saddest part in a way, and it certainly points to the futility of denunciation, exhortation, and similar verbal reactions. Pressure from the Chinese, considerations of political alignments in the world, fear of isolation -- these things may well keep the SU from abandoning the revolution in the udc's [underdeveloped countries] (vide Cuba), but it is obviously useless to expect the CPUSSR to be the inspirer and spiritual leader of that revolution. Nor should the Chinese be put into that position either, though they will certainly do their part. Fidel is neither the Russians' nor the Chinese' man, and there is no reason to suppose that in historical terms Fidel is a unique phenomenon. But I must get back to work on opus ....

Love,  
/s Paul

P.S. In connection with your piece for the Lange volume, have you seen Oscar's speech before the Polish Academy on the role of science in the development of socialism? He sent it to us, so I suppose you got it too. It might provide you with a good starting point.

[PAB handwritten notes March 13, March 20 re: stocks, asking about possible job candidate James O' Connor, PMS short note March 26 re: stocks, omitted]

PAB-PMS

Palo Alto

March 26th, 1963

Dear Paul,

Thanks for your yesterday's letter. I had yesterday a talk with Arrow and told him that I ain't not going to do the Graduate Director job anymore. Apart from the misery that it involves, I can see no worldly reason why the lowest paid member of the staff should carry the responsibility. He said that I had a point, that on the other hand if one wants to be a revolutionary one ought to be prepared to pay a price for it... I observed that if the University considers it proper to pay me 3-4 thousand \$ less than the youngest prof in our Dept. because of political considerations, it should also not entrust me such a major responsibility as the selection of grad students because I would pick exclusively communists, anarchists and other revolutionaries. He agreed that I had a point there too. So all this is being reported by him now to Moe who is in Paris and who will be our permanent chairman beginning next year. All this mamusing: either I'll get rid of the job or at least they'll be "seized" with the problem.

1. Attached Mrs Perlmutter's [?] letter cum reply. I did not think that you wanted me to write to her anything. Substantively I agree with your answer, except that under point # 1, I always stress something that the academic economists have no answer to, namely that [the]  $mc = mr$  principle [marginal cost = marginal revenue] is all very well for the competitive applecart pusher of the textbook. How does this principle work out if you deal with a corp the time horizon of which is eternity, or at least 20 years? There the  $mc = mr$  principle breaks down even by their own textbooks. There is now a lot of literature on this problem of long-term planning &c., and it surely overthrows most of the "conventional wisdom" on the subject. What her letter does show, by the way, is that we have to go as carefully as possible over the surplus concept, to remove the impression of a contradiction as she believes to have found in PEoG, a contradiction which actually does not exist.

2. Also attached is Rahnema's letter. It is most interesting to see how the Rostow-Meiji Restoration- bourgeois revolution course of the State Dept. is beginning to shape up in Iran. This is the new line for the American Empire and very much worthy of attention. In this course (anti-feudal, pro-bourgeois) they may easily find themselves together with the USSR which would create a veritable disaster in the u/d c's [underdeveloped countries]. It itches me to write something about it, except that one would have to know more facts and analyze the whole thing carefully. I gave a lecture on that in the Workshop for Economic Development in the Univ. of Washington; but one thing is to speak and another to write...

3. I have read Oskar's speech at the Polish Academy of Sciences; if anything it encourages me to try to write for his volume what I planned to write on. Think hard, maybe some other topic will pop up.

4. Stanley definitely deserves a serious critical review because he is a genuine "liquidator." On this I do have various thoughts cum notes and am willing to draft something when time comes. If you want to, we can do it jointly: I'll send you a draft, fool around with it, add and subtract and we'll publish it as one review. It may be for certain international reasons more effective to do it this way. If you prefer two consecutive pieces, also ok with me, except then we should decide who treats what.

5. Be careful with what you write in RoM about the SU; matters there are very complicated with lots of opposing pushes and pulls (reflects itself now in the Soviet press quite clearly). As usual in CPSU politics they are zigging and zagging, and I would avoid statements including the word "definitely." If after having written the RoM there is still time, and if you want to, send me the MS for what possible suggestions I may have.

6. The Chinese take verbally a much better position, whether de facto it comes to something much different, that is where the dog is buried. I do not agree that the Sino-Indian dispute is the acid test. I think I wrote about it before, but I would think that they may have made a tactical mistake. They should have raised much more hell about it, bring the matter before the Security Council, ask the SU for its good offices as an intermediary, etc., etc., before doing anything. In my opinion, it is strictly irrelevant who was right and who was wrong in the matter. On that there is no doubt. But even if the South-Koreans did actually invade North-Korea, the thing to do was not to fall into the trap but to throw them out and yell bloody murder! I think the Chinese did fall into a provocation -- and by doing so did lots of harm to the Indian CP &c. But this is a long topic and I think should be treated very gingerly. There is probably nothing harder at the moment than avoiding falling into one or the other grove. And it is a hell of a thing to have a correct "general line."

7. By the way, concerning the Split in the Cap World, have a look at Joe's [Stalin's] Economic Problems. The sob predicted that particular development very precisely, even if he went too far assuming that the imperialists begin fighting each other arms in hands. That booklet of his was a brilliant job, much as he ought to fry in hell for all he did and in particular for all he left behind.

Love,

/s Yours Paul

PMS-PAB

Larchmont

March 29, 1963

Dear Paul,

[omitted]

I quite agree in the matter of  $mr = mc$  and intended to convey the same punkt in referring to the lack of definiteness about what time period is intended to be implied.

The Rostow boys may be succeeding in getting some serious reform in Iran -- I don't know. But they ain't not doing it in LA [Latin America], which is much more important. I only began to understand why no land reforms worthy of the name get adopted down there on this last trip. The reason is that there simply isn't any separate landowning class: all the talk about feudalism is not only wrong but thoroughly misleading. The same class owns money capital, industrial capital, and land. The tenure systems often have more than a little of feudalism remaining, which is one reason why reforms are so much needed, but the owners are typically bourgeois. When you ask for land reform, you ask the bourgeoisie to reform itself, not to take something away from a parasitic landowning class. And needless to say, the bourgeoisie is not exactly enthusiastic. It is not, incidentally, a terribly, businesslike bourgeoisie and readily tolerates irrational practices inherited from the past, but that doesn't make it a feudal nobility. All of this needs to be documented and proved, which unfortunately I have neither the time nor the language ability to undertake. Until it is understood, all sorts of illusions about the possibility of anti-feudal reform (bourgeois revolution) are going to persist in LA. All that is sheer mythology manufactured out of textbooks dealing with the quite different historical problems of Europe.

On the subject of land reform, by the way, get Saul Landau to tell you about what has happened to the Laguna district in Mexico which started off in Cardenas's time as the showpiece of land reform on the basis of the ejido [communal land]. Saul is down there doing some sort of a movie and wrote us a bit about it. Seems the whole thing is a disastrous failure: I had heard something about the debacle but had no idea it was as bad as he describes it. The moral of the Mexican experience would seem to be that bourgeois land reform imposed on a peasant agriculture may secure important political gains for the party in power but solves absolutely nothing economically. The only successful part of the Mexican agricultural program is in the North where U.S.-style capitalist farming, producing export crops, has taken hold. But in the nature of the case this can affect only a very small part of the rural population.

For Oskar's volume, why don't you do an essay entitled something like "The Economic Surplus Reconsidered"? Compare the surplus concept with traditional Marxist concepts, straighten out any ambiguities that others may have found in PEOG, present the bread-loaf illustration, and discuss the difficulties of measurement. This could be in effect a part of the "Theoretical Implications" chapter, so that you would be killing two birds with one stone.

I would like to send you the RoM and will do so provided it gets done in time. The trouble is that I usually don't get to it until the last minute and have to rush through with Leo and the printer breathing down my neck. Maybe I'll be able to do better this time. At bottom, my interpretation of the Soviet position is based more on what I have a strong intuitive feeling "must be so" than on any particular documents or statements. I don't see how a country that is in one sense still poor but has all the material requisites (including the appropriate social institutions) for overcoming this poverty could possibly be revolutionary in the sense that Marx and Lenin were revolutionary. The Russians' problem is not to overthrow capitalism or anything else, and they cannot be expected to put themselves in the shoes of the peoples of the udc's [underdeveloped countries]. The Chinese are in a wholly different objective situation, and there is nothing more natural than for them to be 100 percent revolutionary. I spent yesterday reading the Chinese tract entitled "More on the Differences between Comrade Togliatti and Us: Some Important Problems

of Leninism in the Contemporary World," 199 pages long and written by the editorial department of Honggi. It is absolutely pure Leninism and an extremely able performance.

I don't say that Leninism solves all the problems. It didn't even in Lenin's time: the theory of the labor aristocracy as the basis of the Social Democratic betrayal was always very weak and is much more so now than ever before. (The Chinese might, but do not, apply it to Togliatti and the French and Italian CP's: it is a weakness of their position that they do not attempt to explain the roots of "modern revisionism.") But I am convinced that vis-a-vis the udc's Leninism is absolutely correct and "modern revisionism" disastrously wrong. With the udc's being increasingly the focus and center of the international revolutionary movement, this means that the Chinese have an unbeatable advantage. Perhaps the Chinese challenge will push the Russians into a Leninist position themselves, but I doubt it. "Modern revisionism" is no accident and cannot be sloughed off with an apologetic "excuse it, please."

What the Chinese say, by the way, is unlikely to make much impression on Togliatti who, I am sure, knows the Leninist texts as well as the Chinese comrades. He has a mass party that ain't not interested in making no revolutions, and he's got to figure out some way to keep the thing together. He either has to be a reformist, whatever verbiage may be used to disguise the fact, or else go into the wilderness. The Chinese have no answers for him, and their references to new awakenings, etc., in the European and American working classes only go to show that they don't know what's going on in these parts of the world. The truth is that these working classes are now, for both economic and psychological reasons, pretty solidly lined up with their bosses against the udc's. It's a lousy spot for a Togliatti to be in.

On this subject, have you been reading France Observateur? Martinet and Mallet are in the process of elaborating a "theory" which is probably intended to give some intellectual respectability to a position not unlike Togliatti's (neo-reformism for neo-capitalism). I wouldn't be at all surprised to see this current take hold in the French CP, with Martinet & Co. joining up again in due course and becoming the ideological pooh-bahs. In the meantime, Bourdet has broken with M (all the rest of the staff is with M) and seems to be out of F-O altogether. [handwritten footnote: Needless to say, Bourdet did not break with Martinet because of a principled revolutionary position, but rather because of a muddle-loaded romantic anti-de Gaulle attitude. As between M + B, M is undoubtedly in a much stronger position.]

I suppose one might (perhaps ought to) ask what kind of a line does make sense in a developed capitalist country if Leninism seems pretty irrelevant and modern revisionism is really nothing but a modern version of Kautskyism. But that's not for this letter...

One final point: I am somewhat distressed about the apparently deep difference between us on the Sino-Indian dispute. The Chinese did yell bloody murder about what the Indians were doing from 1959 on. The trouble is that no one paid any attention. Of course the capitalist press distorted the whole business, but the Soviet attitude was also unfriendly. You should remember that the first border clash took place in November, 1959, and was certainly not the fault of the Chinese. Khrushchev was then at or near Camp David, apparently seriously and sincerely under the impression that he could come to an agreement with Ike for a modus vivendi plus disarmament. Chi, when we talked to him in Mexico, was convinced that the Soviet plague-on-both-your-houses statement which was issued at the time was a sop to Eisenhower, and it makes good sense. In any case, the Chinese felt, and I think rightly, that they were being badly let down by their ally. How could they turn around and ask the SU for its offices as intermediary? The fact

is that they were alone, and there was not a damn thing they could do to bring political pressure on the Indians. Under the circumstances, they showed a very great deal of patience and forbearance, allowing the Indians to push them around for the next two years. I don't know whether they were right to act when they did, but it is clear to me that no self-respecting socialist nation can permit itself to be walked on and spat at indefinitely. When they finally did act, they absolutely did not commit the mistake of the North Koreans. They smacked the Indians down hard and then withdrew. This was a classic case of war as a continuation of politics: it had nothing to do with acquisition of territory or any nonsense like that. Nor am I impressed by the damage done to the Indian CP: any CP that is willing to play the rotten game of its own bourgeoisie, as the Indian apparently has been, had better have a crisis like this and find out what is deadwood and what is serious revolutionary cadres. It will be a better party in the long run. As for the udc's and neutralists, the plain fact is that they did not rally to India's support, and the Colombo plan concedes all that the Chinese have been claiming. The trouble is that the Indians absolutely will not negotiate. This seems to me to be about as clear a case as any I know of where real socialists have no choice but to back the right side!

Love, /s Paul

PAB-PMS

[Handwritten]

[Palo Alto]

March 30, [1963]

Dear Paul,

The significance of what Bronfenbrenner reports is somewhat obscure to me. That there is a build-up of "excess capacity" in WEurope and Japan is very likely because there has been going on a very rapid process of delayed modernization of plant and equipment. Clearly when such modernization takes place, particularly at an accelerated pace, a lot of equipment becomes in a sense obsolete but is still around. In some sense it becomes excess capacity, although strictly speaking, it is one the way to the scrap pile. Does this mean that excess capacity can be indefinitely built-up like public deficits? I see no reason for this. After all at some point, it becomes highly irrational to sink capital into something that yields no additional profit. Assuming with Bronfenbrenner that the govt+cartel-arrangements keep prices and profits up, they surely would do it also without any further unnecessary investment. The slowing down of the investment drive in Germany and France would seem to indicate that something of that sort is beginning to happen, although there is still plenty of room to go until the countries become truly Americanized. And the decline in labor costs per unit of output would seem to be due to two factors. One is that they did keep unruly wages down as much as possible, the other -- lining up with the above -- is that productivity of labor has been growing very fast as a result of technological change. Without being passed on in prices (cartels &c) this rise in productivity led to higher profits cum more investment and stable or very slowly rising real wages.

Did you read Mason's Presidential Address [Edward Mason, President of American Economics Association in 1962, probably his departing speech/paper before turning reins over to the next president, who was Gottfried Haberler]? P.4 is almost addressed to us. One actually should write

a well-argued, serious reply to his paper because it is both mighty bright and so immensely borniert [ignorant]. This should be done either as a special article or perhaps in an extended preface to opus -- it goes after all right at the center of what we are talking about.

Am making slow progress; hope to get out of the QoS stuff and start working on IS. The former bores near to tears.

On the Negro issue: I do not know of any one book dealing with the matter. You could write to Professor E. Franklin Frazier, Howard University, DC, who is probably the most competent man on Negreology and ask him. Lots of stuff can be found by simply consulting the Statistical Abstract. Also get hold of the new Manpower Report to the President which discloses the tremendous size of the Negro unemployment problem.

More later,

Love, /s Paul

PAB-PMS

[Memo precedes letter dated March 31, 1963 on one page]

Memo:

Sol writes from Peking that Engels wrote a series of articles in Vorwaerts in 1893 under the title "Kann Europa Abruesten?" [Can Europe Disarm?] These were published, he says, in a collection of Engels' stuff called Kapitalistisches Wettruessten, Leipzig, 1929 [Capitalist arms race], which he has never seen (and which I never heard of). The only place it can actually be found now, he thinks, is the Russian Sochinenya. If you have ready access, you might look the item up. Perhaps it has more than passing interest under present conditions. (Sol surmises that Engels must have taken the position that disarmament is impossible under capitalism, but he doesn't know. Clearly that is the present Chinese position, and I'm afraid I go along with it. Interesting to know if the old boy already said it all.)

March 31, 1963

Yesterday arrived Vol. XXII of Sochinenya (the corresponding volume of the German Werke hasn't come out yet) which contains the series of articles referred to above. It so happens that Engels' position is strictly the reverse of what Adler surmises. The articles contain various interesting observations on the nature of standing armies, but their principal argument is summarized in the following paragraphs at the beginning.

(1) From the Preface: "I start in these articles from the following assumption which increasingly gains general acceptance: the system of permanent armies has been driven all over Europe to such an extreme, that either peoples will be economically ruined by it being unable to stand the burdens of military' expenditures, or it will lead inevitably to a general war of extermination -- unless the permanent armies will be transformed in good time into militia's based on the general armament of the people."

(2) Also from the Preface : "I shall attempt to prove that such a transformation is possible even now, even with contemporary governments and in the contemporary political situation."

(3) From Article # 1 : "I assert: disarmament, and eo ipso a guarantee of peace, is possible; it is even comparatively easily attainable and Germany more than any other civilized state has for it the possibility and the historical opportunity. " (The last two words freely translated.)

The interesting prediction which was borne out is contained in Article # 8 where Engels argues that the outcome of the next war will be decided by Britain, the fleet of which will be able to starve out Germany. But this point is not at issue here. -- In this series of articles Engels' "swing to the right" towards the end of his life is probably as pronounced as anywhere, and the tone of the pieces is very ... Khrushchovian.

The volume contains other very interesting material which I have never seen before -- an interview of Engels given to News Chronicle -- about which I will write at some other occasion.

/s Paul