

a few minor changes so as
 not to sound as if only Heisen
 counts:
 ① The top of the question
 should have of other "
 Hegel's conception of Cause & Eff's
 R. p. 4 should be more
 front. In a word, reader
 sees Hegel, Vlt & a Blaise
 Phebozhan.
 ② You cannot
 of such an extreme
 conclusion as Marx's dehumanization.
 "The Idea" is Hegel without
 predicting your thesis with
 "as Marx abstracts in his
 Critique of the Hegelian Dial-
 ③ p.s. you have

Dear Lou: FEB 3 1986
 Arrived for you, Part III
 of your study of Dialectics.
 I suggest you submit it as
 three cardmas as med to
 John & James for first
 Journal on Sociocology. Phil,
 or whatever: it is called C&S
 Kevin & I feel him I propose
 this to you & then, probably
 all the way in. I am not,
 pre-con. period discussion
 I'll publish it as I can
 Bull of it then I'll let
 Read all 3, see whether
 something interesting would
 consist of. I am not, more

1/30/86

another extreme about Hegel's
addition to his Phil. of Mind,
as "turning everything around"
which Hegel of course would
have denied, insisting that
it was "inherent" in his work
indeed "flowed out from" it
I say, instead, something as simple
as "addition" or "supplement."

Will write more
when I get through with it
I've had only 2 copies - I've
only rough draft of it - secured
+ read for you -
book looks "How is it
further on with
you, Love"

11254

Feb. 1, 1986

FEB 4 1986

Dear Lou,

Because I was anxious to congratulate you for the good piece you did on the study of dialectics and to try and clear the way for you to get published in John W.'s journal on philosophy, I rushed to tell you that without really going into detail on the technical aspect. So I continue with certain changes that are necessary for submission to an academic journal:

1) To begin with this should not be part III; it should be something that is a totality itself. And as I told you in the little note I suggest you have three quotations, not only Hegel but VII and FF. Everything has to be specified by source and page number. Thus when ~~it~~ you begin the text it will be considered roman numeral I.

2) Of Hegel you can never just say Logic; it has to be specified as Science of Logic or the Logic from the Encyclopedia and always pagenated. Also, outside of the quotations at top all references should be in footnotes instead of parenthesis. Pagination in parenthesis is only permitted when it is ~~in~~ all from the same book that has been specified.

3) Now to continue with what I call protecting your flanks. Let me begin by emphasizing that you cannot say such extremes as "dehumanize the idea" unless you say Marx says so and further whether or not you agree with Marx's claim. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Hegel certainly ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ did not leave out reality from the self-development of the idea as is clear from his seriousness in relation to history.

4) On the otherhand do not credit ~~wik~~ Hegel with "history and its process". But history to Hegel was "contingency" that is to say ~~as~~ it happened, it didn't have the permanency of ideas; he needed ideas to prove which of history was not contingency but became a category.

p.2 5) Oh Lordy, don't ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ "dethrone God" and then attribute it to that Lutheran Hegel. What you could say is: It is true ~~as~~ has been accused of pantheism and ~~an~~ atheism and that there is no doubt that in his philosophy the apex is not reached by religion, but by philosophy. Nevertheless as against Aristotle's universal ~~and~~ ~~idea~~, he did consider human reason that universal absolute activity. ~~And Lenin certainly did~~ not only ~~catch~~ that, but it inspired him to break with his own vulgar materialism and cognition ~~was~~ ~~include~~ ~~that~~ ~~"Cognition"~~ ...

6) p.3 final paragraph begins with "Clearly". I propose you say I think or that (This writer thinks) that what could be called Hegel's empiricism...

7) p.6 Geraets -- and I am going to ask you to cut some of the references out because it begins to sound as if the whole essay was just something against Geraets whereas you should have in mind, as you indeed do, references to several thinkers -- should be cited by exact ~~ex~~ references.

8) p.7 reflective is not any sort of "synonym" for intuitive and certain ly no re; Decarte. Empiric and scientific is what is generally used as practically a single description and intuitive is kept for Jacobi, i.e. intuitionism. In any case that sentence from paragraph 2 after Aristotle, just cut out both adjectives, reflective and intuitive

8) p. 8 we come back to this question of history of philosophy and Hegel would rise ~~up~~ ~~and~~ ~~XXXXXX~~ scream to this age, nothing, nothing, nothing is true history except philosophy. Hegel considered history of philosophy a manifestation of various stages of self-development of the idea which no philosopher dare disregard, because that is what he was born from. And therefore also cut out the word "actual science". And ~~XXXXXX~~

11255

that page also happens to have that expression I told you to watch out for "Turning everything around". You also cannot say what we love to say about ourselves that something in the objective situation "compells" us to do something. Hegel didn't feel compelled except out of his own ideas. And these extreme expressions relate also even to that statement against Jacobi. You will have noticed that the one time that Hegel actually uses the word reactionary (and even there never retrogression) it is more as affect. I believe the more appropriate expression for that last sentence on page 8 is something like this: Jacobi's intuitionism... ~~xxx~~ went so much against the grain of philosophy as science that Hegel actually/used the word reactionary. Then continue on page on with the word to grasp

9) p. 9 I think that the word "rework" that we use so much and you use on Hegel, would be more modestly stated as just he added, and sometimes it should be preceded with ~~xxxxxxx~~ (believe he added)

10) p. 10 can be mostly eliminated with no more than first 4 and 1/2 lines and after the word articulation, eliminate that paragraph and the next, ~~xxxx~~ use only a single para. "There is a duality... actualization." And then proceed to p. 11. Your final section on RD which you will have to cut radically both because there are too many quotations of me and obviously, you man, you agree too much with me. You have to have a way of saying that you think that RD made an "original contribution" and after the quotation from P&R you skip the remainder of the page ~~xxx~~ and go on to the ~~xxxxxxx~~ single sentence on page 10 from the paragraph "In her rigorous... Absolute Idea from which she concluded in her paper to the HSA (and ~~xxx~~ reference should be to Art and Logic rather than New Essays) then to page 13) to "Clearly free creative power..."

Incidentally I don't believe that part on me even though it should have quotation from me should have its own part, just skip a few lines.

It should end with a sentence of your own, not a quotation, which would modestly say I hope that this critique is an interpreted as a way to expand the discussion on the Hegelian dialectic in our age which does have the habit of liking sociology rather than philosophy.

I trust that you informed Kansas John and ~~xxxxxxx~~ Kevin. By the way journals donot accept single space and you may have to submit extra copies. As for us, we will mimeo during workshop taks.

consult
Yours,
Ray

11256