

May 7, 1970

Dear Paul:

It has just dawned on me that what appeared to me as just an abbreviated way of writing title of my Lenin chapter may, in fact, have been your "edited" version of my overlengthy but actually precise (and American, not Russian!) version, so I better explain.


"The Shock of Recognition and the Philosophic Ambivalence" is the authentic expression used in my book in order (1) to relate it to Melville's poetic view that recognition, when it is least expected, is a shock, an awakener to new states of consciousness. (Perhaps you have Edmund Wilson's work of literary criticism, *The Shock of Recognition*, and perhaps he there quotes Melville; I do not have, in *Agassac*, any works by Melville, should you think it necessary to quote him.) (2) The philosophic ambivalence is self-explanatory, especially to a philosophic audience. But I actually think that the literary allusion is as important in this case, and I would not like to see the title changed. Please!

If you are at the University instead of either in demonstration or on way to D.C. for a confrontation with Nixon over the Kent massacre, I would also like to make another suggestion re the December conference on Hegel and Lenin. (Incidentally, the Hegel Society of America is likewise planning its meeting in December. Though "in principle" they agreed with me that the 200th anniversary of Hegel should not go unrelated to the 100th of Lenin's, I doubt they'll have anyone except a professional anti-Leninist pontificating.) Instead of either Lenin or Marx, I could give a paper directly on Hegel. It's probably the only Marxist who ever dared have my lecture listed as "Hegel's Absolutes: A Marxist-Humanist View" and I did not mean that view to be cynical. This can be seen from the title I give it in my new work: "Hegel's Absolutes As New Beginnings". Who will be giving the talk on Hegel? What is your topic? If my paper should be on Lenin or Marx, then I would also wish to participate in discussion on Hegel. I like Lenin's suggestion to the editors of *Under the Banner of Marxism* that they constitute themselves as a body of "Materialist Friends of the Hegelian Dialectic." What do you think of that as a title of one of the sessions? Also, what about "Dialectics of Liberation" for another session, especially if any actual forces, human forces of revolution are to be invited. On the other hand, if by "fads" in your title on women's liberation, you mean to laugh in a superior manner at that new force, then you can expect some sharp criticism from me. I have been too busy with philosophy (where not with revolution) to have anything much to say on that question, but I sure am glad the youth have spoken up on male chauvinism and have refused to wait for "the day after the revolution" for their specific liberation. In any case, if it is possible to send me a copy of that piece by the *TELOS* staff, or if you can send me a copy when it gets off press, I'd greatly appreciate it.

O, yes, do you intend to grapple also with Lukacs? I did like your piece in *TELOS*, although I thought your presenting it as "the most creative philosophic work of Marxism of this century" must have surely been done without Lenin in mind. It is true that Lukacs did not then know Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks*, but essays can never take the place of a book, not even when that book is only in form of notes. What can be said is that in its "underground existence" it did exercise a greater influence than Lenin's in its hypostatized editions. To this day, none has really faced that break in Lenin, much less restate it for our age. If we face that problem in December, it will be a truly historic occasion.

Finally, I don't seem to have that issue of *Telos* which you said you edited with *Radical America*, or was it vice versa? I would very much like to; can you send me a copy? Thanks.

Yours,



14088