

Oct. 5, 1971

Dear Bess and Eugene:

Two very different matters. The minor one concerns Prof. Hayden White who has not returned Ch. 1. A week or so ago I dropped a note, pretending nothing was the matter; I merely inquired whether "Dr. Eugene Cogol" had turned over the manuscript to him, and asked him did he know John O'Neill who will introduce my work, and I was looking forward to his commentary. I think we should not give him beyond Oct. 15th, so, unless you hear to the contrary from me, go see him. For more reasons than one I naturally wish he would come across with commentary. (If you saw how radically my own introduction changed just on the basis of Morgan Gibsons's ridiculous remarks, you'd see how p.b. help us with their criticisms.) And we will need to ask him for a lecture, so we will continue to be friendly, but definitely we cannot tarry beyond the 15th.

The other question is the serious one. Though while paper was going to press I dropped Olga a note for "later consideration" about possible issuance of special "pamphlet" of just my 1953 letters, I've now decided that not only has the centre too much work, but we really must establish a sub-center and until NY can become one, LA must continue to be it; in fact, it should be one even after the East can finally come into its own. Here is what is involved in the present instance:

Every time I reread those 1953 letters I feel somewhat like Ines felt about the phrase "void in time": however did it come about? Surely self-determination of thought is every bit as phenomenal as self-determination of people! Recently there finally appeared two serious works that dealt with those last 3 para. in Philosophy of Mind (#575-577)—Professor Petry who extended Hegel's single volume on Philosophy of Nature into 3 volumes of Introd., commentary, notes is totally empty-headed. Evidently notwithstanding, or perhaps precisely because of the aridity in such total isolation from process in motion, he is full of "hierarchies, levels and structure" and not a whiff of self-movement so that even when he quotes Hegel on "self-thinking Idea" it is immobile. Not only is no illumination thrown on our day, one wonders whether he even read Hegel. The other commentary, by a German professor (Kaurer) is quite profound, within narrow confines, but the confines—wishing to prove it Philosophy of Mind a "theodicy"—make it impossible to work out the ramifications of Becoming, of History (but only of thought), of that leap into uncharted waters.

~~Now~~ I don't know whether I ever told you that those 3 paragraphs is just about the last word we have from Hegel. They were not in the 1827, much less 1817 editions, and were only added in 1830. Just as I did not know where Marx had stopped before I began breaking my head on the work as a whole, so I did not know that they were final thoughts also on part of Hegel. In any case, the movement, the self-movement of those Hegelian Absolutes were such that suddenly (with 1st syllogism where Hegel expresses the structure of the whole Encyclopaedia in #575 as Logic-Nature-Mind) I broke through with conclusion that there was a movement from practice and not only from theory as Nature as the mediating agent in that syllogism turns both to Logic and to Mind. Then came the 2nd syllogism (#576, Nature-Mind-Logic) in which Mind itself becomes the mediating agent out of which the whole can be constructed. Finally, came the total break, not only with all predecessors, but with my "co-leader" as I decided that with the 3rd syllogism (#577) we have done with the "Dialectic of the party" which had been his preoccupation I was busy "popularizing" and decided, instead, that the self-thinking Idea, Absolute Mind, we were in the new society, as theory and practice, objective and subjective, history and science had come full circle and united.

Now then, I believe that, by just including these letters in a Bull. with a lot of stuff, we can have it neither for show to others, nor as a "permanent" feature of development. Moreover, certain things I cannot

14131

say, you as editor can. First, is the simple statement of fact that Marx had broken off his Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic as he proceed to working out his original philosoph--Historical Materialism--at such and such a paragraph; that my analysis begins the paragraph and continues through to the end. Secondly, that recently--200 years since birth of Hegel--there finally are some in academia who are concerned with these 1830's (Site especially Reinhart Koselleck's Maurer, Hegel und das Ende der Geschichte: Interpretationen zur Historiologie, pp.85-6), but these are hardly Marxist interpretations so the 1953 Letters remain unique.

I don't know whether the original (1955) Introduction to the 1953 Letters were included in this year's reproduction; I assume so; in any case, that Introduction plus Grace's letter should of course remain.

But, above all, it should look like something unique. I've full confidence in Paul's artistry and the local's philosophic maturity in discussion which would serve to help him his creativity.

If you agree to make yourself responsible for its issuance, and time so that both Black pamphlet and Absolute Idea would issue out of West Coast, it would mark a new high stage. You need not write me; you need to inform Olga to whom I'll send a copy of this.

Yours,

Paul