

Bergman Publishers, Inc.

224 WEST 20 STREET • NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10011 • (212) 675-5714

November 10, 1971

Dear Ray - first I want to congratulate you for finishing the book. I know what it means, since I am also one who "started" nearly a decade or so ago, and am far from finishing. Then I envy you, but very sympathetically. Following the advice of one of my best teachers in the movement, whose name was Ernst Mayer (Latin happened to respect him as much as I do), I have a generally favorable attitude to the literary production of a revolutionary - even ~~unseen~~ sight unseen.

Yes, I wish to read it (as it should not take me more than two weeks) but not as a publisher. So far (though) I am not limited by Lyle Stuart - ~~in the~~ if you look at my list, ~~so far~~ U.S. is losing money on my publications (except the Marxist Cookbook which ~~was~~ <sup>has</sup> not the imprint "Bergman Publishers" though I ~~organized~~ <sup>organized</sup> it at wrote the Introduction) and will surely not make ~~if~~ <sup>any</sup> ~~realize~~ <sup>realize</sup> my future plans. There are to bring out old revolutionary literature in English. This is my goal as a publisher, ~~then~~ <sup>then</sup> I see a sense in my work and abilities - ~~disregarding~~ <sup>disregarding</sup> the financial costs.

I have a concrete interest in publishing (since we both know what this word means, I don't have to elaborate here "concrete"). Philosophy means for me the same as theology today. I like both and I am writing myself not seldom in reading the old subtle arguments of the old enlighteners against the existence of God - still for the "unity of theory and practice" because basic. Though what is going on in the Churches today is of great importance, if one would let himself in in discussions about

Therewith, one could not feel one's self to join in the fight against Vietnam.

Hegel is for me not the "dead dog" as Griczo was for Hores Horensolin. No, but still I know that f.e. Lassalle <sup>and Hores Hores</sup> ~~threw~~ Hegel by heart much better than you and I. What I now find has now in Eastern Germany is truly true Lassalleism in practical practice [there is a lot of Hegel going on in the German universities, West as even more East]. Read the letter of Lassalle to Marx from March 6, '89. where there is everything said about unity of theory and practice, about real revolutionary movement - you can not do it better, believe me (as much as possible you are). I was the first in this country who ~~was~~ brought in the Grundrisse and revealed about it as told everybody ~~what~~ that this has to be studied, but do you think Marx did not know why he left it aside and preferred to work another decade, bolstered more than ever by kidney, gal-bladder, and financial misery, to get Kapital I out? ~~Why~~ He even said it already in the preface to the "Critique", why he did not want to publish the Introduction to the Grundrisse (as the Grundrisse itself), why he leaves the economic-philosophical manuscript to the young ~~young~~ critic of the time. Because it had nothing to do with real movement, with the unity of theory and practice. He saw that philosophy, even radicalistic Hegel, is only interpretation. I just saw it again in Germany, Holland, Italy, Austria and East Germany to what confusion your Hegel is leading. Lenin did something important when he studied Hegel. ~~But~~ for him it was an important step of practical movement. Russian revolutionary movement was

Bergman Publishers, Inc.

224 WEST 20 STREET • NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10011 • (212) 675-5714

Check with Hegel, this was the <sup>Russian</sup> way to Marx.  
What can Hegel give you what Marx could not? The Idea of Freedom of Humanity?  
Don't be silly. The whole Hegel does not have sound Freedom of Humanity as the Communist Manifesto? [More than 100 years after it was written, the English American Student gets the Manifesto only in a bad and ~~for~~ in some parts false translation of English translation (that Engels authorized the translation does not make it perfect). The I. vol. of Kapital is terrible translated (the Russians did not touch it - the 2. and 3. which they translated is (interestingly) much better.) All these talkies and quotes Hegel serves only confusion. Confusion - as if we do not have enough. Lukacs, the great Hegelian, is not honored because he gives the imprimatur (which he at that time did not want) that you do not need proletarian [even though at that time every page dealt with Proletariat] as that it is not important what heralds Marx's economy last. Worse Marcuse ~~also~~, Sartre etc.  
Marx did not return to Hegel, why should

In his ripest work [State of revolution] Lenin does not quote Hegel though Hegel has wonderful formulation on State ~~because~~ Hegel is ~~confused~~ about State.

we? He went somewhat out of Hegel — <sup>he tells you</sup> ~~but~~ that he <sup>put him upside down</sup> Marx tells everybody that he overcame Hegel, he reduced Hegel, he made use of him Hegel because ambiguously <sup>Hegel</sup> he was wrong, yes wrong, and also could revolutionary. But you do not want that.

(as for Marx, the bourgeoisie already)

Yes, why Hegel, why now? I have my answer.

I have the experience of German illegal movement and especially the confusion "Miles" did, with the help of Hegel and Lenin. I meet the professors of the "third world" <sup>who want</sup> ideology, who want to discuss, <sup>the whole world</sup> what kind of Socialism we should have, what kind of Democracy, what kind of Humanity, since Marx "let us down" in this problem of the future. What confusion!

When Marx started to read Hegel, Stalin was already counter-revolutionary. Only Stalin did not know it.

I would be delighted to read your manuscript, <sup>should be</sup> but even if it is <sup>so boring</sup> as your theoretical essays in your New letters, but I am not interested in it as a publisher and even less from viewpoint of my understanding of unity of theory and practice.

Sorry — but with the best wishes

Peter

P.S. Why Hegel? Why Now? I can give you the simplest answer. Because we have <sup>now</sup> a revival of the 1830 and 1840's at the universities (the pre-Marx period with Max Stirner etc). Looking back from the CHUZPE of Lukacs, Marcuse, Dussel, Skocpol and Peter Bergman, that we are the only ones <sup>who understand Hegel</sup>, I still think that Engels knew Hegel <sup>and that his advice that Heine's</sup> Heine's was the only one <sup>(better than we all)</sup> who characterized of Hegel was the best, is still valid: Hegel was brought the philosophical revolution to an end. Hegel has closed the great circle <sup>which started with</sup> Spinoza, followed by the enlighteners. Humanity as Freedom started with Marx to be concrete. Please, before you publish your book, read Heinrich Heine!

14138