

~~He~~ Feuerbach was just as important as Hegel. You should read him, not only what Engels wrote about him. Feuerbach, and not Hegel, was the first in the whole history of Philosophy who introduced consciously the idea of "W.E." instead of the "I." (For Hegel even "the people" were still "I"! ^{at the Psycho-analysts}) I bet he ~~was~~ ^{was} bothered with Feuerbach.

If you give today's intellectuals only Hegel (or at best Marx ^{via} Hegel), they will never understand the Proletariat as Marx's and Engels' discovery from the "Holy Family" or how important than the ^{as a} whole Marxism is the development of the thoughts of Marx and Engels, and if you wish the development from Hegel, but from many others than Hegel. - [Can't you see that M & E learned most more from Fourier than from the whole ^{contrary to the French and English thinkers} Hegel? Why going back to Hegel? ^{for who still, bothered with} ^{freely} theology no matter what his God exists of?]

Today's intellectuals will never, as that was Lucas's mistake, understand the Proletariat from studying Hegel. The task is not ^{only} the Dialectic of Class Struggle and ^{has by discovery} with it (as I am ^{do} sure you ^{was} emphatic) our Freedom as Humanism - all that discovered long before Marx though Marx was the most consequent ^{being} one - but the role of the Proletariat. That, and that alone, the young people have to be taught and that one can only get from Marx and Engels and Lenin and Luxemburg and (don't jump at me) from Trotsky and Mao [I for one can say nothing things.

since I never, never agree with anything typically
 Trotskyist, and never from Hegel ^(Any part of the proletarian revolution) is more worth than the whole Hegel.
 I am not it typical that the official intellectuals
 in the West as well as in the East fall for "Alienation".
 Lenin, a good word, very Hegelian and Marxian,
 but there is a very very good reason why Marx
 since 1852 did not use this word any more ^{except}
 in connection with labor in the production process. Every
 liberal you can impress with the slogan "Alienation",
 but he will still be a liberal. Indeed: the best way
 to become and feel a Liberal is the outcry against
 "Alienation", because the best way to reduce ^(just abolish) "Alien-
 ation" is to make the fellow "interested" - if the horse
 would could only be interested in the beauty of its
 harness, it would ~~run~~ pull much better.

It is true that up till the later Lenin, Hegel was
 treated as Moses Mendelssohn had treated Spinoza - as

- ⑤ "Toten Hund", but I also fall for it when the Communists
 introduced the great "Campaign" for Hegel. Yes, I profited
 from it, I studied at that time Hegel very intensively
- ⑥ with August Thalheimer, I enjoyed it and with
- ⑦ the "Miles - New Beginn" I thought Hegel to be the
 "window stone of". But when the war began 1938/39
 I began to understand why Hegel ^(Now) is used by
 the Russians just as the Prussians used
 Hegel in the time of the Kings (s. Engels' beginning words
 in "Furchend").

(5)

I bear in mind that I have not read your book, but you can say what you want, I do not agree with "Hegel Now" for whatever reasons you might have. For is it for me to suspect that you simply want to impress. But "Hegel Now" can only lead to more

confusion. Do you know ~~that~~ the Hegel - Cult of the Hungarian "Marxists" after 1945? ^(Hugoracsi, etc?) ^(?) It should be a warning! One can accept every word in Hegel, as still not be a revolutionary. Kautsky etc. tried to do it with Marx - it didn't work, the Party-

I don't mean
Lucas. He
didn't get
it. Clancy
always changed
every 5 years.

Comrad had to cut out sentences from Marx and Engels, "explain" as in the end to say openly that Marx and Engels after all they were human, were 'f' they ^{or were valid for a certain kind of time} made mistakes. True, they were riding with the flag of Marxism ^{but} ^{was} ^{Hilferding} in (1927) on the Party Congress ~~strongly~~ believed ~~later~~ already like a very sick horse ^{at last} as finally my friend Einar succeeded in taking out the word "class struggle" from the (1958) programme. It does not work. The Russians still talk Marxism-Leninism (too

but Stalinism was taken out, ~~from~~ it will come back), but the introduction of "value" etc. in "Socialist Economy", as you had shown, ~~clearly~~ too much with Marx's fetish character of commodities. Don't tell me that Hegel understood the real meaning of Napoleon on the white horse, I do not think he did, but even if he did, the whole Hegel case was based up

to the few pages of ^{section} (I) in the First chapter of "Kapital". Again, what do we need Hegel for? Why Today? ^{It} ^{is} ^{not} ^{the} ^{best} ^{idea} ^{of} ^{great} excitement to teach Hegel today. As it can be smart (it is really done today, a new ^{forbidden} ^{prohibition}) to read Clausewitz - he is brilliant, witty and a great Hegelian dialectician, but will who can teach Clausewitz to ^{and} ^{understand} ^{today} ^{when} his voluminous analyses of the war 1815 is through and through faulty?

Concrete Humanism starts with Marx, with nobody else! Up till Marx is was the great dream! It was before Marx an abstraction, also for Hegel through.

14170

Letter from Peter Bergman

December 14, 1972

Dear Ray - Thank you for the Xmas greetings. I don't know what you want. Right after you informed me about your success with Dell I had written you a note congratulating you. Yes, this is an achievement to be proud of. What else? I still do not believe in Hegel Now. I think it can only lead to more confusion. Sure, I am also for studying Hegel now as I was in the 20's when Lenin's Notes appeared. But not much more than for studying Spirova, Herder, etc. I am afraid it is again a smuggling away from Marx. It is the same, exactly the same as when the great intellectuals started to go back to the "Young Marx". I enjoy, and will agree with, every word of the "Young Marx", but I do not need the "Young Marx" (he really meant what he said about the "nagging mice") since I have a much better (concrete) one from the year 1852 on. [Engels hit it right when he at the funeral after summarizing the great theoretical, philosophical and scientific achievements said: "For Marx was before all else a revolutionist." You are the one who, rightfully, speaks so much about theory as practice--where was Hegel's practice? He-Hegel--er away, maybe you don't know that Hegel was first a journalist (practice) and then took refuge in the university while Marx ("turning Hegel on its feet") started to become a professor but decided to accept the editorship of the "Rheinische Zeitung". You can jump to the top but I do not believe, without even having to see your book, that you know your Hegel better than Lassalle did. Lassalle went to Bismarck. Lassalle was not a renegade, it was the Logik of Hegel to go to Bismarck. [Walking through the streets in East Germany I saw plenty of Lassallian socialists, and nowhere is Hegel taught as much as at the university in Leipzig. Everywhere at the walls you see the good Hegelian word "people" (=Volk) but not once "proletariat". I agree, Hegel introduced the idea of freedom into philosophy by saying: "The people will learn to feel the dignity of man." Here truly is the genius of Hegel; but "Hegel Now" when he lived 30 and 40 years after Karst and Babeuf and still did not go as far as they? His horror against them is somewhat the same as yours against Mao.** What other effect can your Hegelianism have than winning friends for something which is any and basinards from the real Marx? [What the real Marx is, you know from his letter to Weydemeyer from 1852--the decisive year, by the way.] Lenin was right that one should study Hegel to be better able to understand Marx, but one does not need Hegel to understand Marx. Lenin spoke to revolutionaries who fell for Kautsky etc. like he himself before he had studied Hegel; you, however, speak--through the Dell Company--to people who at best are on the way to become revolutionary. One can be a revolutionary without Hegel! Blanqui and Karl Liebknecht were the "Heart and Brain" of the French and German proletariat, but complete "Anti-Hardists". [Liebknecht who was the greatest revolutionary, yes proletarian revolutionary of this century, the speaker of the proletarian youth, was also the author of "

" , a thick monistic work, clearly anti-Hardist.]

*I can't help it but for no word and deed go together. Pärvus was a genial politician with great revolutionary ideas but a scoundrel, and therefore not worth reading any more.

**Let's not kid ourselves. Hegel was revolutionary in Germany (and Russia!) but already far behind, I dare say "reactionary" compared to his French and English contemporaries, far behind St. Simon and even Holbach. The trouble with German philosophy was that it became dependent on Hegel and did not realize what H. Heine had said: "The philosophical revolution is at its end. Hegel had closed its circle." The next step was Weithing (Communism), a step away from Hegel.

14172

Why Hegel Now? Why not Feuerbach Now? After all, Feuerbach was just as important as Hegel. You should read him, not only what Engels wrote about him. Feuerbach, and not Hegel, was the first in the whole History of Philosophy who introduced consciously the idea of "WE" instead of the "I". (For Hegel even "the people" were still "I"! I bet Marcuse and the psycho-analysts never bothered with Feuerbach.

If you give today's intellectuals only Hegel (or at best Marx via Hegel), they will never understand the Proletariat and Marx's and Engels' discovery from the "Holy Family" on. More important than the Marxism as a whole is the development of the thoughts of Marx and Engels, and if you wish the development from Hegel, but from many many others than Hegel. -- [Can't you see that M & E learned much + much more from Fourier than from the whole Hegel? Why going back to Hegel who still-contrary to the French and English thinkers-bothered with theology no matter what his GOD-really-existed of? Today's intellectuals will never, and that was Lukacs' mistake, understand the Proletariat from studying Hegel. The task is not only the Dialectic of Class Struggle and hereby discover (as I am sure you do emphasize) our Freedom and Humanism--all that was discovered long before Marx though Marx was the most consequent--but the Role of the Proletariat. That, and that alone, the young people have to be taught and that one can only get from Marx and Engels and Lenin and Luxemburg and (don't jump at me) Trotsky and Mao [I for one can say such things since I never, never agreed with anything typically Trotsky], and never from Hegel. -- Any one of the proletarian revolutionaries is more worth than the whole Hegel. Remember Marx? One step of real rev. movement.

Isn't it typical that the official intellectuals in the West as well as in the East fall for "Alienation". Sure, a good word, very Hegelian and Marxian, but there is a very very good reason why Marx since 1852 did not use this word any more except in connection with labor in the production process. Every liberal you can impress with the slogan "Alienation", but he will still be a liberal. Indeed: the best way to become and feel a liberal is the outcry against "Alienation", because the best way to reduce (not abolish) "Alienation" is to make the fellow "interested"--if the horse could only be interested in the beauty of its harness, it would pull much better.

It is true that up till the later Lenin, Hegel was treated as Moses Mendelssohn had treated Spinoza--as " ", but I also fell for it when the Comintern introduced the great "Campaign" for Hegel. Yes, I profited from it, I studied Hegel at that time very intensively with " ". I enjoyed it and with the " " I thought Hegel to be the store of wisdom. But when the war began 1938/39 I began to understand Why Hegel(Now) is used by the Russians just as the Prussians used Hegel in the time of the Kings (Engels' beginning words in "Feuerbach"). I bear in mind that I have not read your book, but you can say what you want, I do not agree with "Hegel Now" for whatever reasons you might have. For it is from me to suspect that you simply want to impress. But "Hegel Now" can only lead to more confusion. Do you know the Hegel-Cult of the Hungarian "Marxists" after 1945? I mean etc.* It should be a warning! One can accept every word in Hegel, and still not be a revolutionary. Kautsky etc. tried to do it with Marx--it did not work; the Partei-vorstand had to cut out sentences from Marx and Engels, "explain" and in

* I don't mean Lukacs. He at that time got away from it. Lukacs always changes every 5 years.

the end to say openly that Marx and Engels, after all they were humans, weren't they, made mistakes-or were valid for a certain time only. True, they were riding with the flag of Marxism, but Hilferdig in 1927 on the Party Congress behaved already like a very sick or fallen horse and finally my friend Exler succeeded in taking out the word "class struggle" from the 1956 programme. It does not work. The Russians still talk Marxism-Leninism (too bad Stalinism was taken out; it will come back), but the introduction of "value" etc. in "Socialist Economy", as you had shown, clashed too much with Marx's Fetish character of commodities. Don't tell me that Hegel understood the real meaning of Napoleon on the white horse, I do not think he did, but even if he did, the whole Hegel can not reach up to the few pages of section 4 in the first chapter of "Kapital". Again, what does one need Hegel for? Why Today? (It can indeed be of great excitement to teach Hegel today. As it can be smart (it is really done today, a new fashion) to read Clausewitz--he is brilliant, witty and a great Hegelian Dialectician--to quote from-- but who can teach Clausewitz to militants and historians today--when his voluminous analyses of the war 1815 is through and through faulty?)

Concrete Humanism starts with Marx, with nobody else! Up till Marx it was the great dream! It was before Marx an abstraction, also for Hegel though he undoubtedly went after the experience of the French Revolution further than all Humanists (=Philosophy) before him. I can take Herder and prove Humanism and Freedom as much as you take Hegel and as much as Herder took Benjamin Franklin (Herder calls Franklin his idol of the century because of his " "). Why Hegel? Why not an anthology of Freedom and Humanism. But why nourish Idealism? I will not give up what I learned in the Marxian "Gedex" that Hegel was an Idealist. More than that; just the same as with Spinoza started Philosophy (as Hegel rightly said) and thereby started the end of Theology--just the same started with Marx the end of Philosophy. Why going back?

You know that Marx had planned to write a "Dialectic" similar to "Kapital". I swear that it would not have been a "philosophy" or a "system", it would have been a gigantic Critique; exactly as his critique of Ricardo. Yes, a critique! (if this word means anything than not Hegel Now). I even visualize the title: ("The) Dialectic--Critique of Social Philosophy" and Quesnay, Adam Smith and Ricardo would have been here, Spinoza, Kant and Hegel (and of course all the vulgarists). Would you for example say: "Ricardo Now"? Read the vulgar economists and you will see that Ricardo was not more but not less revolutionary than Hegel. Like consequent Hegel just the same did consequent Ricardo lead to revolution. But NOW?

All this because you seemed always to insist on my opinion. You might, if you wish, use this letter and answer publicly. All the best, P.A.

* Marx never accused the young Hegelians that they could not read-and understand-Hegel--they were used to his language better than Ray Dunayevskaya, what he said is that they were "dependant" on Hegel ["ABHÄNGIGKEIT VON HEGEL"] and "that was the reason why they had not even tried to give a throughout critique of the Hegelian system, though every one of them claimed to have already surpassed Hegel." Communism meant to get away from, to criticize radically, Hegel, and not HEGEL NOW.