

Dear Peter:

April 27, 1982

Yours of 23rd, received yesterday, was a very welcome response not just to the points raised in my letter, but the grasp you have of philosophy and organization, the immediate and revolutionary journalism. Indeed, it gave me the idea of an immediate assignment: for you to write the lead for the next issue on the Middle East. At the same time I wish to comment on the question of "3 books, not one."

Locating the difficulty, pinpointing it as presenting, not 3 books seriatim so to speak, but "as totality" is the problem. So, how about saying something like this: Where M&F, 1957, ended with Automation and the New Humanism, where the link of continuity was Abolitionism and "Today"; and where P&R, 1973, ended with the challenge from the 3rd World as well as WLM and Youth, RL, 1982, ends seeing the link of continuity, the 1880s trail to the 1980s, the NEW IN EACH PERIOD AND IN ALL 3 GOT TO THE CONCRETE WITHOUT LOSING THE UNIVERSAL THROUGH WHAT SEEMS ABSTRACT--2ND NEGATIVITY--most concretely. Thus, in 1914, when VII discovered reason and the concrete in that abstraction--"transformation into opposite"--which M&F captured for 1950s, P&R both began and ended with Absolute Idea AS NEW BEGINNING. Moreover, RL precisely because it deals only with revolutionaries who yet didn't penetrate 2nd negativity as concrete, led us 1st to see that the GREAT DIVIDE, the SECOND Great Divide not only didn't <sup>emerge</sup> in their age, but in our age, at least not with state-capitalist theory but only with total philosophy, M-H when finally a movement from practice that was itself a form of theory first made imperative our task, not of end of philosophy, but its greater, more arduous task because it is an ongoing revolutionary activity.

See what you can do with that by making it briefer, more lucid, shorter sentences, and cut to the measure of what specific audience you are addressing.

Yours, hurriedly,

15339