

Feb 22, 1967

Dear Ray, yes, I was really interested in the portions of your chapter and since I have given up my hyperactive sleep² find time to write you a letter. I might even dig up the 1000 pages from the cabinet where I once wrote about the "tentative fall of the role of profit" and the "organic composition of capital" under state capitalism.

It became a fashion to fêter Marx as a "great philosopher" and even as a "humanist". All this is nice and good, but one forgets that he spent 25 years on the Capital. Very consciously he left philosophy to give the genuine critics of the view, they ^{had} (with Engels) closed for ever "philosophy" after they had put Hegel on its feet.

Try to understand me. I am not against Lenin's discovery of Hegel. He might have had good reasons for it, after himself blundering around with formalist materialism. That he ^{the} mastered Hegel and Marx

I have no doubt - he could not have written State and Revolution without it. But what do you really need Hegel for? You cannot surprise me in the recognition of Hegel's importance, but still, what do we need him for? Don't we have confusion enough? I am afraid that for example to serious revolutionaries in Japan Hegel can very much appeal ^{to} ^{some} ^{of} ^{the} ^{same} ^{people} as to Hengstenberg or to some good fellows

12517 with strong arms or to intellectuals who like

Handwritten note on the left margin: "I read Lenin's 'What is to be done?' 1902. I have also read Kautsky"

Geist
I prefer them that they should stick to Buddhism!

There, there cannot be today philosophy without
Hegel. ^{Why do we use philosophy? we have} But socialists went further. ~~He is the one~~

~~already said~~ Why do we have to get back
to the time before Heinrich Heine who said
everything what had to be said about Hegel and

Bertram: Philosophy as Reciprocity? There is nothing
which gives us ~~no~~ ^{no} ~~useful~~ ^{useful} intellectual

enjoyment ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~as~~ ^{as} Hegel and all
of them who directly read Hegel, i. e. Herder

etc. But only Marx is concrete. In fact, Hegel
became Hegel through Marx. In fact, Hegel without

Spinoza or Herder would not have been - but

Marx could have been completely without

Hegel. What he ^{not Hegel, but what Hegel also used!} really ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~the~~ ^{the} English
+ French Revolutions, the concrete ^{class struggle,} ~~struggle~~

I will write or write about it. The main
question is: what ^{can} you ~~cannot~~ say with Marx

without Hegel. There is nothing! But on

the other side is a danger involved, a

danger of confusion. But isn't there enough

confusion? Do you really think that Rosa L.

did not understand the sch. ~~because~~ ^{because} she

knew Hegel's language? How simple would

this be. Sure it is ~~the~~ Hegel dialectic when Marx

Luciano did change language to the oppressed side
the Hegel a slave penetration of Buddha's teaching, it is very
easy to fall in the course, remember he quote - say he is not about

described in a few short sentences in the Critique of the Gotha programme (1875) the "rest" of "bourgeois law" in the first stage of communist society — Lenin grasped the meaning of these sentences better than anybody, not because of ^{his} Hegel, but because of their concrete meaning for him in the discussion of 1917.

The danger with Hegel is that the ~~Konzepts~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Marxists~~ ~~can~~ ~~quote~~ ~~him~~ ~~and~~ ~~at~~ ~~the~~ ~~"~~ ~~quarter~~ ~~of~~ ~~Marx~~ ~~"~~ (which Hegel was not!) Quersay as the physiognomist gave ^{Marx at least} ~~him~~ ~~as~~ ~~much~~ ~~as~~ ~~less~~ ~~than~~ ~~Hegel~~. And already in their time knew M+E what confusion Hegel created — today the confusion can only be greater, with Kropkin and ~~Marx~~ ~~being~~ ~~around~~. By the way: I never had anything of Trotskyism in my blood and I don't like to measure who is "better", but I liked ^{had} ~~Saint~~ ~~just~~ ~~always~~ ~~better~~ ~~than~~ ^{Kropkin} ~~Napoleon~~. If ~~to~~ ~~Marx~~ ~~allowed~~ ~~himself~~ ~~sympathy~~ ~~for~~ ~~the~~ ~~Turkey~~ I am allowed some sympathy for ~~Marx~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~Brandlerianist~~ ~~MAOTSETUNG!!!~~ ~~The~~ ~~Chinese~~ ~~(~~ ~~who~~ ~~taught~~ ~~me~~ ~~Hegel~~ ~~)~~ ~~would~~ ~~be~~ ~~happy~~ ~~if~~ ~~he~~ ~~could~~ ~~see~~ ~~the~~ ~~writings~~ ~~of~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~walls~~ ~~in~~ ~~Peking~~. When I read the first times the "resolutions" of the Chinese Central C. against Kropkin's "revisionism" it reminds me their ~~the~~ ~~Chinese~~

- 4 -

taught Spinoza as Hegel to the Chicago Students
in Moscow 1924-27. He always told me that
they were the best students he ever had. I used
to make him mad when I quote Hegel against him.

Now, Ray, I gave you also the "concrete" lead
with which to criticize my critique of your
Hegel apologetik - I leave it to you, everybody
has a right to misunderstand everybody - I
am not against Hegel, but I see a danger in
the re-discovery of Hegel, I see more confusion.
Therefore since I am not religious I dare
say that to me personally is Hegel nothing
more than HECUBA!

I am not against theory, I am for it very
much, but one should really be concrete. The
Johnson "Great Society" or "Wirtschaftswunder"
is an excellent material for the organic composition
of capital, why not spend the time and
energy for such a book which could even
be read? - one concrete step which would
to say be more than 10 programmes,
if I may paraphrase Marx!

Believe me, I mean it!

Poor.

Yours
f

P.S. By the way, ~~speaking about Hegel.~~

12520