

Oct. 10, 1956

Dear Saul: I hope you will forgive me my sin--it looks like this chapter which has grown to 3 chapters will need to be retyped before your editing and final retyping. It could not be helped. None other will be like that; although one may be almost that bad (The Great Divide ~~xxx~~ additions on NQ), none, absolutely none will be that bulgy. The reason is that this is the one I had hoped that socialist economist (Erich) would do in part by summing up my previous study and checking figures, but in the end I had to do it all myself. And it grew and grew because I feel now that my study of Stalin was deficient because it answered only the question (so dear to Johnsonites) of personality and the objective, while not left out, was subordinate.

Here is how it shapes up now: Ch. I-- Russian

S-C vs. Wkrs Revolt; A-The 1st 5 Year Plan, pp.1-7
B-2nd 5 Yr Plan, pp.7-12
C-3rd 5 Yr Plan & Summation, pp.12-18
(in which also must be incl. pages from NI study, attached)
Ch. II--Why Did Stalin Behave As He Did? Portrait of a Totalitarian
pp. ~~13-18~~ 19-23
Ch. III--Beginning of the End of It., p.24-26

Of course I dare say nothing of the size of the pages and fantastic cut, nor the Statistical Abstract (one thing at least you won't have to do twice. One single quotation from Mx is missing; otherwise it is all there.

May decide to stay till Tues.--it all moves so slowly and time is so short--but then we'll have something to crow about when it is all done.

Yours,

F. M.

12132

C
O
P
Y

Oct. 14, 1956

P.S.

I have got J down pat re the "technical aspect" of not being able to do Absolute Idea. Once they departed from the proletariat as centre, they could not possibly have created a dialectic, so they (J&G) thought they must prove AI as dialectic method, the "correct" method. First he tried it in Dialectic Notes and naturally got lost on Synthetic Cognition of Trotsky. Then, 6 months later to be exact when I translated Lenin and insisted that that means Capital in particular, not "philosophy in general", must be the crux of the work, J came up with this: if we could show that all that Lenin did that was right was "dialectical" and all that Bukharin did was wrong and "non-dialectical", then thereby we will have "proven" the absolute. As usual, we were to leave it to him; meanwhile G had not even done the Syllogism which had been set as her task and as a preliminary to the Absolute Idea. That none of it was done, you know, but what has dawned upon me now is the utter senselessness of "proving" the dialectic or the AI. The dialectic has to be created and that "proves" the AI. Thus, Marx in 1844 more or less rejected the AI, but in 1867 created a new dialectic and thereby proved the AI. The same was true in 1915. Lenin created a new dialectic out of the deeper and lower layers of proletariat and thereby proved the AI. With all due proportions the same was true in 1953 when we let the beginning of the end of totalitarianism seep into us that we anticipate the revelation and thus "prove" the AI by creating out of the new stage a new dialectic. What Marcuse can't see with his "notion" of proletariat qua class is that the dialectic is always recreated out of abstracta and so he too wants it "proven". MARXISM AND FREEDOM will put a period to all of them so that we finally can begin on new beginnings.

R

12133