

Bergman Publishers, Inc.

224 WEST 20 STREET • NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10011 • (212) 675-3714

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 finished. Then I envy you, yet very sympathetically. Following the advise of one of my best teachers in the movement, whose name was Ernst Haiger (he in happened to respect him as much as I did), I have a generally favorable attitude to the literary production of a revolutionary - even ~~revolutionary~~ sight unseen.

Yes, I wish to read it (if it should not take me more than two weeks) but not as a publisher. So far (though) I am not limited by Lyle Stuart - ~~unless~~ if you look at my list, ~~it~~ So far L.S. is losing money on my publications (except the Merchant Cook Book which ~~was~~ not the imprint "Perseus" Publishers though I organized it at ^{any suggestion} wrote the Introduction) and will merely not make if I realize my future plans. These plans are to bring out old revolutionary literature in English. This is my goal as a publisher, here I am a slave in my work at abilities - ~~disregarding~~ 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 ready the old subtle arguments of the old enlightenment against the existence of God - still for the "unity of theory and precise" theology because basic. Though what is going on in the Church today is of great importance, if one would let himself in in discussions about

14135

Thoreau, see does not feel see prior to join in the fight
against Vietnam.

Hegel is for me not like "dead dog" as Grinza was for
Moses Hess in Berlin. No, but still I know that f.e. Lassalle ^{and Marx} knew
Hegel by heart much better than you at I. What I saw just
now in Eastern Germany is ~~very~~ true materialism
in 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, 1859, 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 fermes you
are). I was the first in this country who ~~saw~~
brought in the Grundrisse and raved about it and 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, longer
more than ever by Kidney, gal-bladder, and financial
necessity, to get Kapital I out? ~~but~~ He even
said it already in the preface to the "Critique",
why he did not want to publish the Introduction, or
to see Grundrisse (at the Grundrisse itself), why he
leaves the economic-philosophical manuscript to
the ~~surviving~~ critic of the voice. 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 somewhat important
when he studied Hegel. Russia 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

In his ripened work (State of Reason) Lenin does not quote Hegel though Hegel has wonderful formulation on State, because Hegel is confused about State.

Speak with Hegel, this was the way to Marx.
What can Hegel give you what Marx could not? The Tree of Freedom or Humanity?
Don't be silly. The whole Hegel does not have Social Freedom or Humanity as the Communist Manifesto? [more than 100 years after it was written, the English Bureaucrat Standard gets the Manifesto only in a bad and far in some parts false translation of English translation (that Engels authorized). The translation does not make it perfect].
The I. vol. of Capital is terrible translated (the Russians did not touch it - the 2. at 3, which they translated is (interestingly) much better.] All these talkings about Hegel serves only confusion. Confusion - as if we do not leave example. Lukacs, the great Hegelian, is now however because he gives the impression (which he at that time did not want) that you do not need proletariat [even though at that time every page dealt with Proletariat] at that it is not important what meets Marx's Economy last. Worse Marcuse etc., Sartre etc.
Marx did not return to Hegel, why should

WE? He went ~~screaming~~^{he tells you} out of Hegel — ~~but he~~^{that he} ~~put him upside down~~
Marx tells every body that he overcame Hegel,
he refuted Hegel, he made use of him Hegel
~~because~~^{Hegel} ~~he was wrong, you were wrong and also~~
~~(as far as Marat was concerned)~~
~~the bourgeoisie~~
~~already~~ Couler revolutionary. But you do not want that.

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

When
Marxism
starts to
read Hegel,
Marx was the
whole night
already
consider
revolution
leave, what kind of
Humanity, since Marx "let us down"
this problems of the future. What confusion!

I have the experience of German illegal movement
as especially the confusion "Miles" did, with the
help of Hegel at Lenin. I meet the professors of
Soviet world ~~who want~~^{want} ideology who want
already to discuss, what kind of Socialism we should
leave, what kind of Democracy, what kind of
Humanity, since Marx "let us down" in
this problems of the future. What confusion!

I would be delighted to read your manuscript,
but even if it is ~~now~~^{now} boring as your theoretical
essays in your News letters, but I am not
interested in it as a publisher or even
less from viewpoint of my understanding of
necessity of theory at practice.

Sorry — best with the
best wishes

Peter

P.S. Why Hegel? Why Now? I can give you the biengest
answer. Because we have ^{now} a revival of the 1830 and 1840's at the
same time (the pre-Marx period) with Max Stirner, etc. Looking behind
from the CHUZPE of Lukacs, Marcuse, Dreyfus-Schaya and Peter
Pernau, that we are the only ones who understand Hegel, I state
that Hegel knew Hegel ~~but that his advise that Heinrich~~
~~Heine, was the only one who characterize of Hegel was the best~~
~~(better than we all)~~
is still valid! Hegel has brought the philosophical revolution to an
end. Hegel has closed the great circle ~~which started with~~
Spinoza, followed by the enlighteners. Humanity at freedom starts
with Marx to be concrete. Please, before you publish your book,
read Heinrich Heine!