

June 15, 1986

Dear Raya,

Both your letter to Steinkraus and my preparing for a meeting on the Call led me to reread the Science of Logic on "Idea of the Good". There I ~~was~~ saw for the first time that when Hegel has AI as unity of theoretical and practical idea on threshold of the AI, it is not so one-sidedly in favor of the practical idea as I had thought. In fact, he is saying that without the theoretical idea, the practical idea returns to Kantianism. He has just finished subjecting the practical idea to a sharp ~~ex~~ critique: "There are still two worlds in opposition, one a realm of subjectivity in the pure regions of transparent thought, the ~~ex~~ other a realm of objectivity..." (S of L, p. 820)

①

This is what all of the Marxists, VIL ~~xxxx~~ included, seemed to miss. Apparently they were so happy to have Hegel in favor of "practices". Lukacs certainly does no better than Lenin on this point (The Young Hegel, pp. 348-52) —and then, unlike Lenin, reduces AI to God and so forth, and runs away from it completely.

~~xxxx~~ Reading your correspondence with HM in Vol. XII (and why did you so play down that in your intro, I feel there is a lesson here for me which I am not grasping) I noticed that he opposed your "direct" use of Hegel for analysis of contemporary scene as much or more than your view of the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ proletariat. All of this leads to a scathing critique of all HM, to whom Marx's critique of Feuerbach could apply: they left the "active side" to be developed by ~~xxxxxxxx~~ idealism, ever since Marx's death, which is why BSA gives you a more serious discussion than ~~xxx~~.

I remember when ~~xxxxxx~~ I was writing my thesis on Lenin and quoted to ~~xxxx~~ the part on AI as unity of theoretical and ~~xxx~~ practical idea, and he said: well, if what Lenin comes up with after 300 pp. on Hegel is "unity of theory and practice", then how is that original? That is in any case an ambivalent legacy that VIL left behind, leading others to still disregard Hegel.

All of this leads me to two suggestions: (1) That we include 1 or 2 of the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ post-HMF letters to and from HM as an appendix to the new edition of D of L. (2) That I try to write an essay "RD on Hegel", which perhaps Owl of Minerva would consider publishing. Without attempting to ~~xxxxxx~~ "speak for" you or "summarize" ~~ix~~ your position, which I could not and would not want to do, it could perhaps serve to introduce academia to the ~~xxxx~~ full range of ~~xxxx~~ your 50 years of writings on Hegel, whether in PER, HMF, TW and TP columns, HM correspondence, D of L, or 1949-51 correspondence. If I first write such an essay, even if it cannot find a publisher, I think I would be also in a far better position to revise my Lenin ~~xxxx~~ thesis. What do you think?

2/Yes
Fig

not 50
Concentrate
on the
points
1949-51

Best,

Kern

11260