

Hayden White UCLA

July 15, 1972

Dear HW:

Thank you very much for your kind letter of May 31 and now I have the good news to report: I have landed a contract with Dell! Working for that explains the delay in my answer, and I trust therefore you will also forgive me for beginning, first, with what Dell Publishers seem to want from some "names" like Marcus, yourself, and two others in academia in quotable letters to me that they could use for advance announcements of Philosophy and Revolution which is not scheduled for publication before Fall, 1973. In a word, there is no hurry in the commentary on the manuscript in toto--and they will either xerox or send galley proofs to the few chosen in sufficient time long before that date next year. The urgency applies only to expression of willingness to do so. May I hear from you soon? (Your friend Van Dusen of Harper Torchbooks sent a very nice letter of rejection which stated that, though Harper & Row cannot say, yes, at the present for another Marxist work, they do hope "our competitors will say, yes" to me.)

Actually, I am anxious for you to get advance copy of the whole before publication for the more important reason, to me, of your reviewing the work in journals like History and Theory and others you mentioned to me to which you have access to as analyst as well as reviewer. The reason that predominates in my mind this far in advance is that I feel we are not very far from McCarthyism of the 1950's which covered Marxism and Freedom in a shroud of silence.

Now then your point of criticism on one of the aspects of the Marx chapter in P&R. Of course the dialectic, to Marx, was "also a method of analysis." Of course, he wished very much to actually popularize some Hegelian terms by "examples". And, most important, Lenin caught that, just that, in the very section on forms of value of Chick to which you refer. Yet, when I refer to that in the chapter on Lenin's philosophic ambivalence, I proceed, not to talk of the various forms of value, but to go directly to the fetishism itself. That this is not only due to the fact that the Communists have so degraded "forms", or, at best, have used it only as contrast to essence, and not as Universal form which towers over essence as freedom does over political "forms" is seen best in your very independent expression. I'm referring to your use of that most unique Hegelian concept, mediation, as if it were hardly more than Lenin's most unfortunate use of the word "transmission belt" when, in fact, he meant that between the CP and the masses, the unions were a most human expression of forces uncontained by parties and states and intellectual elite. In a word, I wanted to stay longest at Marx's original creativity rather than the "also's" even where the also is important, is necessary, is true, in order to make sure that none will have a point of departure for staying at the never-ending repetitiousness of what other eras have already solved. On the other hand, I agree with you 100% when it comes to our own era, and I follow most carefully all your suggestions as I now am at the very end of editing for publisher. So, many, many thanks.

Yours,

14147