

Richard Huett, Editor-in-Chief  
Laurel Editions-Delta Books

Nov. 29, 1972

Dear Richard:

Hurriedly, as these conferences\* never seem to end and I'm leaving for another one--the Second Int. TELOS Conference where I am to speak on "History and the Dialectic". But, of course, nothing takes priority over Dell publication of *Philosophy and Revolution*, so here are the answers to questions you raised in letter of the 27th I just received:

1) You are absolutely right. There is to be no period after "Absolute negativity" on p.ii; the emphasis was supposed to have been on the elimination of the last two words, "is the" so that "Absolute negativity" of p.ii immediately continues with p.iii "pervades, moves....."

2) The only chapter which was previously published in an earlier version is the one on Lenin, Chapter III, The Shock of Recognition and the Philosophic Ambivalence of Lenin, and it is so marked on p.138. If it needs to be identified elsewhere, then here it is and please note that the reference to New Critics Press not repeated by me as that publisher seemed to have gone out of existence before ever it was published. In any case, it is the same journal and same conference: TELOS, Spring, 1970; also in both Serbo-Croat and English versions of PRAXIS, 5/6, Zagreb, Yugoslavia. (When TELOS wrote me recently that their announcement of publication of *Teleg* Conference never did take place, though evidently set in print or something, I made it clear to them that my work will be published by you and therefore they would have to give you credit, not v.v. In any case, the chapter is not the precise form in which it was published in 1970.) Also, while it is true that the Sartre chapter made the rounds, that was not a published, but a mimeographed version, and, again, is not the same.

3) May I take a few more days before I give an answer as to sub-title? Your suggestion "From Hegel to Sartre, and from Marx to Mao" is good. But since I also wished revolutions brought in as real, i.e., to stress that it is not only theory, but reality, I kept hoping I would come up with something that mentions from French Revolution through Russian to Today.

4) I do not dedicate my books because I consider all who helped as collaborators, and last sentence on p.v says: "I consider Philosophy and Revolution to be as much their work as mine."

Yours,

\*I just got a call from UCLA who, in April, are having a whole week devoted to WL, and I am to address them on April 16th on "Women as Force and as Reason." Incidentally, do past reviews of Marxism and Freedom when it is from such important source as London Times help present?

14165