



and dialectic to the development of science, and, in fact, it could be helped in its own field if it did understand the dialectical philosophy. It is no accident that the theory of relativity came in the historic period of the RR, nor that of the unified field theory at the time of Automation and Humanism. I became so excited when the formula was first published, though I did not and do not understand a single part about it, that I raised heaven and earth to try to meet Einstein. By the time I met his assistant, Boris Kaufman, and convinced her she should introduce me, he died. I have always wanted a science chapter in my new book. The division of the "two cultures" cripples each of them.

p.viii. Knower and doer are used in the sense of trying to see the totality or unity. It can be the very same person who knows and does. If there is a separation between activity and knowing, if knowledge is used as if it too had no observer, analyzer and participant it is defective. Other with a capital O is one of the most difficult and important concepts in Hegel and here HM is correct in the way he tries to use it with a little "of" so to speak. What he is saying is that nothing is alone, it is always related to other. Even when it is not a person but a thing it is so. For example, the doctor analyzes the sick person not only in terms of himself and his disease but in terms of "other"--the state of health. That all would be fairly easy to understand. The difficulty comes in the fact that at the end of the dialectic process other turns out to be "yourself." That is to say, it is one more phase of your own self-development, and it inheres in you, and not out of some external contact. Mankind certainly is struggling more than to maintain itself; it is struggling to put down its own pre-history, and first begin its true history, the human dimension, which needs not only to be freed from subjugation, but to begin to develop the "is", not the "have".

You are absolutely right unless you pinpoint "progress in the consciousness of freedom" as KM had done, you can get nowhere, and with all his knowledge of Hegel, this is what often happens to HM--his concept of the backwardness of the manner, their alleged failure to be that subject of transformation of reality just has him deafened.

pp.ix-x. You have caught the point on positive and negative, and HM precisely there shows how far he must recede from Reason when he suddenly accuses it of being the villain. There is no substitute for Humanism, and KM pinpointed the fundamental error "the lie of the principle" in Hegel when he said it was due to his de-humanization of ideas. It still is that. It is not Reason which is at fault, it is the men who reason so poorly.

I meant to tell you that not HM but Hegel himself, especially the Encyclopaedia or "Small" Logic you should really always have with you, first because it is kosher, and secondly because now that you are getting into it, I believe you will really soon be swimming easily --which is when your self-liberation, in thought, will gain that new dimension which will make it a collaborator in the new book.

Good luck!

Love,

*Kaufman*

13885