



In contrast, Kelly starts in great good humor and makes clear to begin with that not being a "Leninologist" and not having read his notes on Hegel for many years, he isn't really clear, but feels he agrees with me on my critique, since "practice and volition were of higher value to him than 'the Absolute' or indeed Das Denken", promising me he will write in greater detail after he has had a chance "to match the thoroughness..." that I supposedly achieved. Whereupon he makes it clear that disagreement with me on Lenin is not any sort of endorsement of my interpretation of Hegel; "who, for me, is ~~not~~ a revolutionary philosopher in the sense of comprehending the Absolute either as 'the new society' or as 'ceaseless motion ... that permanent revolution'. He is a revolutionist in his claim for knowing and the manner of those claims; ~~and they cannot be denied a presumed impact on society.~~ After which, he begs off because we would just be rehearsing "our old debate".

GAK then says that what he is really talking about is the question of the relationship of ~~the~~ objective and Absolute and that objective to Hegel is history, politics, social and "as such it seems a part of nature even preponderantly so, and lends itself to the Marxist (reinversion)". He gives credit to Marx in only one claim and that is "Hegel's true interest is not the Philosophy of Right but Logic ... Logic is not used to prove the nature of the state, but the state is used to prove the Logic." (Kelly is referring to O'Malley's translation of Marx's "Critique of Right," p. 18 )

*vi. rephrasing on Marx*

(This last para. shows him more religious than even Dupré and even than Hegel. Work it out.)

He also quotes in German from the Philosophy of Right the z. ~~from~~ para. 13. I will leave Cieskowski be.