

October 19, 1963

Dear Bessie:


Once again I have changed my mind on that Mao supplement. It is wrong to consider it an "Appendix", new or otherwise. Not only is an appendix generally documentary, but it is subordinate. This is true even when it is something as great as the appendices in M&F for, though originals and far superior to a modern text, it nevertheless was used as background, as illumination of that modern thesis—state-capitalism and humanism. But it was the modern thesis that had to stand on its own feet or fall flat on its face.

Mao Tse-tung is new all right and must be given space as a chapter of Part V: The Problems of Our Age: State Capitalism vs. Freedom. It is true that, if it had been written then, it would be Ch.XV, Mao following naturally after Stalin, and the final chapter would remain the positive in the New Humanism. But the truth is that, as a new schism within state capitalism, it didn't even exist then. And as it is added now, it will be Ch.XVII, but it will not detract from the New Humanism note we ended on, since this still ends on the note of a book still to come, and a philosophy of Subjectivity first to be developed.

Now this isn't just a technical question. Already, the very idea of it as chapter meant that I could not patch it together as I had in *Algonac*, but had rather to create a new part in which all the new on the non-viability of state-capitalism and the possibility of war between China and Russia solidly together as a unit, rather than scattered all over the place. Now I am also reshifting the beginning. And, if Olga doesn't take it out of my hands and retype soon it might end up by being a book, after all. But, no, no, no, it must be the paperback and must come early next year, if not January, then February. (Wayne publishers are refusing to commit themselves until they have both additions—Mao, and the new Introduction I haven't even begun; and no doubt are laying the groundwork for trying to jack up price to us.)

Finally, the whole work has given me new ideas on the class to be conducted here. As you know, here we are beginning with a sort of extra (Sartre which, if we can't get a sponsor on Wayne University campus, we'll do under our own power, but not at office for only an outside place could emphasize the new and attempt to attract white intellectuals. This, however, is not as important as is the method which, after a single discussion this Friday, convinces me that it must, very early in the sessions, go directly to state-capitalism and that state-capitalism must not be limited to Russia, as is M&F, but must include Mao. Especially with the Freedom Now movement here (and the Trotskyists trying to use the movement to create a "third party, all black" with whites doing most of the yelling "all black"! ) and the color question being so uppermost in the Negro revolutionary, there will be a tendency towards China, and we must nip it before it ever gets started for that is not only a virus, it is a deadly cancer. We'll discuss it at the REB when we meet next week, and I want to hear also from you when you intend reaching the chapter on state-capitalism in the LA classes. I will also send a copy of this to Barbara and find out what she is planning in Milwaukee. Let me get your reactions at once.

Yours,



P.S. I just received from La Nuova Italia 2 other reviews of M&F, including one in the largest daily paper in Rome, occupying two full columns of the length of nearly a NY Times page. Damen too wrote: they're having a conference in Nov., and he has evidently broken with Raimondi altogether as he says he has not much to do with Azione Comunisti: the Trotskyists have really gone haywire on Mao in Italy especially; evidently this was the basis of the unity of Pablo and JPC—Mao's "permanent revolution" theory! Lordy, lordy!!

13877