

and indigestible Hegelianism. While Marx's historical investigations point away from Hegel, his theoretical self-consciousness remained profoundly Hegelian (as is evident in the 1859 Preface and the Grundrisse).

The final paper, 'Teleology in Hegel', given by Professor Manser, consisted of a detailed commentary on the chapter on teleology in Hegel's Science of Logic. Contrasting Hegel's account of teleology with earlier teleologies, which attributed purposive ends to nature, Manser argued that Hegel's teleology is primarily humanistic. Teleology was reintroduced into modern philosophy by Kant, and Hegel maintained that he had raised the right questions but given the wrong answers. Hegel's own account of purpose marks a radical departure from the tendency to present formal distinctions between final and efficient causes, mechanism and purpose. According to Manser, Hegel's concept of teleology is best approached through an analysis of human desire and skilled labour. In order to fulfil his desires and render the world hospitable, the craftsman or farmer is forced to interact with the external world, making use of tools and natural laws, and in so doing adding to his knowledge of nature and increasing the scope of future desires and possibilities. With references to the Science of Logic and examples from the Philosophy of History, Manser illustrated Hegel's account of the 'cunning of man' who, in the employment of tools and machinery, such as ploughs and windmills, reveals that nature's mechanism and human finality are not externally opposed but are integral moments in a dialectical totality where ends and means are not distinct categories but are fluid and interpenetrable. In the following discussion the similarities and dissimilarities between the Hegelian and Darwinian conceptions of evolution were considered. The conference closed at 4 p.m.

S. Easton

University of Sussex

Sixth Biennial Convention of the Hegel Society of America

The sixth biennial meeting of the Hegel Society of America was held on 2-4 October 1980 in Champlain College, Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario, in very scenic surroundings and against the colourful background of Canadian autumn. Prof. John Burbidge (Trent) was in charge of local arrangements and Prof. K.R. Dove (Benington College), as programme Chairman, was responsible for the finalization of papers and speakers. The proceedings followed a formal pattern: a forty-minute lecture, a twenty-minute comment and a general discussion. A very full programme and a large number of participants produced a slightly rushed atmosphere during the convention, but one will get a second, more leisurely chance to digest the rich and varied intellectual fare when the proceedings of the convention in due course appear in print (there is hope it will be somewhat sooner than in the past).

The general theme of the convention was 'Hegel Today' and the order of papers, speakers and commentators was as follows (commentator's name in brackets): 'Hegel's Rejection of Absolutism': William Maker, Clemson (Edward Beach, Stanford); 'Hegel and the Formalization of Logic': D.T. Lachterman, Swarthmore College (Joshua Cohen, M.I.T.); 'The Dialectic of Teleology': Willem de Vries, Amherst College (Myrian Bienenstock, Hebrew University, Jerusalem); 'Hegel and Moral Theory Today': David Hoy, Barnard College (G.A. Schrader, Jr., Yale); 'Hegel's Answer to the Contemporary Impasse in Philosophy': Richard Winfield, New York (Q. Lauer, S.J., Fordham); 'Logic and Dialectic': Stanley Rosen, Pennsylvania State (John Burbidge, Trent); 'The Dialectic of Human Relations': R.N. Berki, Hull (Kathleen Wright, Haverford College); 'Hegel's Critique of Political Economy': Peter Stillman, Vassar College (Albert Fried, SUNY at Purchase).

In the evening of the first day of the convention, H.S. Harris (York University, Toronto), the retiring HSA President, delivered an address on 'Would Hegel be a Hegelian today?' and Z.A. Pelczynski gave a lecture commemorating the late Sir Malcolm Knox.

The number and range of papers and the complexity of issues raised in them make it impossible to summarize their contents, even briefly. Only a few general and impressionistic comments can be made. While on this side of the Atlantic the predominant mood is still one of curiosity and discovery, a far greater degree of confident familiarity with Hegel was assumed on the other side of the ocean. Problems tended to be dealt with on a more specialized and technical level - an obvious result of a far greater amount of teaching and research on Hegel which had gone on in USA and Canada for some years. One seemed to detect a slight split between some of the younger and some senior participants of the convention. The former seemed more willing to question (or to ignore) the fundamental assumptions of the Hegelian system and to try and make partial sense of Hegel, sometimes with reference to contemporary analytical philosophy. Such 'revisionism' was met with criticism from those who believed in the essential unity and coherence of Hegelian thought and who were sceptical about the validity of radical re-interpretation or the possibility of illuminating the obscurities of Hegel with light borrowed from hostile sources. In general, the dominant mood of the meeting was that it was contemporary philosophy which had much to learn from Hegelianism rather than the other way round. Although Hegel's social and political philosophy formed only a small part of the meeting, the papers of P. Stillman and R. Berki excited a particularly lively and heated debate, which suggested that this aspect of Hegel's philosophy had quite a strong appeal also in North America.

A measure of light relief from the serious side of the convention was provided by a performance of 'The Absolute Boot' by F.W. Linder, the last of three plays inspired by Hegelian philosophy in Germany in the 1830s and 1840s. The play had been specially translated into English for the Trent performance by L.S. Stepelevich. As can be imagined, the task of staging a philosophical play in which there was hardly any action, and pages of The Phenomenology of Spirit were recited more or less straight, proved a formidable theatrical problem.

At the business meeting the HSA elected its new officers: President - Q. Lauer, S.J. (Fordham), Vice-President - J. Burbidge (Trent), Secretary - P. Stillman (Vassar) and Treasurer and Owl Editor - L.S. Stepelevich (Villanova), who was not opposed. It was decided to hold the 1982 convention in Clemson, South Carolina, and to devote it to Hegel's philosophy of history. It was also agreed to organize an international conference jointly with the British Hegel Society in the autumn of 1981, in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of Hegel's death. Q. Lauer, E.E. Harris and H.S. Harris (the last three presidents) were elected the HSA representatives on the planning committee. To strengthen links with the HSGB it was agreed that the HSA President and Owl Editor and the HSGB Chairman and Bulletin Editor should be honorary members of the sister societies on the other side of the Atlantic. The presence of three HSGB members at Trent (R. Berki, A.V. Miller and Z.A. Pelczynski) was noted with pleasure and hope for more British participants in 1982 was expressed. The possibility of HSGB members subscribing to the published HSA convention proceedings was also raised. (The HSGB members interested in the forthcoming volume on The Phenomenology of Spirit should contact Prof. L.S. Stepelevich, Dept. of Philosophy, Villanova University, Villanova, Pa. 19085).

Z.A. Pelczynski

Internationale Hegel-Vereinigung: 1981 Congress

The International Hegel Association will hold its 1981 Hegel Congress at the Liederhalle in Stuttgart, 25-28 June 1981. Its theme is 'Kant or Hegel? The Forms of Proof in Philosophy'. The following is an extract from the printed 'Invitation' (which also contains a detailed programme) received by the Bulletin Editor. Copies may be obtained from Professor Dieter Henrich, Philosophisches Seminar der Universität, Marsiliusplatz 1, D-6900 Heidelberg 1.

'The International Hegel Society organizes its next Congress 200 years after the appearance of the Critique of Pure Reason and 150 years after Hegel's death. It will take up the controversy between the transcendental proof method and the forms of reasoning closely connected with those of Hegel, both in their historical and contemporary manifestations.

'The programme therefore contains three groups of colloquia. Questions of method of the Kantian philosophy and the Idealist critique of Kant will be discussed in the first group, which is also concerned with the relation of transcendental motives and speculative thinking within Fichte's and Hegel's systems. The second group takes up the fundamental questions of philosophical proof from the viewpoint of important positions and developments in contemporary philosophy. In the third group those particular problems of philosophy will be controversially discussed for which the difference between the two conceptions of proof is of decisive importance: in the philosophical theories of norms, science, society and art.