

Harriet ~~talk~~  
There to Paper

12/22/86

Very rough sudden decision to include Phenomenology pretty much at the beginning, and yet, have it again at the very end, when I will propose that by June we re-issue my notes on Phenomenology, with truly new introduction yet to be written, but essence of which is given ~~precisely~~ precisely here, precisely because it is on organization.

KM is considered <sup>H's</sup> ~~the~~ greatest work, the/work of genius, ~~the~~ and yet so profound that it becomes ground for his own new continent of thought. And we know for a fact that these 1844 essays, "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic", is H's spontaneous work of genius, which in embryo has the totality of his ~~dialectic~~ dialectic. "Negation of the negation" becomes not only revolution, but that which comes after, the destruction of capitalism and the creation of a new humanism. Now the point is what?, specifically? <sup>world</sup> The phenomenal ~~was~~ was not just appearance, and the philosophic categories would come out as the essence; no, the phenomenal world was the essence that appears. So what was all Hegel's many stages of alienation?, if it wasn't the subject ~~was~~ confronting the objective world? That, said Marx, is the fatal flaw in Hegel; that is the de-humanization of thought so tht consciousness instead of ~~examining~~ spotlighting the essence, the Notion, because it spotlights the human being who thinks, consciousness throws a mystical veil. It is that which has to be removed, which Marx is removing, in his transformation of the Hegelian dialectic, without for a moment forgetting his own indebtedness to it, because it is this process of development of man/woman and society as the objective and subjective development that illuminates, when humanized, and which shows History to be not just history as thought, but history of humanity's self-  
Development.

10837

2

And, as Hegel himself shows, /organization of thought and organization reveals the to the Absolute: of man's activity, /the pathway

"The goal, which is Absolute Knowledge or Spirit knowing itself as Spirit, finds its pathway in the recollection of spiritual forms as they are in themselves and as they accomplish the organization of their spiritual kingdom. Their conservation, looked at from the side of their free existence appearing in the form of contingency, is History; looked at from the side of their intellectually comprehended organization, it is the Science of the ways in which knowledge appears. Both together, or History (intellectually) comprehended, form at once the recollection and the Golgotha of the Absolute Spirit..."

Because to Marx it wasn't consciousness in itself developing outside of the human being; it was the human being itself who develops consciousness, and with it, creating a world that man shapes himself, not out of whole cloth. Marx's indebtedness to the Hegelian dialectic manifested itself in the very next work, the "Theses on Feuerbach". There Marx credits not Feuerbach's materialism, but Hegelian idealism for having developed "the active side of, in contradistinction to materialism", of consciousness.

\* \* \*

The point of having a new Introduction to my notes of Phenomenology has one transition point, 1964-68-- when the objective situation finally compelled me to articulate publically the question of "why Hegel, why now?" for our age. The specific period I'm referring to includes the time when the Sino-Soviet orbit became openly the Sino-Soviet conflict; the time of the so-called cultural revolution in China (1966); and the failure of the Japanese New Left to recognize that they must confront philosophy and not just the politics of that stage; and finally, the collapse of the May, 1968 events in France, and with it the new global

3

The second transition point actually becomes two transition points, because the responsibility, organizational responsibility, for the Idea ~~of Humanism~~ ~~of Marxist-Humanism~~ of Marxist-Humanism developing Marx's Humanism for our age, is so urgent in the 1980s, the 1880s of Marx's last decade becomes a transition point for our age. This is so because the objective horrors of the 1980s, with Reagan's retrogressionism, demands not alone analysis of objective events, but that the 1980s become a turning point for Marxist-Humanism.

Plenum.

This will be developed in summer in time for the ~~Plenum~~ Plenum. The 8 months to the Plenum, however, demand that we concentrate on only 2 things: the biweekly and organizational growth. We have only one other philosophic point. That is the question of the change in ~~the~~ <sup>our</sup> relationship to Lenin; a Philosophic Notebooks, which is why I must begin with a critique of ourselves, particularly of the 12/1 minutes, for this sum-up.

HERE FOLLOWS WHITE PAGES, BEGINNING WITH "The present critique must begin..."

10839



page 8

Most critical of all will then become what we have taken for granted because we rejected the elitist party way back when (somewhere in the early 40s)--the ~~the~~ Dialectics of Organization. Take the fact that from the first of the <sup>Marxist-Humanist</sup> theoretical works, MF, were two very serious chapters on organization, one on the different forms of organizations in Lenin's life, and the other where I called Organizational Interlude, <sup>I</sup> where ~~is~~ dispose of the whole 2nd International 1889-1914. They are very important chapters we should reread them. <sup>to me, that is the issue now, this!</sup> How happen that we didn't follow through on that form <sup>which</sup> not only hadn't followed through but had ~~that form to show that Lenin had forgotten his own~~

critique as he felt compelled to return to the 1903 uncritical edition of What Is To Be Done sans any of the critiques of what he himself had written in the pamphlet 12 years? <sup>And</sup> ~~neither~~ <sup>neither</sup> PN, Imperialism or merely noted that State and Revolution, which so obviously resulted in his digging into the dialectic, had not a word to say on the party, though God knows <sup>he</sup> was preoccupied with the party, the program, <sup>and</sup> but always kept it as a separate question? The one time dialectic <sup>does</sup> enter <sup>is</sup> was the famous 1920 trade union debate as it always had entered <sup>as</sup> when he <sup>continued his battle battles</sup> fought with Bukharin, critiqued his Economics of the Transition Period and left ~~it~~ as his final word in the testament <sup>the most serious abstract</sup> that Bukharin never fully understood the dialectic. <sup>sharpest yes</sup>

~~The subject wasn't touched by anybody since the whole political committee decided not to reveal the Will to the party much less the public. When the factional fight became so intense as to move for the expulsion of Trotsky, he did reveal the Will, but by then few people listened, certainly not in Russia. The whole point is that no one -- and that includes the people like Lukacs and Korsch who did raise the question of dialectics as revolutionary in the early 1920s -- paid any attention what ever to Lenin's PN, when finally they were published in Russia in 1929. So that each, Lukacs especially, tried to appear as the only one, and that was against Germany social Democracy, not directed to the CP.~~

10840



Ba

Begin with the Sept. 15 REB discussion on the ramifications of the Convention Perspectives and the collectivity of the REB-NEB, the REB-FTC, and the relationship of the Center to the locals, including the Sept. 21 letter to the new NEB members, [redacted].

It is clear that the present tasks of the moment have never been far away from the relation to the historic birth of Marxism in the 1950s, and therefore made most integral with the objective movements that we have designated as the movement from practice that is itself a form of theory. And theory, which is itself a form of philosophy, specifically, its dialectic methodology.

It is clear from the letter of Sept. 21 to G. and Jane that when we talk of the Absolute, we see, "in the Absolute, not a system, not a hierarchy, but new beginnings, new beginnings of such phenomenal importance as to become the determinant of the end, --an end that will only come to the future, when masses-in-motion become Reason."

Stop for a moment and look at just two words-- New Beginning. Do you recognize how historically-philosophically new that is, what a breakthrough that is, not only in general in philosophy, not only in post-Marx Marxism, but it is a further concretization of what Marx himself had achieved when he transformed the Hegelian dialectic. That is to say, that when the "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" ~~ended at paragraph 384,~~ saying he would return to it later, the "intermission" lasted 40 years of such great achievements as the Grundrisse, Capital, the revolutions of 1848 and 1871 themselves, ~~and~~ none, beginning with Engels, knew the precision of that paragraph, much less tried going ~~through it~~. Indeed, all that Engels did was to project then not Marx's Marxism, but his own interpretation. Lenin didn't even know of the existence of the 1844 ms.

10842



when he delved into the Science of Logic, yet the objective situation made him confront Hegel directly. As late as our epoch, we were so happy to see that study-- which had never been translated into English-- that it became our ground, and did help us to dig further into the Hegelian dialectic, first by ~~beginning~~ noting that differences in interpretation of Hegel and Lenin between Johnson and myself. Then in 1953 we criticized Lenin for disregarding the last half of the last paragraph of Hegel's Science of Logic, ~~and~~ ~~xxx~~ by following out ~~Hegel's~~ direction by going to Philosophy of Mind. That was 1953. In 1957 we did not develop that critique of Lenin, but dwelt instead on the greatness of the PH. Even in 1973 in P&R, when we spoke of the philosophic ambivalence of Lenin, it was still the ambivalence between politics and philosophy.

It is very different now, as you can see, and whereas I can not go further into it, I will/release one of the letters I wrote to non-Marxist Hegel scholars. The book is in too rough a stage to release it yet. What however, we did do on Sept. 28, 1986, was to try to concretize and prepare ourselves for the biweekly, was to stress the significance of the whole Marxist Archives. Mike drafted a series of 4 workshops/classes in "Tody's Global Crises and the Marxist Archives". This was followed up on Sept. 19 when the REB continued its discussion on the ramifications of the Perspectives.

Now please note the Oct. 14 REB minutes, where I am supposed to be assigning, but the collapse of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit has me address the REB, and this becomes the Lead in the Nov. REB. (and I hope that such diversions won't continue) In one respect this is of course a diversion from the book-to-be, / but in a more serious respect, it actually is a development of the book on organization itself, precisely because it is a book on the

10843

84

dialectic of philosophy. This can be seen especially clearly in the Nov. 3, 1986 "Dear Colleagues" letter, where I raise the question that when I return to the REB Dec. 1 ~~xxxxxxx~~ <sup>to prepare</sup> for the sum-up Jan. 3, I become more and more conscious of the "very near disappearance from our vocabulary of the phrase 'organizational growth'". Olga reminded me that actually it was the need for organizational growth that had made me first propose that we consider a biweekly N&L.

Now it may not have been that clearly stated back then, and it certainly was no "headline", but the whole ~~concept~~ direction, ever since the formulation of "Not by Practice Alone" in 1984, was the concretization of that concept-- "Not by Practice Alone". That is to say, ~~the~~ <sup>it became imperative to concretize</sup> the abstract phrase, "self-determination of the Idea", especially after the counter-revolution in Grenada ~~came out of the revolution itself~~, and made it all too easy for the imperialists to invade. Let me put it another way. Unless one fully grasps that transformation into opposite as/result from the separation of philosophy of revolution from revolution itself, the counter-revolution practically becomes inevitable.

1984 therefore, became for us not just physically the "big move" to Chicago, and not just historically, because that's where my roots are, but the actuality of history, American Marxist history. When I say "American", note that Black is inseparable from it. This concept was the idea of location and locale as inseparable from a new philosophic moment of development, as I developed earlier. (p.5)

In a word, what ~~spat~~ relates to us at this moment, especially for Chicago, but meaning all locals, is to test ourselves these 8 months to the Plenum on the simultaneity of producing a biweekly that meets the challenge from the objective situation in so Marxist a way <sup>at the same time</sup> that the in-person dialogues that would be pursued by each one of

10844



those not yet involved, in a way that they would want to become  
part of this new continent of thought and revolution that is M.Hism.  
Esch activity, as well as the activity of the masses, then will  
result in the transformation of reality.

10845