You have seen my letters to non-Marxist Hegelians on the question of the Idea of Cognition, , where Lenin stopped just on the threshold of the Absolute, and indeed have seen my disagreement with Lenin on that question, way back in 1953 at which time ~~I~~ I seem to have limited it to the last half paragraph, but in any case this is for the book and not for today's discussion. ~~NMX~~ But we do have one year, not two, for the Book .

That is an urgency not just because we say "one year, not two", but because the Reagan Retrogression has brought us to the brink and the organizational question as the meaning of all these crises in philosophy as well as organization, in politics as well as economics, in having to say not just that we are dealing with the opposites future/present, but with the survival of civilization in a nuclear world. Here's the question [illegible] Let's look at the 1982 from vantage of 1988 / Either [illegible]

****

¶We often say the words "by no accidemt", but on the question of 1980 being the Year of the Book, the sequence should have been the whole series of books and developments from M&F, and P&R on. The reason I didn't do so was that, though this ~~NMXX~~ makes up the Body of Ideas we call M-Hism -- and indeed, they are pivotal, and each one is such a futther development, both in relationship to the objectivity and subjectivity of developments, that we could not possibly be organizationally what we are for 32 years. And yet, and yet, and yet. The reason I have now rolled it back to 1953 in the discussion of the philosophic moment from the history of Marx himself to today, ~~shows~~ ... points to a totally different Dialectics [illegible] relationship bt. Phil Moment [illegible]

Transform to The Phil. Moment

10939

Instead of going on with "not by accident", which would be transposed to Philosophic Moments, we should here go to 1980 from the vantage point of 1988, both as to the latest economic crisis and myriad political crises, and look at what has developed subjectively to what M-Hism produced but that from the point of view of Marx himself. Put differently, I'm asking: Is this the place where I should introduce The Philosophic Moment? Adn with it the division of this talk into 3 parts:

~~PART~~ PART I: THE PHILOSOPHIC MOMENT -- MARX, LENIN, HEGEL, ~~PAGE~~ final PAGE OF PHENOMENOLOGY, MARXIST-HUMANISM 1953

PART II: ORGANIZATION: BRA

Why 1987? Lukacs + Pathos/1986

One thing I did not mention in discussing 1953 is that the letter of 5/20, where I suddenly speak on the Philosophy of Mind came after CLRJ had said in his Notes or the letter accompanying his Notes that he had looked into Phil. of Mind, and found nothing there "for us" (naturally that mean JFT). So why did I got to the Phil. of Mind after connecting the end of the last few pages of S of L with Phil. of Mind? ~~And that was directly after~~ I ~~was describing that I considered~~ wrote repeated what JFT had wrote on ... in the Marx's development in the section on commodities ~~that~~ not only ~~was that like~~ bore resemblance Hegel's syllogistic UPI ~~but~~ so the accumulation of capital, its General Absolute Law, was based on the AI, holding that just as that meant the ~~[illegible]~~ dialectic of bourgeois society, its end by the revolt of the workers, ~~but~~ so Marx" also set the limits to dialectic of the party, which is part ~~of~~

10990

of bourgeois society and will wither away with ~~its~~ the passing, ~~and~~ ~~will~~ of the bourgeoisie..." Therefore, what we, as JFT and CLRJ wrote ~~XXXX~~ was not just a book, but a philosophy, a whole new philosophy dialectics for our age of post WWII, and that, of course, meant cracking the absolute. That is where we all stopped. , but CLR, instead of saying that's where he stopped, said he would do it all by himself, leave it to him and he had looked into Phil. of Mind and found nothing inthere for us.

So, whatever it was that was driving me in 1953 to write those letters of 5/12 and 5/20, it suddenly became the whole of Hegel's work, beginning, as always, with what Marx said was most important in Phen., going through the S of L with Lenin, but refusing to follow either Lenin in that last para. or CLRJ on the fact that he found nothing in Phil. of Mind, and delving not only into that work, but into those last final syllogisms that nobody, including bourgeois academia, had seriously tackled the next decade. I was not debating them, or what they did or did not do; in this case, my "ignorance" saved me from having to argue with them or anybody, but, again it was Marx who, though he broke off his mss. before ~~XXXXX~~ the final section of Phil. of Mind, the very sharp digging into capital, especially the general law of capitalist accmmulation and the new passions and forces, led me to conclude suddenly that the dialectic of the Party as well as of the contradictions in the AI itself, resulted in my seeing what I called "the new society," ;i.e. the end of the division between mental and manual.

10991

The breakthrough on the Absolute -- i.e. seeing in it the movement frompractice as well as from theory -- led, as you know, to the structure of M&F. It didn't stop there, as we concretized the theory of state-capitalism and went beyond to M-Hism. Each of the books that followed was a futher concretization and development of those 1953 letters, so that as new and exciting as P&R with its AI as New Beginning was, which detailed the movement from theory, by contrasting it to all other claimants of new, be it Trotsky, Mao or Stalin -- ended with a movement of practice that is itself a form of theory , but the new forces and passionsseemed to tower above the movement from theory. RLWLKM was again trying to stick to a still newer force, and, of course, Marx's newly uncovered EN. And that's where I was confronted with and issued a challenge to <u>all revolutionaries</u> including the one (RL) who did appreciate spontaneity of the masses, but still held on to the vanguard party precisely because she had not gone into philosophy, remaining a revolutionary materialist economist who refused to dig into philosophy.

Though we criticized that, did we do any better than just calling it philosophy <u>after</u> the challenge was issued? We did decide upon the book on organization. But, again, the <u>practice</u>, practice, practice, in this case the paper, took priority so that, at our very highest moment of accepting the test of a Biweekly, we became careless about both organization and philosophy. That's what has been at the root as well as preoccupation with, nearly solely with, the Biweekly, to the point of forgetting that the why the form has changed search for Reason was the [illegible] Philosophic Moment

1

B. THE BOOKS AND THE MOMENT

Though an organization preceded the books and it's difficult to imagine there would be any if there had been no organization, that had "voted" to [redacted] publish -- I very deliberately and logically did not follow the chronological order, because, without that philosophic-historic moment of 1953, there would have been neither an organization nor books. There would have been constant factional fights within the perimeters of Trotskyism with a slight bow to the theory of state-capitalism, or even have that change with what it is that the objective situation and new movements arise which [redacted] pull at you, as they did at CLRJ, and I don't know how many factions have gone under who began by disagreeing with whatever organization they were in, but had no other philosophic ground. Instead, the philosophic moment that didn't separate the challenge of the ominous objective situation of McCarthyism, from the subjective development not only as movement BUT AS IDEA, led us [redacted] to first begin developing fragments of the moment that [redacted] signalled the ramifications, their meaning for today, 1954 to 1957 and resulted in M&F.