

Handwritten notes: 3 things, ind. & soc. Ontology Project Not whole man

Q JPS: "It is clear that the periods of philos. creation are rare. Bet. 17th & 20th c. I know of only 3, & these I identify with the following famous names: there was the moment of Descartes & of Locke, that of Kant & of Hegel, finally that of Mx... Existentialism... I hold to be a parasitic system which lives on the margins of real science... Mxism, that idealist protest against idealism... underwent an eclipse... The Dane was to reappear at the beg. of 20th c. when people began to think of fighting against the Mxist dialectic by opposing it with pluralisms, ambiguities, paradoxes..." "I consider Mxism to be the ultimate phil. of our age..."

Today's Mxists cannot do justice to real facts, specific events, particular individuals. Abel, in restating Sartre, says the latter "envisages Mxism as foundation for a psychology of the indiv. & sociology of groups... a deeper grasp of both indiv. & social, & phil. anthropology. JPS calls his wk "a prolegomena to any future anthropology."

Then LA asks whether there is such a thing as a single aspect of an indiv. being identical with the whole man, as is class for the "dogmatic Mxist." & this he answers: "For the S of B/N this was the individual's ontological project; for the S of that work, the 'whole man' is contained in which a particular indiv. tries to render his own experience into a whole... Sartre calls his method the most complex ever designed for understanding human beings... Sartre's method for understanding individuals is really a method for inventing individuals; its value was shown to be dependent on the motive for employing it; moreover the method has no particular relabn. to Mxism for there is no reason why in terms of this method the class connection of an indiv. should be privileged as against other type of data....."

LA continues: "What interests S now is not at all to see the indiv. as a 'whole' but as a 'totalizer'; not one who makes a totality of his own life, but as one who, failing to make a totality of his own life, totalizes the his process... Sartre can permit himself to write in the 2nd section that the indiv.'s understanding of his own life 'should go as far as to deny the particular qualification of that life & to look for that life's dial. intelligibility in the whole human adventure.' But what is an indiv. life that is bereft of its particularly qualifications?... Here I think Sartre has falsely equated serialization with class membership on the assumption that both negate individuality & by further assuming that 2 things that are the same thing are equal to each other. What is worse S by reasoning in the way has destroyed, it seems to me, any validity in the idea of soc."

JPS thinks of the pol. group as fighting against the inertia of the masses. "In fact," continues LA "the whole of the Gr turns out to be a systematic withdrawal from the indiv. of what was granted him in Questions of Method as well as in B/N... The pathetic & active role he now hands over to the pol. group (over)

Handwritten notes: 1/1/1961 Mx. & Indiv. inertia of the masses Proletariat inertia

which, if you please, is seen as the ontologically terrified entity, terrified precisely because it lacks an ontological structure, lacks Being, is nothing but its practice, its acts, exactly as in B/N, the individual was seen to be nothing but his practice, his acts." S's "attempted synthesis of Existentialism or infusion of Existentialism into Marx, to use his own terminology has ended by projecting onto the pol. group or party all those traits which in B/N were reserved for the indiv. & said to define his humanity. The only entity or character in S's Gr. which can be called human is thus the pol. group or party; compared to it, ~~the~~ individuals & classes have the inhumanity of Being as such. Now this is a metaphysic; it should be properly designated as such; it is the metaphysic of Stalinism for it places against the horizon of Being the historically limited form of the CP of the per. when Stalin was its leader. Yet S does not scruple to introduce this metaphysic by asserting that these, his new ideas, could only have been formulated or advanced in the post-Stalin era!... The book is monstrous in size & is certain to be brief in its effect. It did succeed in giving me the feeling which B/N... was presumably saying & what the Gr. is presumably unsaying, 'Man is a useless passion.'"

12854

JPS HAS FOOTNOTE TO A NEW ED. OF "MATERIALISM & REVOLUTION"
which says: "As I have been unfairly reproached with
not quoting Mx in this article, I should
like to point out that my criticisms are not directed against
him, but against the Mxist scholasticism of 1949. Or, if you
prefer, against Mx through Neo-Stalinist Mxim."

(This is from 1955 ed. ~~xxxx~~ and I do not know how 1949 got in
in view of fact tht original essay was '46 or latest '47--in msg.
it was probably '46 & as Situations I, Paris, it was 1947) Moreover
"neeStalinist" certainly did not appear as term till death of Stal. in '53)

12855

JPS HAS FOOTNOTE TO A NEW ED. OF "MATERIALISM & REVOLUTION"
which says: "As I have been unfairly reproached with
not quoting Mx in this article, I should
like to point out that my criticisms are not directed against
him, but against the Mxist scholasticism of 1949. Or, if you
prefer, against Mx through Neo-Stalinist Mxim."

(This is from 1955-ed, ~~xxxx~~ and I do not know how 1949 got in
in view of fact tht original essay was '46 or latest '47--in mag.
it was probably '46 & as Situations I, Paris, it was 1947) Moreover
"neeStalinist" certainly did not appear as term till death of Stal. in '53)