

to 1984 Convention

"THE SELF-THINKING IDEA" AND THE DIALECTICS OF A BODY OF

EVOLUTIONARY IDEAS: WHAT IS NEW IN THE CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP ?

*are are
to of
philosophical*

I. Philosophically, the Obvious is Never to be Taken for Granted

II. Marx's New Sense of Objectivity--"Human activity itself as objective (gegenstandliche) activity"--~~is~~ Ground for our Age's New Sense of Objectivity and 2 Kinds of Subjectivity

III. What is New in the Concept of Leadership: When is Philosophy and Philosopher One -- "One, Not Two" is ~~not~~ ^{never} a Variant of "Leader Maximus". Rather it is on what is a whole new Continent of Thought and of Revolution, which is why JPS's commentary on 3 centuries of philosophy is pertinent ^{to M-H} ~~is~~.

IV. N&L Committees ^{Voluntary} Elections, Past and Present

X //

Instead of explaining which sections are on Marx and his time, and which deal with our age, I will begin with ~~the~~ the question ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~relationship~~ ~~between~~ ~~the~~ ~~two~~ ~~eras~~.

RELATIONSHIP OF PHILOSOPHY TO MASSES IN MOTION

Let's ~~begin~~ ^{critique of the title itself} with the most obvious -- "The Self-Thinking Idea"

^{that} does not itself think -- in order to show you the exact opposite is the truth when you don't accept the obvious at face value.

Of course ideas by themselves do not think. People think. But when you labor at the Idea and its development, the one who digs for its meaning, why this specific idea came to describe that particular action and what flows from it, you have reached a new

stage of cognition. Specifically, here are 3 dates in Marx's "self-development": 1843-45; 1864-71; 1872-80. The first revolt that transformed Marx into a revolutionary was the peasants' theft of wood in 1843, followed by the weavers' revolt in 1844, which Marx declared to be a greater stage than the French Revolution.

That made all the intellectuals laugh at Marx's ridiculous "utopianism", as they "proved" what a real revolution, like the French Revolution,

was. His answer was that as great as it had been, it never questioned private property, but the peasants stealing wood and the weavers tearing up the deeds did. Once he made that declaration, the Self-Thinking Idea, flowing into the Subject Marx, declared ~~sent~~ way beyond Descartes's doubts, way beyond ~~property questions~~, way beyond ~~man/woman~~ ^{the determining relationship}, ~~which~~ we know ^{all} from the 1844 MSS. What we ^{don't} know that deeply is Marx's

weaver
act
new

11 Theses on Feuerbach

The years 1843-45 are central to the totality of Marx's discovery at the very start, for it is then, philosophically,

that you 1st grasp -- and that only because we do finally have Marx's Marxism as a totality and have thought out our own age's problems dialectically -- that "1, not 2" is NOT a question of mere leadership, much less a quantitative question, but one of PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION IN PERMANENCE AS GROUND FOR ORGANIZATION.

Let me explain concretisly EACH of the 1843-45 years

(1) 1843, Marx breaks with capitalism and its religion and suddenly uses the expression "revolution in permanence" -- evidently his way of expressing that it isn't just a single issue

that is at stake, not even when it is as fundamental as class struggle, but the challenge both to religion and "civil rights for Jews." (It is published in Marx's D-F journal which also published Engels' Outline of Political Economy, which greatly impressed Marx.) Every emancipation is a restoration - Wall & J

(2) In 1844 Marx creates the Econ.-Phil. MSS, when he meets Engels and gives him an oral presentation. Engels accepts that total challenge to what is. A life-long collaboration begins and

never ends. They decide to challenge the post-Hegelians, the Left from which they both came. The German Ideology results, the central thesis of which is a critique of Feuerbach's "materialism," ^{but never settles as if preferred over Hegel's "idealism"} Before or directly after this, however, Marx, again alone, writes 11 Theses, so critical of Feuerbach that to this day it defines the uniqueness of Marx's historical, dialectical humanist materialism as against not only Feuerbach ^{and} all mechanical materialism, ^{but also as creating "idealism" with the creativity of dialectic self-development} Thesis I (not XI) projects "Human activity itself as objective (gegenstandliche) activity." What is of the essence for us is that the 2 are as wide-worlds apart then, ^{as some 20 years later are seen in the context of} Engels' Origin and Marx's EN. I don't mean only that Marx's Theses on Feuerbach

^{casts} what Marx wrote in 1844-5 and Engels' in 1888 ^{rather than} that Marx's a profound illumination on our new sense of objectivity and

2 kinds of subjectivity ^{for the 1844-85 Perspectives}

while Engels was the "platform" ^{represented as is} ~~and also of himself in that~~ "Marx-Engels" ^{one} (became the foundation of the 2nd Int., which, as you can see from M&F and all our principles we simply regard ^{no more than an} Organizational Interlude, 1889-1914.

^{We haven't met leadership yet, have we? We won't until}

We are tracing Marx and Marx alone, and for him, soon after the Address to the CL on "revolution in permanence", he proposed disbanding, ^{without ever giving up the word, Party} as he explained it, ^{he means Party} "IN THE EMINENT HISTORICAL SENSE." ^{is a word} the only organization we do have to consider is the one he led and the period is FIRST INTERNATIONAL & THE PARIS COMMUNE, 1864-73

^{Let me explain} So integral were masses in motion ^{to the} historic revolutionary sense that, 1st, he hailed the P.C. as what the masses created ^{that by} and that "discovery" ^{they duplicated the} genius of a non-statist form of "workers' rule" ^{and} a dice that was defeated ^{last} advised going "lower AND DEEPER INTO THE MASSES", ~~and~~

the explanation he gave for not signing the documents of the 1st Int. was he never believed in any "cult of personality." It ^{took Khrushchev to turn that into} ~~the opposite~~

Whether this was written in the same period when, with Engels, they were writing German Ideology ^{or} whether it was done after, there's no doubt whatsoever that, where Marx's break with Feuerbach was total, Engels' was not. Indeed, when Engels discovered it ^{after} Marx died, he had already written his own, quite different estimate in his work, Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy, to which he appended ^{an edited version of Marx's 11 Theses.} Nothing could more clearly manifest the difference between Marx's revolutionary dialectic and Engels' determinist materialism. 16287

Instead, we turn to the point before the link takes us ^{turning to the} ~~MISSING~~ ~~MISSING~~

WHAT HAPPENED TO MARX'S CRITIQUE OF THE GOTHA PROGRAM ^{the Case of} ~~POST-MARX MARXISTS?~~

It took until 1891 before Engels succeeded in having the GSD finally publish the Critique of the Gotha Program -- as a ^{just a} "contribution to the discussion". The discussion was about their new program, the Erfurt Program, which followed the creation of the 2nd International in 1889, ^{and laid all these concepts (Marxist Party)} Just as ~~the~~ ~~concepts~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Party~~ Engels said that Marx said became "Marxism", so the Erfurt Program became the model for all "Marxist" parties. It took all the way to 1914 and the outbreak of WWI and the betrayal of the GSD and the 2nd International before ever anyone thought of returning to the Critique of the Gotha Program. Lenin did so in 1917 when he was writing State and Revolution. As profound as his analysis was when it came to smashing the bourgeois state, he had not a word to say about Marx's concept of organization. Yet, ^{Marx's} ~~the~~ ~~Critique~~ ~~was~~ ~~a~~ ~~rejection~~ ~~of~~ ~~any~~ ~~Party~~ ~~whose~~ ~~non-revolutionary~~ ~~attitude~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~Paris~~ ~~Commune~~ ~~always~~ ~~had~~ ~~been~~ ~~called~~ for going "lower and deeper" into the masses, and not just the organized proletariat. Put in another way, Marx's Critique was the creation of the inseparability of ^{revolution} philosophy (and) organization.

Program
launched
in 1848
the
Paris
Commune
was
the
first
time
that
the
proletariat
took
power
in
Paris
for
two
months
in
1871
and
it
was
the
first
time
that
the
proletariat
was
the
ruling
class
in
Paris
for
two
months
in
1871
and
it
was
the
first
time
that
the
proletariat
was
the
ruling
class
in
Paris
for
two
months
in
1871

You say that ~~is~~ Marx, ~~and~~ not any "Self-Thinking Idea."
Of course, ^{that doesn't dissolve} but instead of looking at the most obvious, why not dig deeply into what ~~is~~ ~~it~~ ~~is~~ ~~some~~ ~~years~~ ~~after~~ ~~the~~ ~~1848~~ ~~MS~~ ~~and~~ ~~still~~ ~~Marx~~ ~~had~~ ~~never~~ ~~dropped~~ ~~the~~ ~~idealism~~ ~~from~~ ^{that concept of human activity as a new science along with the} ~~his~~ ~~historical~~ ~~materialism~~ -- not the petty-bourgeois ~~idealism~~ but the concept of the future in the present. ^{Lenin's Critique} ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Gotha~~ ~~Program~~ ~~was~~ ~~written~~ ~~when~~ ~~Marx~~ ~~had~~ ~~just~~ ~~completed~~ ~~the~~ ~~French~~ ~~edition~~ ~~of~~ ~~Capital~~, with all its new categories

~~now examine the final~~ decisive ~~stage of~~ the French edition
of CAPITAL ~~the~~ new empiric studies of pre-capitalist societies
and new view of what he had heretofore thought the greatest
enemy, Russia, once it also had a group of revolutionaries ~~while~~
the Eisenachists ~~led~~ to the Lassalleans ~~of the~~ Golthe ~~papers~~ Marginal Notes his

~~the~~ the magnificent covering letter (written, inci-
dentally, on his birthday, May 5) and then look at how the Second
International's German Social Democracy transformed the organiza-
tional conclusion ~~into~~ ^{of the bargaining about principles} its absolute opposite. What Marx had
written was: "Every step of real movement is more important than
a dozen programmes. If therefore, it was impossible to go beyond
(it) one should have concluded an agreement for action... but
NO BARGAINING ABOUT PRINCIPLES."

word "movement", to ~~deny~~ ^{principles} philosophy, ^{What the GSD uses is the 'movement' of a movement} as if it ~~were no more than~~
program, like the Lassalleans'.

was more
practical
and simple

Neither RL who 1st declared
neither RL who 1st declared

As we approach the 20th century, ~~neither~~ RL who 1st declared
profoundly that 1905 was but the 1st of the new type of 20th c.
revolutions, nor VIL who did turn to the question of organizational
form of these new revolutions -- indeed, is credited with being
the 1st and only one who created a theory of organization with his
What Is To Be Done? -- claimed to have created a new Universal ^{movement}
Indeed, VIL claimed the opposite -- i.e. that he just followed or-
thodoxy except that he lived under Tsarism and therefore needed
special, concrete features. Whether VIL did or didn't mean
that organizational form as a Universal (between 1905 and 1917
he insisted it was only a question of a very specific case) and
when in 1917 he was establishing a new Universal -- State and Rev.

5

after he experienced the greatest revolution of his time and its cfeation -- the Paris Communez-^{from} which he concluded that it was necessary to go "lower and deeper", a phrase Lenin first "discovered" in 1914. In a word, Marx had by ^{then} ~~now~~ worked out his whole body of ideas and it was at that point that he not only rejected a unity of so-called Marxists and La~~pp~~alleans but set a totally opposite foundation for organization with his philosophy of revolution. Lenin's silence on the question of organization in ~~State and Revolution~~ State and Revolution did not, unfortunately, mean that he had abandoned his concept of ^a party of "professional revolutionaries"; ~~just when~~ ^{Once} the Bolsheviks gained power, ~~and~~ the concept of an elitist party was no longer just "Russian", or merely ^{needed for} ~~the purpose of~~ functioning under Tsarist ~~regime~~. It ^{had} gained international "stature" ^{in the 21} conditions for the Third International, ^{violated, no matter how} ~~the~~ ^{first} ~~principle~~ ^{never to be} ~~was~~ ^{the objective situation.}

That this made it all the easier for Stalin to transform the concept of the Single Party State shows the extreme which flows from a vanguardist concept.

^{Leadership, Leadership}
 To make matters worse for our age, Trotsky further reduced the question of revolutionary Marxist organization to the question of leadership. ~~Chapter 4 of P&R and~~ Chapter 4 of P&R and ~~the Appendix~~ Please reread the Appendix to Chapter 11 of RLWLKM. ~~It is no accident whatever that this~~ ~~last estimate of Trotsky as theoretician was made an~~ appendix by me to the chapter on ~~Marx as the~~ Marx as the Philosopher of Permanent Revolution Creating New Ground for Organization.

Back to [unclear] of Rarities of Phil. Creation

But, him
P.R.
P.M.D.

Ironically enough, JPSartre, who absolutely has no idea of what an organization ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~is~~ ^{is} tailending Stalinism, ~~is~~ ^{is} a philosopher ~~who~~ ^{who} felt compelled to justify to himself why he was willing to subordinate ~~Existentialism~~ ^{Existentialism} to Marxism. He illuminated the whole question of the ~~importance~~ ^{rarity} of philosophic creation. In his Question of Method he shows that for the entire period of 3 centuries ~~the 17th to the 20th~~ ^{the 17th to the 20th} only 3 distinct philosophies ~~predominated~~ ^{predominated}, and ~~for~~ ^{for} Marxism, Marx alone ~~created~~ ^{created} the philosophy of revolution but it ~~will~~ ^{will} remain until we are finished with capitalism.

Here is how he expresses ~~it~~ ^{it} (P190P4R)

the rarity of philosophic creation:

Between the 17th century and the 20th, I see 3 periods, which I would designate by the names of the men who dominated them: there is the "moment" of Descartes and Locke, that of Kant and Hegel, finally that of Marx. These 3 philosophies become, each in its turn, the humus of every particular thought and the horizon of all culture; there is no going beyond them so long as man has not gone beyond the historical moment which they express.

~~For it: "He had been..."~~

that be subtler
great illumination:

Resubmit
Weg of [unclear]
[unclear]

1957 to which [unclear]
[unclear] because

that I will leave us ~~unprepared~~,
On the contrary I will stress what none
fully know: the most contradictory year 1957. Watch us discuss

WHAT IS NEW IN LEADERSHIP FOR OUR AGE, THE DIALECTICS
OF A BODY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS: *Before M*

How difficult it is to work out a concept of leadership
comparable from a philosophy of revolution and concrete enough
to answer the questions of our age can be seen clearest in the
book I have called "On The Threshold" *in Perspective* when we participated
in the 1950 strike at the same time as we worked out philosophy,
which turned out to be a long, *very hard, long* trail.

The *absolute* contradiction in that ~~trail~~ trail to break-
through to "Self-Thinking Idea" also re leadership happened
in 1951 when at one and the same time, I made a breakthrough

the relationship of philosophy to organization *but not org'l.*
~~question~~ of "personalities". And yet, to really see
it is and how it is that the philosophy of revolution is
expressed in the "discoverer" *UNDE* WHEN IT IS THE DISCOVERY OF A
THE NEW CONTINENT OF THOUGHT AND REVOLUTION. *in Marx to Marx do*

I had been working for an entire
of Marx, and it became clearer every day that it really
was Marx alone, and not Marx and Engels. And that was true
if we were talking about the early Marx *(P)* the Marx of the
critique of Capital, *(P)* the Marx of the Critique of the
German Ideology where he truly seemed one in letters and "con-
sciousness" only to finally perceive *to did not fully understand*
its dialectics. *All this became clear in 1951*
M-KW-E-N = W. some after 1950 & before 1951
The whole JRT had been very anxious to break once and for
all the Trotskyism once we summed up 10 years of the existence
of the S-C tendency in SC&WR. But Johnson insisted the time
was not ripe. None were ready to challenge him. The following
year, however, when he changed his mind *found he had to*
part of the New York leadership that we should not leave
that he met with opposition to his motion for split.

that he would be voted down, he postponed the vote, in Pittsburgh where I was living and knew nought openings. I left that very night to listen to the the opposition. The argumentation brought to my question I had been working on, that it was Marx, and Engels, who discovered a whole new continent of and revolution. *That was the first time I openly expressed it.*

I stopped right there, it would have been great. tely, the ~~question~~ question for which I was brought was that J. was right, always right. I jumped to usion that it was always "one, not two" and J. was Read the speech (with which I first became re-acquainted e dug into 1950-53 for the new pamphlet) to grasp fully radiction.

followed, once we split on this ~~assertion~~ assertion tainly had not been proven, was what I referred to "underground existence". It would indeed have been a

aster had not the death of Stalin showed how apolitical *(Nov. 1953)* an ~~idea~~ *idea* had become, *and the living base.*

after having refused to discuss the AI, forbade us to fight the bourgeois the break was inevitable. The difference between *then* could only ~~be~~ be worked out, the

pphic breakthrough made on the AI in 1953 was achieved. *then* for the first time fully released us from any diversion

from philosophy. Thus came ~~the~~ N&I as *the very first* ation of worker and intellectual

ographed pamphlet being VIL's PN and my AI Letters

*don't go into what we all know as major theoretical ~~errors~~ as well. *What's that meant by theory?**

same time, the organization was open, was decentralized, the paper, and the whole question of relationship of rank le to leadership, between leaders and ranks, were likewise parated from philosophy.

Handwritten notes and scribbles on the right side of the page, including a large circular scribble at the bottom right.

The highpoint may have come when we worked out "rev. in permanence" as ground of org. AS A CATEGORY BUT (LONG BEFORE it appeared as category it was the actual methodology. ~~xxxx~~ underlining all our activities as well as writings. What we are still weakest in is that this is not projected to others so that though, for ex., we use the expression N&L as organizer for M-H we hardly practice it quantitatively in subs. Concretisation is an

~~separable~~ theoretical-practical matter, ~~there~~ there is but one word ~~---~~ -- i.e. one act-- left to express it. And that is projection, projection, projection. Understanding M-Hism ~~and~~ ^{if I have} telling it to ourselves means nothing. It's only when you know how to project so others can understand, and grapple with it so passionately that they want to join, that you have shown that you understand and are not just praising ~~it~~. ^{oneself.}

Let me give you just one example of how we still haven't projected concretely how great and action-like is Absolute Idea. Will anybody please tell me whether they have ever witnessed when so great a tragedy happens as the loss of an editor, the one and only we had, not only without a single issue being skipped but with the paper already having experienced for a year in advance: (1) a young Black intellectual, Lou, practicing writing as a Marxist-Humanist columnist; (2) a new element of labor -- one who has experiences with immigrant labor -- as well as one experienced in basic industry -- and all these precisely in the space that had been allotted to CD, and specifically placed on page one. This ~~was~~ ^{was} the very one who both had broken through on Absolute Idea; ~~and~~ had established that unique relationship of worker and intellectual ~~and~~ ^{had} never separated theory from practice. ^{It is this}

16295

~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~relationship~~ ~~between~~ ~~worker~~ ~~and~~ ~~intellectual~~ ~~is~~ ~~not~~ ~~clear~~ ~~at~~ ~~all~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~text~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~document~~

9.10

Let me let show you, briefly, the past categories in choosing leadership in the context both of concrete needs, each conv. Perspectives--which ~~make~~ shows also that the whole org. is leadership when it practicing phil. in its activities, and yet concretely these become others don't.

1st--1917--only I&B stepped down
2nd, 1930s--esp. CIO & Spanish Rev. J

(I'm not sure Alan is to be counted there--1934 indeed--or ~~others~~
1940s--OLGA, ~~ANDY~~, IG JOHN, INEZ--1950 pamphlet shows
them alive & kicking preparing theoretically for rev.--to-be)

We're in the main the consequences of 1960s & 1970s with 1980s coming in now--so here it is spelled out last conv. & this

Finally, what is not in voting also flows from ~~the~~ ~~of~~ ~~conv.~~
is leadership = Sithe-N = this ~~is~~ ~~more~~ ~~to~~ ~~conv.~~ ~~the~~ ~~final~~

Ontilly, too, we had new roots, ~~of~~ ~~Mc~~ ~~Shaw~~
Both ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Bomb~~ & Laurent ~~Offer~~

July 1984

Report by Raya for
Executive Session

"THE SELF-THINKING IDEA" AND THE DIALECTICS OF A BODY OF REVOLUTIONARY
IDEAS: WHAT IS NEW IN OUR CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP?

I. Philosophically, the Obvious is Never to be Taken for Granted

II. Marx's New Sense of Objectivity -- "Human activity itself as
objective (gegenstandliche) activity" the Ground for our Age's
New Sense of Objectivity and Two Kinds of Subjectivity

III. What is New in our Concept of Leadership:

When is Philosophy and Philosopher One -- "One, Not Two".

It is never a variant of "Leader Maximum". Rather, it is on
what is a whole new Continent of Thought and of Revolution.

Which is why Jean-Paul Sartre's commentary on three centuries of
philosophy is pertinent to Marxist-Humanism.

IV. News and Letters Committees' National Elections, Past and Present

New
p4 keep 5 lines 7 penult
cut off
Return home
cut 6/11
cut 6/11
cut 6/11

Report by Raya for
Executive Session

"THE SELF-THINKING IDEA" AND THE DIALECTICS OF A BODY OF REVOLUTIONARY
IDEAS: WHAT IS NEW IN OUR CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP?

I. Philosophically, the Obvious is Never to be Taken for Granted

II. ~~Marx's~~ ^{The} New Sense of Objectivity, "Human activity itself as
objective (gegenstandliche) activity," the Ground for our Age's

New Sense of Objectivity and Two Kinds of Subjectivity

III. What is New in our Concept of Leadership:

to constantly ~~renew~~ ^{renew} the ~~MISSILE~~ ^{MISSILE} ~~LINE~~ ^{LINE} ~~philosophy~~ ^{philosophy} is what
When is Philosophy and Philosopher One -- "One, Not Two":

It is never a variant of "Leader Maximum". Rather, it is on
what is a whole new Continent of Thought and of Revolution.

Which is why Jean-Paul Sartre's commentary on three centuries of
philosophy is pertinent to Marxist-Humanism.

IV. News and Letters Committees' National Elections, Past and Present

New subs

Relationship of Philos. to masses in motion

Whatever happened to CGP; the case of PMU + leadership

Back to Dialectics, its double edge, when is it...

What is new in leadership for our age: the body

of ideas shows that it is not by practice alone;

the movement ~~from~~ ^{from} ~~theory~~ ^{theory}

"THE SELF-THINKING IDEA" AND THE DIALECTICS OF A BODY OF
REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS: WHAT IS NEW IN OUR CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP?

I. Philosophically, it is wrong to take the obvious for granted

II. The new sense of objectivity in our age of state-capitalism, which is why Marx's sense of Objectivity -- "Human activity itself as Objective (gegenstandliche) activity" -- has new meaning; the Ground for our age's new sense of Objectivity and two kinds of subjectivity.

III What is New in our concept of Leadership: It is high time to reveal that the missing link -- philosophy -- is what has kept even the greatest revolution -- Russia, Nov. 1917 -- unfinished.

IV News and Letters Committees' National Elections, Past and Present