

Which turns out to be a promise about the "Universals of 1948", but evidently before we can do that, we have to get back to Logic, but really not to Logic but to Trotskyism, which he calls Synthetic Cognition: "In the last section of the Logic, Hegel takes up the climax of his system, the Idea of Cognition. Briefly, it is for us the elucidation of scientific method... (p. 157) this is fantastic because we are the very Idea of Cognition I have referred to which I am still working out and he is mixing up what is on Synthetic Cognition where Hegel rejects mathematics, saying that at its height, the Synthetic Cognition there is building a theorem and that is unsuitable and rejected by philosophy. J. thinks that the way Synthetic Cognition is taken up in it inadequate expression at the height of mathematical development and what the Synthetic Cognition in the final chapter on AI which is ~~part~~ part of Dialectic Cognition, and then diverts back to mere understanding in the very early sections of the Logic ~~and then goes~~ ~~XXXXXXXX~~ to our period to designate Trotskyism

as Synthetic Cognition. Since we were all rejecting Trotskyism because Trotsky was politically, specifically/considering nationalized property as ~~what~~ what made Russia a workers' state, we accepted the philosophic

equating Synthetic Cognition to understanding and labelling Trotskyism as Synthetic Cognition. All this is but a way of ~~saying~~ saying why ~~we~~ we should not be "impatient" about the AI, because we must begin at the beginning, and the beginning is the French Revolution, which turns out to be the beginning of the Puritan Revolution in England and the French Revolution already shows us -- state-capitalism! This goes on ~~and on~~ and on, so that when we reach some sort of conclusion of what ~~the~~ the JFT task is to get back to Marx's "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation, Lenin's State and Revolution, and how (p. 204)

"Sometimes you can work backward. I remember telling Rae one day 'Go and

search for an independent Negro movement. It ought to be there.'
She found it in a few hours, over a million Negroes buried and forgotten.
Over and over again I have to look for an important missing link or links."
In any case, we don't get much of AI because what he returns to is various
parts of Essence, Form and Content, Cause and Effect, action and ~~response~~
reaction or reciprocity, ending with p. 226-227. "The only propaganda,
the only theoretical principle of Marxism that is worth any attention
is the analysis of the bureaucracy and why it should be destroyed ...
I think of the Stalinists in Germany in 1933 and in Spain in 1938. They
too explained ^{that} their treacherous compromises are due to the fact that the
workers are not ready. Dialectic explains their difference and their
identity." Those are the very last words.

Now, whereas these are the last words, it is not that there was
nothing on AI. After he told us not to be impatient, he did go in to a
little of Hegel, but, believe it or not, mainly on Kant. (pp. 164-174) and
even quoted the paragraph from the Marx's 1850 Address on "revolution in
permanence". But the point is that there are so many diversions to political
needs that the AI, too, -- and there is very little on the AI -- no more than
the ⁶ pages of 164-170, but that was introduced by the reversal to Kantianism:

" Kant in 1781 had done for thought in its day what Leninism had done
for the revolutionary movement. And I for one never think of Hegel as a
single individual. Kant had made the French revolution into a philosophical
method. As Hegel says somewhere in the Introduction to the Large Logic,
Kant had made Thought the intermediary between Us and Things. We used
Thought to find out about Things. Knowing was in thought so that Being
might be discovered in its truth. Engels has summed it up once and for all,
despite all that modern philosophers write ..." (p. 162)

10828

(transpose to section where J. quotes "revolution in permanence")

The contradictory and, in a certain sense, meaningless way that "revolution in permanence" is quoted is that it is preceded by the question of Party. Today and for years past, there is no fear whatever that the proletariat will not form 'a party'. The question of 1948 is what kind of party, what is the character of the proletarian party in 1948. This kind of party that will be all proletarian and all whatever hangs on what is attributed to Lenin as the party being the knowing of the proletariat. "But for the proletariat, the most important, the primary thing is the withering away of the party. For if the party does not wither away, the state never will.

"This is our Universal -- the question of the party. Lenin could only pose it by implication..." After which, he gives the tendency what they are to do as students of Logic, as Marxists, whereupon he diverts again on the French Revolution at much lengthier space than on the AI.

(p. 172) J. writes: "The party is the knowing of the proletariat as being. Without the party the proletariat knows nothing. We are here at the climax of a development characteristic of class society. The proletariat is the only historical class to which the party, the political party, is essential. Before this, all political parties were mere approximations..."

11/25/86 P.S. Chris accumulation of errors on Phil
on V/L's relation to the Party
specifically SOR to 1981 Kes
& Had embrace of JE + Galaxies of Nature
+ his own "Invading Socialist Society"

10829