

10917 1/5/ chaos state (not only) Etee NEVER + Vm medical as Bi-Willy 5/11/87 Only think but

The Organization, the Paper, the Book, -- All Equal Philosophy of Marxist-Humanism

The Book is not a book

To see duality in each, elaborate on

Let me first ~~elaborate~~ each of those words. The

Organization its ground, its activity, its growth; the paper = its ~~journalistic~~ journalistic reflection of MHism (as) it meets the challenge of the most concrete ongoing objective <sup>pol.</sup> situation; the ~~book~~ the relationship of ~~philosophy~~ philosophic-political in all its forms, both those born from spontaneity and to the historic form of party ~~as~~ as Marx referred to it, and as MHism worked it out in the post-WW II period.

(Difference between update and total reconstruction.)

Now then, the reason I said all this equals the philosophy of MHism is that I wish to stress is the fact that whereas we cannot have the new book unless I really am away from the organization, ~~the~~ the organization in turn, having ~~passed~~ <sup>convinced</sup> that it ~~can~~ <sup>has</sup> meet the objective situation on a very-nearly daily basis, ~~most~~ <sup>may</sup> now ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> as serious and consider ~~itself~~ <sup>itself</sup> a collectivity for the book, NEVERTHELESS, THE TRUTH IS THAT THIS BODY OF IDEAS IS ALL IN THE BOOK'S, FROM M&F THROUGH WLDR AND THE INTRODUCTION/OVERVIEW TO THE 1983, 1984 PAMPHLETS. IT IS THAT KIND OF TOTAL RECONSTRUCTION WHICH ~~discloses~~ <sup>discloses</sup> THAT IN FACT IT IS ~~1953~~ <sup>1953</sup>, ~~NOT~~ <sup>NOT</sup> 1955 or 1957 THAT LAID THE ~~FOUNDATION~~ <sup>ROOF</sup> AS WELL AS THE GROUND FOR ALL THAT FOLLOWED AND THAT NOT ONLY AS THEORY, BUT AS PRACTICE, AS ORGANIZATION, AS PAPER.

That this doesn't refer only to where you were <sup>not fully</sup> here 57-60 will not bully above you since you ~~have~~ <sup>learned</sup> from it

To be preceded by 1/5/87

The missing link has left more than a little residue in US who should be the stress here

may at this waste for some 30 yrs. ~~but~~

PROJECTION however lagging far behind

Handwritten notes on the right margin including "was hampered by pride that you 'wouldn't' have done any such thing -"

I want to spell this out <sup>more</sup> ~~concretely~~. It is <sup>ma</sup> ~~very~~ <sup>important</sup> to me that <sup>the</sup> concept of the paper ~~as~~ <sup>to</sup> begin with, a name that was rooted in America, in revolution, in dialogue-- letter-writing-- came after a lengthy study of the Committees of Correspondence, so that immediately we had -- and that was when we were still JFT-- committee-form instead of party to lead, letter-writing as a form of journalism, that was itself dialectical and the dialogue was a continuing process, whether as letters to the editor, or whether such lengthy essays that met the objective situation, ~~and~~ and not just as news but as a momentous world historic stage-- specifically the Beria Purge. So there we were, fighting over the very first issue of Correspondence on the question of Subject, as well as ~~activity~~ activity, and soon on the question of political ization.

I'm (not) referring to Stalin's death, but to Guatemala.

The specific duality that was attempted as a unity in the 1986-87 Perspectives, on the decision for ~~the~~ the coming bi-weekly, was that with the decision for the biweekly was the organizational growth flowing out of it. Naturally, the year-end Summation, "The Year of Only 8 Months", did not mean to limit our test of ourselves to the ~~the~~ readers. (Whereas the N&L year is Sept. to Sept., the calendar years are Jan. to Dec.)

*Concrete Party*  
*15/1/88*  
*concrete*

*detailed*  
*summary will*  
*that show when*

*Here*  
*2%*  
*1/1/88*

*+ SKIP*  
*at once*  
*1/1/88*  
*10/1/88*

*TRAP*  
*1/1/88*  
*1/1/88*

~~But~~ The fact ~~is~~ that the organizational growth has  
 been minimal points to something a great deal more serious  
 than thinking that one ~~abstract form~~ <sup>form</sup> like the paper, can  
 hold the key to organizational growth. It is true that the in-  
 tegrality we looked forward to did not follow. But ~~it's not the~~  
~~fault of the paper.~~ Here is what I mean by "a ~~great deal~~  
 more serious": Projection of MHisism had been narrowed in  
both  
our concept ~~between~~ between philosophy and organization,  
and  
the organization and paper. This could throw us off the rails  
 of our uniqueness if each one of us doesn't immediately  
 work at a very serious self-critique.

TE  
SP

TE  
P4  
CV  
A

\* \* \* \* \*

Once again, let's ~~spell out that year~~ <sup>spell out that year</sup> 1953. The break-  
 through <sup>is</sup> on the Absolute Idea. The breakthrough declares that  
 there is a movement from practice as well as from theory, and  
 becomes absolute only in the unity of the 2. The breakthrough  
 includes all Absolutes as one, but that is to say whether it  
 is Absolute Knowledge ~~within~~ <sup>articulated</sup> the Phenomenology which ~~is~~  
~~the~~ Absolute as the Organization that is History and  
 the Organization in the spiritual kingdom. Or whether Hegel  
 has now worked ~~out~~ out all those phenomena as philosophic cat-  
 egories and held that the Absolute Idea meant the unity of  
 Theory and Practice, qualifying it however, by warning the  
 readers that there is still the Philosophy of Nature and the  
 Philosophy of Mind before you will actually have a totality.

10919

The final Absolute-- Absolute Mind (Geist), which ends the Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences-- expresses it as the unity of objectivity and subjectivity, but it doesn't really end in unity, because that in turn becomes a new beginning, so that the unity of self-determination of the Idea and the self-bringing forth of liberty leaves doors open for future generations. I, in the 1953 letter, call this: "We have entered the new society".

What I'm driving at on the 1953 breakthrough of the Absolute is that it embodied a totally new element of form, structure and politics for the organization and the paper, and the missing element of philosophy in what we now define as post-Marx Marxism. Yes, we were still in the JFT. Yes, I was only half conscious of what was driving me to work ~~out~~ out all the major works of Hegel and kept apologizing and proving that I was only doing it after midnight. But here is what followed: 1) convention that voted to publish issue #1 of Correspondence; 2) decalaring ourselves Committees of Correspondence; and 3) the 1st issue in October on the Beria Purge, and all the attacks on me , plus McCarthyism, which led to ~~the~~ split in 1955.

HERE

95  
12

Finally to get back  
to Tokyo 5/2/87  
+ B. W. W. W.

10920

Notes on last points:

1) Issue #5-- March 27, with West Europe Lead.

Look at the "On the Inside" box. Where is "Reagan and Gorbachev, two of a kind". It is practically hidden. We still don't understand what it means to advertise the objectivity of what we do.

2) Everything seems to center on activity articles, without even the appreciation for what we do as the form in which these articles appear, how different they are when in the context of MHism's body of ideas.

3) ADS. This NB. Where are the creative, serious, educational ads? Space is needed for that, yet we don't consider our body of ideas as objective enough to "displace" an activity article and thus have ~~an~~ an ad.

4) Finally, we have to have a good reason for taking up the question of the biweekly on June 1 REB. Why are we raising the question of the paper before we discuss the analysis of the objective situation?

The March 23 REB was deceptively concrete, and ~~was~~ not understood. It is a category that has to be seen, not person, not only the REB.

KEY is that the objective situation demands focusing on the NEW BOOK, AND INVOLVING THE WHOLE ORGANIZATION, not as a 2 year project, BUT AS 1 YEAR.

*Handwritten scribbles*

*Handwritten notes:*  
event  
20/1/80  
1/80  
No members  
1/80  
10921