

May 25, 1987

Notes on relationship of the Philosophic moment to Organization in Marx.

To this day the 1844 was the philosophic moment of Marx's discovery of that whole new continent of thought and of revolution that M "Marxism" certainly lacked and instead singled out ~~xxxix~~ one of the developments -- economics -- so ~~xxx~~ that we didn't know new humanism until ~~xxx~~ the Depression. But in fact, it is that which was the ground for organization throughout his life the moment he did ~~have~~ "experience" the ~~xxx~~ philosophic moment, even if it was only correspondence (letters) soon to become international correspondence.

Seriously, however; as organization, and that organization -- Communist League -- accepted the challenge to the existing capitalism world, and that not separated from all political tendencies and parties. I'm, of course, referring to the Communist Manifesto, whose second part is a critique of utopian socialism, etc. What we want to do here is to compare the 1847 CM to the 1864 ~~eg~~ First International ~~xxx~~ hailing the PC as the form, the working existence, the communal non-state as needing only release of ~~all~~ the mental, manual and emotional potentiality. Why then is ~~xxx~~ the actual~~x~~ concretization ~~of~~ of a new unity so sharply

10959

critiqued as if in the Gotha & Programme? That becomes the whole rub and the urgent problematic of our day which must be worked out.

First, xxxx enter history, in 1847 critique meant the ruthless critique of all that exists that he ~~xmp~~ spoke of in his philosophic break with the bourgeoisie and Hegel, concretized on the level of the existing "parties" in that period. (As we were to see in 1860 in his letter to Freilingrath, when Freilingrath, in refusing to get involved on the Vogt Affair, said he didn't belong to the party any longer. Marx's reply was, neither am I to any existing in the party. I didn't mean it/ephemeral sense, I ~~marx~~ meant it in the historic.) Clearly, Marx meant that no one could re-write the history, and both the revolution of 1848 and the Manifesto, that anticipated it and followed it, are historic).

It is that historic period that changed when international workers got together to take a position on what was happening on a different continent. That too had a "manifesto", perhaps not as bold as CM thought Marx, which was actually the preamble to the constitution and by-law to the First International.

AT THE SAME TIME Marx didn't ~~xx~~ hesitate a second once the PC burst out, and some trade unionist didn't share the enthusiasm, to ~~xx~~ write them out of the First International and ~~xx~~ not declare the need to go

10960

lower and deeper, but insist that them didn't represent the majority of the masses; the Paris Communards did and it is that Idea that defines history now as both ongoing and the future.

So, what happens in 1875 -- how the self-development of the Idea that we now call Marxism has concretized itself when it's greatest theoretical work is finished, and that has philosophy spelled out in the most concrete terms from fetishism of commodities to the new passions and new forces that ~~sexwikk~~ go against the accumulation of capital.

And he has the experience now of both parties and forms of organization emerging spontaneously from the masses.

There is no way now, no matter how Marx kept from trying give any blueprints for the future, not to develop a general view of where we're headed for the day after the conquest of power, the day after we have rid ourselves of the birthmarks of capitalism when a new generation can finally see all its potentiality put an end for once and for all the division between the mental and manual labor.

10961

(The transition point from Marx will have to be on Lenin, though it must be very, very brief.)

Why did we think once we took the big step of separating, indeed breaking with the elitist party, that it is sufficient to do so politically without doing so philosophically? Wasn't it because we actually had not penetrated the dialectic of organization in its relationship to dialectics of philosophy though we certainly never stopped using the word "dialectics"? In a word, even when we used ~~Absolute~~ in relationship to method and definitely stressed that we do not mean just a tool or application, we ~~said~~ did think that it was not just the threshold of the Absolute Idea, but the Absolute Idea as its ultimate as if Absolute Mind was no more than what Absolute Idea was in the Logic and Hegel didn't need to tell us that we better not stop there and instead ~~get~~ to Philosophy of Nature and Philosophy of Mind.

No wonder that

When CLRJ said that he looked into Philosophy of Mind and found there nothing for us. I must have felt dissatisfied since that is where I went, and ~~said~~ precisely, I might say, on the question of what we called "dialectics of the party", specifying however, that I wasn't interested either in the mass party, which the masses will build, or in the elitist party, which we definitely oppose, but in what happens to a small group

10962

* * * * *

"like us" who know that nothing can be done without the masses, and are with them, but they are theoreticians and they always seem to be around too. So, what is the objectivity which explains their presence, as the objectivity explains the spontaneous outburst of the masses? In a word, I was looking for the objectivity of subjectivity.

Now then, it seems to me that in a certain sense we could call it a shock for me to have experienced this year by 1987, when a great deal of ~~work~~ research was done ~~by~~ others -- Eugene, Mike, Peter, Cyrus, Kevin, Sheila, Olga -- on the many ways that spontaneity appeared in the forms of councils, soviets, committees, communes, and so forth, not only to say the generalization: Yes, the party and the forms of organization born from spontaneity are opposites, but they are not absolute opposites. The change in the title to Dialectics of Organization and Philosophy really means that the absolute opposite is philosophy, and that we have not yet worked out organizationally. Because, ...

Concretely, here is what is involved. Whether we take the Spanish Revolution in 1936-37, or the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, we will find that the great outburst and new ~~new~~ forms of organization with workers as decision-makers, with workers as Reason, ~~were~~ went as spontaneously to search for the party as the party went to search for them. And even when they were anarchists, they gave in to the

10963

~~parties~~ single party. (We will go into each one later.)

Or take Pannekoek. The Council Communists were certainly earlier on the scene and directly opposed Lenin in a friendly way, ~~on~~ on the question of a single form of organization, insisting that when it comes to production, the people at the point of production must maintain their power after the revolution. But, ~~did they ever give up their~~ along with party? Didn't they think ~~said~~ Rosa Luxemburg, that spontaneity is no substitute for the wholeness of internationalism and theory? On the contrary, they took that for granted. What not only was not taken for granted, but never even approached in any way whatever, unless one calls "approached" a total rejection, was philosophy. Except, except, except.

The except, of course, refers to Lenin. So happy were we that he had felt compelled to go back to Hegel that we acted as if it's only a matter of "not having time to get to" making his Notes public. Indeed, the enthusiasm for Lenin's dive into Science of Logic (IL) didn't question what about Phenomenology, of which there is evidence that he had read before writing Imperialism. There was too much of taking for granted attitude. The debates within the movement after the death of Lenin were so factionally motivated that there was no reason to pay any attention. The point then became: what has changed in the objective situation, in the theoretic void following the death of Lenin, without ever delving into philosophy.

10964

Again, it took the combination of a Marx, one that we didn't know at all, the young Marx, and the discovery of many in the context of the momentous of the archives, ~~againxxxxxx~~ objective situation, which showed that not only Russia, but the whole capitalist world, was falling apart, right after it had succeeded in putting down all attempts at new beginnings that strove to follow from the Russian Revolution. ~~The~~

The significance of

~~It took all the way to the aftermath of WW II before the question of philosophy was reached seriously enough to become conscious of the movements from practice as a ~~newxxxxxx~~ opening in the philosophy itself, which was directly related to that movement from practice. Indeed, both arose/because of the self-determination of the Idea and the movement from practice. Jamming up against each other, was on the road in a way that the duality ~~wouldxxxxxx~~ to a new unity.~~

One must not ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ hem in a new duality into an old reality~~ism~~ because of the similarities of abstract opposites colliding. It is the concrete opposites that demands a new unity. Without that, philosophic moment, there is no way to hew out a new path.

In the case of organization, every~~one~~ Left was grabbing at some old contradictions, and with them, some old solutions. cogent The most ~~painful~~ moment for ~~this~~ our problematic was the Creative, new fact that Pannekoek (and Gorter), with that ~~maxxxxxxx~~ concept of council communism

10965

i.e., power in the hands of the workers at the point of production, came the old, vulgarized abysmally narrow, imperialistic philosophy of Lenin's 1903 Materialism and Empirio-criticism, as against Lenin's great new philosophic breakthrough on the LL, and as if that self-movement of ideas and of people was a "betrayal" of the class struggle.

And to this day, that is what the Council Communists are swearing by, (Lenin as Philosopher).

Lenin, too, never raised philosophy directly in relationship to organization. It was at most, a phrase like the famous ~~and infinitum~~ reference in the Trade Union Debate, where he brings in, in a general way only, dialectics and eclecticism. (See P. 65 of Vol. IX Selected Works, on "a glass cylinder".)

And the epigones have been busy trying to say whereas it was correct for Lenin not to touch the question of the party when there was the great phenomenon of Soviets, "we" must no longer avoid the question of party. Whereupon, they end up just with two more reasons for being in favor of the vanguard party.

In one single word, we must go into these untrodden paths. We must not, I repeat must not, look for a crutch just because a new epigone is using the word "democracy"

to mean more than one party, and a Maoist espousing at one and the same time, "bombard the headquarters" and "the Party remains the vanguard". *10966*