

5/29/87

Parts

PART I for June 1: I -- Introduction -- The Chaotic State of this report plus a glimpse on the objective situation which demands not just frequency but meaning of the period to create a philosophic cadre so that Practicing Dialecticians are not just "journalistically" ~~manifested~~ manifested, but the essay forms which we created when we first declared 1980 to be the Year of the Book and transformed N&L into a 12 pager, with a stress on essay-writing.

PART II: The Philosophic Moment -- That will be the main body of the discussion and will include everything from Marx down, including us, especially 1953, but end with Hegel and ~~Organization~~ zation.

PART III: ORGANIZATION AND BOOKS, especially the book <sup>incl. by others</sup> on the Dialectic of Organization and of Philosophy. The point here is what does the whole organization being involved in this book mean? And ~~what~~ what is the difference between Universal and Particular, not in general, but very specifically, on this book, signal in relationship to the uniqueness, historic right to existence of N&LC mean? <sup>Finally,</sup> why the informality and pre-pre-<sup>P</sup>perspectives discussion, which resembles a great deal more of a final Executive session --and some of this will no doubt be used for that -- rather than the politics of the objective situation and the precise tasks of ~~the book~~ 1987-88.

10986

Why First? Why Now? may very well help  
the process, not above 1987 but bus for 1980 notes, following  
at the same time, making the book within JPT should  
Vick

5/29/87

-2-

The PART III that I was going to include a simple, brief para. on "Why Phen? Why Now?" has been so extended that I may just forget it altogether. Instead, what should be included in Part III, ~~IN~~ are the work by others done on Organization for the book which led<sup>me</sup> to the more or less shocking conclusion that ~~XXXXXX~~ what is needed is a great deal more than just my single statement that the form of organization, whether party or sponteneity are opposites but not absolute opposites. That is to say, the not absolute opposites cannot simply be what we've always taken for granted -- that, "of course" philosophy is our distinguishing mark. That is exactly what is wrong -- taking for granted. Hegel knew whereof he spoke, even if it was in an abstract form when he declared "taking for granted" instead of demanding proof and process is a "barbarous procedure."

Here is where we go into Eugene, Mike, ~~Mike~~ Peter, Cyrus. Others, too, have contributed -- I'm limiting myself to those, here. Because their's was directly on the book.

Part IV N&LC and the Paper, its relationship to the philosophic moment; its relationship to the specific year 87-88; its relationship to the book on dialectics of organization and of philosophy.

Since all  
this would  
make it too  
long even for  
a Plenum/Comm.  
the problem is to  
CWT, CWT, CWT, CWT

10987