

RD -- For Executive Session, Sept. 1, 1985

THE SELF-THINKING IDEA IN A NEW CONCEPT OF AND
RELATIONSHIP TO THE DIALECTICS OF LEADERSHIP,
AS WELL AS THE SELF-BRINGING FORTH OF LIBERTY

"...philosophy appears as a subjective cognition, of which liberty is the aim, and which is itself the way to produce it."

"...it is the nature of the fact, the notion, which causes the movement and development, yet this same movement is equally the action of cognition."

--Hegel, Philosophy of Mind,
paras. 576, 577

"...after labor, from a mere means of life, has itself become the prime necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual ... only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

--Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program

I. "The Power of Abstraction" *pp 1-2*

II. The New in This Year's Concept of the Dialectics of Leadership *pp 3-5*

III. Becoming Practising Dialecticians as ~~Our~~ Project *One*
Marxist-Humanism *combine with*

IV. THE PROCESS: *8/2* New Type of Collectivities, New Concept of Leadership; the Absolute Method *new moments*

"The concrete totality which is the beginning contains ... for the transcendence of the opposition between Notion and Reality, and the unity which is truth, rests upon this subjectivity alone."

-- Hegel, Science of Logic, Vol 2, p. 477

EXECUTIVE SESSION -- THE SELF-THINKING IDEA IN A NEW CONCEPT OF AND RELATIONSHIP TO THE DIALECTICS OF LEADERSHIP

(para. 576) "...philosophy appears as a subjective cognition, of which liberty is the aim, and which is itself the way to produce it."

(para. 577) "...it is the nature of the fact, the notion, which causes the movement and development, yet this same movement is equally the action of cognition."

"Power of Abstraction"

It is not only the title that is abstract and strange, but the whole context of what I will present -- long, long before I come to the concrete question of the dialectics of leadership -- is going to be abstract. In fact, I'm going to make "pure" abstraction of the Self-Thinking Idea, a veritable Universal, because I wanted, first of all, to firmly establish that the Self-Thinking Idea does not, I repeat does not, mean you thinking. Forget what I never stop repeating in the critique of Hegel, that it's not Ideas floating in the upper regions of the philosophers' heavens that "think"; it is people who think. That

is totally wrong. ~~When~~ you are serious about tracing the Logic of an Idea to its logical conclusion. Therefore, instead of any person, including what was primary to Hegel, philosophers, thinking, I want you to face the Idea itself thinking, (i.e.) developing it to its ultimate. At this point, remember how often, or rather, how rare it is that you think something through to the end. Indeed, if you do follow ~~the~~ ^{way} abstract ~~thought~~ ^{thought to the end}, you'll probably wind up sounding like an absolute idiot, or a monster. ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~idea~~ ^{idea}

~~things~~ ^{things} will only end up by proving that the Idea is no itself

Universal. Ideas "think," not sequentially, but consequentially, related to other Ideas that emerge out of historic ground, and do not care where all this might lead to, including transformation into opposite.

And yet, it is precisely because it is abstract; it's precisely because it goes to the ultimate without caring where this leads, that we can see what Logic does to a concrete Idea. It is this type of Absolute Method that Hegel had in mind as he was reaching the conclusion of the Absolute Idea, and said all truth is Subjectivity and Subjectivity alone. It is philosophy, and not philosopher, and if that philosophy is revolutionary and if that Idea is the Idea of Freedom, then a new Humanism will first arise ~~and~~

But it took a Marx to see that and only then could we talk about a whole person who is not just personality but Subjectivity -- body, emotion, thought as a totality that is bound for a new journey: the ~~absolute~~ absolute movement ~~of becoming~~ of becoming. It is this "power of abstraction" -- this is Marx's, not my phrase -- that Marx introduced early in the very ~~first~~ *Preface of* Capital on the most concrete thing of all, a Commodity. ~~introducing~~ *introducing* it in the very Preface of Capital, before ever the reader had plunged into that most difficult Chapter I, ~~which~~ he kept developing in 1867, *Further yet* 1872-3, ~~and~~ very last decade.

The the end will result in the Self-Bringing Forth of Liberty.

The new in this -3- years concept of J

99
E

Our problem today is what is new in our concept of Leadership? And what does it mean that this subjectivity alone contains the truth and ~~with it~~ with it subjectivity has absorbed objectivity. It is this new sense of fully objectivity that our age is the first to understand ~~fully~~ i.e. to understand Marx's meaning ~~in distinction~~ in distinction from Hegel's. Just try to concretize this in historic terms and you will see what ^a hard and very nearly impossible task that is. For example, when I first tackled the question of ~~Hegel's~~ Hegel's meaning of subjectivity in that sentence, I hardly went further than class, class distinction. I refer to the section "Two Kinds of Subjectivity" in the new chapter ^{added to M&F} Since that wasn't exactly what I meant, ~~and~~ what I was trying to bring in which was new was the distinction between two kinds of Marxists -- Lenin and Mao's -- I didn't really

that you could consider yourself a Marxist and be so near the cliff that by just the slightest deviation you would fall right into the abyss of a new void.

I tried again in 1969 vs. Dick who did not see the very deep gulf between Herbert Marcuse and me. That was good, but not yet good enough as I was only on the threshold of Absolute Idea as new beginning.

I tried again, this time with the "help" of Sartre's deep appreciation of the rarity of truly original philosophic creation, in which he held that all the way from the 17th to the

Q: you look at human activity itself as objective activity (gegenstandliche) activity

[Handwritten scribbles and diagrams on the left margin, including a large circular diagram with internal lines.]

20th century the world had seen three and only three such creations: Descartes and Locke; Kant and Hegel; and then Marx alone. ~~And it was his~~ And it was his (Marx's) creation that would persist until the end of capitalism, so that every other philosophy, including Existentialism, ~~must~~ must abide by that. It was some help, but I immediately began to take strong exception ~~to~~ ^{to} Sartre's putting Kant and Hegel in the same category. So far as I'm concerned -- and in this both Hegel, from his ^{vantage-} point, ~~and~~ and Marx from his will support me -- it isn't that Hegel didn't appreciate Kant ~~or~~ ^{or} that he denied that Kant was the first to bring the dialectic into the "modern" age -- i.e. the age of industrialization and the French Revolution. It is that Hegel felt that the beginning was not really the ~~answer~~ answer to all the new questions that the new age posed, ~~that he had to break with all~~ ^(the ground is not yet the whole Hegel had) of them, Kant as much as Descartes, in order not to "stop dead" at what was new, but rather begin ~~anew~~ ^(a new).

... and accept that challenge from the objective situation. The double edge of the dialectic is that the very new birth which contains a new stage of production means the perishing of all previous stages, so that the new dialectic can start from new beginnings, new passions, new forces, new Reason;

Do not follow any post-Marx Marxists, in one way or another, though they didn't know ~~it~~ ^{it}, they did.

(Handwritten scribble)

(Handwritten scribble)

(Handwritten scribble)

exactly what Sartre does in combining Kant and Hegel
 and ended up being Kantians, not Hegelians, ^(concerned with the list) never
 stopped just with Class so that the very period in which
 he discovered the proletariat as the revolutionary class,
 was also the period in which he broke with Feuerbachian
 materialism and its non-comprehension of the dialectic
 as the moving force. It wasn't that he ^{skipped over} ~~skipped over~~
 either women or culture but the very totality of seeing
 all as new beginning led him to break also with Hegel to
 whom this was just abstraction. The only point Sartre was
 right in, outside of the generality of the rarity of
 philosophic creation, was the recognition ^(although) ~~that~~ it only
 lasted a moment before he returned to Existentialism ^{that}
 all who deviated from Marx by ^{concluding that their "addition"} ~~concluding that their "addition"~~
 of what was "new" was not a deviation but a mere question of
 what was new today that Marx had not seen, only meant
 going to a stage of pre-Marxism, ^{or post-Marxism as he says} ~~or post-Marxism as he says~~

These
 are
 all
 on day
 REVI

III

Our task is
 as first that

Becoming practicing
 Dialecticians

→ as you not only
 just articulate, but

(Practical)

lets take advantage of the fact that this is not a ~~choice~~
 we have no elections, so we cont. to talk

Do not think that only for Ph. It becomes

essential than ever ⁶ as we begin A NEW *Dialectics of Power*

On the question of how abstract thinking, without regard to consequences; ~~but~~ ^{however} make sure that you would think that thought through to its logical conclusion, the best "ex" may be the following in relationship to ~~Lukacs~~ ^{Lukacs'} ~~making~~ making a universal category of the word totality. I have often referred to it as ~~wrong~~ ^{wrong} of course, and in private conversation stressed the fact that Marcuse should have dedicated his One Dimensional Man to ~~Lukacs~~ ^{Lukacs} since it is really ~~Lukacs~~ ^{Lukacs'} who ever since 'reification of ~~thought~~ ^{thought}' and "totality" has created the human ^U for just that type of one-dimensional thought. But it took a bourgeois liberal intellectual Marshall Berman ^{in his lengthy article} in the Voice Literary Supplement (July, 1985) to put it most concretely!

hah!

Finally, there is the idea of totality, according to which the question of freedom becomes 'purely tactical' because 'freedom cannot represent a value in itself': the only real issue is whether the Communist Party, incarnation of the working class, holds the totality of power. If these ideas were brought together -- the primacy of totality, orthodoxy, incarnation -- they could generate a theology of total submission, a metaphysical undertow that might well be strong enough to drown all Lukacs's dreams of liberation."

All that needs to be added

Lukacs runs unabashedly to his ^{fixed} preoccupation's logical conclusion. Once he decided, way back in 1919-20 that the "update" of Marx's principle about the reification of labor he would work out for the reification of thought, it led to that idiotic conclusion. Marcuse took this one step further, to his age of the 1950s, up to 1960 itself, and ~~published~~ ^{published} One - Dimensional Man. Nevertheless, he then skipped rudderless to the absolute opposite extreme of accepting Youth, no matter what they did, and Black as if Angela Davis was that representation of Black. So what are revolutionaries doomed to if thought, too, becomes reified? Marcuse's next answer was the uncritical Soviet Marxism, and Lukacs' last work, Social Ontology, meant the acceptance of the most unique, very specific capitalist category, socially necessary labor time! as the value of labor under Socialism!

IV The Process: New type of Collectives, New Abs. Method

Now then, the concrete problem today is Organization and Leadership; what you have to work out is how, at one and the same time, you cannot deviate from the principle and yet be open to all new, objective and subjective

developments. Let's use these abstractions as the context in which we reconsider what we mentioned as our main proposal on the Biweekly; how we mean to prepare for it by a trip to ^(Appalachia) Kentucky as well as Mexico, and ~~to~~ to the new strike in steel as well as to Spain and even India. And with ~~each~~ each ~~trip~~ trip we developed a new collectivity.)

Keep

Vol. 2 page 471: "Absolute Method... (means) objectively universal... every beginning must be made from the Absolute... the progress is therefore not a kind of overflow..."

Vol. 2 page 477: "The concrete totality (which) is the beginning contains... for the transcendence of the opposition between Notion and Reality, and the unity which truth rests upon this subjectivity alone."

108

✓ If the new type of collectivity, --
 whether it is Gary, Isaac, Olga, or
 B (who brings in a new section
 of the ~~new~~ ^{new} ~~W.K.G. class~~ ^{the 100 pages work}
 Anne ~~in both with~~ ^{with} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~new~~ ^{new} ~~concept~~ ^{concept} of the dialectic
 of leadership ~~the~~ ^{the} concrete proposal to transform the N&L
 into a bi-weekly next year whether we embark on the national
 international trips with the new type of collectivity, or take
 on the immediate task, now that we finally have WL&DOR, of
 selling ~~it~~ ^{it}, not as salespeople but as founders of Marxist-
 Humanism, the need is for one more look at the concrete
 tasks the Perspectives listed.

Dialectic Methodology of the

The Process which engages in complex interaction
 I was trying ~~to~~ ^{to} work out, i.e. concretize the meaning
 of my ~~own~~ ^{philosophy} ~~on~~ ^{at} the last REB meeting, ^{when I read} that if one doesn't
 grasp fully the 4th section, "A 1980s View" of chapter 12, one
 can't sell the ~~1st~~ ^{4th} ~~book~~ ^{book} as a founder of Marxist-Humanism.
 Here is what I meant:
 Consider Marx's "new moments" ^{in his last decade} along with new moments
 grasped at turning points of his life then here is what
 they will get when they think of ~~the 4th section~~ ^{the 4th section} of the 4th book.
 (1) the fact that Marx now decides that that the accumulation
 of capital is not ~~universal~~ ^{the}. He does not mean ~~that~~ ^{that} that it
 is no universal ~~capitalism~~ ^{capitalism}. He does mean it is no universal
 for the world, ^{and} ~~and~~ countries can experience other forms of
 development, ^{and} ~~and~~ even then he qualifies it by saying that
 they must do it together with what the advanced capitalist
 countries do.

with Social
 base, ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~pr~~ ^{pr} ~~activity~~ ^{activity}
 & ~~with~~ ^{with}
 rival ~~ideas~~ ^{ideas}
 Methodology
 in projection
 of its ~~phil.~~ ^{phil.}
 human.

2/11/52 And conclusion in his final decade was the revolution can actually take place first in backward Russia rather than in advanced Germany.

Most important of all is:

(A) The multi-linear human development demonstrates no ~~one~~ straight line i.e. no fixed stages of development. The Iroquois women, the Irish before British imperialism, the aboriginals in Australia, the Arabs in Africa, have displayed greater intelligence, more equality between men and women, than the intellectuals from England, or the U.S.A., or Australia, or France or Germany.

(B) The gens form of development is higher, a higher form of human life than class society, though the former too showed that, in embryo, class relations started there. *Amos*

Do interrupt yourself here for a conference with Marx in the Critique of the Gotha Program which includes the sentence that was so alive and worrysome to Marcuse in his last decade that he asked me what do I make of this sentence on labor being "the prime necessity of life." Here is the whole paragraph:

In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished, after labor, from a mere means of life, has itself become the prime necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly, only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Now then let us look at the same type of new moments at other turning points of Marx's life which opened new doors for him which he in turn opened for a new generation. Take the artisans/ ^{ed} Marx in the Grundrisse considered having experienced a greater self-development and initiative by working manually.

as well as mentally then even those considered geniuses like like the artists.

Or, for that matter turn back to when he first discovered that new continent of thought and of revolution and broke with capitalism in 1843, when he called for "revolution-in-permanence" not only in order to uproot the old society, but to undergo a "revolution in permanence" in every facet ^{of life} including self-development.

When it comes to taking responsibility for the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism in ~~our~~ ^{this} ~~era~~ ^{age} when we are aiming for nothing short of actually helping to transform the objective international situation, here are the problems we face:

Why was it that the 1905 Revolution which certainly had international impact and certainly made Lenin most conscious of Asia, "Africa", at best, was thought of as "India" ^{and Africa} And if anyone thought of Egypt, it was only because the Greeks were there, and it was half "Mediterranean"?

Why was it that RL so far in advance of all other Marxists, so movingly describing the Kalahari Desert, ~~Mozambique~~ ^{Namibia} (Southwest Africa), Martinique, couldn't see them as reasons ^{for}

Couldn't it possibly be that all her love and dependence upon the spontaneous unorganized masses ^{new class} "pushing" the leadership to act in a revolutionary way meant that even in that new love the ~~class~~ ^{new class} concept was predominant for leadership?

Philosophy is both more and ^{and at the same time} totally different from "decision making" in the very crucial sense that decision making too is a ^{first} negativity unless self-development of the individual means all individuals.

In the concrete that would mean that when we in class bring in a philosophic question to be discussed we do not get reduced to that being decision making, even though decision making is an indispensable preliminary to the self-development that is individual responsibility for philosophy, preliminary

11

to eruption of actual revolution.

For take the question of the preparation for transforming N&L into a bi-weekly, and together with it the nitty-gritty, most concrete question for all -- the special fund. That is actually the greatest determinant as to whether we do know how to sell the book not as salespeople but as founders of Marxist-Humanism.

Even more critical on the question of doing something as Marxist-Humanist founder is the question of that special fund which seems to be its exact opposite, ~~and not~~ ^{But in fact} it is a fact that the whole concept of a workers' paper that would be not only a form for what workers say, ~~and~~ ^{desire} would equally be one where the intellectual would find not ~~only~~ ^{not} a home, but a very new responsibility ~~to~~ ^{to} talking philosophy, not by ~~helping~~ ^{reducing} reducing ~~it~~ ^{to} to common sense, but ~~by~~ ^{by} ~~being~~ ^{being} so clear about what it means ^{ing} that it doesn't necessarily require a strange vocabulary except in its historic senses ~~of~~ ^{of} knowing why we must not disregard the past, ~~and~~ ^{and} it was in that past that Marx's Marxism was first expressed and will remain for so long as capitalism exists? And indeed, isn't it this that intellectuals that ~~were~~ ^{were} not Marxist-Humanists, and indeed thought it was a pretty far-out idea, were willing to support ~~it~~ ^{it}. Indeed I ~~got~~ ^{got} at one and the same time, as little as \$25, and what ~~sounded~~ ^{sounded} unbelievable/fantastic to us, the first \$1,000. It was 1956, and it was given to ~~the~~ ^{assure} ~~publication~~ ^{publication} of M&F. ~~And~~ ^{And} please don't forget here that this first big contribution was given by the one, the only one in the whole world that took up guns against Hitler's invasion of Austria.

cut

*new commitment
thought
rev*

The sharpest expression of theory is METHODOLOGY and let's never forget that METHODOLOGY is the result of the complex interaction of 1.) social base 2.) theoretical analysis and practical activity and 3.) the STRUGGLE WITH RIVAL TENDENCIES AND RIVAL METHODOLOGIES.

The point about all of these concrete tasks outlined for this year (and some for next year) is that they must be tested by the Absolute Dialectical Method. The question of new new book-to-be on "The Dialectics of the Party" and, most important of all, the real historic-philosophic beginning of the century-long-delayed outline Mark sketched for future generations, and submitting to that type of test by the Absolute Method, is actually expressing its goal. The interpenetration of philosophy, organization, self-development would result in humanity itself developing its full potential. The development of all human faculties assures the birth of a new man, new woman, new youth, of the classless, non-racist, non-sexist society.

—30—