

11/18/66

RE: REPRODUCTION OF SUMMARY ON PHENOMENOLOGY MADE IN 1960, WITH  
NEW (11/18) INTRODUCTION

Because it is essential to begin every retrospective as a current event and one in which the future is present, I think it would be important to start on the difference between p. 1, which starts these 1960 notes and page 2, which is where I want to start the retrospective with. Page 2 is not only earlier than p. 1 in relation to the section in Hegel -- 2 relates to pp. 80-81 while 1 relates to an overall view, centering on the p. 240 section -- but it's p. 2 that is really relevant to today as well as overall. That is to say, the whole question of <sup>what constitutes</sup> a birth-time and a period of transition, as well as <sup>hegel's</sup> what distinguishes Dialectics from all other philosophers -- Absolute Knowledge -- is that "everything depends on grasping the subject and expressing the ultimate truth not as Substance but as Subject as well" and what tells it all, i.e. the uniqueness of Hegel's philosophy and the uniqueness of Marxist-Humanism.

On the other hand, para. 1 is totally new and certainly was never stated by anyone anywhere, Marxists or non-Marxists, and that is that I suggest at once that it would not be vulgarizing Hegel but concretizing all those Universals if we thought of the 800 plus pages as constituting only two divisions. The first of which would comprise Consciousness, Self-Consciousness and Reason and the second Spirit, Religion and Absolute Knowledge. There is also the great value in that 1st page of attitudes of mind to the objective world, <sup>knowing</sup> ~~even though~~ even though <sup>historically important,</sup> those attitudes reflect nothing but "the giddy world of perpetual self-creating disorder" (p. 249)

10821

In a fundamental sense, an Introduction is also an Overview, subject though that overview be not the overview of the specific/reprinted, but ~~the~~ <sup>what</sup> others, especially when that other is a Karl Marx, have said on the subject, so that I should ~~not~~ here bring in the historically different periods between 1844 when Marx 1st critiqued Phenomenology, which of course remains the ground for all of us, and I'm damn sure that it was only after I read that that I thought of the subject at all, it certainly always remained and still remains that Marx's calling this the most creative work of Hegel and the ~~the~~ work which ~~the~~ revealed that the mystical veil ~~did nothing to~~ <sup>could not</sup> hide the actual movement of humanity, which is what made it so great and, far from being one man's view, was the summation of 2500 years of historic development, beginning with the ancient Greeks in 500 B.C. (to which he will later add: actually comprising all human development). Indeed, it was that which made Marx insist as late as the 1870s that the Hegelian Dialectic was the source of all dialectic, his own included.

Handwritten notes in a circle:  
 To B  
 from  
 (Hegel)  
 (Phenomenology)

Technically, there will be a star at the end of the 1st paragraph, and the fn. at that star will note that what followed <sup>in</sup> (original pamphlet) the D of L was a letter of Nov. 17, 1968 that was actually on the Phenomenology -- the section on literature and specifically tragedy (pp. 730-749) of the ~~the~~ Phenomenology, that I had deliberately left out because I did not want to go into literature. But it was included by no accident when the pamphlet was produced at the end of the '60s, and I'm ~~not~~ <sup>including that letter</sup> now precisely because the whole question of literature and philosophy and the question of culture in general and philosophy has gained an especially new philosophic life with Shklar's book (Freedom and Independence). The New Introduction should develop a little more of that work.

10822

And now ~~retracing~~ retracing the pamphlet exactly as written then, it is clear that ~~the~~ reality is not limited to the reality of Hegel's time but that of the post WWII world, specifically ~~1959~~ 1959 and the emergence of Castro's Cuban Revolution and the development in Mao's China. You will remember that I had already proof-read the galleys of Marxism and Freedom when Mao made the speech "On Contradiction" and it cost me a lot of money to add a fn. 17 on the critique of it. It actually led to the 2nd edition of M&F (1964) when it was developed into a whole chapter on "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung" which became the ground of M&F ~~when 1964 became 1965~~, with me in Hong Kong interviewing Chinese refugees ~~at the time~~ <sup>I had that in hand</sup> where the Cultural Revolution was called an Education Campaign, <sup>where I was invited by the translators of M&F</sup> it was followed by my trip to Japan ~~where~~ people holding the position of state-capitalism, having broken with the CP and the youth having translated the Early Essays of Marx. Those critical years, 1964-66, followed by 1967, when the Japanese friends, ~~having not taken the road to philosophy or to Humanism~~ <sup>1967-1968</sup> ~~...~~

(develop the whole question objectively and subjectively of 1964 to 1968, which would show that the Sino-Soviet orbit having become the Sino-Soviet conflict, and the collapse of the May 1, 1968 French outburst compelled the working out of all that had been "in the head" ever since 1948-51, 3-way correspondence on philosophy, the actual Miners' general strike, <sup>(the death of Stalin)</sup> the '53 AI Letters, but never fully concretized until, first, the pamphlet with the Japanese on a-cism, with my answer to them, which we called "State-Capitalism and Marx's Humanism or Philosophy and Revolution", so that only then was full organizational responsibility taken for finally getting down to Hegel's philosophy IN AND FOR ITSELF -- WHY HEGEL? WHY NOW?)

On the 100th anniversary of the fall of Capital

10823

Finally, as we get to the 2nd subdivision that I had suggested for the Phenomenology -- Spirit -- and here, too, it's not Hegel's or Marx's age that is the only subject, but the modern reality and philosophy, specifically, comparing pp. 537-548 with the point in Existentialism and ~~the~~ <sup>Hegel's</sup> sharp critique of materialism by saying "matter is really pure abstraction" (see my page 6)/.

Do not forget certain very great Hegelian ~~lectures~~ <sup>lectures</sup> that ~~is~~ <sup>are</sup> so profound that ~~sounds~~ <sup>they</sup> as if ~~he~~ <sup>they</sup> had been written just this minute. See whether you don't think of Ronald Reagan <sup>, the Great Communicator,</sup> when you read this:

"the darkness of thought mated with the clearness of expression."

And, of course, we end with the Golgotha.

\*\*\*\*\*

Tactically I think I will propose to the Jan. 3 Sum-Up that the Phen. Notes with this type of Introduction be put out as a pamphlet by us, somewhere in Summer of 1987, and that we ask L.A. local to do this -- but not to expect me to have the Introduction finished too long before then. They could estimate that it would not be more than 4 to 5 pages in addition to the pages from D of L (9 pages of text and 2 pages for the Letter).

10824