

(12/17/86)

Substitutionism, or Theory/Philosophy

destalinized

In our epoch the ~~various~~ Left tendencies that are trying to save the question of the "Party" have suddenly returned to the question of Marx on that subject, specifically the Feb. 29, 1860 letter of Marx to Freilegrath. For the moment, I will not go into the question of the peculiar interpretations of historical facts

1st there is the letter of Marx to Freilegrath of Vol. 41, p. 81.
2nd, is Rubel 'Marx Without Myth'--and the article Johnstone quotes from Rubel is 1961, whereas what I'm quoting is the chronological study of 1975 that he co-edited with Margarat Manaley, and that really is not only p. 162, but actually pp. 160 - 169 as the affair on Vogt is on that.
3rd, is Deutscher's 'The Prophet Armed', 1954, Section "At the Door of History", specifically pp. 90-92, at which point there is a footnote on RL's 1904 critique of Lenin.
Finally, see appendix to chapter 11 of RLWLKM.)

1910?
In the 1967 Socialist Register Johnstone brings in the question of LT and substitutionism during his discussion on Marx in 1860: "Half a century later such a conception was dubbed 'substitutionism' by Trotsky who imputed it to Lenin and attacked him in the name of Marxism for allegedly favouring the party substituting itself for the working class which, he argued, would lead to a single 'dictator' substituting himself for the party."

Whether it is the 1967 article by Johnstone or the 1981 article by Cunliffe (which really is a horror precisely because it is a hodgepodge of Johnstone and R. Rossanda's 1970's Maoist article on ~~THEYXHXH~~ Class and Party ~~on the co-revolution~~)

10830

The point is -



What I'm getting at is whether this more or less scholarly work by Johnstone or the so-called historical Maoist twist, ^{RR quest} is in fact a very deliberate way of making Marx and Engels one, escaping from Dialectics and fitting Marx into what the concept of democratic-Trotskyist-Stalinist-Eurocommunist present day problem to suit their own outlook.

The way this all connects back to Trotsky's substitution and Luxemburg's contradictory position, of being, at one and the same time for spontaneity and for the Party unity, ^{unity, unit} is ^{these} revolutionary

at the early period when no one stood out and no objective ^{burst} movement to prove ^{on their viewpoint, no point of departure in the abstract} the one or the other, ^{they} all ^{sentences} ^{of the party, or Russia, or the} ^{correct} ^{outlook,} ^{perfection} abstract, but Lenin, saved himself by always trying to prove ^{where} ^{left the trail} what was needed in the concrete.

Scandal having his pulse on the concrete objective situation as well as what

was what was the correct instinct in the period between ^{what happened in the per. bet.} actually 1905 revolution until the outbreak of world war ^{his} ^{digging} into the Hegelian Dialectic ^{is that} the ~~dialectic was not related to the question of the Party.~~ ^{Specifically the party. Instead he} ^{continued to be. Bolshevik fraction politically only.} ^{what was} ^{equally} ^{was} that all those correct



instincts, when he ^{was} ^{critiqued} ^{What is to be Done} in the 12 years ^{Party} ^{from} ¹⁹⁰⁵ ¹⁹¹⁴ ^{disappeared} ^{with} ^{reference} ^{was} ^{Gen} ^{SD} ^{which} ^{had} ^{heresy} ^{been} ^{his} ^{word} as the shock ^{is} ^{betrayal} ^{not} ^{necessary} ^{total} ^{break} Marxist-Humanism is the first to work out by ^{an} ^{refusing} to separate organization from the Dialectic of philosophy itself, is not only new in relationship to the ~~Marx~~

What happens at the end of the line to the party? No one is off.

"Party" but is very deeply rooted in the post-WWII period, ^{and} ^{its} ^{objective} ^{subjective} ^{historic} ^{philosophic} ^{appearance}.

In a word, when K.H. in 1941 ^{was} ^{separating} ^{from} ^{reformers} ^{but} ^{from} ^{other} ^{concepts} ^{of} ^{socialism} ^{and} ^{communism} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{USSR} ^{at} ^{that} ^{time}

① ^{be} ^{new} ^{also} ⁱⁿ ^{concepts} ^{when} ^{the} ^{1940s} ^{had} ^{led} ^{how} ^{to} ^{put} ^{present} ^{let} ^{ref} ^{as} ^{the} ^{end} ^{of} ^{it}

Small underground like Russian led how to put present let ref as the end of it

What is it, precisely, that makes it so difficult when

you try to take the question of proof, not ^{merely} as something

"scientific", but as process which is every bit as ^{precise} ~~precise~~

great a determinant

in philosophy as in organization? Why did it seem to be

necessary, in the early period to throw the word ~~substitut~~

substitutionism around at an opponent, as if Marx left

us ~~a final answer~~ ^{es} total an answer organizationally as

philosophically? The truth is--and that is where Engels

comes in as not being a Marx--that though Marx and Engels

seemed to speak the same language, the same "advice" to

the various movements that were attracted to the vision

of this new continent of thought and of revolution, ~~it~~

wasn't so

Insert over

← INSERT - OVER

This is seen especially clearly after Marx's death,

but ~~xxxxxxx~~ the ground was laid in those 6 years

between the founding of the First International where

Marx was on the first floor from the very first moment,

while Engels did not leave Manchester or take an important

place until the First International ^{was in crisis} and Marx asked him to

come in 1870. (those 6 years need to be studied and not

dismissed as if that was demanded ^{only} by the fact that he

supported Marx and couldn't get away ^{for} ~~xxxxxxx~~ the

orgi. needs of

the moment?

1st Int?

had to financially
effort

Now in the period after Marx's death you can see that

the choice of who is the keeper of the documents and who are

the people who are the chosen ones, from Bernstein, Kautsky

and so forth, that Marx had very different views. But it

~~(xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)~~

CUT

CUT

INSERT (for over) A

One more point re substitutionism because I do think that that has been used so loosely that it's precisely its abstract usage that has nullified any meaning that it might

have had before a revolution had proved both the actual process and the underlying ~~philosophical~~ philosophy. Thus, 1904 ^{might have} just ^{been} "mistake" that might have proven to be correct instead of a mistake.

1905 surely showed, ~~first~~ ^{1st} the form was very different that any one of the factions thought of, was completely spontaneous, and indeed all the factions believed in the Party and were busy arguing

whether the soviet was ~~a substitute~~ a challenger to their philosophy, ^{a need to go for the Party faction - Ma or Ed & Secy} but then joined it when they saw that's where the action is. 1907

Congress proved that ~~those~~ ^{the one} who supposedly had the greatest of all permanent philosophies--revolution--didn't have the slightest idea of what

they had consented to, ^{when men} since they refused to so much as put the nature of the ~~events~~ ^{agenda} on the agenda and talked as if he (HT) came for action, and not for a gabfest. That this was ~~a bunch~~ ^{copy} of rhetoric,

~~meaningless~~ rhetoric, was ~~guy~~ further proven by its persistence as if it were philosophy extending itself to ~~predicting~~ ^{shamelessly} "predicting" 1917 ~~and~~. Not only that, repeating the idiocy in reprinting it in 1922.

copy really was for the accept. it once

10833

wasn't only that at all. Rather, where Engels is praised mainly--
and I added my share of that part at one time--his insistence
out of ~~XXXX~~ loyalty and so forth that the Critique of the
Gotha Program must be published. What is the greatness of
being published if its published as a 'contribution to the
discussion'? And what is the use of the Erfurt Program if
the criticism is limited to ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{Engels} letter to the author
when you know that that is the program that every single Marxist
group in the world is going to follow? And he was present ~~and greeted~~
at the founding of the Second International

10834

(INSERT) -6
CONT.

Now Lenin on the other hand, when he tried to sum up the meaning of the 1909 outburst in 1910, that is, before the Revolution, correctly exposed the abstraction plus by digging into historical significance showing that conciliationism was not only a trait characteristic of organizational looseness, but theoretical. ~~But~~ Trotsky never faced that, never answered; indeed, Kautsky--and Trotsky was part of that elitist Austrian group--refused to publish it on the grounds that it was the one that was factional.

That word substitutionism then underwent several other transformations when on the one hand Trotsky he was wrong on only one thing, and that was the organizational failure, and he fully accepted Lenin's conception, i.e., in 1927 to have accepted the 1902 version of the party does a great deal further shrouding of any of the differences which Lenin kept admitting had occurred before and after 1905.

CIR tried digging into Dialectic of the Party, but failed because he had his conclusion about "abolishing" the bureaucracy, the trade unions, the ~~parl~~ parliament, anything and everything except what the masses produced for which they are to have total responsibility, and that the theoreticians too will disappear. The result was the infamous tail-ending of Russian state-capitalism, including world war II.

Now how does all this suddenly tie in with both the Third Attitude to Objectivity and the Theory of Cognition, as in the Science of Logic only, not as abbreviated in the Smaller Logic. What is fantastic here, insofar as Lenin is concerned, is that even though he preferred the Smaller Logic, especially its final

10835

Smaller Logic
The Science of Logic

INSERT CONT - C

~~sections, Theory of Cognition and Absolute Idea, his outline of~~
~~the Smaller Logic leaves out entirely what is new in it, the~~

Introduction and the Three Attitudes to Objectivity, limiting himself to just the three parts, Being, Essence and Notion so that it looked like a schoolboyish memorization of categories.

10836