

3/16/87

WHAT IS MARXIST-HUMANISM? HOW TO PROJECT IT AT MOMENTOUS  
HISTORIC MOMENTS?

I. The 1st Moment of Articulation and Structure of MSF --  
as original act of world history; plus Afro-Asian Revolutions;  
1957, '58, '59.

II 1957-59. When the Nov. 1956 Revolution erupts, something  
both  
so great happens, ~~in actuality~~ in actuality in the Revolution  
and in stirring up cognition, where it makes its own leaps  
in consciousness. Suddenly and precisely because of that  
simultaneity of subjective and objective, that is the moment  
where all doors fly open and each human being is ten feet tall.

III New forces are forever arising, so that I could have "3  
new pages of freedom" typed directly into the text of the book,  
as the events were happening at that very moment, so that with  
the new chapters would at one and the same time be seen what was  
happening in the second America as both a new stage of world  
production -- Automation -- before even the word automation was  
invented, and the new stage of cognition, Humanism, made the Black  
Dimension translucent enough to occupy the same stage as the  
Hungarian Revolution.

10869

With the American roots of Marxism, as well ~~as~~ as the world Humanist concepts becoming a single word, Marxist-Humanism readied itself to enter the international scene; I had been calling for an international conference of ~~all~~ all those who opposed both the ~~U.S.~~ U.S. and Russian poles of world capital, as well as ~~so~~ ~~meticulously~~ meticulously tracing the emergence of a whole new Third World focused on ~~(new)~~ African revolutions, that that pamphlet (Afro-Asian Revolutions) went with me too to that conference where I articulated M&F, and indeed where I made the concrete motion that Africans be invited; though the Africans alone had arranged the meeting for me following the Milan Conference.

We all know by now that M&F itself had added two significant footnotes on the galleys as the book was going to press on Mao's latest version of On Contradiction -- How to Handle Contradictions Among the People -- had been expanded into a whole pamphlet, not as a description of the Afro-Asian Revolutions, but as an unfurled banner of them, which nevertheless ~~was~~ warned of the latest enemy from within -- the administrative mentality -- so integrated in such an amalgam of adventurism that it might very well look very attractive to ~~the~~ the new revolutionaries who sure hungered for a shortcut from the low level of technology that imperialism ~~was~~ burdened them with.

10870



Considering that that is the one book that has been quite well projected by the organization and is constantly being used in classes, the question still remains why was '59 nearly omitted until recently, even though the reason for it, the publication of M&F, meant the trip to Europe, the international conference of state-capitalist groupings who would be challenged by me on the philosophic question, not just as either on the American or European question -- and they certainly thought Europe was way ahead of backward America politically -- but as a world question, specifically Africa. <sup>What I came with</sup> was not only M&F in hand and going to press with the Italian edition, but Afro-Asian Revolutions pamphlet. To them it sounded as if that only proved my backwardness, but in fact I brought with me the Humanist Speech of Senghor <sup>(on the occasion of</sup> his union between Senegal and Mali, contrasting it ~~to~~ to the ~~state~~ intellectuals both in France. Be they state-capitalist, bureaucratic collectivist or existentialist, they <sup>filled</sup> ~~represented~~ the same theoretical that Daniel Bell's End of Ideology did. All you had to do to see that is the European failure to see neo-fascism of DeGaulle and what to do about it.

<sup>of</sup> In that sense, ~~projection~~ projection as act of world history, that I will skip from the '50s, except to say that Philosophy and Revolution, which we talk of as a '70s work, actually also began in that year of '59 as a "corollary" to M&F when I explained, after being accused of some form of religiousity, that there was no way to have a successful revolution unless you did have ; and they "corrected" me to say that Lenin said you can't have a successful revolution without theory, not philosophy. And they all acted as if they had good political theory.

10871

The question that persists to this day is this: ~~How~~ How, in spite of the fact that M&F had been the best projected work, the methodology of projection has not extended to this third <sup>(philosophic)</sup> moment to which I'm going to skip now. <sup>8283</sup> Let me give you just a hint of what I will not develop until it comes to 1984-87. It involves the Phenomenology, or rather our publication of Dialectics of Liberation without an Introduction, and my present proposal that we reproduce only the Notes on the Phenomenology and its Introduction ~~not~~ not be a mere Introduction/Overview but a very new grasp of Karl Marx's first Moment of what we've certainly spoken a great deal and correctly so on the significance of 1844, without seeing that his relationship to Hegel's ~~need~~ need to go to Nature was gone away from Lenin's "translation" of Nature as Practice.

10872



AND that be  
the most I talk  
I did present for all Marxists for  
in ~~discontinuity~~ <sup>discontinuity</sup> each per. as new obj. C  
i.e. money & life demand ~~and~~ continuity, ~~fractals~~  
projection of the ~~also have for dis~~

III. The Third Marxist-Humanist Philosophic-Historic Moment--

Post-Marx Marxism as pejorative: RLWLKM 1982-83; Marx's where to  
begin after Hegel, 1841, for Marx, A PMM after ~~MLC with the program~~

Why the <sup>presently</sup> jump over the '60s and '70s, both of which I will  
of course return later? The reason lies with my finding missing  
from my 1983 trip with RLWLKM in hand my type of projection of  
Marxist-Humanism that I did with the first moment when I presented  
M&F and extended it to '59 at the International Conference in  
Italy. ~~What was missing~~ <sup>in 1983</sup> was not just the  
single element but the totally new category -- Post-Marx Marxism.

I began suddenly feeling that there couldn't have been this  
big division between what I was saying and what our comrades  
were ~~hearing~~ hearing if from the Center as I well as at  
the Local, there was a profound comprehension of that little  
phrase Post-Marx Marxism. ~~Shadowing~~ Shadowing somewhere in the  
background seemed to be emerging a difference, not just between  
Marxist-Humanists and non-Marxist-Humanists, but within Marxist-  
Humanism. Indeed, it held over until the Convention, which is  
why I felt so utterly mad and insisted on re-writing the final  
section, "Not by Practice Alone". Please don't tell me it's only  
one--the third section. Reread the whole '84-85 Thesis in July,  
especially 'from Managua to Grenada'. HERE IS what I would tell you:

The changes would I've been talking so much about  
since Reagan's bombing of Libya actually began at  
end of 1983 with invasion of Grenada. But because ~~could be~~ <sup>was</sup>  
within Grenada which paved the way for ~~the~~

St. Mary's  
Convent  
St. Mary's  
Grenada  
Co. assistance

And <sup>(is that where)</sup> ~~Because not only~~ ~~all~~ the tensions between myself and you begin, <sup>at the start of the MHC in 1984</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>actually</sup> the popularization, the following-through of all the concrete in 1983, that is to say, new editions of ACOT, AAR, (as well as the new pamphlet on the Miners' Strike) FFSABT miss the fact that it's not just an update but in a very fundamental sense a totally new ~~update~~ projections, because they come after the new category of post-Marx Marxism. It isn't that they used the phrase. ~~Whether~~ Whether regarding the new, the specifically new of this decade -- RLWIKM as well as EN and rejection of FE as KM, or the Miners General Strike Pamphlet after Gramscian Marxist-Humanism was hungering <sup>for some M-H etc</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> experience a shock of recognition of its Uniqueness, Universality, rather than particular and smartness, for the moment when the Self-Determination of the Idea and the Self-Bringing Forth of Liberty finally ~~became~~ <sup>become</sup> ~~one.~~ <sup>one.</sup>

~~I also felt that each one took a single element -- a single element only -- like the Women, WL, or making RL the heroine, or the Black Dimension, or (Organization) rather than the book as a totality. And ~~when~~ <sup>that totality at a new beginning</sup> ~~was mentioned~~ <sup>was mentioned</sup> ~~the book as a totality, chapter 12 was not~~ <sup>the book as a totality, chapter 12 was not</sup> ~~discussed~~ <sup>discussed</sup>~~

But here I will return to // women = 1/3 = P+R

for all to work out, seeing that it is rooted in 57'59 ~~projected~~ as the founder, MHC projected it. Later I may show how latest present day event = China 1988-4 = made me suddenly see the phrase "1957" / "1972"

A

"As a new beginning has no precedents, ~~so far as I know~~. (Absolute Ideas in Science of Logic, and that was after the three final syllogisms in the philosophy of Mind, that I suddenly said to myself: it is not only a new beginning, it is as new beginning, that Marx clung to Hegel after he discovered his own new continent of thought -- that was the new beginning. Why did no one see it?

Is Lenin's State & Revolution "as a new beginning"? No, I don't think so. Revolution first had to be made real again after that betrayal, so it was only our age, post-WW II, when the movement from ~~theory~~ practice was itself a form of theory that theory ~~had to~~ have a new beginning in philosophy.

~~As a new beginning was then, that is the real 1970s,~~  
Hegel's works became the ground for testing whether as a new beginning is what we have to test, and it must be tested through all who came before us in the Marxist movement, Marx himself, Lenin, Trotsky, ~~and Mao~~ Mao, the new Existentialists, the East Europeans, the Africans and philosophically also Frantz Fanon, disregarding psychoanalysis, but adding to Wretched of the Earth the part on Hegel in <sup>9/15</sup> Black Skins, White Masks. I felt strongly that if I listened to those who wanted me to begin with chapter 9, we would lose precisely that great new philosophic

moment, Absolute ~~and~~ Negativity as New Beginning so that the uniqueness, the originality, the challenge from listening to Hegel as I heard him, would be lost in "politicizing" ~~which is~~ actiplizing

Task 1/15

which is Marxist



*Again*

~~what~~, what is that little phrase, as new beginning?  
In Hegel, to the extent to which he used the new beginning,  
it was quite abstract. It was used at every new part;

In Marx, it was definitely the revolution, and that was so  
dominant that the post-Marx Marxists ~~misread~~ it at once as the  
"abandonment" of philosophy. Engels certainly made it that, or  
reduced it to <sup>historical</sup> only, while ~~reducing~~ <sup>reducing</sup> Dialectical method to  
~~as it was only a tool.~~

No one in the Marxist movement bothered to refer to it at all;  
it was just taken for granted that ~~Marxist materialism~~ materialism  
is <sup>the</sup> substitute.

When Lenin <sup>felt</sup> ~~was~~ compelled to return to it, it was definitely  
not the Absolute, but the Dialectic Method. It was true it was  
no mere tool; but since ~~XXXXX~~ the emphasis always was that it  
was a theory of knowledge that was referred to in the end as  
epistemology, Dialectic which he did want you to read in Hegel  
himself, was burdened with being in the hands of materialists,  
militant atheistic materialism. So we come to the ones, to the  
only ones, who did finally say, let's look at it; it's for our  
age. I'm referring to JFT.

When it finally wound up with the Nevada Document (Notebooks on  
Dialectics), which at one and the same time I considered so great  
that it inspired me to translate Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks,  
and on the other hand I saw the difference -- and the difference  
all went to Lenin's credit -- between Lenin's Notes and J's.

At which point I began to realize that what J. was really  
referring to was <sup>the</sup> Notes I read <sup>to him</sup> way back in 1941 in an on-sight.

~~translation~~ <sup>translation</sup> from Russian; in any case we were not on same

*Photographed with  
me last th  
I began with the  
about mid 1940s*

10876

7  
8  
1  
0  
7