

Off the top of my head

There were days when I very nearly got disinterested in the book I am working on now, on the dialectics of organization. I should explain the phrase about "not interested" in the book. Not only is that not true, but no doubt I will have some rough idea about the book for the Convention. What I meant to convey instead, and wrongly used the word "not interested" was this:

1) the book will not contain the answer, i.e., any kind of blueprint or any kind of finality of what type of organization is needed. That cannot possibly be known until it appears.

2) 2ndly and mainly, we have the body of ideas. The trilogy of revolution isn't just a phrase. Rather, the phrase came out when we wrote RLWLKM, because by then it was ~~z~~ clear that whether we called it M&F, and we structure it on the movement from practice, the revolutions that gave birth to the modern age-- industrial, philosophic, political-- and which then proceeded to concretely ^{not} analyze/"a" modern world, but the specificity of our post-WWII era-- state-capitalism and its absolute opposite, the new passions and new forces that were seen arising-- and that proved its own existence with such new forces in production (automation); in politics (the 1st revolts against Communist totalitarianism); and in the emergence of the revolutionary Black Dimension in the US as well as in Africa.

OR whether in P&R, we then went on ~~z~~ to trace the movements from theory-- Hegel, Marx, Lenin-- the appearance of alternatives, philosophic-political alternatives, be they inside or outside-- Trotsky, Mao, JP Sartre-- or such totally new revolts as in East Europe or emergent new Third World which saw Frantz Fanon as well

Off the top of my head 22222

as WL, showing itself on the same level as the 1st ~~xxx~~ moment in
Marx-- HUMANISM.

Thus, with RLWLKM, where we not only dealt with the ~~originals~~ ^{originals} ~~arguments~~
~~xxx~~ and alternatives, but with all post-Marx Marxism, the uni-
fying thread of all 3 works was indeed a concept as well as a
practice of the Dialectics of Revolution.

In that context, "no interest" in the book on organization
meant that the 1st moment as well as its development philosophically
of our unique original contribution to Marx's Humanism, was indeed
Marxist-Humanism. ~~And~~ And everything that will follow this develop-
ment could not move without that foundation. This became glaringly
clear to me when suddenly the question was "just" essays over a
35-year period, on a single subject. And that single subject, WL,
was one that was not particula_rly the dominant one in those three
decades. It is this which made it imperative for me to show that
somehow there was a responsibility for the Idea, before it actually
gained that ~~xxx~~ name of Marxist-Humanism. And that responsibility
~~xxx~~ meant organizational responsibility for ideas. And in order
to see that the nomenclature of dialectics of revolution has to
be made so integral to that single topic, that readers should feel
that it is ~~an~~ an extension of the trilogy of revolution -- the
dialectics of revolution. This in turn brought about a feeling
that something was missing in the way we are projecting Marxist-
Humanism, resulting in a dissatisfaction with the rejection of
the new editions of these pamphlets as if they were mere updates.

Finally, the fact that the various assignments on organizational
form ~~brought~~ brought back a plethora of studies, very nearly all
of which have not moved further than movement from practice that
is itself a form of theory, as if the very 1st 1953 breakthrough

10878

off the top of my head 33333

on Absolute Idea was not ~~that~~ that the Absolute Idea contains not only a movement from ~~the~~ practice, but theory. Only together would they result in that missing link-- philosophy-- which remains missing. Even though Lenin had broken through on Notion, in so far as seeing that there was no separation between idealism and materialism.

Peculiarly enough, the new critique of Lenin as ~~not~~ having "remained only on the threshold of Absolute Idea", didn't, did not, result from any direct "searching" for a critique of Lenin, but as we were struggling with Marx's Math Mss., and our 1st interpretation of our too-fast running to give the answer for our age, which made us skip Hegel's critique of math in "Synthetic Cognition" at its highest point, the "Theorem". This Hegel judged-- and in this both Marx and Lenin agreed with him-- that it made math completely unsuited for the tasks of philosophy. In those pages from the Idea of Cognition, where exactly Hegel, Marx, Lenin, reached at their highest stage, suddenly made us face the truth, that that sentence (Cognition creates) was never concretized, and because Lenin went off to practice, It never fails, ~~that~~ because of ~~the~~ course revolutionaries want to practice revolution, and do not realize that philosophy is action or it is nothing. And it is nothing if you fail to unite the 2.

10879