

May 25, 1987

Notes on relationship of the Philosophic moment to Organization in Marx.

To this day the 1844 was the philosophic moment of Marx's discovery of that whole new continent of thought and of revolution that M "Marxism" certainly lacked and instead singled out ~~xxxxx~~ one of the developments -- economics -- so ~~xxx~~ that we didn't know new humanism until ~~xxxxx~~ the Depression. But in fact, it is that which was the ground for organization throughout his life the moment he did ~~xxxx~~ "experience" the ~~philosophic~~ philosophic moment, even if it was only correspondence (letters) soon ~~to~~ to become international correspondence.

Seriously, however, as organization, and that organization -- Communist League -- accepted the challenge to the existing capitalism world, and that not separated from all political tendencies and parties. I'm, of course, referring to the Communist Manifesto, whose second part is a critique of utopianism socialism, etc. What we want to do here is to compare the ~~1847~~ 1847 CM to the 1864 ~~1st~~ First International ~~xxx~~ hailing the PC as the form, the working existence, the communal non-state as needing only release of all the mental, manual and emotional potentiality. Why then is the actual concretization ~~of~~ of a new unity so sharply

10959

critiqued as ~~if~~ in the Gotha & Programme? That becomes the whole rub and the urgent problematic of our day which must be worked out.

First, ~~xxxx~~ enter history, in 1847 critique meant the ruthless critique of all that exists that he ~~was~~ spoke of in his philosophic break with the bourgeoisie and Hegel, concretized on the level of the existing "parties" in that period. (As we were to see in 1860 in his letter to Freilingrath, when Freilingrath, in refusing to get involved on the Vogt Affair, said he didn't belong to the party any longer. Marx's reply was, neither am I to any existing party. I didn't mean it/ephemeral sense, I ~~was~~ meant it in the historic.) Clearly, Marx meant that no one could re-write the history, and both the revolution of 1848 and the Manifesto, that anticipated it and followed it, are historic).

It is that historic period that changed when international workers got together to take a position on what was happening on a different continent. That too had a "manifesto", perhaps not as bold as CM thought Marx, which was actually the preamble to the constitution and by-law to the First International.

AT THE SAME TIME Marx didn't ~~hesitate~~ hesitate a second once the PC burst out, and some trade unionist didn't share the enthusiasm, to ~~write~~ write them out of the First International and ~~not~~ not declare the need to go

lower and deeper, but insist that they didn't represent the majority of the masses; the Paris Communards did and it is that Idea that defines history now as both ongoing and the future.

look at

So, what happens in 1875 -- how the self-development of the Idea that we now call Marxism has concretized itself when its greatest theoretical work is finished, and that has philosophy spelled out in the most concrete terms from fetishism of commodities to the new passions and new forces that ~~go~~ go against the accumulation of capital.

And he has the experience ^{now} of both parties and forms of organization emerging spontaneously from the masses plus phil.

There is no way now, no matter how Marx kept from trying to give any blueprints for the future, (not) to develop a general view of where we're headed for the day after the conquest of power, the day after we have rid ourselves of the birthmarks of capitalism when a new generation can finally see all its potentiality put an end for once and for all the division between the mental and manual labor.

(The transition point from Marx will have to be on Lenin, though it must be very, very brief.)

Why did we think once we took the big step of separating, indeed breaking with the elitist party, that it is sufficient to do so politically without doing so philosophically? ~~What~~ Wasn't it because we actually had not penetrated the dialectic of organization in its relationship to dialectics of philosophy though we certainly never stopped using the word "dialectics"? In a word, even when we used absolute in relationship to method and definitely stressed that we do not mean just a tool or application, we ~~never~~ did think that it was not just the threshold of the Absolute Idea, but the Absolute Idea as its ultimate as if Absolute Mind was no more than what Absolute Idea was in the Logic and Hegel didn't need to tell us that we better not stop there and instead ~~go~~ to Philosophy of Nature and Philosophy of Mind.

No wonder that
 / When CLRJ said that he looked into Philosophy of Mind and found there nothing for us. I must have felt dissatisfied since that is where I went, and ~~precisely~~ precisely, I might say, on the question of what we called "dialectics of the party", specifying however, that I wasn't interested either in the mass party, which the masses will build, or in the elitist party, which we definitely oppose, but in what happens to a small group

10962

"like us" who know that nothing can be done without the masses, and are with them, but they are theoreticians and they always seem to be around too. So, what is the objectivity which explains their presence, as the objectivity explains the spontaneous outburst of the masses? In a word, I was looking for the objectivity of subjectivity.

Now then, it seems to me that in a certain sense we could call it a shock for me to have experienced this year 1987, when a great deal of ~~work~~ research was done ~~by~~ ^{by} others -- Eugene, Mike, Peter, Cyrus, Kevin, Sheila, Olga-- on the many ways that spontaneity appeared in the forms of councils, soviets, committees, communes, and so forth, not only to say the generalization: Yes, the party and the forms of organization born from spontaneity are opposites, but they are not absolute opposites. The change in the title to Dialectics of Organization and Philosophy really means that the absolute opposite is philosophy, and that we have not yet worked out organizationally. Because...

Concretely, here is what is involved. Whether we take the Spanish Revolution in 1936-37, or the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, we will find that the great outburst and new ~~xxx~~ forms of organization with workers as decision-makers, with workers as Reason, ~~xxxx~~ went as spontaneously to search for the party as the party went to search for them. And even when they were anarchists, they gave in to the

~~single party~~ single party. (We will go into each one later.)

Or take Pannekock. The Council Communists were certainly earlier on the scene and directly opposed Lenin in a friendly way, ~~as~~ on the question of a single form of organization, insisting that when it comes to production, the people at the point of production must maintain their power after the revolution. But, ~~did~~ ^{along with} did they ever give up their party? Didn't they think ~~like~~ ^{along with} Rosa Luxemburg, that spontaneity is no substitute for the wholeness of internationalism and theory? On the contrary, they took that for granted. What not only was not taken for granted, but never even approached in any way whatever, unless one calls "approached" a total rejection, was philosophy. Except, except, except...

The except, of course, refers to Lenin. So happy were we that he had felt compelled to go back to Hegel that we acted as if it's only a matter of "not having time to get to" making his Notes public. Indeed, the enthusiasm

for Lenin's dive into Science of Logic (IL) didn't question what about Phenomenology, of which there is evidence that he had read before writing Imperialism. ~~There was too much of taking for granted attitude, the debates within the movement after the death of Lenin were so factionally motivated that there was no reason to pay any attention. The point then became: what has changed in the objective situation, in the theoretic void following the death of Lenin, without ever delving into philosophy.~~

10964

