

November 13, 1966

Dear Frank:

Because I'm "lazy" and do not have the precise expression of your note to me I have to do this from memory. However, there is no doubt that I know exactly what and why I said what I did at the Convention about wanting the comrades from the 1950s to help me illuminate, objectively and subjectively, what was that new epoch that started with the Miners' General Strike, i.e. the movement from practice that was not (I repeat and underline the word not) separated from theory as philosophy, though I certainly was not conscious. What I mean by not being conscious is that I was not conscious that there was a difference between myself and JBJ and that it was very serious. Of course, the MCS pamphlet (but that of course was a 1984 product) shows that in 1948-50 there was a three-way exchange of philosophic letters and that my submission of the translation of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks kept pointing out that Lenin had a great deal more to say than CLRJ was saying in his Notes on the Dialectic. But, again, I didn't think I was rejecting JBJ and saying -- i.e. concluding -- that he was departing from Lenin's view of Hegel.

So what I want to know from you, who were especially interested in philosophy and kept plying me with questions about Hegel and "Other" to the point where we forgot the hotdogs for the picnic, is why you had no vibes whatever on a gestating separation between me and JBJ. Indeed you chose him as against me. First, what is it that J. said his tendency about how awful I was and that I was the intellectual interested in writing the book, and he supposedly was -- what? And this at a time when he didn't take any priority about Morgantown and I was there with you, actively engaged in that strike?

I also remember being shocked to read your praise of Fidel and your uncritical report of your time in Cuba without a word about ~~USSR~~ Cuba choosing one of the two poles, Russia or U.S.

Not only that -- that awful bulletin that you obviously edited and told "the true story" of "small mass partyism" which I was supposed to have engaged in by wanting the first issue of Correspondence to be revolving

11578

about the misere en strike in 1951 -- that is something I'd like you to tell me how it came to be. I know that it was my fault in the sense that I still capitulated to JBJ's view, abstractly -- i.e. I was opposed to "small man partyism." And therefore I let him get away with the attack on me. That's what always happened when a Universal is degraded to a Particular, or a Particular is raised to a Universal. Please don't ask me to explain that at this point. I'm merely dictating the background and I want you to develop from your experience and what you have in your files of the Johnson group after the break from Forest. Secondly, with eyes since rejoining us, what do you think of the decade or rather two decades between 1950 and 1970, which led to your own break with CLRJ?

Finally, ^{how} ~~was~~ the heck was Humanism, or rather, the rejection of Humanism, explained away on the basis of its "bourgeois character" or its Christian or Existential nature? I'm referring to the fact of what was ~~not~~ not known to you, probably, ~~but~~ but was a big dispute (silent, as always) between J. G. and me, on the last section of the document we handed to the SWp called "State Capitalism and World Revolution". Specifically, on the last pages in which Humanism was disregarded on the basis of its followers then -- JFS and the Christians -- rather than on the basis or even mention of the fact that 1944 wasn't just an Alienation but what Marx called "a new Humanism." The way it would have been told to the Johnson group would have had to have some bearing on whether there was any admission of my 1953 Letters on the Absolute Idea, which CLRJ refused to say a word about, but promised G. to do so upon his return to England.

Do also, please, reread ~~my~~ closely my open letter to Buhle, especially the truth of the split as against what they have transformed into its opposite in the so-called Oral History.

Yours,
K. J. G.

11579