

to 1984 Convention

"THE SELF-THINKING IDEA" AND THE DIALECTICS OF A BODY OF
EVOLUTIONARY IDEAS: WHAT IS NEW IN THE CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP ?

*Here are
to 4/1/84*

- I. Philosophically, the Obvious is Never to be Taken for Granted
- II. Marx's New Sense of Objectivity--"Human activity itself as objective (gegenstandliche) activity"--~~is~~ Ground for our Age's New Sense of Objectivity and 2 Kinds of Subjectivity
- III. What is New in the Concept of Leadership: When is Philosophy and Philosopher One -- "One, Not Two" is ~~not~~ ^{never} a Variant of "Leader Maximus". Rather it is on what is a whole new Continent of Thought and of Revolution, which is why JPS's commentary on 3 centuries of philosophy is pertinent ^{to M-H} ~~is~~.
- IV. N&L Committees ^{Released} Elections, Past and Present

X//

Instead of explaining which sections are on Marx and his time, and which deal with our age, I will begin with ~~the~~ the question ~~of~~.

RELATIONSHIP OF PHILOSOPHY TO MASSES IN MOTION

Let's ~~begin~~ ^{critique of the title itself} with the most obvious -- "The Self-Thinking Idea"

^{that} does not itself think -- in order to show you the exact opposite is the truth when you don't accept the obvious at face value.

Of course ideas by themselves do not think. People think. But when you labor at the Idea and its development, the one who digs for its meaning, why this specific idea came to describe that particular action and what flows from it, you have reached a new stage of cognition. Specifically, here are 3 dates in Marx's "self-development": 1843-45; 1864-71; 1872-80. The first revolt that transformed Marx into a revolutionary was the peasants' theft of wood in 1843, followed by the weavers' revolt in 1844, which Marx declared to be a greater stage than the French Revolution. That made all the intellectuals laugh at Marx's ridiculous "utopianism", as they "proved" what a real revolution, like the French Revolution,

From his Hegelian philosophical journal with a Prussian VISION

was. His answer was that as great as it had been, it never questioned private property, but the peasants stealing wood and the weavers tearing up the deeds did. Once he made that declaration, the Self-Thinking Idea, flowing into the Subject Marx, declared ^{the} way beyond Descartes's doubts, way beyond ^{the capitalist system on production and} property questions, way beyond ^{the} man/woman ^{and} the determining relationship, ^{in a book} which we know all from the 1844 MSS. What we don't know that deeply is Marx's

weaver
act
new

11 Theses on Feuerbach

The years 1843-45 are central to the totality of Marx's discovery at the very start, for it is then, philosophically,

that you 1st grasp -- and that only because we do finally have Marx's Marxism as a totality and have thought out our own age's problems dialectically -- that "1, not 2" is NOT a question of mere leadership, much less a quantitative question, but one of PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION IN PERMANENCE AS GROUND FOR ORGANIZATION.

Let me explain concretisly EACH of the 1843-45 years

(1) 1843, Marx breaks with capitalism and its religion and suddenly uses the expression "revolution in permanence" -- evidently his way of expressing that it isn't just a single issue

that is at stake, not even when it is as fundamental as class struggle, but the challenge both to religion and "civil rights for Jews." (It is published in Marx's D-F journal which also published Engels' Outline of Political Economy, which greatly impressed Marx.) Every emancipation is a restoration - Wall & J

(2) In 1844 Marx creates the Econ.-Phil. MSS, when he meets Engels and gives him an oral presentation. Engels accepts that total challenge to what is. A life-long collaboration begins and

never ends. They decide to challenge the post-Hegelians, the Left from which they both came. The German Ideology results, the central thesis of which is a critique of Feuerbach's "materialism," ^{but never settles as if preferred over Hegel's "idealism"} Before or directly after this, however, Marx, again alone, writes 11 Theses, so critical of Feuerbach that to this day it defines the uniqueness of Marx's historical, dialectical humanist materialism as against not only Feuerbach ^{and} all mechanical materialism, ^{but also as creating "idealism" with the creativity of dialectic self-development} Thesis I (not XI) projects "Human activity itself as objective (gegenstandliche) activity." What is of the essence for us is that the 2 are as wide-worlds apart then, ^{as some 10 years later are seen in the context of Engels' Origin and Nat.} Marx's EN. I don't mean only that Marx's Theses on Feuerbach

^{casts} what Marx wrote in 1844-5 and Engels' in 1888, ^{rather than} that Marx's a profound illumination on our new sense of objectivity and 2 kinds of subjectivity for ^{the 1844-85 Perspectives}

while Engels was the "platform" ^{though represented as 'b' and 'a' of himself and that} "Marx-Engels" ^{one} (became the foundation of the 2nd Int., which, as you can see from M&F and all our principles we simply regard ^{no more than an} Organizational Interlude, 1889-1914.

^{We haven't met leadership yet, have we? We won't until} We are tracing Marx and Marx alone, and for him, soon after the Address to the CL on "revolution in permanence", he proposed disbanding, ^{without ever giving up the word, Party} as he explained it, ^{he means Party} "IN THE EMINENT HISTORICAL SENSE." ^{is a word} the only organization we do have to consider is the one he headed and the period is FIRST INTERNATIONAL & THE PARIS COMMUNE, 1864-73

^{Let me explain} so integral were masses in motion ^{to} historic revolutionary sense that, 1st, he hailed the P.C. as what the masses created ^{that by} and that "discovery" ^{may duplicate the} genius of a non-statist form of workers' rule. ^{and} once that was defeated ^{last} advised going "lower AND DEEPER INTO THE MASSES". ^{and}

the explanation he gave for not signing the documents of the 1st Int. was he never believed in any "cult of personality." ^{It} took Khrushchev ^{to turn that into} ^{the opposite}

Whether this was written in the same period when, with Engels, they were writing German Ideology ^{or} whether it was done after, there's no doubt whatsoever that, where Marx's break with Feuerbach was total, Engels' was not. Indeed, when Engels discovered it ^{after} Marx died, he had already written his own, quite different estimate in his work, Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy, to which he appended an edited version of Marx's 11 Theses. Nothing could more clearly manifest the difference between Marx's revolutionary dialectic and Engels' determinist materialism. **16287**

~~now, examine the final~~ decisive ~~date~~ ^{Novelle} the French edition of CAPITAL ^{new} new empiric studies of pre-capitalist societies and new view of what he had heretofore thought the greatest enemy, Russia, once it also had a group of revolutionaries ^{while} ~~the Eisnerists~~ ^{how to the Lassalleans} ^{the Golthe} ^{Marginal Notes} his

~~the~~ the magnificent covering letter (written, incidentally, on his birthday, May 5) and then look at how the Second International's German Social Democracy transformed the organizational conclusion ^{of "no bargaining about principles"} into its absolute opposite. What Marx had written was: "Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programmes. If therefore, it was impossible to go beyond (it) one should have concluded an agreement for action... but NO BARGAINING ABOUT PRINCIPLES."

word "movement", to ^{principles} deny philosophy, ^{What the GSD uses is the "movement"} as if it were no more than a program like the Lassalleans'.

was more ^{practical} ^{and} ^{principles}

~~new some defective~~

^{As we approach} the 20th century, ^{we find that} neither RL who 1st declared profoundly that 1905 was but the 1st of the new type of 20th c. revolutions, nor VIL who did turn to the question of organizational form of these new revolutions -- indeed, is credited with being the 1st and only one who created a theory of organization with his What Is To Be Done? -- claimed to have created a new Universal. ^{only} Indeed, VIL claimed the opposite -- i.e. that he just followed orthodoxy except that he lived under Tsarism and therefore needed special, concrete features. Whether VIL did or didn't mean that organizational form as a Universal (between 1905 and 1917) he insisted it was only a question of a very specific case and when in 1917 he was establishing a new Universal -- State and Rev.

5

after he experienced the greatest revolution of his time and its creation -- the Paris Commune -- ^{from} which he concluded that it was necessary to go "lower and deeper", a phrase Lenin first "discovered" in 1914. In a word, Marx had by ^{then} ~~now~~ worked out his whole body of ideas and it was at that point that he not only rejected a unity of so-called Marxists and Lassalleans but set a totally opposite foundation for organization with his philosophy of revolution. Lenin's silence on the question of organization in ~~State and Revolution~~ State and Revolution did not, unfortunately, mean that he had abandoned his concept of ^a party of "professional revolutionaries"; ~~just when~~ ^{Once} the Bolsheviks gained power, ~~the~~ the concept of an elitist party was no longer just "Russian", or merely ^{needed for} ~~the product~~ of functioning under Tsarist ~~rule~~. It ^{had} gained international "stature" ^{in the 21} conditions for the Third International, ^{violated, no matter how} ~~the~~ ^{the objective situation} ~~was~~ ^{never to be} ~~violated~~.

That this made it all the easier for Stalin to transform the concept of the Single Party State shows the extreme which flows from a vanguardist concept.

^{Leadership, Leadership}
To make matters worse for our age, Trotsky further reduced the question of revolutionary Marxist organization to the question of leadership. ~~Chapter 4 of P&R and~~ ^{Chapter 4 of P&R and} Please reread ~~the Appendix~~ ^{the Appendix} to Chapter 11 of RLWLKM. ~~It is no accident whatever that this~~ ^{last estimate of Trotsky as theoretician was made an} ~~last estimate of Trotsky as theoretician was made an~~ appendix by me to the chapter on ~~Marx as the~~ ^{Marx as the} Philosopher of Permanent Revolution Creating New Ground for Organization.

9.10

Let me 1st show you, briefly, the past categories in choosing leadership in the context both of concrete needs each conv. Perspectives--which ~~make~~ shows also that the whole org. is leadership when it practicing phil. in its activities, and yet concretely these become others don't.

1st--1917--only I&B stepped down
2nd, 1930s--esp. CIO & Spanish Rev. J

(I'm not sure Alan is to be counted there--1934 indeed--or ~~others~~
1940s--OLGA, ~~ANDY~~, IG JOHN, INEZ--1950 pamphlet shows
them alive & kicking preparing theoretically for rev.--to-be)

We're in the main the consequences of 1960s & 1970s with 1980s coming in now--so here it is spelled out last conv. & this

Finally, what is not in voting also flows from ~~new~~ ~~of a conv~~
is leadership = Sitke-N = this ~~is~~ ~~more~~ ~~to~~ ~~conv~~ ~~of~~ ~~conv~~

Int'lly, too, we had new roots, ~~of~~ ~~Mc~~ ~~Shaw~~
Both ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Bomb~~ & ~~Laurent~~ ~~Offer~~

July 1984

Report by Raya for
Executive Session

"THE SELF-THINKING IDEA" AND THE DIALECTICS OF A BODY OF REVOLUTIONARY
IDEAS: WHAT IS NEW IN OUR CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP?

I. Philosophically, the Obvious is Never to be Taken for Granted

II. Marx's New Sense of Objectivity -- "Human activity itself as
objective (gegenstandliche) activity"; the Ground for our Age's
New Sense of Objectivity and Two Kinds of Subjectivity

III. What is New in our Concept of Leadership:

When is Philosophy and Philosopher One -- "One, Not Two".

It is never a variant of "Leader Maximum". Rather, it is on
what is a whole new Continent of Thought and of Revolution.

Which is why Jean-Paul Sartre's commentary on three centuries of
philosophy is pertinent to Marxist-Humanism.

IV. News and Letters Committees' National Elections, Past and Present

New
p4 keep 5 lines 7 penult
p5 cut out
p6
p7
p8
p9
p10
p11
p12
p13
p14
p15
p16
p17
p18
p19
p20
p21
p22
p23
p24
p25
p26
p27
p28
p29
p30
p31
p32
p33
p34
p35
p36
p37
p38
p39
p40
p41
p42
p43
p44
p45
p46
p47
p48
p49
p50
p51
p52
p53
p54
p55
p56
p57
p58
p59
p60
p61
p62
p63
p64
p65
p66
p67
p68
p69
p70
p71
p72
p73
p74
p75
p76
p77
p78
p79
p80
p81
p82
p83
p84
p85
p86
p87
p88
p89
p90
p91
p92
p93
p94
p95
p96
p97
p98
p99
p100

Report by Raya for
Executive Session

"THE SELF-THINKING IDEA" AND THE DIALECTICS OF A BODY OF REVOLUTIONARY
IDEAS: WHAT IS NEW IN OUR CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP?

I. Philosophically, the Obvious is ~~Never~~ ^{It is never to take} to be Taken for Granted

II. ~~Marx's~~ ^{The} New Sense of Objectivity, "Human activity...itself as
objective (gegenstandliche) activity", ^{in our age = S-C =}
^{has new meanings!} the Ground for our Age's ^{Remains}

New Sense of Objectivity and Two Kinds of Subjectivity

III. What is New in our Concept of Leadership: ^{It is high time}
^{to constantly re-eval the MISSING LINK philosophy is what}
When is Philosophy and Philosopher One -- "One, Not Two".

It is never a variant of "Leader Maximum". Rather, it is on
what is a whole new Continent of Thought and of Revolution.

Which is why Jean-Paul Sartre's commentary on three centuries of
philosophy is pertinent to Marxist-Humanism.

IV. News and Letters Committees' National Elections, Past and Present

New subs

Relationship of Philos. to masses in motion

Whatever happened to CGP; the case of PMU + leadership

Back to Dialectics, its double edge, when is it...

what is new in leadership for our age! the body
of ideas shows that it is not by practice alone;
the movement from theory

"THE SELF-THINKING IDEA" AND THE DIALECTICS OF A BODY OF
REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS: WHAT IS NEW IN OUR CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP?

I. Philosophically, it is wrong to take the obvious for granted

II. The new sense of objectivity in our age of state-capitalism, which is why Marx's sense of Objectivity -- "Human activity itself as Objective (gegenstandliche) activity" -- has new meaning; the Ground for our age's new sense of Objectivity and two kinds of subjectivity.

III What is New in our concept of Leadership: It is high time to reveal that the missing link -- philosophy -- is what has kept even the greatest revolution -- Russia, Nov. 1917 -- unfinished.

IV News and Letters Committees' National Elections, Past and Present