

Abraham 2, 1968

Now the first thing I want to make very, very, very clear is that Hegel has a validity all his own, and I want to talk about Hegel today. I am going to take for granted instead of reiterating all the time about what Marx did or did not take from Hegel. I am taking for granted that we are Marxists. I am taking for granted we are proletarian revolutionaries. I am not going to waste one minute's time on that. If I mention Marx at all, and even Lenin, it is only so to speak, in passing, in order to show what each of them took from Hegel, and what we have to take from Hegel. But on the whole, the subject is Hegel and no one else.

The second thing I want to make clear, is that so far as I am concerned, Hegel is his major works. That is to say, Phenomenology of Mind, Science of Logic, Philosophy of ~~Logic~~ ^{Mind}, and I am not the least bit interested in Hegel's stupid reactionary ideas about the state, and I will ~~not consider them. I will not even consider~~ ^{pay no attention to them either as they are unwarranted} ~~more serious work.~~ ^{other parts in Hegel's} Philosophy of Right ~~because there is nothing he can say that Marx hasn't already said on the~~ ^{and if I'm not completely wrong, what Hegel made me do} Philosophy of Right. ~~the criticism of the~~ ^{which became Marx sharpened his sense for ideas, precisely, and} Philosophy of Right ~~is the criticism that people think what is a legal~~ ^{and it's not complicated} essence is actually a legal superstructure, which reveals the actual state of production and economy which led to Marx's discovery of the materialist foundation of history, ~~and all the rest of it.~~ ^{Marx has said} After that everything he criticized, or took from Hegel, ~~was~~ ^{done} as a revolutionary materialist. And that is the way we consider it. So I am disregarding Hegel's Phenomenology of Mind, ^{the more serious work} because ~~it's not what we take~~ ^{it's not what we take} it's not what we take. ~~I am even disregarding the lectures he had on "Philosophy of History and History of Philosophy" because they were so boring he was showing examples that his great ideas are not as good as they sound.~~

But I am not interested in how he applied them. I am only interested in ~~the~~ actual logic and movement of those ideas which he set not only as a summation of all that went before, but as the both prerequisite for Marxism, and as something we have not yet exhausted. We first have to work out many of the ideas before we can transcend them.

Phenomenology of Mind
 Hegel's ~~was~~ summons to grasp the spirit of the times. It was a demand that the philosophers give ear to the urgency of the times. It was a challenge to ~~all~~ ^(in modern times) all the philosophers who came before him, and the greatest ~~was~~ Kant, that if we are to live up to the fact that 25 years had passed, including the French Revolution, and that philosophy was still using their old categories, then we have to stop using the conclusions of other philosophers, right or wrong, as a pillow for our own intellectual sloth, our own laziness, our own attempt not to meet the challenge of the times. And that a new thing had happened in the ~~world~~ world in a 25 year period which compelled a new stage of cognition. And a new stage of cognition means both a summation of what has happened up to your time, and a recognition of the pull that the future has on you. It is this summons which we want to see how he answered ~~it~~, and what it has for our day.

The greatest and most total attempt he made was in the Phenomenology of Mind which was ~~to~~ to have been an introduction to The System, but is actually his whole work, ~~and~~ ^{generally recognized as} his greatest ~~work~~ ^{work}. ~~What I want to do with it in addition to making sure that we realize that Hegel, despite the absurdity of his work, is actually dealing with 2,500 years of ^(Western) civilization, (it starts too far that way).~~ We must recognize that. But what I want to do with the whole work, since we cannot go into great detail, is to make even a coarse abstraction in one sense, and follow that through as in Vol. II of Capital. In other words, Marx says that the only way we will see the law of motion of capitalism

is if we disregard anything that interferes with just two departments of production, means of production and means of consumption (constant capital and ~~the~~ variable capital etc.). And all of the time it is just two, like two classes. I want to take the whole 18 stages of Hegel's development of Consciousness, Self-Consciousness, Reason, into two major stages. One will be combining Consciousness, Self-Consciousness, and Reason, which I consider the development from 500 BC, slave society ^{and Aristotle etc. as the ancient world's greatest philosopher} and Reason, which is capitalism, ^{and the French Revolution, Lutherism, and Kant's} and the second department is all the rest of what he goes into, that is Spirit, the various forms of Alienated Spirit, and why there is still alienation even though you have reached religion and Absolute Idea. So there is two departments: 1. Consciousness, Self-Consciousness, Reason; 2. Spirit, Religion, and Absolute Idea.

In this first department, what we have all previously emphasized from Marx forward is the section of Lordship and Bondage, because we recognize that Hegel in showing that the lord could demand anything and the slave was completely negative and had to follow through, and yet Hegel insisting the the slave is the one ~~who~~ who sets a mind of his own, and the ~~lord just~~ ^{fact is that} ~~the first of all that the~~ slave getting a mind of his own was the basis for Marx's great development of proletarian consciousness, and especially it was ^{the} proof, who didn't know his first day and all his work on labor himself, that he really did have in mind reality which included class structure, and he really did have in mind, history. ^{including labor} However, that is not what I want to emphasize.

The reason I do not want to emphasize this is because I am tracing the dialectic of thought itself. The importance of that section, as great as it is, is that he ~~has~~ gotten a min^{or} of his own, but whether he will get to Reason, whether he will get to Spirit, is a lot of questions about it. The main questions are the following. He is showing that if you already become Conscious, not only of the world and yourself as opposites, but of yourself as yourself getting Self-Consciousness and going to somewhere further to try and break down this division between opposites and you, and at that point you are so thrilled with the idea that you have this idea, that it could become, in his words, "Just a piece of cleverness, and not yet the mastery over reality." And because it could be just be a piece of cleverness and not yet the mastery over reality, you can become just an alienated soul. Therefore he has other reasons for doing it, and I want to take up one more point in the Self-Consciousness, which is Stoicism.

For example, he shows that it is not only that he is opposed to the alienated soul who has gotten this piece of cleverness and who is what we could call a Beatnik today, but even he is opposed to what other philosophers, and he himself when he deals with life, consider a great stage, Stoicism. Everybody thinks you are great if you are a Stoic, you can withstand all sorts of things, unpleasant things before you and great. So he says, don't forget that Stoicism arises when there is universal slavery. In other words instead of being for the Stoics he is against them. He wants to emphasize that things. Stoicism arose because you as an individual recognized that this is a horrible society--there was universal slavery and you couldn't overcome it. You weren't so to speak a mass movement to overcome it. As you as an individual were great, you were going to be a Stoic, and actually it was a rationalization, for the Greeks had not been successful in their plans and then trying to

develop such stupidities as "A philosopher is free even though he is in chains." So you are showing that everything that appears great is only a further stage of alienation and even when he comes to Reason, and I will come to that in a moment, that will be so. So the important thing, therefore, for not stopping on Lordship and Bondage on which we always previously have stopped, is that first of all that is only a beginning of his getting a mind. Hegel is showing that if you are going to master reality, you are going to have to get a lot further than that, and that certain attempts to master it by such thought as Stoicism, even when they are correct either as individual integrity or correct in the criticism of the rest of society, nevertheless, the fact that you can use such an argument both perhaps for somebody trying to be free and say the opposite, that you are maintaining your existence and saying a philosopher is free, shows that it is absolutely insufficient to become the master of reality instead of this piece of cleverness. Therefore I am stressing and emphasizing that what came out after he got a mind of his own (the ~~idea~~^{idea}) was a new stage of so to speak, retrogression, where the intellectuals all began saying "Oh sure, the Roman Empire is dead, but we will be either stoic or we will in some other form, such as just behave ourselves, just overcome it." And even when it moved to overcome it spurred by social revolution, whether he considers it at one time Christianity or at another time the actual French Revolution, most of the time he does consider it the French Revolution, that is still not the answer. So that is why I do not want to stop at where you have a mind of your own, and what is across what level now in the alienated soul, in Stoicism, in Skepticism, all of which were good little paths on the way to freedom, but they were not the answer.

9701

So, as against using either the conclusions of other philosophers as a pillow for intellectual sloth or against either the Alienated souls and the Stoicism, he is showing a new movement of history. There was an actual revolution. It broke down everything, and it smashed to smithereens, and it started something new, and the people who started it and who did this great thing recognized Reason as their deity, Robespierre and the others, and yet what happened? In other words, why did the Terror follow? Why did Napoleon follow? Why didn't we yet get the Millennium? So he comes to Reason as a very new high stage, but we will see that instead of Spirit, which is our next department, Being, too, never, or having killed all the Alienations of society, it just doesn't, it just brings that to a higher stage. So Reason can't do that. It is the last part of this movement from 500 BC to the French Revolution.

Now we come to Department II, the central core. The reason that everybody says "well if you have come to Spirit, why are there still Alienated Souls?" The alienated soul, he says, have moved to a higher development, he is now an Alienated Spirit. The higher development is that the man has achieved this revolution, but he begins to identify himself either as fiction or as person with this, and from now on the State is more or less an order. There is a tremendous attack on the State, never mind that he was a Prussian philosopher. He attacked it thoroughly, and totally and completely—even any future that there would come between the person and his development. So there isn't a single person on our stage today, whether you take Mao, whether you take *Baylan*, whether you take Fidel Castro, whether you take any other person that you could find described in the Alienated Spirit as to what happened when there is a new revolution and you get where there becomes a distinction between the relationship of reality and the relationship of thought in such a way when you begin to identify yourself with that *Baylan* and *Fidel*.

faction and you begin to have to big reign of Terror in thought as so to speak the revolution had in actual revolution. A reign of terror in thought against the other, the new opponents etc. And the new opponents even includes religions though he was a ~~Christian~~ Christian (I will come to ~~that~~ that next).

Culhane

His criticism of what he called the discipline of culture is the foundation for Marx's criticism of the superstructure. This was a man who was not proletarian revolutionary, but he criticized all culture as very good for having first found the least superstition and all that sort of thing, but now you have surpassed that by what Marx called the increasing in the fetishism of commodities and if I would be so far as to say, if we could so to speak shine the shoes of Marx himself, we would recognize that his whole three volumes on The Philosophy of Religion as the most attack on the so-called vanguard party, (if all you vanguard partyists will forgive me) than we have ever seen because he does with the church, though he is a Christian, what we want to do against the Stalinist party. He is saying, "Look at that, Christianity came in because finally we saw that one was free only, like in oriental religions, not a few were free only, like those who were great enough to be philosophers and they talked about philosophy, but man as man was free. Jesus insisted that man as man is free. And this one little church, the Catholic Church said they were the only interpreters of this thing and they don't let you have direct, unmediated, contact with God and this humane creature." And then he goes on to say, first of all we have lot to learn and not to say that we have but to learn ~~from~~ from it. But secondly it comes from the fact that the church was a hidden atheist that here is our first step towards it, that the church is supposed to have been the height of superstition and superstition such excesses both in the ~~Catholic~~ Catholic Church and in the terror of the French Revolution, that he is so afraid of an atheistic excess that always this is not it, I have to go to philosophy, and I will come to that later, but the philosopher

he is a man and he is on this earth. so that is the basis for all the attacks on Hegel as being a hidden atheist and by Golly, he was. But the point that we are trying to stress by now being over in Department II and having spirit and showing that that is still alienated and discipline of culture. Then religion, that that has been perverted and the persistence that man must decide, so to speak, and not the course decide as to what will finally evolve. It brings us to the final stage of the Absolute Knowledge.

He comes to Absolute Knowledge and he says, "Look, this is history. This has been in such a much degree the emanation of of spirit of man. Now there is also the science of this spirit, whether in religion or in actual science, and this will evolve to form Absolute Knowledge. The absolute knowledge of science and history uniting as one becomes the transition point for the Science of Logic which I will go to, and to the Philosophy of Mind, I will be overwriting all the other Absolute. One is Absolute knowledge in Phenomenology, then we will have Absolute Idea in the presence of Logic, and then Absolute Mind in the Philosophy of Mind. But it is always moving in this direction.

This can be viewed as the evolution of the spirit over the life of the individual and over the life of man, nevertheless that was the history in the form of the spirit of man. Now we go to the Science of Logic (in a certain sense it is a little too abstract) the other one just flows out of this and it is part of the Science of Logic which is the beginning of the actual development of the spirit of man but in actual philosophic terms. Logic is the first stage of civilization in the sense that it is the first stage of civilization. Science of Logic is the first stage of civilization. It could be said that it is the first stage to deal

With either Being or Essence, I am going to go directly to Volume III, Notion, and especially the last section, The Doctrine of Notion or of Freedom.

The Absolute Idea

The Doctrine of Notion or of Freedom is in actuality the objective and subjective way to get to the new society. And it is this which Lenin grasped in 1916. All these people who say he didn't or he did, or why he wrote etc, that is small talk. The great thing is this is what Lenin grasped. And he kept saying when it said Doctrine of subjectivity, Book of Subjectivity, Book of Notion, and when he saw that it was to reveal himself was the expression "or of Freedom" he was so thrilled and he kept saying "So what has the Absolute Idea to do with it?" But when he came to the Absolute Idea itself, he didn't have so much against it either. But the thing is that he grasped it because we had reached an entirely new stage of development, of economics, of politics etc. There he was compelled in a way to Logic, not only to see the betrayal of his ~~own~~ ~~country~~ ~~in~~ the social democracy or near betrayal of his own country, but because he began to think in new ways of thought. He said, "Oh, my God, I don't know what this really not only reflects the world but creates it. And look at that this can create the Grossen. Why didn't we see all that?" And he began to try to explain how what are the stages of Cognition, Analysis, Unification in Logic. What are the stages of Judgment? What are the stages of Syllogism? Where does the Universal of Socialism and the realization of it come in? In a one state, a workers state, a state which is not just for individuals, but the highest form of individualism, the state of the future. They all merge in this highest form of individualism. It was this sudden concept that he grasped that it was a new stage and it had shown the way to the (I don't know what the materialist of all idealistic and materialistic ends) that it was a new stage and it was that.

I want to take up just to see what was decided because it is

easier to understand, but actually it was this Doctrine of the Notion and of Freedom. At this point I will go over to all the people who are trying in an academic way to do something and not getting there precisely because they do not have the proletariat in mind, but they also do not stand in awe of thought even though they are philosophers.

Both ~~and~~ Lenin, even though Lenin went further in the Absolute Idea happened to have stopped (in other words Marx came to the part where it says so this all ends in the Absolute--and he begins to say on ~~the~~ the one hand it doesn't mean anything because he returned to a closed system of thought again, but on the other hand it does mean something, because Marx was always returning back to it.) But as it happens it cuts off at a certain paragraph at the very beginning of the philosophy of mind, the section which begins on the Absolute (well in all the works it is Absolute Knowledge, Absolute Idea, Absolute Mind) in the Philosophy of Mind he calls it Absolute Mind, and when Marx finishes the Phenomenology of mind and he deals with Absolute Knowledge, he then tries to tie it from a different angle. So he says if we go ~~through~~ through his whole system and reach this same point in his whole system in the philosophy of mind we will find, and then he quotes two paragraphs from the Introduction of the work where it transfers into the philosophy of mind and the manuscript breaks off. And that is the problem of our time.

One of the central points in the Absolute Idea just before Hegel reaches what we call the "self-determination" ~~is~~ sentence which reads "The self-determination is the self-determination, it is, it is, it is itself speak." And everybody has said that this determination is a notion, but they didn't know that self-determination is a notion. And I also stressed now because he has said that the self-determination is a notion of nations as being an impulse to bring the proletariat into existence. In fact the self-determination of the proletariat is ^{various} ~~the~~ which is broken into two.

second subjectivity, but he interprets second subjectivity that the intellectual will do it or will bring me back to the new stage. So it is ~~against~~ ^{against} these three serious issues that I want to discuss, and show how I feel the problem of the Absolute Idea.

I want to discuss it all within what we call historic barrier. In other words you come to all that you can say because history does not present you with new problems, and on the other hand why certain people who are not as great as Marx or Lenin, but by living in a different historic age are compelled to deal with these problems. For example, whether or not Marcuse could be a scientist, his Introduction to ~~Marx~~ was not reproduced in the Japanese edition, but in ~~Marx~~ which I said is that I am great in the analysis of Marx etc. I think, at least, it has been nothing original since the Luk ~~off~~ period until now, but the Frenchman attempted it. But when I come to have all this in the period I have reviewed in Part I in order to deal with the reality of today, he disagrees with it, and mainly it revolves around the reality of the proletariat. So I am a romantic. Regardless of his analysis of the proletariat in the proletarian revolution, the truth is that the intellectual, including the Marxist intellectual had not been able to break down either the humanism of Marx or the fact at the point where it broke off in the Absolute Idea (the theory). And the new stage for the theory of the proletariat to be it came from the masses. It was the minor ~~3~~ strike, it was all this was in ~~1917~~, and Hotel has a word for it. He says that only the concrete (you know when he talks about accumulation of ~~concrete~~ things to be able to think the concrete things) that demands a new stage in philosophy and theory. Because it can be only when your philosophy to be a great reality of the proletariat comes from below. So he thinks that the new stage is that fact, and these so-called materialists Korsch, and the intellectualist of the ~~Marx~~, Korsch, do not recognize that fact, and I want to show that.

So that I want to end on what I began, to give ear to the urgency of the times and the summons to recognize the spirit of the age by saying and recognizing the fact that this age's subjectivity must be broken into two: 1. is what the proletariat is called to do. They're going to do it anyway, we better begin listening; 2. the other is what theoreticians must do. Their task isn't ended because the impulse comes from below. They have to first begin to work out, not just to satisfy with quick political answers. And the working out of that subjectivity of the theory of our age of the Absolute Idea in the concrete form of philosophy, and theory and politics means concrete philosophy and concrete politics. There is no point in saying anything about realistic philosophy if we don't mean it. That is our age and that is why we talk about the concrete point of philosophy and Revolution.