

Present: All

- Agenda: I. A Whiff of the New Book in Relation to the Changes in the Editorial Statement; 11/24 vs. 11/3, and the anticipation of Jan. 3, 1987. --Raya
- II. Discussion
- III. Brief Reports by Eugene and Peter of Trip to Salt Lake and West Coast
- IV. Ongoing Activities
- V. G&W

I. Raya began her report by pointing to the fact that, though the bizarre U.S.-Iran liason has drastically changed the objective situation, it is precisely that climatic stage of the "changed world" that has proven the imperativeness of the bi-weekly. Specifically, it challenged Marxist-Humanism to act as if N&L were not only a bi-weekly but a veritable daily, and at once to work out its analysis of the objective and subjective situation as a unit.

The difference between (or should I have said, the concretization of?) what objective-subjective meant when it was spoken of in the Dear Colleagues Letter of 11/3 as an anticipation of what the Dec. Edit. would be, and what it became when the concrete objective situation burst forth in so startling a manner as it did with arms sales to Iran. What is of the essence, Raya continued, is never to forget the 2 senses of the concrete.

We all think that we know what concrete is: I certainly never stop harping on it. Yet we use the word as if it meant only the immediate--what to do this moment, or what is the deadline for the paper, or what will be the agenda of the meeting we are going to, no matter what has arisen Objectively or what has come from the Center. But the truth is, there are 2 senses in which "Concrete" is used philosophically and we should always be aware of both. One is the immediate, and one is the concrete-Universal. I want to repeat: the Universal, too, is concrete. And the concreteness of the Universal is not easy to articulate. We have not inwardized that concreteness, do not have it in the very marrow of our bones. To say, truth is concrete, sounds very abstract and it is easy to just tack it on as mere conclusion.

But, in fact, unless we have grappled with it--and "it" means making the Universal concrete by proof that it is as necessary to achieve in thought what Hegel called the "self-determination of the Idea," as it is in direct action--we will end up by tail-ending the activists without expressing our unique position, leaving the Universal, whether that is book, or Archives, or the logo of our newspaper, "Theory/Practice" as something "taken for granted."

That type of thinking--"taking for granted"--that everybody, "knows", and that we as Marxist-Humanists certainly know--is a method Hegel designated "barbarous".

To be a dialectician, instead,

is to practice the Absolute Method, and know that you cannot reach truth of the Absolute without it. On the contrary, you remain on the threshold, and from the threshold you do not necessarily go forward. You can definitely fall backward.

10678

It is this which made me decide to change the title of the book so that the Dialectic of Organization and Philosophy as unit, while the "Party" and forms of organization springing up spontaneously are another unit. Though they are opposites, they are not, I repeat, NOT, absolute opposites. It is what Marx labored so hard to change when he said that there have always been rich and poor, but only under capitalism have they reached the absolute contradictions of capital/labor, as well as the contradiction with all other Left materialists and idealists, exuding instead a "new Humanism".

Now then, when it comes to the objective situation, especially when you consider that it is something as fundamental as the break-up of the Iceland Summit, which we had titled "all things fall apart", I had the right to think that since that objective situation is past, and since we are concerned with the bi-weekly, the objective situation could be very brief while the bi-weekly would be greatly expanded.

When the objective situation was as startling, as new as that U.S.-Iran illicit vice, it meant exactly what will confront us with increasing the frequency of the paper. That is to say, what else do you expect of capitalism, and just act as if there is nothing new, or ask new this is new, but why in the hell did you use Changed World way back in the Gulf of Sidra?

In a word, you have to show not just illiteness in arms for Iran, which violates U.S. law, but the totality of all that is involved with what no one even now has touched in all the inundation of exposes, that have been and will be pouring forth-- and that includes not only the mass media and the rulers, but the Left--none analyzed it the way our Editorial has either in showing its deep roots in post-WWII world that showed only 2 super-nuclear powers existing, U.S. and Russia, both bent on a nuclear race for single world mastery even if that should spell out the nuclear holocaust that would mean an end to civilization. Reagan retrogressionism has reached one kind of climax with his foray in the Gulf of Sidra followed by the bombing of Libya itself and disregard of airspace of independent nations, as they are disregarding national boundaries.

So ominous is the present climatic situation, that Reagan must be stopped before his two years are up in the presidency, before we have American troops in Nicaragua and confronted with an unstoppable march for the nuclear holocaust.

So what can we, a little group like us, do while not having illusions that we ourselves can change things? We can still be absolutely confident that we can initiate matters both in clearing our heads and creating a forum for the voices from below, and those voices from below to be heard in the context of a philosophy of Marxist-Humanism. They sound louder that way.

As I was dictating the last paragraph of the Edit. to Mike, he started laughing at the footnote I was dictating. The footnote related to the Syria-controlled Lebanese paper Ash-Shira'a. Mike said did you notice the date of this paper which broke the story of the secret trip of the U.S. to Iran was 11/3, the very date of the Dear Colleagues Letter. I laughed too, as I recognized that so todayish is the nature of the Marxist-Humanist Archivist Mike, that he sees Archives in today's headlines, so that both in the past and the present, there is the anticipation of the future.

10679

say that the reader was waiting to hear. Especially when the same editorial was able to point in this very issue to rank and file voices here and abroad, South Africa and Iran.

What the Edit. doesn't say-- though it ends very concretely on the bi-weekly not only as historic roots on the whole question of Committees of Correspondence and voices from below so that we even get the announcement of the new sub price of \$5.00 a year--is how the very articulation of the need for organizational growth has practically disappeared from our vocabulary. But you certainly have heard plenty of that since the 11/3 DC Letter, and it will continue into the 1/3/87 sum-up. The point is that all the strands from the paper to the Archives to the objective situation is integral to the book-to-be.

The nub of what has been the philosophic need of the age that began in the post-WWII world--and which CLRJ did make a stab at but couldn't get anywhere--was to see that as great a divide as Lenin's PN had made, the practice that followed State and Revolution was so historic, so world-shaking, so great, that no one had stopped to ask either: what happens after the revolution, OR what in thought (if they knew dialectic thought at all) do we develop now as the next step?

The Dialectic of Thought demands that our age finally get down to the concretization of that pivotal, climatic Idea of Cognition. In the penultimate chapter of the whole Science of Logic I found a difference in Hegel himself as to how the concept of self-determination of the Idea in the SofL and how he had shortened it in the Logic in the Encyclopedia.

While that created for me a way to start correspondence with non-Marxist Hegelian scholars, what really was urgent for the book was where we are as Marxist-Humanists in relation to Lenin.

When we appear publicly to differ from VIL only politically-organizationally, i.e., ever since 1950 we rejected the concept of the vanguard party to lead and constantly developed that (preceded in the 40s of being so passionately for the national liberation movements and insisting that they are a new world stage), philosophically our translation of and digging deep into Lenin's return to Hegelian dialectics in 1914 made it appear that that Great Divide in Marxism still held for the post-WWII world. Now, on the other hand, we further develop what in 1953 seemed only the difference of $\frac{1}{2}$ a paragraph of the Absolute Idea which Lenin in his PN had asked to be disregarded. We now are expanding it to be one of the pivots of the book-to-be:

1st, we point to the fact that Lenin's dating of the end of his PN, 12/14/14, is actually not the end, as he continued for 4 other pages, which showed his preference for the Smaller Logic rather than the SofL. The difference is that Hegel himself had made a category in the Smaller Logic of "Will, Volition, of action" which "proved" to Lenin that Hegel considered Practice as higher than Theory. In truth, that was only the end of the penultimate chapter, the Idea of Cognition, not the Absolute Idea. Put differently, the phrase he singled out from Hegel: "cognition not only reflects the world, but creates it," was left at the state of an abstract conclusion. It never was concretized. This is what we are trying to concretize in the book on 'Dialectics of Organization and Philosophy' which I will develop further on 1/3/87--not that I'll be anywhere near finishing the book by then.

10680

Raya began her report by pointing to the fact that...

bizarre U.S.-Iran Liason
the objective situation has changed ~~to~~ drastically
with the ~~and~~ it is precisely that climatic
stage of the "changed world" that has proven the imperativeness
of the bi-weekly. Specifically ~~the~~ challenging Marxist-
Humanism to act as if ~~it~~ were not only a bi-weekly
but a veritable daily ~~to~~ ~~work~~ work out ~~the~~
~~most~~ analysis of the objective and subjective situation
as a unit. You will need to work out for yourself
the difference between ~~what~~ (or should I
have said, the concretization) ~~is~~ what objective-subjective
meant when it was spoken of ~~in~~ *the Dear Colleague letter 7/4/3*
as an anticipation of the ~~is~~ what the December Editorial
would be and what it became when the ~~objective~~ *concrete* burst
forth in so startling a manner as it did with the
arms sales to Iran. What is of the essence *how come*
to forget the 2 senses of the concrete. ~~What~~

2 We all think...

Keep p. 1 para. 2; keep p. 2, ~~para. 2~~.

of Jan. 3, 1987.

CW
facing
1st
new
has been
 In ~~the~~, at one and the same time, the last of the 12
 pagers now on the presses, and preparing for the balance sheet
 we will draw up at the Expanded REB Jan. 3, we need, first of
 all, to inwardize the difference between what was presented
 at the REB in November and what the objective situation has
~~been~~ challenged us with. I don't know how many of you have
 felt one ~~of~~ of the attitudes I suddenly experienced when
 the bizarre US-Iran liaison ~~last~~ burst out, but I said to
 myself: that's the greatest vote for the biweekly, indeed for
 a digly, that I ~~we~~ could have ever given. Not only that,
 it illuminates ~~the~~ even the reason why I changed the
 title of the book itself, ~~to~~

I
or
or
But
or
as needed
conclusion
 Here is what I mean. We all think that we know what
 concrete is; ~~we~~ certainly never stop harping on it. ~~It~~
~~is~~ Yet we use the word as if it meant only
 the immediate-- what to do this moment, or what is the deadline
 for the paper, or what will be the agenda of the meeting we
 are going to, no matter what has arisen either Objectively
~~or~~ or has come from the Center. ~~But~~ the truth is there are
~~two~~ two senses in which "Concrete" is used philosophically and
 we should always be aware of both. One is the immediate, and
 one is the concrete-Universal. I want to repeat: the Universal,
too, is concrete. And the concreteness of the Universal is
 not easy to articulate. We have not inwardized that concreteness.
do not
 have it in the very marrow of our bones. To say, truth is concrete,
 sounds very abstract and it is easy to just tack it on as needed conclusion

10682

as necessary to achieve in thought what Hegel called the self-determination of the Idea, as it is in direct action-- we will ~~not~~ end up by tail-ending the activists without expressing our unique position, and considering the Universal, whether that is book, or ^{leadings} archives, or ^{the logo} of our newspaper, "Theory/Practice", ~~as mere abstraction~~.

That ~~type~~ type of thinking -- taking for granted that everybody knows, and we as Marxist-Humanists certainly know-- is ^{a method} what Hegel ^{described} "barbarous".

To be a dialectician, instead, is to practice the Absolute Method, and know that you can not reach truth of the Absolute without it. On the contrary, you remain on the threshold, and from the threshold you ~~can~~ ^{do} not go forward, ^{if necessary} but can definitely fall backward. It is this which made me decide to change the title of the book so that the Dialectic of Organization and the Dialectic of Philosophy ^{are} ^{one}, while the "Party" and the forms of organization springing up spontaneously ^{are another unit} though ^{two} opposites, ^{are} not ^{separate} NOT absolute opposites. It is what Marx labored so hard to change when he said that there have always been rich and poor, but only under capitalism have they reached the ^{absolute} contradictions of capital/labor, as well as the contradiction with all other Left materialists and ~~idealist~~ idealists, ^{excluding idealist} and ~~any~~ a "new Humanism".

Now then, when it comes to the objective situation, especially when you consider that it is something as fundamental as the break-up of the summit, which we had ^{called} ~~called~~ "all things fall apart", ^{is} you have the right to think that since ^{it} is past, and since we are ~~concretely~~ concretely

Very brief which 31 - nearly would be
~~handled with mere references to the November issue, and expand~~
~~greatly what we mean with the change in frequency of appearance~~
~~of the newspaper, by concentrating on what it has meant~~
to us from its very origin.

When the case
was as startling, as new as that U.S.-Iran illicit
it meant exactly what will confront us with
frequency of the paper. That is to say, what else do you expect
of capitalism, and just act as if there is nothing new, or at
least now this is new, but why in the hell did you use channels
back in the Gulf of Sidra? In a word, you have to show
not just illicitness in arms for Iran, which violated
U.S. law, but the totality of all that is involved with what
no one -- and I want to repeat no one even now has touched in all

the inundation of exposes, that have been, ~~is~~ and will be pouring
forth-- and that includes not only the mass media and the
rulers, but the Left--has analyzed it the way our Editorial
has. *e. Then in showing its deep roots in part - the world with but*
2 Nuclear Babemists, both in nuclear race for single world mastery even if
Let me cite just one example. So serious is the funda- *Spells of*
mental shift of the Reagan administration, not just in *the left*
lying, which it does all the time, but in actual siding
with Iran as against what they were tilting ~~to-- Iraq--~~ and
in tow to Reagan there is no one less than King Fahd,
that I am anxious to write a whole new PPL on the Middle East.
But it isn't even something as fundamental as the Iran-
Iraq wars, and when it is pointed out that in fact those
merchants of death were sending the money from that deal
to the contras in Nicaragua, *that is to is*
only one aspect,

cut

10684

characterizes Reaganism since the moment he got the Presidency, but it is ~~the~~ the whole reactionary direction from fundamentalist evangelism to neo-fascist Botha is what got him the power in the first place. It is to see a "Communist", Russian, a Red, -- ~~or~~ ^{or} a ~~hopeless~~ ^{hopeless} worker ^{or} an unemployed, a Black-- under every bed. The world to him is divided into ~~two~~ ^{two}, and only two, super nuclear powers. And America ~~must have~~ ^{aim to} superiority over Russia, ~~with~~ ^{with} notwith~~standing~~ ^{standing} the fact that this Star Wars would be ~~the~~ ^{the}

Crash

Following

the nuclear holocaust for civilization as a whole. It ~~has~~ ^{has} come to one kind of a climax ~~with~~ ^{with} Reagan's foray into Gulf of Sidra and disregarding ~~the~~ ^{the} Lybia ~~and~~ ^{and} the Changed World that began there has reached ~~its~~ ^{its} climax ~~that~~ ^{that} must be stopped before we find troops in Nicaragua and indeed the whole nuclear holocaust.

Nat. Bomb

So what ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~so~~ ^{so} now for a little group like ~~ours~~ ^{ours} is not to have illusions that we can ~~do~~ ^{do} ~~it~~ ^{it} to be absolutely confident that we can initiate both in clearing heads, and create a forum for the voices from below, and those voices from

Q

below to be heard in the context of a philosophy of Marxist-Humanist. ~~They~~ ^{They} ~~sound~~ ^{sound} ~~like~~ ^{like} that way.

As I was dictating the last paragraph of the Editorial to ~~the~~ ^{the} he started laughing at the footnote I was dictating.

Ash-Burns, 11/3 and 11/3 "Dear Clarence"

not contribute to the December issue (and certainly there will be many times when I will not be able to contribute to issues) I told Mike to please get something from the Archives, not as past and not even as living present but just the same subject and only at the end would it say "from the Archives" and indeed, it would surprise the reader to say that, because it would have the subject Russia, and the U.S. and the question of nuclear war and the question of the future awaiting humanity if we let the rulers run amok that way.

P What I asked him to find was what I wrote against Khrushchev when he claimed to have found a new ~~weapon~~ ^{bomb}, which, if it were released, would flood the whole world, and he had the so-called non-aligned nations so scared that Tito, who was the first to break from Russia, and was among the non-aligned, got the whole Conference to side with Russia against the U.S., which I hardly need to tell anyone here is not exactly the way M-Hism was resolving that Conference. In a word, the ~~whole~~ whole basis of the new creation of M-Hism, as it looked to the Post WWII world and developed the movement from practice and the movement from theory, is so basic a ~~determination~~ determination of the ~~world~~ world, that when we look at archives it reveals not just a hard, long trek of the process of development of M-Hism, its objectivity and subjectivity, ^{great} that notion is inseparable from source, content from form, and the future is present in the todayness.

10686

moment in Absolute Method that makes the universe
concrete and gives the Marxist-Humanist condition
is not a matter just of style or the analysis of a piece
but they have something to say that the reader
to hear. Especially when the same editorial was able to do
in this very issue to rank and file voices here and
abroad, South Africa and Iran.

Now all this, the details of what you will first be reading
in the new issue in a few days, is integral to the book to be

we ourselves did not develop post-Marx Marxism as a pejora-
tive ^{until} 1982. ~~W~~ Have we lived it since then? Can we practice
it now that we have a bi-weekly, with its logo "Theory/Practice"?
Is the ~~sharp~~ sharp distinction in the fact that this year's
expanded REB is not with the NEB "in general", but with
the local at the Center which will have the greatest technical
responsibility, --has the full implication of that been grasped?
It means the concretization of what we have all voted for at the
Convention--and I want to stress what the Convention voted for
, not what an individual thought whether or not it was voted for
at the Convention. ^{It is} ~~so~~ so universally concrete as well as so
individually concrete that it will look totally new--but this is
one appearance that is essence appearing ^{precisely because} ~~precisely because~~ ^{and} ~~and~~
it is a fact of ^{Regan's} ~~this~~ Regan's imperial presidency in a nuclear world
that we are bound to suffer for 2 more years. ~~We~~ We must not
ip passively suffer for 2 more years, but battle hard against,
and the frequency of appearance coupled with the brevity
need when we only have an 8 pager instead of a 12 pager, is a
pathway for doing that.

10687

preference for the ~~xxxxxxx~~ Smaller Logic where Hegel made
~~xxxxxx~~ category of what had not been a category in the
Science of Logic: "Will or Action", "Volition". In a word,
it wasn't only the ~~xx~~ last half paragraph of the final
chapter, Absolute Idea, that Lenin had openly asked us
to disregard, and I first began my "debates" with VII
in 1953, but he had actually not worked out what Hegel insisted
was of the Absolute,
~~xx~~ the proof, i.e. the dialectics of thought itself, in
the Absolute Idea. Put differently, the phrase he singled
out from Hegel and that he loved so much: "Cognition not
only reflects the world, but creates it", far from being
concretized, was left at the stage of an abstract con-
clusion. This is what we are trying to concretize in
the book on ~~six~~ Dialectics of Organization and Philosophy
and which I will develop further on Jan. 3, 1987-- not
that I'll be anywhere finishing ^{the proof - much less} the book by then.

* * * *

10689