

(D)

Talking to Myself on the first (12-2-60) Notes on Phenomenology of Mind, but leaving out what is also on Phenomenology and is dated 11-16-68, because obviously it would limit it to ~~xxxxxxx~~ literature, specifically tragedy, and had a very specific, organizational aim--the wife of a close contact who was almost going to join. There is in any case sufficient reference to that section of Phenomenology in the 1960 Notes.

The whole idea of the present is the Dialectic of Philosophy itself, and ~~now~~ ^{now} no matter how "great" we were-- and it took plenty of chutzpah to have divided the whole of the Phenomenology into just two parts: I. Comprising Consciousness, Self-Consciousness and Reason; and II. Comprising Spirit, Religion, and Absolute Knowledge.

The point was, that, politically, what was preoccupying us was the before and after of a revolution that goes so perversely in such opposite directions as did the Russian. It has great "cleansing" in the sense that it removes all rubbish that erudition throws ones way--quantity of facts ad max nauseum, and leaves outturning points that ~~xxxxxx~~ historic ~~xxxxxx~~ directs.

On the other hand, or at the same time, the "cleansing" unfortunately turns you away from philosophy as philosophy, in this case dialectics proper, METHODOLOGY. Put differently, we were so disgusted with elitism and that included not only Trotskyism but the JPTs, specifically the "philosophers"

10772

Grace and CLR James, and the general degradation of methodology to a means, a tool, an instrument--~~xx~~ and its opposite the workers will solve all problems so that we failed to draw the totality of the meaning of what we so ~~xxx~~ proudly ~~xxxx~~ quote from Hegel. Take the penultimate paragraph on page 1:

Even skepticism, Hegel tells us, which corresponds to some form of independent consciousness, is very negative in its attitude, so much so that it leads to nothing but 'the giddy whirl of a perpetually self-creating disorder. That is why both stoicism and skepticism lead to nothing but the the Unhappy Consciousness, or Alienated Soul.

And did we ever throw around in a most careless way, the expression, 'the giddy whirl of perpetually self-creating disorder', without ever drawing it out concretely on the Dialectic when ~~ix~~ it came to the Absolute and all the ~~xx~~ rhetoric of CLR James.

Go to page 2 and see whether to this day we really do understand "life of the whole" which however cannot be seen before being seen. We certainly repeated often enough but who of us go through, patiently, go through "the seriousness, the suffering, the patience, and the labor of the negative" that must not take "easy contentment in receiving or stinginess in giving". So you see it has nothing to do with finances. It has everything to do with

the totality of the Dialectic, of the Absolute, of Absolute Method.

The reason, the need for this new Introduction is to, at one and the same time, restore the ~~F~~ Dialectic as it flowed out from that great genius, Hegel at the very moment he didn't know he was breaking with all previous philosophy, from the teachers and ^{closest of} colleagues not to mention still holding on to the embrace of the ~~THE~~ French Revolution and then developing "Absolute Terror" as its end.

Now look how Hegel combines immanent rhythm and strenuous toil as way to reject the philosophers--all the philosophers-- and for the last 25 years ~~have~~ have gone their own merry way without so much as having a ~~NEW~~ language to express the changed world since the French Revolution has upset everything and not only in France but in all of Europe, when he calls "those ~~king~~ 'representatives' who like the dead burying their dead" (p. 130) at which point I have every right to say what I did, "to hell with all the parties (representatives) who are out to lead. Instead he, Hegel, was hewing new paths to science, to revolutions, which he claimed would become the "position where, in consequence, its exposition coincides with just this very point, this very stage of the science proper of minf. And

10774

finally when it grasps this, its own essence, it will connote the nature of absolute knowledge itself." (p. 145) There may have been less to science in 1807 than technology but there ~~was~~ also was a great, great deal more. ~~TAKE~~

Take what has ~~was~~ always been CD's great favorite which was Hegel's analysis of Enlightenment which I quote on page four and appears in the Phenomenology on page 512.

"Enlightenment upsets the household arrangements, which spirit carries out in the house of faith, by bringing in the goods and furnishings belonging to the world of Here and Now..."

What was even more revolutionary in that revolutionary philosophy was the way he dismissed Matter as "pure abstraction", not because he was buried in spirituality of the church. Rather, because he was so material; here is how he hit out against vulgar materialism; in my page 6:

"pure matter is merely what remains over when we abstract from seeing, feeling, tasting, etc., i.e., it is not what is seen, tasted, felt and so on; it is not matter that is seen, felt, or tasted, but color, a stone, a salt, and so on. Matter is really pure abstraction...(p. 592)

Before going into the last three pages, 7,8,9 I want to make a big jump to 1969, to one of the latest Canadian academic discussions in 1982 on the meaning of Absolute

10775

Spirit ("Le Sens de l'esprit absolu") on the 150th anniversary.

J.R. This has become especially relevant to me because I just received a letter ~~EM~~ from one of the participants, Louis Dupre, in answer to my letter and he reminds me that academia does not accept my equating all Absolutes--Knowledge, in the the Phenomenology, Idea in Science of Logic, and Spirit in Philosophy of Mind. [Rather, whether or not they equate Absolute Mind with Absolute Spirit with God, or just philosophy, it is sui generis. The ~~xxx~~ ^{three} most exciting is H.S. Harris who always returns to the source--he's the one who wrote a 700 pages before he even reached the Phenomenology; he's the most erudite one, and he wrote the paper "And the darkness comprehended it not". The other two is Louis Dupre who although he ~~has~~ ^{heads} religious studies at Yale, is the most open one to all tendencies ^{and that includes revolution} and the only one who ~~is~~ ~~it~~ took the economics of Marx seriously enough to really dig into that as well as Marx's view of culture, instead of leaving it just at the Humanist Essays. ~~And the most elitist, the very orthodox~~ ~~Quantin Lauer~~ Dupre's essay is "Hegel's Absolute Spirit: A Religious Justification of Secular Culture"; the most elitist and orthodox Catholic is Quantin Lauer, whose paper is "Is Absolute Spirit God?" What characterized all three papers, indeed, all papers, i.e., in the Revue de l'Universite d'Ottawa is not just the

10776

The whole point of the timeliness of this discussion is not that it is a commemoration of 150 years. Quite the contrary. It is precisely because, rather than a commemoration, it actually answers today's problems and in doing so actually elicits / ORGANIZATIONAL questions that you wouldn't think is anywhere near the interest of Hegel either in his time or in ours, is what makes it so contemporary. And this contemporaneity emerges not in order for someone to say, well he was young and this was origin which Hegel long since abandoned, in fact totally demolished as he glorified the state, is now quoted not to show the youthfulness and contrast it to the abandonment, but to the objectivity which first brought it about, that is to say, the French Revolution which had him say utopian things like "we must also go beyond the state. For every state has to treat man as mechanical clockwork; and this it shall not do. So it shall cease." This abolition of the state (quoted on p. 448) which certainly did not get repeated again, nevertheless remained in Hegel's concept of freedom and not merely in the poetry of Holderlin, or the myth of Hyperion. It is the way H.S. Harris defines dialectical in the mature period: "that is to say, they are not directly consistent with one another."

10777

Dupre's commentary and questions here, becomes even more important as he expresses it as a Universal Brother-Hood:

"But from the time that (Hegel) decides that there is a radical breach between spirit and nature, his philosophy assumes this tripartied character, logic, the basic conceptual structure -- nature, meaning sub-human nature, spirit in otherness -- and spirit, which is the realm of the realization of human nature, in the old terminology. The introduction of this radical breach between spirit and nature is at the same time the abolition of what used to be an absolute divide between Absolute Spirit -- and finite spirit which was part of Nature. Because now all of spirit is separate from nature and it becomes continuous."

10778