

3/6

WHAT IS MTT?

I. Prolegomena

a) Instructions
of Miller to
Reconstructions
9/1/1952

A very "off the head" ;kind of talking to myself, of something that, on the one hand, I will want in a month or so to talk as a sort of Testament to the four, recorded but not shown to anyone; and, on the other hand, has been peculiarly brought about by the work on the article on "Whither China?"

Suddenly, a category we've been working with -- how not to say Party or Person but Philosophy -- but never being able to really make it concrete-- became concrete with the word "it" and of all things meaning it isn't a question of Mao, the Helmsman, but it, Mao Thought, which was the only thing that had historic validity when both objective and subjective merged in the victory into power. It was though "it", that is, the perversion of social revolution into guerrilla warfare, internationalism into nationalism, surrounding the cities, not so much by peasants as by a peasant Army. It is this that gained power, kept it, and everyone could only become the rulers by being Mao Thought. In a word, after all these struggles, and after it took 2 years just to be able to give an official statement on Lin (or rather, mis-statement) they came up after a decade with the Mao Tse-tung Thought being not just Mao, but Mao "representing" the thought of the collectivity which calls itself The People's Republic of China.

Phil, not Party
JFT
Sincerely
Thought

1951 - in Slop

Bizarre as it may sound, as well as unrelated, I suddenly said to myself, "I'll be darned, one not two in 1951 was true, even if I named the wrong person as one, first because there was no other thought than the theory of state-capitalism, and theory is not philosophy. No matter how many times you can show that Humanism was mentioned from the very first approach to the theory of state-capitalism, and how many times it was a great deal more deepened during those 40 years, especially once the question of philosophy was not only asked but related between Hegel, Lenin and Marx's Capital, not to mention the actual mass outburst of 1949-50, no generalization of the objective and subjective was so integrally related as to constitute philosophy.

1951

b) 1953

Not only that, all this was prolegomena, even the great breakthrough into the Absolute in 1953 in those 6 weeks before the East German Revolt -- and the very, very clear reference therein to Organization, not Party, not Soviets, but the strictly theoretical-practical grouping like ours (JFT) actually specified

10863

what we are projecting now on the Dialectics of Philosophy and Organization. The whole point is that even at that great breaking point, because it was the self-determination of the idea and was ahead of the actual outbreak of the revolt, it didn't jell to the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism. For that to occur, subjective - objective must be a single unit, indivisible, and that didn't happen until the Hungarian Revolution, when both the 1844 and the new form of revolt merged.

Essays

Indeed, it's only 1957, when M&F was completed and I was writing the Preface, that the simple phrase came out that the aim of the book was two-fold: the re-establishment of the Humanism of Marxism, and its American roots. So, strictly speaking, the theory which is so necessary when you first face a totally critical, objective situation -- in this case, state-capitalism -- can become the threshold to philosophy and just because it's threshold only, can twist you backward, as it has twisted many state-capitalists.

1956-7 K.M.'s Humanism in Dialogue

II

In order to dig into, as well as measure up to the historic dialectic that was created with Marx's continent of thought, we must pause once again on 1951 and "one, not two," in order to understand what happens when there is no "One". I mean it was easy to show Marx and not Marx and Engels, and Lenin, not Lenin and Trotsky. But, after all, life does go on, so what happens when there is no "One"? When there is an inter-regnum, there is theory; in a word, there is no theoretic void, and the attempt to reach for a philosophy (like the final section of SCWR) instead of reaching for the future tries to transform the political conclusion into a philosophic universal -- the result was that by no accident whatsoever, CLRJ's Notes on the Dialectic had actually stopped by calling attention to "our" Universal, which meant State-Capitalism, and therefore simply led, not to the future, but back to Trotskyism. And when, in 1951, I spoke of "one, not two", I was speaking only of the conclusion to leave the SWP. The experiment -- i.e. mimeographed Correspondence -- was chaotic enough for which "politics" did save us in the sense of recognition that we had become de-politicalized not to recognize what a new world stage had been created with the death of Stalin.

It is here that the greatness of the break is fully philosophic, is fully the dialectic of the Absolute, as being a movement from both theory and practice. But, there was no living practice, so that the self-determination of the Idea which incorporated that unity of theory and practice remained abstract. Once the totality of both state-capitalism and the movement from practice was alive and kicking in West Virginia, in East Germany, in Hungary, it was only then

Not in the sense