

- 1 -

Lectures on RIEGEL IN JAPAN

9697

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 ~~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 Right, ~~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 more serious work, ~~but~~ ~~by no means~~ ~~but~~ Marx sharpened his ~~critique~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~state~~ ~~and~~ ~~he~~ ~~has~~ ~~done~~ ~~so~~ ~~much~~ ~~work~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~Philosophy~~ ~~of~~ ~~Right~~. ~~because~~ there is nothing we can say that Marx hasn't already said on the Philosophy of Right. In the criticism of the Philosophy of Right, Marx analyzes the ~~criticism~~ ~~that~~ ~~we~~ ~~think~~ what is a legal essence is actually a legal superstructure, which reveals the actual state of production on economy which led to Marx's discovery of the materialist foundation of history, ~~that~~ ~~all~~ ~~the~~ ~~material~~ ~~is~~ ~~history~~. After that everything he criticized, or took away from Hegel, ~~as~~ ~~a~~ ~~revolutionary~~ ~~materialist~~. And that is the way I consider it. So I am disregarding Hegel's Philosophy of Mind, even though that is a serious work, because Marx has said all that in the Philosophy of Right. I am more interested in politics, which has a directly bearing to us, ~~and~~ that is not what we take up. And I am even disregarding the lecture he had on "Philosophy of History and History of Philosophy" because they were the way he was showing examples that his great ideas are not as bright as they sound.

-2-

9698

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 a 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 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 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 first task at present he will do is in the Phenomenology of Mind which was to have been an introduction to The System, but is actually his whole work, ~~and it is considered his greatest work~~. What I want to do with it is, in addition to making sure that we realize that Hegel, despite the claim of his work is actually dealing with 2,500 years of Western civilization, (Western too for that matter) we must recognize that, but that I want to do with the whole work, since we cannot go into great detail, is to make even a mere abstraction in one sense, and follow that up as in Vol. II of Capital. In other words, Marx says that the only way we will see the law of motion of capitalism

-3-

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 10 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~~
in French only & greater number
Aristotle ~~etc. etc.~~ ~~on philosophy of art~~ Anti-Raison, which is capitalism,
French
The ~~French~~ Revolution, Industrialism, ^{in part} 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 of 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 Worship 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 ~~one~~ who sets a mind of his own, and the ~~Lord~~ ~~not~~ ~~the~~ ~~slave~~ ~~gets~~ ~~that~~ ~~mind~~ ~~of~~ ~~it~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~slave~~ ~~getting~~ ~~a~~ ~~mind~~ ~~of~~ ~~his~~ ~~own~~ was the basis for Marx's great development ^{1843 March} of proletarian consciousness, and basically it was Marx, who didn't know his first Sys and all his work on Labor himself, that he really did have in mind nothing which included class structure, as he really did have in mind, history, ^{including labor movement} history, that is not the mind I want to emphasize.

9699

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 mind 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 ~~is~~ 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 train in the ~~the~~ Self-Consciousness, which is ~~a~~ 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 ~~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 exclude the others. Stoicism arose because you as an individual recognized that this is a horrible society--they was ~~universal slavery~~ been ~~and you couldn't overcome it~~. You weren't ~~what we would call~~ so to speak a nice movement to survive in it. So you as an individual were great, you were going to be Stoic, in actuality it's a rationalization, ~~for~~ for the Greek. It didn't mean anything, it means nothing 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 saying the opposite, the reason living from 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 ~~class~~) was a new stage of so to speak, retrogression, where the intellectuals all began saying "OH we are t, the Roman Empire is dead, but we will be either stoic or we will in some other form, such as just beat up ourselves, just overcome it." And even when it seemed to overcome it spurred by real revolution, whether he considers it at one time Christianity or at another time the actual French Revolution, most of the time he does not like the French Revolution, that is still not the case. So that is why I do not want to start at where you have a mind of your own, so I want to stress what Hegel saw in the alienated soul in Stoicism, in Skepticism, all of which were good little paths on the way to nothing, but you can't know.

- 5 -

9702

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 them to a higher stage. So Reason ends the first part of the department of this movement from 600 B.C. 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 they 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 on 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 let to the world will be between the person and his development. So there isn't a single person in our society today, whether you take Mao, whether you take Chairman, whether you take Fidel Castro, whether you take any other person that you can't find described in the alienated spirit as to his being, and when there is a new revolution and you approach it in becomes a transformation between the relationship of reality to the individual or to right in such a way when you begin to identify yourself with the Chairman Mao Tse-tung. 7

-7-

9703

faction and you begin to have as big a 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 [redacted] Christian (I will come to [redacted] that next).

Culture

His criticism of what he called the Philosophy of culture is the foundation for Marx's criticism of the superstructure. This was a man who was not a proletarian revolutionary, but he criticized all culture as very good for having first founded certain superstition and all that sort of thing, but now you have it reversed than by what is now called the ironism in the fetishism of commodities and if I would go so far as to say, if we could so to speak shake the shins of Marx himself, we would realize that his whole three volumes on The Critique of Religion as the greatest 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 still thought to be the only interpreters of this thing and they don't let us have direct, personal, contact with God and this human creature." In other words in, first of all we have lot to learn in not being religious but in atheism from him. But secondly it comes from the fact that he was a former atheist. He was an atheist that here is no God, no God, but he was supposed to have been the heliot of everybody. He was supposed such a deserter both in the [redacted] Catholic Church and also in the terror of the French Revolution, that he is so afraid of us, yet he claims him as ours this is not it, I have to go to philosophy, to get into a more exact point. But the philosopher

he is a man and he is on this earth. so that is the basis [redacted] 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 what is still alienated and discipline of culture. Then religion, that that has been converted and the persistence that man must decide, so to speak, and not the church decide as to what will finally evolve. It brings us to the final stage of the absolute knowledge.

Hegel

He comes [redacted] to absolute knowledge and he says, "Look, this is history. This has moved in such a way which shows us the movement of spirit of man. Now there is also the science of this spirit, whether in religion or in actual science, and this will unite 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, and a - everything will culminate in one Absolute. One is Absolute knowledge in Phenomenology, then we will have Absolute Idea in the Science of Logic, and then Absolute Mind in the Philosophy of Mind. But it is always moving in this direction.

This can obviously be taken up later. In all the writing even the life of Hegel himself which you didn't see him, nevertheless go that was the history in the turn of the 19th century. Now he comes to the Science of Logic (in a certain sense it's a little too early) the other one just flowed out of him in the grip of all the forces of evolution, and beginning to talk about the social organization of the world, but in actual philosophic terms, *↓* where there's a huge number of types of civilization in the same manner as there are in Germany now, talking about the stages of civilization. So you see he wanted to do something more than to deal

-9-

9705

with either Being or Science, I am going to go directly to Volume III, ~~Nation~~, and especially the last section, The Doctrine of Motion or of Freedom.

The Absolute Idea

The Doctrine of Motion 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 those 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 he said Doctrine of Subjectivity, Book of Subjectivity, Book of Motion, and when he saw that it was himself who was the expression "or of Freedom" he was so thrilled an' 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. just the same as the others accepted it because we had no other anti-feudal movement of development, of economics, of politics etc. There he was compelled in return to Idea, not only to see the betrayal of his Lenin comrades in the Social Democracy or their betrayal of his own comrades, but he began to stand in awe of thought. He said, "Oh, my God, look at this! It's as if it didn't only reflects the world but creates it." And look at that this can't be expressed. Why didn't we see all this?" And he had to try to break from that and the stages of Cognition, Analysis, Synthesis in logic. What are the stages of Judgment? What are the stages of Syllogism? Here does the Universal of Socialism and the universal of the existence in one state, a worker's state, a socialist state, a communist individual, the historical stage of individual state, the capitalist state. They all merge in this big Absolute Idea. That is what is so great about it and this sudden change to Absolute Idea. It goes back to the Absolute Idea stage and it is a stage of total freedom (from the absolute materialistic of all individualistic ways of work to the absolute freedom of all materialistic ends) that is what the Absolute Idea is all about.

I want to fill in up just the Absolute Idea because it is

9706

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 proletarian 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 began 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 three 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 take it from a different angle. So he says if we ~~go~~ ^{turn} up his whole System at such this same point in his whole system in the Philosophy of Mind we will find, and then he quotes two paragraphs from the Philosophy of Mind where it transfers into the Philosophy of Mind of the bourgeois school. 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 final and definitive stage is a ~~single~~ sentence which reads "The self-determination of the self is the self". In fact the ~~single~~ itself spans." And everybody thinks that this definition is in motion, but then again it's not itself in motion, and it's still... and I didn't know nor did I ever think that this was a contradiction of motion or position. It is enough to note that the self-determination of motion is being imposed to bring the position to a standstill. In that the self-determination of the self has ^{the} right to stand and it breaks into two.

-77-

9707

In other words there is a movement from practice, that is where I set my movement from practice, is to hear itself speak. Where it comes so to speak elementally in the proletarian, as instinctive. And there is a movement from theory which doesn't come so elementally and may have many pitfalls. And at this point, you see, where they have to listen to the masses, well he said self-determination of nations, there is the question of how will the two unite? So suddenly Hegel brings in a lot of jokes in sympathy.

Sullivan

So this self-determination, when he begins to laugh at Antithesis,
because you know everybody says that Hegel is supposed to stand for a Thesis,
an Antithesis and a Synthesis--and that is a lot of nonsense. He doesn't
stand for anything. But he does stand for a lot of jibes about people
who construct mechanically. And so he says it could be 3, it could be 4
it could be 5, he makes a lot of jibes. And when he comes to the point
where it could be 5, because you really do not have a beginning, every
beginning is a result of some other condition he says "Well even on the
fact that all the answer is in subjectivity (Now I have shown you the
Doctrine of Objectivity, I have shown you the Doctrine of Subjectivity and
I am talking of the unity of theoretical or the practical idea) but in
essence the unity occurs in subjectivity alone, therefore it isn't really
your first notion of the objectivity of the world." I don't understand
of the details of this which I can't say to my satisfaction. But
I do want to say that Mr. Hegel's notion of "the Philosopher
of Pragmatism" for whom I say he is a philosopher, is his idea
~~that~~ ~~he~~ ~~is~~ ~~a~~ ~~pragmatist~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~sense~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~word~~ ~~pragmatist~~, I will
try to explain what I mean by ~~pragmatist~~ in the sense of Mr. Sullivan.
He is a pragmatist in the sense that he is not able to conceive
the word Philosophy without Pragmatism. In other words, if he had
not had Pragmatism he would not have had Philosophy.

- 1 -

9708

in Philosophy and Revolution. But I want to address that he is not for this Synthesis nonsense, and so I argue that the now, the greatness, the problem for our age is to solve this little local subjectivity. How does this unity to resolve itself in this little subjectivity.

Marcus, at the other classic Marxists, a process at this stage is to give up. To run away, and I will show you the basic fact they run away from. They think they are real materialists when they do it, but they are not. They say the absolute I is the result of the fact that mental and manual labor was so far separated, and it was a pretechnological stage that ~~law rulers~~^(law rulers) lived in after all, the beginning of industrialization and not the end. They say that he ran back to, so to speak, to what he was before. I completely and totally disagree with that because he ran back to what he was before in the state, not in the absolute I. That is one of their criticisms, [REDACTED] (Incidentally I and all of those ^{Stalinesque} ~~Marx~~) pardon me, but they are nothing--they are very mechanical and they do not understand anything--they talk out fine phrases, but the methodology of all their people is stillness if not something worse. So they couldn't have learned very much about the absolute I or Marx or Lenin on this question. But the point is that the criticism on a in theory did tackle it. The ^{first} ~~first~~ that I consider the most serious Reinhold ~~Reinhold~~ who is Christian and so to speak said, "That is I that I should serve, because he wasn't so to speak a mere Christian. He laid the foundation for Marx, he laid the foundation for atheism, he laid the foundation for all that we have suffered since. So Marx said, "From God's sake and ~~to~~ God be with you if what I said you want." A man who would consider himself a Marxist, an economic Marxist, is saying "From God's sake, if he is not atheistic, 2. what we have to do is to help him to get to the God's sake. And for him ~~the~~ reality is that the ~~reality~~ of the Marxist movement and it isn't from the revolution for him, it is from the God's sake, he didn't do the revolution for him, he did it for the God's sake. So the religious

-27-

9709

- second subjectivity, but he interprets second subjectivity that the intellectual will do it or will bring you back to the new state. So it is ~~in~~ ^{against} these three serious acts 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 Hegel or Lenin, but by living in a different historic age are compelled to do things like those. For example, whether or not Marcuse could be an authentic, his *Introduction to Man* was not reproduced in the Japanese edition, and in consequence of which I think that I am great in the analysis of Marx etc. in Marx, which has been nothing original since the Lukács period until now, just as the Frenchmen attempted it. But when I come to have all this reproduced in material I have demanded in Part I in order to deal with the reality directly, he disagrees with it, and mainly it revolves round the role of the revolutionist. So I am a romantic. Regardless of his analysis that I don't believe in the proletarian revolution, the truth is that the intellectual, including the Marxist intellectual had not been able to break from either the bourgeois or Marx on the fact at the point where it broke off in the absolute line (the arrays). And the new state for the few of us, the new regime, so to say, it came from the masses. It was the minor's strike, it had all started well in III, and Hoxha has a word for it. He says that it is only the concrete (you know when he talks about compulsion of ~~concrete~~ thinking to connect with the concrete things) that demands a new stage in philosophy of man. Because it comes only when your children begin to live your adult life, and the adult life comes from below. So he who is like me doesn't accept that fact, and those so-called materialists Korsch, and those different to him, Marcuse, do not recognize that fact, and I want to do so too.

-14-

9710

So that I want to end on what I began, to give ear to the urgency of the times and the courage to recognize the spirit of the age by saying and recognizing the fact that this "new" subjectivity must a ~~since~~ broken into two; 1. is what the proletariat is going 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 merge for our time in a single definition. There's no point in saying anything about revolution without talking about theory. That is our age and that is my opinion - according to the point of Philosophy and Revolution.