

Marx's Marxism. Nor does it mean that its only the works of Engels that were written by Engels suffer from that economic determinism. There is not one single thing that Marx wrote, except of course, what Engels didn't live to see either, like the EN, that Engels didn't publish with a new Introduction. It is that interpretation that ~~gave the direction and still gives the direction.~~ All those who speak ~~of~~ betrayal do get an audience, but those who say Engels did not betray, it is much, much deeper than that, that's what he understood Marx to say, which means that he's not an individual, it is not just subjective, he answers something deeply objective: what is it? And why does it persist a near century after? To try to answer that, means to face the question of what is there in this degenerate, retrogressive era that makes one mistake one's attitude for independence, when its actually mouthing something that represents some form of the old that has taken advantage of a new form of ~~new~~ existence. And how very deep must be the uprooting. Not only that, the reorganization of one's self that really spells out revolution-in-permanence, now that the global economy is talked about as the "nature" of capitalism

Methodology. When is it Absolute and when is it degraded to a tool, or ^{method} equated with dynamic. When Luxemburg said the proletariat has this great tool, dialectic methodology, so it need not be afraid of ~~losing~~ ^(falling prey to) the false ideology

10816

she hardly meant philosophy. Rather, it meant the political dynamism that would arise from the Marxists following the workers, the mass uprisings. Even her opposition to parliamentarism was not as total as it seemed in the speeches, because tied to it always was the Party, the Party, the unity of the Party. And even when she created the German Communist Party, she still left a legacy not to try for a new International. What then was she waiting for?

Methodology when it's Absolute, i.e., total, ~~total~~ finding its concretization in the actual working out of both mental and manual problems as well as organizational, and that is when we run into all the trouble -- Organization.

It seems to me that all Lenin's correct emphasis on theory, that without revolutionary theory there cannot be a successful revolution, is not seeing the very big gulf, almost unbridgable, between theory and philosophy. In a word, theory, political theory, economic theory, organizational theory if you exclude from that philosophy, can definitely be correct and immediate and correct with the long view and still not be philosophy. For example, the theory of state-capitalism was certainly very important. It meant ~~the~~ 1st, facing reality as it is, even if as it is involves the recognition that your own workers state is no more, has been transformed into its opposite; you still have, because of having faced the critical reality, lots of positive things to go on, such as rejecting what is.

10817

Secondly, looking for the opposite, which is masses in motion, thirdly, working out how that could possibly have happened without an imperialist invasion and seeing that so-all powerful was the objective world stage of the economy that without a full social revolution, that thing that you've just overthrown re-appears in this new form of the ^(single) state plan. Finally, and above all, bring forced by that objective situation to look for the absolute opposite, and the absolute method and thus the human beings themselves. That is we were ready philosophically ~~to~~ to work out Marxist-Humanism for our age.

The uniqueness of all I have shown, from 1957 through '86, from seeing the movement from practice embedded in the Absolute along with the movement from theory to grasping at the fact that Absolute Method was also just the beginning for what you yourself must work out, which can never be a blueprint, to the Absolutes I must now work out any distinctions between those Absolutes, in ~~the~~ Phenomenology, in Idea (Science of Logic), in ~~the~~ Geist (Philosophy of Mind), which Dupre insists is not the same as Idea.

Transcendence and the Future.

10818

