

THEORY & PRACTICE, History of a Concept from Aristotle to Marx
by Nicholas Lobkowitz, 1967 Univ of Notre Dame

(here only section on Mx & only as related to praxis)

p.242 re Mx asking that H's private consciousness about his system be separated from the obj. consciousness expressing itself in his system. & on that p. ftn. is on "constantly digging mole of true phil. knowledge" Q Shakespeare: "Well said, old mole! canst work in the ground so fast?"

P.273: negating phil. does not mean muttering a "few angry sbanal phrases... You cannot abolish phil. except by actualizing it."

CRITIQUE BECOMING "MATERIAL FORCE" "It entails a shift in the meaning of of 'praxis'....In short, whereas all other Left Hegelians considered praxis as an effluence of AK, Mx discovered that it also might be an almost ontological dev. on the part of HISTORY. If present society contained a group powerful enough to transform the world....real history rather than Knowledge was the true principle of salvation.....THEORY STILL WAS THE ACTIVE ELEMENT.....

P.340: "In short, Marx does not accuse Hegel of having treated labor as if it was a thought activity. Rather, accuses him of having in the PHEN.

DESCRIBED HUMAN HISTORY IN TERMS OF A DIAL. OF CONSCIOUSNESS, NOT IN TERMS OF a dial. of labor. When he says that the only labor which Hegel recognizes is abstract mental labor, he has in mind THE STRUCTURE OF PHEN, in fact of H's whole phil., not the passages on labor in the PHEN. Another writing by H. For what Mx wants to say is that H's description of the movement of self-

CONSCIOUSNESS IN AN ADULTERATED DESCRIPTION OF THE HISTORICAL MOVEMENT OF LABORING HUMANITY...p.323 "Moreover, Mx claims that the very fact that H translates the real dial. of laboring humanity into a dial. of a mentally laboring self-consciousness is itself a reflection of alienated labor."

p.418: "His(Mx's) point simply is that human practice is rev. BY ITS VERY NATURE. It is what men do that is decisive in history... what they constantly & inevitably do as determined by what past generations have done. In other words, the fact that men are dependent upon their circumstances, & nevertheless constantly succeed in overthrowing them can only mean that HUMAN PRACTICE BY ITS VERY NATURE leads to & results in an OVERTHROW OF EXISTING CIRCUMSTANCES & THE CREATION of new and less 'limited' ones. This is why in the German Ideology Marx without further ado IDENTIFIES 'MATERIAL PRACTICE' AND 'REVOLUTION' (Passal 28ff)"

p.419: Praxis in Marx "might be described as a relatively homogeneous human activity which can take on many different forms: it may range FROM bodily labor of most humble sort to pol. revolutions; & it may be anything in between AS LONG AS IT RESULTS IN A TRANSFORMATION OF mind-ind. realities which entails a humanization of man."

On. p.424 Lobkowitz q KH on Feuerbach a materialist sans history.... & on p.425, ft.437 "Mx's remark that Feuerbach reduces praxis to its 'dirty-Jewish form of appearance' probably alludes to the passage in the Essence of Christianity in which Feuerbach argues that the commandments of the Jewish God extended to vulgar external activities as keeping oneself clean; cf. F.VI,39.