

Nov 2, 1966

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 that so far as I am concerned, Hegel is his major works. That is to say, Phenomenology of Mind, Science of Logic, Philosophy of ~~Logic~~ ^{History}, 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 ~~any~~ ^{more} serious work. Philosophy of Right, ~~because~~ ^{because} there is nothing we can say that Marx hasn't already said ~~on the~~ ⁱⁿ Philosophy of Right. ~~the~~ ^{the} criticism of the Philosophy of Right, ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~the~~ ^{the} criticism that ~~people~~ ^{people} think what is a legal essence is actually a legal superstructure, which reveals the actual state of production and economy which led to Marx's discovery of the materialist foundation of history, ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~all~~ ^{all} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~rest~~ ^{rest} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~it~~ ^{it}. After that everything he criticized, or took over from Hegel, ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~as~~ ^{as} a revolutionary materialist. And that is the way we consider it. So I am disregarding Hegel's Philosophy of Right, even though that is a serious work, because ~~it~~ ^{it} ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~as~~ ^{as} a serious work, which has a relationship to us, ~~and~~ ^{and} that is not what we take. ~~I~~ ^I ~~am~~ ^{am} ~~even~~ ^{even} ~~disregarding~~ ^{disregarding} the lectures he had on "Philosophy of History and History of Philosophy" because they were so far away he was showing examples that his great ideas are not as good as they sound.

Handwritten notes:
pay no attention to them either as they are unimportant or as they are stupid
I will not even consider more serious work
Marx sharpened his sense for ideas, especially, and
there is nothing we can say that Marx hasn't already said in the Philosophy of Right.
the criticism of the Philosophy of Right
Marx has said all the rest of it
After that everything he criticized, or took over from Hegel, is not as a revolutionary materialist.
I am disregarding Hegel's Philosophy of Right, even though that is a serious work, because it is not as a serious work, which has a relationship to us, and that is not what we take.
I am even disregarding the lectures he had on "Philosophy of History and History of Philosophy" because they were so far away he was showing examples that his great ideas are not as good as they sound.

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~~ ^{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~~ ^(in modern times) all the philosophers who came before him, and the greatest ~~was~~ ^{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~~ 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 most total attempt he made was in the Phenomenology of Mind which was ~~to~~ ^{to} have been an introduction to The System, ^{generally recognized as his} but is actually his whole work, ~~and~~ ^{is} ~~his~~ ^{his} greatest ~~work~~ ^{work}. ~~What I want to do with it in addition to making sure that~~ ^{we realize that Hegel, despite the absurdity of his work, is actually dealing with 2,500 years of Western civilization, ^(Western too! for that matter) We must recognize that. ~~But what I want to do with the whole work, since~~ ^{we cannot go into great detail, is to make even a crude abstraction in one sense, and follow that through in Vol. II of Capital.} In other words, Marx says that the only way we will see the law of motion of capitalism}

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 hint 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 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 point in the self-Consciousness, which is 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 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 emphasize the things. Stoicism arose because you as an individual recognized that this is a horrible society--there was universal slavery and you couldn't overcome it. You weren't so to speak a mass movement to overcome it. As you as an individual were great, you were going to be a Stoic, and actually it was a rationalization, for the break had not been successful by the Romans and 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, for maintaining your 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 kind of his own (the ~~idea~~^{idea}) was a new stage of so to speak, retrogression, where the intellectuals all began saying "Oh sure, the Roman Empire is dead, but we will be either stoic or we will in some other form, such as just behaving ourselves, just overcome it." And even when it moved to overcome it spurred by social revolution, whether he considers it at one time Christianity or at another time the actual French Revolution, most of the time it was as if it the French Revolution, that is still not the answer. So that is why I do not want to stop at where you have a kind of your own, and what is wrong with that law in the alienated soul, in Stoicism, in Skepticism, all of which were good little paths on the way to freedom, but they were not the answer.

9701

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 crashed 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, for power, or having killed all the Alienations of society, it just doesn't, it just brings them to a higher stage. So Reason ends this first and most important part of this movement from 500 BC 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 there 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 it to the world came between the person and his development. So there isn't a single person on our stage today, whether you take Mao, whether you take Baylan, whether you take Fidel Castro, whether you take any other person that you can find described in the Alienated Spirit as to what happens when there is a new revolution and you get where there becomes a transformation between the relationship of reality and the relationship of thought in such a way when you begin to identify yourself with the State, you are in the

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 ~~Christian~~ Christian (I will come to ~~that~~ that next).

Culhane

His criticism of what he called the discipline of culture is the foundation for Marx's criticism of the superstructure. This was a man who was not proletarian revolutionary, but he criticized all culture as very good for having first freed us from superstition and all that sort of thing, but now you have imprisoned them by what we call the increasing in the fetishism of commodities and if I would be so far as to say, if we could so to speak shine the shoes of Marx himself, we would recognize that his whole three volumes on The Philosophy of Religion as the most 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 said they were the only interpreters of this thing and they don't let us have a direct contact with God and this humane creature." He talks like even this, first of all we have lot to learn and not to say that we have but we learn ~~from~~ from it. But secondly it comes from the fact that he was a philosopher of religion. He is an atheist that here is our point of view, but he is supposed to have been the height of everything and he committed such excesses both in the ~~Catholic~~ Catholic Church and in the terror of the French Revolution, that he is so afraid of an ~~atheist~~ atheist because here always this is not it, I have to go to philosophy, ~~but~~ but the philosopher

With either Being or Essence, I am going to go directly to Volume III, ~~Notion~~,
and especially the last section, The Doctrine of Notion or of Freedom.
The Absolute Idea

The Doctrine of Notion 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 these 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
And he kept saying when it said Doctrine of subjectivity, Book of Subjectivity,
Book of Notion, and when he saw that it was in regard himself was the expression
"or of Freedom" he was so thrilled and 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. But when he saw that it was developed it ~~was~~
because we had reached an entirely new stage of development, of economics,
of politics etc. There he was compelled in return to Lenin, not only to see
the betrayal of his ~~country~~ ~~country~~ in the social democracy or near betrayal
of his own country, but ~~because~~ because he began to study in the way of thought.
He said, "Oh, my God, I don't think it is just that this actually not only reflects
the world but creates it. And look at that this man could have grasped.
Why didn't he see all that?" And he said, "But why not? What are
the stages of Conception, Analysis, Unification in action. What are the
stages of Judgment? What are the stages of Syllogism? Here does the
Universal of Socialism and the Universal of liberalism merge in a new
state, a new society, a new individual individuals, ~~and~~
the highest individuals, individuals, individuals. They all
merge in this highest individuals individuals individuals. It was
this sudden concept individuals individuals individuals individuals individuals
stage and it has shown individuals individuals individuals individuals individuals
of all idealistic individuals individuals individuals individuals individuals
materialistic ends) that individuals individuals individuals individuals individuals
I want to talk ~~up~~ up just to individuals individuals individuals individuals individuals because it is

In other words there is a movement from practice, that is where I get 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 could 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.

So this self determination, when he begins to laugh at ^{Syllogism} 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 ^{any part of it}. So he begins to make a lot of jokes about people who construct mechanically. And as he says it could be 3, it could be 4 it could be 5, he makes a lot of jokes. 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 the ideal and the practical ideal) but in essence the unity occurs in subjectivity alone, there here it isn't really your first mention of the ideal is the answer." I don't want any more of the details of this because I don't want to get into details. But I do want to say that this is the "Challenge of practice-Ideas" in that I say that it is a challenge of the idea ~~about the idea~~ I don't want to say it is a challenge of the idea, I will talk about the challenge of the idea. I don't want to say it is a challenge of the idea, I will talk about the challenge of the idea. I don't want to say it is a challenge of the idea, I will talk about the challenge of the idea. I don't want to say it is a challenge of the idea, I will talk about the challenge of the idea. I don't want to say it is a challenge of the idea, I will talk about the challenge of the idea.

second subjectivity, but he interprets second subjectivity that the intellectual will do it or will bring me back to the new stage. So it is ~~against~~ ^{against} these three serious ~~issues~~ ^{issues} 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 Marx or Lenin, but by living in a different historic age are compelled to deal with these problems. For example, whether or not Marcuse could be a scientist, his Introduction to ~~Marx~~ was not reproduced in the Japanese edition, but in essence what he said is that I am great in the analysis of Marx etc. in Marx, at least he has been nothing original since the Luk ~~and~~ ^{and} period until now, but the Frenchman attacked it. But when I come to have all this in the period I have reviewed in Part I in order to deal with the reality of Italy, he disagrees with it, and mainly it revolves around the reality of Italy, he disagrees with it, and mainly it revolves around the reality of the proletariat. So I am a romantic. Regardless of his analysis that I am a reality in the proletarian revolution, the truth is that the intellectual, including the Marxist intellectual had not been able to break down either the humanism of Marx or the fact at the point where it broke off on the Absolute Idea (the theory). And the new stage for the theory of the new subjectivity it came from the masses. It was the minor ^{and} strike, it was all this was well in ~~the~~ ^{the} Hotel has a word for it. He says that only the concrete (you know when he talks about compulsion of ~~the~~ ^{the} things to be concrete things) that demands a new stage in philosophy and in science. Because it comes only when your philosophy to be a great reality of the concrete things come from below. So he thinks that the new stage that I set, and these so-called materialists Korsch, and the intellectualist of the, Korsch, do not recognize that fact, and I want to say that.

So that I want to end on what I began, to give ear to the urgency of the times and the summons to recognize the spirit of the age by saying and recognizing the fact that this "new" subjectivity must be broken into two; 1. is what the proletariat is called 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 means Science that is a real definition. There is no point in saying *anything* about realising philosophy if we don't see that. That is our age and that is why we talk about the real point of Philosophy and Revolution.