

1917-1918
1919-1920
1921-1922
1923-1924
1925-1926
1927-1928
1929-1930
1931-1932
1933-1934
1935-1936
1937-1938
1939-1940
1941-1942
1943-1944
1945-1946
1947-1948
1949-1950
1951-1952
1953-1954
1955-1956
1957-1958
1959-1960
1961-1962
1963-1964
1965-1966
1967-1968
1969-1970
1971-1972
1973-1974
1975-1976
1977-1978
1979-1980
1981-1982
1983-1984
1985-1986
1987-1988
1989-1990
1991-1992
1993-1994
1995-1996
1997-1998
1999-2000
2001-2002
2003-2004
2005-2006
2007-2008
2009-2010
2011-2012
2013-2014
2015-2016
2017-2018
2019-2020
2021-2022
2023-2024
2025-2026
2027-2028
2029-2030

precisely because it is ~~FEAR~~ to all post-Marx Marxists
TODAY, in facing the challenge, beginning with
after Marx's death, precisely because he never betrayed
aprecisely because he offered it as a "bequest" of KMIN a word, it is
is nothing ad easy as saying, "update" is needed, much less merely
you are wrong; I am right. NO IT MUST BE SERIOUS & TODAY MUST BE
USED NOT AS "update". RATHER, NOW THAT WE HAVE ENGAGE it is no such
thing, how could that possibky be?

Proof of the seriousness
of the challenge is precisely this where we see 3rd
worlds & ~~talked~~ it AMP indeed some of the formulations were
years since you wrote some of the articles in TRIBUNE are

WHAT IS MORE, when it comes to peasant
+ ~~the~~ ~~creation~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~1930s~~
Finally, THE WHOLE OF MARX'S NEW CONTINENT OF THOUGHT & OF REV.
is ~~not~~ ~~back~~ ~~in~~ ~~1891~~
which, on one hand, finally published 64th ed. of ORIGIN
WHERE ~~REDUCED~~ MARX'S NEW CONTINENT OF THOUGHT & OF REV. to
a th of s.v. in pol. eco. along with Morgan matriarcal gens & Darwin's
evolutionism.

So ~~no~~ ~~moments~~
really bring us back to
"new"
HUMANISM not
just because + IS ~~European~~
On one hand, they
out have
MIE with
"Future in Present"

throughout his whole 40 years of work, and was precisely what created the way to discover still newer moments, in which we can actually find the trail to the 1980s.

cal

Take that thesis on Epicurus and Democritus, when he was still a Young Hegelian, and see the question of fetish and God and his love for Epicurus' attack on "the tyranny of the gods" and confining them to the interstices. And at the same time, look at his greatest theoretical work, Capital, and see that in the French edition, in the precise section on the fetishism of commodities, you will find exactly when Marx begins to contrast capitalistic commodity and the other pre-capitalist as well as future societies -- and there we have precisely this quotation from Epicurus. The point I'm making is that not only are there not two different Marxes, one young and one old, but Marx as a totality must be seen not as a merely numerical total but as a concrete totality -- and thus we will find the trail to the 1980s in the 1843-44 break, which I call the discovery of a new continent of thought and revolution.

1844 EP -- 2 negatives and 1 positive + Man/Woman

(Q to rd: ~~Do you wish to contrast RL's analysis of intellectual legacy vs. practical fighters to KM's analysis of philosophy as theory, p. 123)~~ ~~intellectual practice~~

Black in 1861
No Star to Freedom
1861 1860 (2) STB. B
as name

1861 11/17/1861

II. This brief view we have just had of History and its Process and the quote I used from Hegel on Absolute movement of becoming

appeared ~~XXXXXXXX~~ in Marx in his very first draft of Capital, which we call the Grundrisse -- and just as the definition of Time was from V P & P, the expression on becoming appeared as he was working out the laws of value and surplus value and conc. and centr. of capital. Here it is: (Show Grundrisse and point to fact that only at the end of 900 pages, KM first says it is all wrong, he should have started with that, and puts the whole ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ massive mss. away) including the fact that it has many things not in Capital, especially the totally new relations to pre-capitalist society, which we will first get as new moments in the 1880 mss., and think how post-Marx Marxists who finally have grappled with it, but hate Hegel just as much, come to the conclusion that the Grundrisse is Capital -- (I'm referring to Rosdolsky) ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Nothing could be further from the truth.

For CUNY
7/1/1861

Find
1887
First
Grundrisse
Pre-Cap
Contract
to 1861

1861
when
1861
1861
1861

1861
1861
1861

Here is the actual labor of 10 years, before Capital is ready for publication: (1) All we get from Grundrisse are the 2 chapters of CPE and there you can see that he is still applying dialectics (S of L) and he doesn't like that. Before he will recreate it, we have to turn to the objective situation and see a new relationship of reality to philosophy. The specific event is 1860 and John Brown's attack on Harper's Ferry, 1861 creation of the First International.

W.E.
Here
1861
1861

What are the laws of value?

(2) Here are the 1861-63 manuscripts, where we get the theories of value and surplus value and this time

we begin to see the break with the whole concept of theory. It is ~~XXXX~~ in 1863 that what we now know as Vol. 4 and as Theories of Surplus Value (but what Marx called History of Theory) Marx likewise puts away, 1780 pages.

(3) 1865-67, the structure now shows the working day (point to M&F to see actual pages, etc.). Show the chapters on Civil War and ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Working Day, but Marx is still dissatisfied. ~~What happens then --~~ AND THEN IS NOTHING SHORT OF THE PARIS COMMUNE, ~~the French edition~~ (4) 1872-75: (a) concept of abstract and concrete labor; (b) acc. of capital, both as against what he had thought would be the final chapter and the paragraphs left out by Engels.

Q pp 148-149

British
+ to this day, even with new/edition which did correct the language, we have Part 7 broken up into Part 7 and 8, so that what Marx called "So-Called Primitive Acc. of Capital" which was not separated from "Accumulation of Capital" all by itself as if that was limited to pre-capitalism.

III/ LAST DECADE. One of those quotations I read that Engels left out was actually from Vol. II. Not only ~~XXXX~~ was FE not able to publish Vols. II and III together as Marx asked, but he hurried to fill what he considered a "bequest" -- the Origin. Let's turn to what Marx wrote as Ethnological Notebooks, and what Engels published to see why they are not one.

1875 , when French edition was complete, an organizational problem arose that to this day ~~XXXXXXXX~~ only RLWLKM has devoted a chapter (Ch. 11 -- "The Philosopher of Permanent Revolution Creates New Bound for Organization"). We want to stop at the word dialectic and see again when it comes to light as history itself reaches a turning point. I'm referring to WWI, the ~~XXXXX~~ collapse of the Second Inte'nl and Lenin's philosophic reorg'n and ambivalence.

What happened in our age when finally the EN were transcribed and we could see that ~~XXXXXXXX~~ the way Engels filled the bequest had little to do with what Marx wrote, whether that was what he did take up (Morgan's Ancient Society) and what he did or didn't know about, British imperialism and India.

Lenin's love of the Hegelian articulation of "cognition not only reflects the world but creates it" was responsible for the "rewriting" of P.C. as State and Revolution -- BUT stopped short of reorganizing himself on the Party.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

Other forces of revolution: The Peasant Q and Engels work on Peasant wars in Germany to Black dimension , Sojourner Truth and the Civil War, the intelligent Black and aborigines.

Final Q pp 194-5

15478