

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 ~~FEA~~ 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 & ~~and~~ 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 ~~the~~ 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, ~~we~~ ~~have~~ ~~the~~ ~~1917~~  
our ~~future~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~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 as theory, p. 123~~ to KM's analysis of philosophy <sup>practice</sup>)

Black in 2 ways (1) history  
No Star & Freedom  
1860 (2) STBA  
as name

1861 in 17th July

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 ~~XXXXXX~~ 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 ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ 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. *Instead III for the rest*

1887  
Find Grundrisse  
Pre-Cap  
Contract to 1861  
1861 when  
Part 1  
Part 2  
1875  
1881  
1887

For CUNY  
7/17/81

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  
P.T.S.  
Plan

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

What are the new laws =

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