

Thus, tho (p.327)"Indeed no attempt to publish a complete edition of their work was made before the 1920s" is reported as if that fact meant nothing on fact they did NOT indeed become ground for what calls itself Marxist. Then the fact that this 1st attempt at Gesamtausgabe intiated by Rysazanov remained incomplete&that only in 1956 was there an attempt made for Ger.complete ed..&even now (1977) are still incpmplete is again cited without a single conc'sion.+nothing whatever on break in 1930s ,Stalinism,etc.etc.

Mijemo these pp.

THE HISTORY OF MARXISM, Vol. I, Marxism in Marx's Day,
Edited by Eric J. Hobsbawm (1982; Indiana Univ. Press, first
published 1978 in Italy)

Chapter 10, pp. 290-326 --

"Engels and the History of Marxism" by Gareth Stedman Jones

GSJ begins the story by saying that since Engels' death in 1895, it has been very difficult to arrive at a balanced view of that history since FE, who was both co-founder with Marx of Historical Materialism has since the breakup of the 2nd International been treated either as only a follower or as a "misguided falsifier of true Marxist doctrine" (p. 290), and that that couldn't possibly be due to lack of information since the best 20th century scholarly biog. of Engels is by Gustav Mayer .

He attributes these errors first to Lukacs' and secondly to Korsch's critiques, even though Lukacs acknowledged his error. In a word, because in each case, like Landshut and Meyer who were the first to publish a version of the 1844 Manuscripts and wanted to make those Mss. the "proof" that Marx was only a ethical humanist against the Leninist interpretation of Marxism.

P. 295 is the beginning of how these super-scholars, in this case a super-structuralist like GSJ, keep repeating as pure truth the nonsense about how well-known Anti-Duhring was to Marx, even though the year this essay was written, 1977 it was already well-exposed and in an English publication, i.e. Terrell Carver's essay. (The same thing holds true of Marx's relationship to Darwin that was exposed by Margaret Faye which we refer to in the RL book.) The footnotes (#) give a reference to a 1858 letter (July 14, Engels to Marx) and ftn. #10 is a ref. to Althusser on "Contradiction and Over-determination" from Althusser's For Marx + NLR #179, 1973.

He goes on and on about Engels early days from 1839 to 1842 and once more on how Marx was influenced by Engels' article on the Critique of Political Economy.

Towards the end of the article (p. 320), when he comes to the period of the 1880s, especially what FE wrote after Marx's death, specifically 1887: "As a consequence of the division of labor that existed between Marx and myself, it fell to me to present our opinions in the periodical press, that is to say, particularly in the fight against opposing views, in order that Marx should have time for the elaboration of his great basic work." After which GSJ adds, as if that were anything new: "Such a relationship would never have lasted, had it simply been one between master and disciple, creator and popularizer. It worked because the initial theory was the joint property of both of them, so that both could be equally committed to its enlargement through the development of a specific theory of the capitalist mode of production...."

In a word, all he does is to end up with a reference to Socialism, Utopian and Scientific...