

Notes after Nov. 7, 1985
take to myself that

What I am interested in regarding Marx and 1st Int. is not the whole period. Rather '71 to the end which I believe is '73 or '74 even though it may not have been transferred to NY until '77. The reason I want to skip both the early years preceding, with the sole exception of LaSalle's figure in Marx's thought, not "personally" but 1) dialectics 2) political economy 3) relationship to proletariat. All 3 aspects were jumped into one as if it were a personal fight with Marx being "jealous" of ~~Engels~~ LaSalle's wealth and ~~xxxxxx~~ intermingling in bourgeois circles up to the very highest ruler, Bismark, though Marx not for a moment suspected that actually ~~Engel~~ ~~Bismark~~ LaSalle was intriguig with Bismark. Another instance was when LaSalle died from the dual--the sadness Marx felt was precisely that intermingling, i.e. how could a socialist waste so much time on a divorce case and so over rate the justice in the case as to have time upon time focused just on that. So that something as absolutely feudalistic as a dual becomes a challenge to his "personality."

When it comes to the ^{1st} international, especially the last years, it had taken all that long time before he ever convinced Engels to leave his god damn factory and come to London and be a member of the 1st Inter. Engels never having bothered to have realized that if Marx was taking all that time "away from" Capital, his life's work, that that was to him the work of Capital. All Engels could see was that Marx was procrastinating all over again, finding any excuse whatever in order not to "finish the writing." Which is why I consider anyone who writes on KM and FE as one to know absolutely nothing. That is why, I am so distrustful on the exact things

10798

Engels has left out from those so-called sweat words that Marx had directed towards LaSalle who already was dead and here was a new group, and Marx himself saw that since Movement was so crucial that they didn't after all make public their critique and history proved them right. Did it? If it did how happen Engels insisted upon faithfulness to Marx with his demand that it be published this time? Wasn't this one more sign of conciliationism--philosophic/political conciliationism--to congratulate Kautsky on the Erfurt Program, ~~and then to~~ add limiting his critique of it to only one sentence?

I want if possible the exact wording of the Critique as written by Marx and the Critique as published by Engels. I think that this year the Marx-Engels correspondence. They would not be chronological.

Finally, the 3 years that are most significant is (1) the one conference directly after the failure of the PC which has the lower and deeper phrase. (2) the 1873 period which is the beginning of the French translation of Vol I--there must be a lot of correspondence going on where Marx shows great annoyance with Roy. The stupid Rubel has the gall to retranslate because the Roy is useless or incorrect and so forth without ever telling us what Roy did that was wrong and why he is so critical of FE on Vol. II and III whereupon he does more cutting than ever Engels permitted himself.

(3) Finally the interrelationship between the completion of that French edition 1875 and the critique of the Gotha Program in Marx himself making a category of the fact that the two are intimately related. Moreover, Marx himself is way too disciplined I mean self-disciplined, on the relationship of organization to dialectics so that all those great critiques and the opening of the whole quest on of the stage after the revolution are

~~with~~ referred to just as "principles" and even just programs.

these letters are responsible for our age

10799