



2) (1847) Marx sees the draft, and decides not to use that as ~~the~~ ground. Instead, we have the ~~work~~ work of a revolutionary genius, which challenges the whole bourgeois world and with that spectre haunting Europe, assuring the bourgeoisie that its days are numbered, while the proletariat is ~~the~~ conquering power. It becomes the manifesto not only of the little Communist League that commissioned it, not only of the actual <sup>1848</sup> revolutions that follow, but the mark of all revolutions, climaxed in Nov. 1917 in Russia.

3) (1882). In the numberless texts published between 1847 and 1882, in having become a world historic manifesto, no change is ever introduced into it, though errors have been acknowledged. Quite the contrary, the errors too are stressed as historic and not to be touched. What is touched is that 1882 Russian edition to which a P.S. is added that outlines so new a perspective that it will actually not become reality until the death of both Marx and Lenin.

4) (1883-1888). Engels issues a new edition in which supposedly, because Marx had not lived to see the great new developments, Engels puts a star into the very ~~first~~ first sentence of that great historic challenge <sup>Engels' claim</sup> "All history is the history of class struggle." ~~That meant~~ meant all "written" history and what had become available since that day in writing are the new findings by ~~the~~ the new science of anthropology and for the analysis of ~~those~~ those findings by Morgan, people should read his Origin of the Family, which was supposedly a bequest of Marx.

both the poetic flow and world  
Now, 1st Engels stopped ~~the~~ the dialectic flow of that ~~historic~~ historic pronouncement. 2ndly, he reduced the historic significance by making it a question of factual data. 3rdly, it isn't ~~the~~

true  
 That the facts he was talking about that the new science of anthropology discovered were found after Marx's death. The truth, rather, is that Marx not only knew them and made no less than a 98 summary and commentary, but that he was trying very hard to convince Engels to please read Morgan's work. And Engels acknowledges as much when Bebel and Kautsky keep asking how it happens that Engels didn't know that Marx had left many, many, many unpublished mss. that Engels didn't know about. Engels then uses a two-fold answer: 1) that, had he known, he would have bothered Marx to finish them; 2) Marx felt absolutely confident that Engels would be scrupulous and precise as to how he presented Marx.

Whatever it is that Engels thought he did, the point is: Why did the post-Engels Marxists, who were by now acquainted in part with material unknown to Engels, not only continue Engels' offhanded way, but what is worse and what really disoriented the next generation, raised up Engels to Marx's level. It is this just this -- which transformed post-Marx Marxists from a question of chronology to a derogatory category, which, at one and the same time took liberties with what Marx had written and published and did not delve into all the new that they learned from these unpublished documents to create a true Marx-ground for both comprehending Marx and, in a Marx way -- Marx, not Engels -- to interpret their own period. Thus;

1) When the Nachlass was first published it was the person who published it that ~~was~~ edited it and introduced it, that became the bigshot and that was by no means restricted to Engels. It continued with Mehring on the early material with Kautsky on the Theories of Surplus Value, with Ryazanov on the 1844 Manuscripts. The only time a truly serious confrontation with what was new in Marx and therefore in their comprehension of what they thought was Marxism occurred only after revolution. That is to say, the 1917 revolution brought the manuscripts to light, but it was only after still other total crises, like the

H.E.R.  
 C.D. 1/22/21

Sn"  
 because  
 to Phil  
 ground on  
 Engler  
 Why  
 Incg  
 RZ

30s and further revolutions which ~~was~~ compelled original contributions for one's own age.

Therefore, when we confront our own age and do have the overwhelming part of his heritage available, we must in turn not limit ourselves to what is new but reconsider Marx from the very beginning as Marx and Marx, alone.

*Arthur  
Cavendish*

This may be very, very far removed from many of the problems confronting us ~~now~~ on the simple level of leadership, when that is restricted to the period since the Plenum, the so-called personal crisis that occurred in the same period, but was learned by me only recently, and the actual ~~present~~ situation of the single day, Jan. 2, and the view from there to Labor Day. But the truth is, that all our discussions on Leadership have been altogether too abstract. The need to stress philosophy ~~was~~ in place of vanguardism has created all sorts of ~~abstract~~ loopholes as to what Leadership is, first among the leaders themselves, who supposedly all do believe in philosophy vs. vanguardism.

*21*

2ndly, these loopholes created a veritable vacuum, instead of responsibility of leadership ~~now~~ towards the organization. That is to say, instead of merely repeating endlessly, in an abstract way, the principle of "individualism which lets nothing interfere with its universalism" and diving into the concrete and making that our responsibility, ~~now~~ the attitude toward the personal became totally apolitical. I mean that whereas personal is personal, it is under no circumstances true that this is either unconnected with the objective situation with organizational perspectives, with relations between leaders, and above all between leaders and ranks! If that were not so, there would not be so many "scandals" that suddenly bring down a government, a party, a tendency, a stupidity like that of the

JFT with it "Balance Sheet Completed".

Because the last part of the presentation is very much directed to one person, E, the political/philosophical analysis may appear "personal", but in fact I'm going to show that I do not mean just one person. I mean the three sitting here, and I don't mean just personal crises but, at once and the same time, Leadership in relationship to the organization and philosophy as action, as concrete, *And but in rel to Chairman*

but in relation to Chairwoman. Therefore, let's first consider the classes: Originally, there was not a comprehension of what I mean by a single person being responsible, so that it looked like the rank-and-file would not be involved; and when it was understood, the failure to name the reporters, far from ~~manifesting~~ manifesting the modesty intended, actually gave both the wrong impression and shifted responsibility to the author rather than the reporters.

2ndly and more important, that which was supposed to distinguish the different kind of classes these were to be, and show leadership responsibility for the direction turned out to be the opposite. That is to say, there was no dialogue. One talked past the other without any regard to what questions were actually raised. It is true that the individual reports of the three were certainly the best, but again, it was the report of an individual. It was not a projection grounded in, on the one hand, what the book tried to project, and on the other hand, what the organization needed as expressed ~~the~~ most concretely each week.

Finally, when <sup>we</sup> I did succeed in the last class in both having an audience and laying ground for a continuing relationship, the technical end was one more flop in a continuing set of flops that has carried through for literally decades.

As for Leadership responsibilities within the Leadership of the REB, I was most surprised to find that we met only once a month and that I was present at all but one -- and that one revolved around all that I had done in relationship to the center. That must not continue. Both the paper and the political type of discussions the REB needs cannot develop under such ~~casual~~ casual conditions.

As for Leadership in relationship to the correspondence of the Center with the Locals and the outside, I honestly don't think you know what leadership is. It is true that the weekly letters are good and regular; so are the letters that go to the outside which are quite valuable, even though there are quite a few loopholes there, whether in regard to Robert Alexander or Florence Becker Lennon. There seems to be altogether too great a concern with my supposed need for freedom from detail, so that I do not get to know the many important things....

But the one point that really shook me up/because there we had reached so high a new stage in self-development on the one hand, and the need for the Center to hail that self-development, as well as the element that should have shaken up everything in relationship to the so-called personal and the very important perspectives for the future especially regarding the book, ~~the relationship of current events and~~ seeing the inseparability from the book, the Black dimension -- was the Nov. 5 letter from Lou. Here was a case where an NEB member who did not enjoy the super-confidence of the Center, had leaped so far ahead as to create new ways that have not been created by the Center for the way the classes should be run. Here was a situation, where the very local that had been declared by me last year as the best, even as Chicago was considered the worst, and in both ~~the~~ cases it was linked to that Ch. 12 in the book. It is true that in the one case, where it was so good,

it was not so much the Local's "superiority" as the fact that there is no substitute for a revolution even when one is not at the actual spot, but that's exactly it. Both in the question of Iran and the question El Salvador, those great meetings produced a strictly N&L book "internal" meeting which was very nearly a mass meeting. And now, ~~after~~ after the Plenum, we find that very same local both gaining members and the individual organizer leaping ahead.

Well if it were a true center of leadership, that would have been made into a pure "Hollywood production" on a Marxist-Humanist ground. By not just announcing the members which we always do and congratulating them, but also by making the local a category, quoting from the individual letter sections such as we do when comrades send in reports of international trips. So why don't we do that in our own organization reports?

And what exactly does that show of comradeship or lack of it?

Finally, that part was dealt with by Mike -- the telephone.

\*\*\*\*\*

Now if you think that all this is not "really" the perspectives, the philosophy, the politics, ~~the~~ <sup>need for</sup> organizational growth, then you really do not understand fully the horrible whip of the counter-revolution under which we are all living. The reason, for example, that I decided that though I really have no time, I must nevertheless create some for penning a PPE on the Middle East,

15324

Will anyone dare to meet that Trojan Horse head-on? And the new in the counter-revolution is the fact that it wasn't the Russian Army that had to directly invade, but the state-capitalist ~~rulers~~ rulers within Poland that ~~is~~ is doing the counter-revolutionary work. As I pointed out previously to the REB, we have to begin all over again to explain state-capitalism, and the greatest enemy is at home.

This relationship of the objective situation to our perspectives is naturally not just to the Leadership and what we are discussing here but to the whole new stage of our perspectives in relationship to both the book as salesmen and changing from classes to discussions of current topics that were raised at the REB and will be repeated on Jan. 2 .