"Post-Marx Marxism as a pejorative; why did it take till the end of RLWLKM before it was so expressed even though long before what I thought originally would be the first chapter of RLWLKM, focusing which on the last from Marx's pen, the EN, there was a whole chapter screamed" "Engles is no Marx".

1st, the polemic against Draper was way too lengthy, but that was so, not merely because of WQ, but because 1844 was arrogantly dismissed as the "lucubrations" of the young Marx. In a word, what seemed to have been disregarded all the time was that the afocus was not WL, but Marx.

RL was so precise and <u>volitical</u> that the question of dialectic itself was not dug into so that it continued to look as if it were only the extension of what WVIL was always correct on-- the National Question.

Rather than the "new" element since his reading of the <u>Science of Logic</u>. I now believe that what was not obvious there was that the dialectic especially the Absolute, had been relegated to epistemology rather [including] than reality.

"administrative mentality", while correct, is too Leninist. That is not sufficiently cleared off to say, transfer description politics, so that the free flow of dialectic development as well as origin, is not as starkly and precisely articulated as in Hegel when he talks of the backwardness of so-called of Meccanatural religion that still worships an object, like the Black Stone or the Shpinx of Eygpt, Whatever is dead and materialized and thus who makes a fetish of it acquire meaning; depends ask on the articicer to require meaning;

"The artificer, therefore, combines both by blending the forms of nature and self-consciousness; and these ambiguous beings, a riddle to themselves-- the conscious struggling with what has no consciousness, the simple inner with the multiform outer, the darkness of thought mated with the clearness of expression-- these bresk out into the language of a wisdom that is darkly deep and difficult to understand". Phenom. of Mind (p. 707).

10865

The point is that it is a concrete subject, RL and a concrete movement, WL, that had to be worked through before the full recognition that the sigle chapter that was reserved for Marx had to become a part unto itself. Not only that, Marx had to be seen not just from 1843 "the formal" break with capitalism, but 1841, in his doctoral theses which made clear a great deal more than Hegel. It was the Frussian seality of the 1840s and AND Marx's dialectic which gave new meaning to the dialectic as well as to the reality, to answer his passion for A NEW BEGINNING.

It was only then that all development -- 1844, 1848, 1867-the moment of anticipating: get ready, get set; go. That moment
can not I repeat, cannot, dialectically make its appearance until
all the other elements are set for the new beginning. It was so
for the word "Post-Merx Marxism" to make its appearance after
RL as a totality, after VIL's critique of the half-way dialectic,
after WL's insdequacy to meet the challenge from reality, much
less from Marx's EN.

AND NOT JUST ENGRES, BUT ADIEU TO ALL POST-MARX MARXISTS.

What now remains is how to project all this in one sentence or two or three, but no more.