

ROUGH NOTES FOR CHAPTER 2, PART II

FROM THE GRUNDRISSE TO THE CRITIQUE OF THE GOTHA PROGRAM

The 1850s, constitute the period <sup>when</sup> Marx turned to economics so seriously as to work out what <sup>Lenin</sup> ~~Marx~~ made his name ever since the economic laws of capitalism. That, therefore, is supposed to be the centerpoint of the post-Marxist movement. Yet they knew ~~Marx~~ absolutely nothing about the famous Grundrisse. These would not be published until our age. There was, however, one small part -- its Introduction -- which was wrongly attributed to be the Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy and ~~was published in 1885~~ after its publication by Kautsky in 1903 (Neue Zeit, March 7, 14, 21, 1903. It happens to also be the period when "Vorwärts" (3/14/1903) published RL's "The Progress and Stagnation of Marxism". ~~was published in 1903~~ If she read these, it did not cause her to comment but, as it happened, the Marxist movement had been challenged about the stagnation of Marxism; and Luxemburg rose to the bait.

She first correctly separates Marx from the Marxists. She also admits that ever since the publication of the last volume of Capital and the last of Engels' writings, there has hardly appeared any independent development. Again, she rises to the defense of Marx, saying that it certainly isn't because Marx was too rigid, that first "it is only where economic matters are concerned that we are entitled to speak of a more or less completely elaborated body of doctrines bequeathed us

by Marx. The most valuable of all his teachings, the materialist dialectical conception of history, presents itself to us as nothing more than a method of investigations, as a few inspired leading thoughts, which offer us glimpses into an entirely new world, which opens to us endless perspectives of independent activity, which wing our spirits for bold flights into ~~unexplored~~ <sup>unexplored</sup> regions."

~~Nevertheless~~ Nevertheless, heretofore, the Marxist heritage lies fallow.

But she diverts in order to show that non Marxists, Fabians, especially the semi-socialist Bernard Shaw, has had a good time "sniggering" -- it's his phrase, ~~which~~ which she is glad to adopt, -- at the fact that Marxists were acting as if all questions had been answered in volume one, whereupon Engels in volume two not only showed that there were plenty of unanswered questions, but that furthermore, the most important question on the decline in the rate of profit wouldn't be answered until volume three. Luxemburg says that's absolutely true and we all sinned the same way. However, and here comes her main point ~~is~~: "As far as the class war is concerned, the fundamental theoretical problem is of the origin of surplus value, that is, the scientific ~~explanation~~ explanation of the economic and social process of capitalist society." And that, therefore, since that is answered in volume I, they have grown tremendously. ~~It is true that~~ It is true that "Marx in his scientific creations, has outstripped us as a party

