

FORM AND SEQUENCE OF CHAPTER 2, Part II

In 1905 there is enough criticism of the fact that no independent contributions by Marxists have appeared ever since the death of Engels and the publication of volume III that RL rises to the challenge. On the one hand, she admits that is so but denies it has anything to do with the rigidity of Marx's theory. She says that first of all that would hold true only on the question of the economic laws of capitalism that Marx describes and they gladly followed, because nothing has happened in [redacted] capitalism to disprove them.

On the other hand, she says that Marx's greatest contribution --the materialist dialectical conception of history-- is hardly more than "a few inspired leading thoughts", that there is plenty of room for development, so that if the "Marxist heritage lies fallow" it is not Marx's fault but that of the Marxists. And whereas it is very important to develop Marx the point is that [redacted] Capital, even when they knew only volume I is so absolutely great and sufficient for carrying on the class struggle that they as the party of practical fighters have done magnificently. [redacted]

[redacted] They have both grown, and as the "party of practical fighters" their needs "are not yet adequate for the utilization of Marx's ideas" which comprise such "a titanic whole" [redacted] (which) transcends the plain demands of the proletarian class struggle for whose purposes it was created."

Critique
of Engels's Capital

II

Luxemburg's article appears in the same month
that Kautsky published ~~of the~~ posthumous papers what he called
"a fragmentary sketch of a treatise that was to have served
as an introduction to his main work" which was dated Aug. 23,
1857. We know, of course, by now, that that was the ~~very famous~~ Introduction to the Grundrisse which was first published in English
in 1904 as an Appendix to Critique of Political Economy, while
the Grundrisse were not yet known and were not published in full in
English until quite recently (1973), part of which were published
as Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations in 1964, . . . but there
is no doubt whatever that it did as methodology become the
centerpoint of all discussions. The question is, what did it
mean? "as it significant other than endless repetition
that production is central and intellectual development mere
reflection of it. Was its significance in any way related to
the Hegelian dialectic, though it is as Hegelian as anything
in the very early essays which they rejected. Was it anything
more than a new formulation of the perennially quoted preface
to Critique of Political Economy?" It is not the consciousness
of man that determines their existence, but on the contrary
their social existence that determines their consciousness."?
Unofrtunately, clearly no. Therefore we must return to
Marx's ~~the~~ Grundrisse, even though we will limit our-
selves to that introduction and to the Pre-Capitalist
Formations. The latter, while it was not known as integral
to the Grundrisse, was known to the extent that, as journalist
Marx had been raising some very new ^{political} questions in the N.Y. (Daily)
Herald Tribune.

14781

III

The sections on Pre-Capitalist Formations must be developed on the plane ~~of~~^{base} of the Chinese Revolution, 1941; whereas the Introduction that Kautsky published must be developed to prove how absolutely stone-deaf they were to philosophy.

Whether it is ~~a~~^{Marx's} reference to the "myth of Adam or Prometheus stumbled on the idea ready-made, and then it was adopted, etc." (Gr. p. 85) as if it were only a dig at Proudhon, or whether it was the reference to "the Mongols ~~were~~^{were} with their devastation in Russia, e.g. were acting in accordance with their production... And the mode of pillage is itself (p. 98) in turn determined by the mode of production" the understanding hardly went beyond repeating what they already knew of economics. One would have thought that the central section on "The Method of Political Economy (pp. 100 - 108) which was the first developed view of history not alone as historic events but of history ~~as~~ as shaped and reshaped by "labor" especially since the methodology ends with a presentation of what he intends to do with all of the five ~~the~~ subjects, from ~~analysis~~ of categories as revealing "the inner structure of bourgeois society" to the question of colonies and the world market in crisis, would have made them stop to question themselves as the "party of practical fighters". Surely the principle that Marx enunciates as "dialectic of the concepts productive force (means of production) and relations of production, a dialectic whose boundaries are to be determined, and which does not suspend the real difference."