

Of the 3 parts of the Grundrisse, only the introduction was published in 1903 in Germany and translated in English in 1904 and published as an Appendix to the Critique. That means the so-called Hegelian language was available for anyone looking for a "missing link" between the philosophic writing and the economic writings of Marx. Let us see whether we can find out what the expressions were and why they either had no impact on the post-Marx theoreticians or were even used in their exact opposite meaning.

The first section immediately establishes, not economics, but "material production". Again individuals are established, not only as social individuals (which, again was vulgarized) but as HISTORICALLY determined. History is the key word of all times:

- 1st | in order to contrast nature
- 2nd | in order to assert

that, as producing individuals, they were not isolated but part of a larger whole - the family, the clan, the community. So much is the whole concentrated as preceding, both the individual and the fact that only with bourgeois society did the different forms of social union "confront the individual as a mere means to his private ends, as an outward necessity." (very Hegelian)

is as a result, not a pre-supposition of history. 3ly | individualization

4thly | the fact that production, as any other phenomena can be understood, not by what it has in common with other forms, but by its POINTS OF DEPARTURE.

On p. 270, he stresses over and over again that: "political economy is not technology" and that it is not only a special kind but also has "a social personality". Again: "all production is appropriation of nature. (p. 273)

The relationship of production to distribution, exchange and consumption is too well known to need any detailed analysis

SUM TOTAL OF RELATIONS CONSTITUTE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE.

The distinction between material transformation and philosophic ones
Material conditions of -2- existence; PRE-HISTORIC STAGE OF HUMAN SOCIETY

The movement, the method of political economy is from "the imaginary concrete to less and less complex abstractions, until we get at the simplest conception . . . but this time not as a chaotic notion of an integral whole, but as a rich aggregate of many conceptions and relations." (pp. 292-293).

The criticism of Hegel here appears a bit too simple when the method of proceeding from abstract to concrete is made synonymous with "a way of thinking by which the concrete is grasped and is reproduced in our minds as concrete." The whole question of the relationship of whole and parts and the whole in its relationship set as thought grasps it and, (21) as it appears in artistic, religious or practical minds. The same is true when he refers back to Hegel's Philosophy of Law which begins with individual possession, whereas, historically "there is no such thing as possession before the family or the relations of Lord and serf, which are a great deal more concrete relations, have come into existence." (p. 295)

Historically, finally, is used to show that a simple category may have existed before the more concrete, it cannot be completed until we reach more advanced society.

"Labor . . . is no longer grown together with the individual into one particular destination." (p. 299)

The 4th section relates production to conditions of production, the form of state and property to relations of production. It is here where a new concept of war attaining "complete development before Peace" (p. 306) is noted as a point that must be developed further.

A similar new concept pertains to the way in which idealistic and realistic methods of writing history are related, whether it be a history of civilization which he calls "a so-called history" if it only talks about a history of religion and the state but he also notes the philosophic concepts must be further developed, especially on the question of objective and subjective. He uses the expression "naturalistic materialism" which he had not used since the 1844 manuscript.

Finally, far from the stress being just on the material side, the relationship of Art is not only almost excluded from any direction with the general development of society, but the relationship that it does have to any form of society is said to be easily understood, whereas what is important is "why they still constitute a source of aesthetic enjoyment."

Process
concern
with
Meyers
Interview
concerning

Condit
Meyers