Par One o enouted Innal - as topiche god THE MAKING OF MARX'S CAPITAL by Roman Rosdolsky, Translated by Pete Burgass, Pluto Fress, London, 1977 Republished 1968, Frankfurt This 581 page book, or which Roman Rosdolsky has worked for some 15 years, has been considered, by established Marxists as the most "authoritative", profound, work on the difference in the structure of Capital. This is centainly the most detailed of the relationship The Grundrisse to Capital. The appearance of the importance of methodology is also quite obvious since, in the introduction itself (and that lasts for no less than 95 pages) no less than 27 pages (subsection IV) after which there is an Appendix to "Methodo logical Comments on Rosa Luxemburg's Critique of Marx's Schema of Raproduction", which is another 10 pages. Furthermore, we return in great part to methodologywhen we deal with the law of value (Part Three). We return again in the conclusion, which is 30 pages and the whole of the last part (Part Seven) "Criti-cal Excursus" which is over 100 pages. With all that voluminous reference to hod -- and, indeed, the reference in those parts I didn't mention la quite pervasively method again, one would think that there really was a confrontation of the Markian liesetic and the Hegelian, other han the simplistic question of standing Hegel right side up. But an fact, nothing of the sort happens, as we shall see. signy. L'Author's Preface (XI to XIV, dated March 1967 -- he died in 1967) begins with his statement of having read one of the few copies of Marx's Grundrisse, here called "rough draft", in (1948, which made him realize that the most neglected part of Marx's theory is his imethodology) and that is why he will concentrate on it. Then begins Part One, called Introduction, where he does establish that the Young Marx and the Mature Marx and the Rough Draft Marx are all one and the same, and the Grundrisse should put an end once and for all to the idea that Marx had moved away from philosophy and dialectics and become just an economist; in fact, it was the economic ( crisis of 1857 which re-established the crucial importance of dialec-- The this Limits & Kaw & robe. He own Subj Scenier Brown H I tics and the Grundrisse.

He then takes up the structure, the 9 yer period between

145 1857 and 1866, which contains the 2 different drafts of Capital .

intended and the 3 bks actually produced.

Too much of this is just on the question of the 6 books originally

a good paragraph against Kautsky's contention that the final chapter

व जी ज

On p. 17, RR does have

of Capital, Vol.I, on the Historical Tendency, is something that is just a variation of "Change in the Appearance of the Law of Appropriation", and Kautsky is wrong again to think that the Appropriation, and Kautsky is wrong again to think that the Appropriation, and Kautsky is wrong again to think that the Appropriation, and Kautsky is wrong again to think that the Appropriation of Labor.

Whatever was true in 1866 Peculiarly enough, however, though RR calls attention to the fact that this meant nothing short of disregarding the new - Working Day, Simple Cooperation, April 26 and 33 -- he, himself, says nothing about that crucial struggle for the Working day, where the real HENNE in the concept of theory occurred. (See M&F)

RR then deals with the previous explanation of the change in the outline, particularly that of crossmann when evidently the Grundrisse was not known at all, and Berhens. So finally, 6: 25, we reach IV THE METHODOLOGICAN IMPORT OF THE ORIGINAL OUTLINE.

It is hearly all based on the introduction to the Critique of Folitical Economy that was published as an Appendix to it, because Marx, himself, had decided not begin with the conclusion. What is peculiar, however, is that everyone on all God's earth week that Crilliant introduction, as if that is the methodology that Marx himself had used, quoting especially heavily Marx's reference to the letter he had written Engels about how happy he was to have accidently reread Hegel's Logic, and how great a help it was for him.

BUT WHAT NO ONE LENTIONS, BUT ON THE CONTRARY KEEPS REPEATING AS THE GREATEST ACHIEVEMENT AND THAT IS THAT ONE MUST GO
FROM THE ABSTRACT TO THE CONCRETE. HOW IN THE HELL CAN ANYONE SAY
THAT THE BEGINNING, THE COMMODITY, 'IS ABSTRACT? WHAT IS TRUE IS
THAT WHEN HE BEGAN WITH THAT WINIT OF WEALTH) THE COMMODITY, THAT
WAST CONCRETE OF ALL THING, WHICH CONTAINED THE CONTRADICTION OF
USE VALUE AND VALUE, HE WAS STILL SO UNHAPPY ABOUT THAT PHENOMENAL
APPEARANCE OF CONTRADICTION THAT HE SAID THAT HE MUST JUMP TO A
MORE PROFOUND INDICATION OF HIS ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTION -- CONCRETE
AND ABSTRACT LABOR -- THOUGH THAT WILL NOT GET ITS EXPLANATION
UNTIL MUCH LATER. It is true that Marx's stress on concrete, when
In the Introduction he was referring to labor, is precisely the
Hegelian explanation: "the concrete is concrete because it is
the synthesis of many determinations, hence the unity of the diverse".
AND AR does at that point refer to-Hegel's own expression in the

12522

Jerwert to Engl

Encyclopedia: "The concept as concrete, and in fact any particular is essentially in itself a unity of diverse determinations." But how does the prove the movement from abstract to concrete as the methodology Marx used in Capital. In fact, far from being the final stage of concretization, when labor was the concept Marx had intended to start with, Marx changed his mind to start with the commodity and when he told the reader at once that he must go to labor, it was not labor as concrete, but labor as in most contradictory of all concepts, the absolute contradiction. Specifically capitalistic, between abstract labor which produces all value and concrete labor which produces the use value.

DRR does make some important points when he deals with the Aranaition from Capital to landed property and from landed! property to gage labor, and is especially good later on when he shows that it isn't true that Marx didn't use the book on landed property, but included it in Vol. III. 7. 42 is especially good in showing that, as far back as 1857, Marx (Grundrisse p. 651) predicts the form of monopoly capitalism" after which he quotes Marx (p. 730) "generally competition is the means by which copital carries through its mode of production Zeven as on page 650-51 Mark had said that donceptually competition is ( none other than the inner nature of capital appearing and realized as the inter-action of many capitals.") (I must here remark that on p. 45/Verwertung) is to me correctly translated as "expansion of value" and in other places as "realization of value" and I do not understand why suddenly this author basing himself on Ben Fow kes' translation of Capital. using the word (valorization.

Appendix to this part, "Methodological Comments on RL's Critique of Marx's Schema of Reproduction", states that since so much was written on the incorrectness of the schema, he will not spend time on this schema. What he doesn't understand is why the methodological premises were not criticized, for that is the most important (RR must have known about my criticism precisely of the methodology, precisely of the relationship are between reality and theory, since the critique of RL was published some 14 years before M&F, and since I had a considerable number of debates on the whole question at that time of how methodology, specifically pragmatism, led everyone astray also on the law of value. The most fantastic

12523

7e

part of all of this is that at the the end of this hefty book, RP. singles out, as a most important work, Oskar Lange's, who by then was the official Polish Communist createst economist, but who at the time when he attacked me for warming exposing the Stalnist revision of Marx's law of yalue and break with the dialectic structure of Capital, was A professor. That was 1944. It was, indeed, framewilking that year-long debate that had evidently called the German refugees attention to search me out. Eirectly after the war, I met RR, and it was in 1948 that we first became EVE S. and de Thom ccuainted with the Grundrisse.

It turns out that it is not methodology RR is discussing. but the theoretical assumption of a closed society of workers and capitalists. Onpage 64 / including ftn. 3) RR quotes RL on why she started to develop her work, because Marx s assumption was \* a bloodless theoretical fiction" ... Again, that is not methodology except insofer as I dealt with it, the contrast between reality and theory, It's also peculiar that RR (p. 66) manages to bring in (ftm. 9) LT's permanent revolution as if that proved the since historically, accumulation of capital always involved relation to non-capitalist countries, that proves the correctness of the permanent revolution. I would say it proved the exact opposite unless LT had gund in that non-capitalist world new revolutionary 70 RR brings in an important quotation from the Theorets of Surplus Value of crises , where Marx definitely relates the question of crises in Vol. IJI to the question of reproduction, Vol II . (This is precisely the section I translated back in the 40s when I worked out state capitalism and it's included in the Archives) . RR even brings in correctly Denin's Philosophic Notebooks, without drawing anything new out of them.

I'm skipping to the section on Rosa Luxemburg, or rather to his  $\sqrt{\ }$ critical excursus, where all disputes regarding reproduction are taken up. And on the neo-Marxists, pp 552 - 572.

First (p.451) RR takes up KK and Hilferding and Otto Bauer who was the first to attack RL's work. Then comes Grossmann. 12524 Again LT is mentioned in a ftn. on p. 453 (Levolution detrayof That is The Sigher world vend when whom your wounding.

And as if that or the other proved anything, RR ends triumphantly with an exclamation point on this sentence: "Their disgegard of Marx's dialectics thus took its eventual revenge on them:" (p.454)

On p. 460 RR goes back to the Narodniks and Engels onto Bulgakov and Tugan-Baranovsky, but the critique of Lenin is hardly understandable in view of the fact that he agrees with all of Lenin against the Narodniki and for the historic correctness of Lenin's anlaysis of Russian capitalism as well as Lenin's contention that there is no contradiction between Volumes II and III ( And yet) the very title, "Lenin's Theory of Realization" carries a itn. which states that this is important because the are evidently appended by the Russians to <u>dapital</u> itself "apparently to serve as a kind! of official exegeses of Marx's work . This practice began in the 1930s and Ledin would certainly not have tolerated it, if he had hee Obviously (p. 477) RR does not accept that c really. RR also holds that because o predominates over v all the time. this weakness in Lenin's theory of realization, came Lenin's "complete rejection of Rosa Luxemburge's book". Here he quotes (p.480) what Lenin wrote in March 1913 to the publisher Thave just read Rosa's new book ... she has got into a shocking muddle. She has distorted Marx I'm very glad that Pannekoek, Eckstein, and Otto Bauer have all condemned her book with one accord and used the same arguments which I already used against the Marodniki in 1899. I intend to write On p. 481 RR returns about Rosa in No. 4 of Prosveshchenie. to the fact that the most important of all of the aspects is methodological, whereupon supposedly terms did not understand the his treatise on the realization problem meither Mark's theories of surplus value (nor) the Grundrisse were known to him: he could have had only less than an adequate insight into the methodologically very somplex structure of Marx's economic work. We now know that according to Marx's plan for the structure of the work, the 1st 2 volumes only figure as the analysis of "dapital in General" that conscouently the results which Marx obtained in these volumes -- (although extraordinarily important -- )still had to be concretized by a later stage of the analysis, that of "Capital in concrete reality.

12525

literature which consciously and in detail takes up the question of the methodology of Marx's Capital." (p. 552) The very last section is one again called "on the method of Marx's Economics" (pp. 561-572). What he says that Large devotes no less than 3 chapters to the Abestion of methodology (1) on the economic laws, (2) "contains a (somehwat dubious) presentation of the materialist conception of history; however, since sociology cannot serve as a substitute for political economy, the transfer methodological value of this chapter is very questionable. What remains as the 3rd chapter which deals directly with the Method of Pol. Econ.

We're back to appearance and essence as the quintessence of Marxism, and where Marx singles out against Ricardo his lacking the power of abstraction, RR quotes from the Grundrisse (p.327). Re never investigated the form of the mediation. On the question of results not being complete unless they are considered together with the process of arriving at them RR has a ftm. 47 on p.56%. Tit was in this sense that Hegel characterized objective logic (the Doctrine of Feing and Essence) as the 'genetic exposition of a concepts' (Subjective Logic). (Science of Logic, Vol.II). cf. Lugaes op cit p. 175; This ability to go beyond the immediate ... means the transformation of the objective nature of the objects of action.

dialectics is that since 1939-40 paper Grundrisse was first published, "ONE NO LONGER HAS TO BITE INTO THE SOUR APPLE AND THO-ROUGHLY STUDY THE WHOLE OF HEGEL'S LOGIC ' IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND MARX'S CAPITAL -- ONE CAN ARRIVE AT THE SAME END, DIRECTLY, BY STUDYING THE ROUGH DRAFT.... BUT UNFORTUNATELY, The IN THE LIGHT OF THIS, O. LANGE'S OTHERWISE USEFUL AND INTERESTING BOOK, MAKES A REMARKBABLY OLD-FASHIONED IMPRESSION: " (This awfully awful and awfully eridite author has all this praise of Lange, even though in a ftr. (56, p. 570) he calls attention to the fact that as late as 1759 he was still extolling Stalin for his great contributions to political economy.

Critical Excursus he wan am & - a matherlapea Since Guilles o ) on this, 100 Memerits 1454 Teloric Frentham Mais Thomas / Regard 41 The of a realization Horaum 1 1 Nes Harr Is The Realisation \$491 FR TO VIL 011 6(1) [ Recover the new-ray corposed on on my are " preference" 1. content 12527