

Handwritten: "Hand half understood by me"

ROSA LUXEMBURG: "FROM THE LEGACY OF OUR MASTERS" (A review of Mehring's Collection of Marx and Engels, published in 1902 -- but her review is dated Vorwärts, Sept. 17, 1901??) Handwritten: "must be a typo"

RL says that at first glance it would seem that we have "totally diverse" and unconnected youthful writings of Marx: his doctoral thesis on Greek philosophy; his articles on censorship and freedom of the press, and on the wood theft; his introduction to the critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law; and his treatise on the Jewish question... Read alone and for themselves these works are of the greatest interest as milestones in Marx's spiritual development; but they remain, even for the most attentive reader, milestones only from which the development which lay between can be surmised without ever becoming clear in its inner and outer connections."

Whereupon she goes into the highest praise of Mehring because otherwise "even the most diligent and thoughtful study of Marx's ~~works~~ parallels between the Epicurean and Democritean theories can decipher the significances of the two masters of ancient philosophy for ~~Marx's~~ Marx's spiritual becoming..." But to the rescue comes Mehring whose "modestly titled introduction and from the motley, disjointed fragments of Marx's spiritual activity, an almost palpable, plastic figure of the man gradually arises full of life before ~~our~~ our eyes." Whereupon RL again goes into how great the atmosphere is when you meet "relatives, teachers, friends, comrades in study and struggle, the men of the 30s and 40s rescued from oblivion and conjured back to life."

Handwritten: "John"

"It is not Marx who, torn from his own time, is brought before our eyes as an alien, an oldtimer, a dead man. ~~Marx~~ relating his inner aspirations and struggles to us in a wild, half-understood tongue. It is we whom Mehring tears away from our time... so we can live and experience all, so we can see our Marx in the midst of his time and in his struggles, in his becoming, in his growth."

To get how far off the beam she is can be seen from the fact that when she goes into these characters we meet like Bruno Bauer and wants to show that Marx is greater she nevertheless expresses it this way, that Bruno Bauer though he overtops his surroundings by several heads, yet next to the stripling Marx -- fervid, still immature, still inwardly torn, searching and groping -- he seems a ~~mere~~ dwarf." Now if you think that just because Marx makes the older, greater man look like a dwarf, RL is beginning to understand the young Marx, the very next para. (p. 3) she talks of Koppen which Mehring has unearthed from the historic-literary ruins, is an artistic pearl in itself." All we can add here is that this great Koppen, who had indeed made his mark as a tenured professor, was so impressed with this "stripling" Marx who was then 22 years old, that he dedicated his book to him, not to mention the fact that Moses Hess Marx in this same period as:

"...the greatest, perhaps the only real philosopher living today ... Dr. Marx ... is still a very young man and is going to give the death blow to medieval religion and politics. He combines the sharpest wit with the most profound philosophical gravity; imagine Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine and Hegel united in one person -- and I mean united, not thrown together -- there you have Dr. Marx." (Sept. 2, 1841)

Handwritten: "to AD See of ..."

14456

from Marx Without Myth, by Maximilien Rubel and Margaret Manale, p.21  
Harper & Row, New York 1976  
Basil Blackwell & Mott, G.B. 1975

By p. 7, RL remembers ~~the~~ first to praise Marx, because as against Hauer, Strauss, Feuerbach, who never left the regions of abstract philosophic speculation, Marx developed himself into a practical political ~~and~~ rightly living, ~~with~~ unbroken feeling for Germany reality enabled him -- as Feuerbach had liberated humanity from the oppressive incubus of abstraction -- to immediately tie together in this the 'critique of heaven... with a critique of earth...' After which she proceeds into such rhetoric on how great reality and life is and how he had to break with Hegel and that it was "only the dialectic, the method of thought that was of service ... in coming out for freedom of the press and for the poor peasant's right to free wood-gathering in the forest -- was already imposing his viewpoint on the Hegelian philosophy of law and of the state rather than deriving this from it. It was, above all, as Mehring himself says, 'Marx's deep and true sympathy for the 'poor politically and socially propertyless multitude', it was 'the heart' which even enters idealistic stage drove him to the struggles and dictated his partisanship."

She seems to be surprised that at the beginning ~~of~~ of the 40s "Marx was already quite familiar with the fact of exploitation, considering it the height of injustice -- as did the French and English workers movements as well in their primeval form." She ~~also~~ claims that the 1842 article which as editor of the paper he says he doesn't know about communism proves "he still did not in the least hold socialist aspirations", which is the exact opposite to what in fact it does prove, which is that he's against vulgar communism and says he's going to study it. She is thrilled with Marx's father and what an upright man he was and shows the following three milestones which Marx went through on his way to historical materialism: "1- the 1837 article to his father; 2-Marx's dissertation; and 3- the introduction to ~~the~~ the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law."

"Still an immature student, Marx began his first inner struggle with the philosophic-critical evaluation of the entire legal sphere."

To make matters even more confusing, she raises Feuerbach on high, in fact to use her words "to the throne"... When Marx with his new ~~work~~ criterion hasten back forthwith to his first great question -- to legal philosophy, and thus to the social forms of life." Which again is exactly upside down; he has always given law of high place and Marx has never done so. And she then quotes an absolutely superior quotation from Marx, which you couldn't possibly see how one could keep calling him immature, especially since that's the very place where Marx openly already states that it's the proletariat that has all the answers, "as philosophy finds its material weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its spiritual weapons in philosophy... The emancipation of the Germans into humans will be consummated."

right a  
2-3  
NO  
that's  
exact  
what  
is  
the  
main  
idea  
learn  
interest  
that  
the  
preoccupy  
Kul  
15:  
concepts

second and  
The third volume of the Mehring collection of Marx and Hegel which continues the collection from July 1844 to November 1847 and from May 1848 to October 1850 is this time correctly listed as being reviewed Nov. 9, 1902.

*Handwritten notes:*  
Died  
The book  
1848  
1850  
P. 100  
100  
100

It thinks that with the 3rd volume we now have the complete edition of the literary remains of Marx and Engels and thus "a balanced, rounded picture of the last half of their political and spiritual life." She then notes that just as the 1st one was "Marx's inner development from Hegelian to Socialist" so this gives us the results "the magnificent deduction of scientific socialism to the Critique of Hegelian Philosophy of Law concludes the overcoming (1-ry) of Hegelianism by Marx." The second volume, she notes, we come to the world of practical workers' movement. On the borderline between the 2 periods stands The Holy Family, like a spiritual monument -- the last battle in the public arena of speculative idealism as well as scientific socialism's closing of accounts with its own philosophic past."

"Hegel has ~~been~~ already been taken off his head and placed on his feet."

She for the first time speaks of (Marx's) "the overpowering depth of thought. And thereby we experience exactly the same thing as in reading Marx's Capital, where one is frequently surprised by the correctness of the views of bourgeois theoreticians introduced in the footnotes; only to perceive the whole wretched limitation and platitudinousness of these 'permanent views' in the analysis of Marx which follows."

Talking about backwardness, she calls attention to how different Social Democracy is now than when Marx called for the 10 hour bill. The worst of all in this which seems to finally be correct in the sense of seeing that Marx as scientific socialist, as revolutionary, and as materialist, is the most ridiculous interpretation of the permanent revolution. (p. 9) last para. she writes: "But a third element is added in, namely, the original concept, which Marx and Engels then had of the March Revolution -- the hopes for the so-called 'revolution in permanence' -- the anticipation that the bourgeois revolution would be only the first act, immediately concluded in the petty bourgeois and ultimately in the proletarian revolution. Marx's 'address to the Central Committee' bears further witness to this. In this sense, the position of Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung appears to be only a well-considered, crafty tactic which aimed at using the bourgeois revolutionary upheaval as a first step in the ultimate proletarian one, to drive it on to the border line at which it must break down and give place to a second, more radical revolution of the revolution. Seen from this viewpoint, the tactic of Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung was no abdication of socialism, no helping hand to the rule of the bourgeoisie; on the contrary, it was a conscious utilization of the rule of the bourgeoisie as a brief first step -- reckoned at a few years, at most -- of the proletarian victory."

No wonder Trotsky didn't "credit" what she calls the "so-called" theory of the permanent revolution, if that was S-D's interpretation of the permanent revolution. Her next paragraph shows that obviously only when you have a mass party, "a self-sufficient socialist workers' party" instead of merely "loose workers' circles" can you call seriously for revolution. What then, dear Rosa, was the CM?

This is a review of the first volume of Karl Kautsky's edition (actual mis-edition, as we know now, but RL didn't) of Marx's Theory of Surplus Value.

RL greets this great work by showing how the lapse of 25 years since the death of Karl Marx, and still there is a "mine of his prodigious labor of thought has still not been exhausted." "It still nourishes the 20th century. And by now she is ready to say that that is so ever since Mehring produced the first writings of "the youthful genius." She seems to think that this is the last of the unpublished works, and we go into praise of Kautsky for bringing it out.

"Superficially, to be sure, the new work of Marx is anything but a finished, consummate history, but rather a brouillon -- a first draft of the work..." Marx had written this in the 1860s, and as we know now, it was the first volume of Marx's first draft of Capital. RL is fantastic in the way she is constantly praising the editors of those who put together (i.e. Mehring first, and Kautsky second) "a totally and promiscuously jumbled material just as it appeared in the process of self-clarification, in the first research into the field, it was necessary to discover a plan, a logical and historical development, and bring it to an outward configuration -- and yet in this to render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's to fill no lacunae with additions of one's own, to build no bridges. Kautsky has elected the most difficult and thankless share of an editor's rights and duties ..." and again we know this is absolutely wrong; KK took altogether too many liberties, all wrong and ~~unjustified~~ and it took all the way to this age to get the mass. as Marx wrote them (1963).

On p. 7 she has a reference to the second volume of Capital that seems to show that she then had no criticism of it, but I don't know. Marx "gradually bores into the material as though with a chisel, ultimately pressing on to that solution with ~~which~~ whose finished shape he presents us in the second volume of Capital, in the form of an a priori construction: namely, his original theory of the exchange between the production of means of consumption and the production of means of production. For those who wish to seriously study the problem of crises, this fragment will be in many ways as important and suggestive as the corresponding chapters in the second volume of Capital.

on contractions of capitalist production. She quotes Marx (and that is always beautiful!) "which still hasn't found its own form of proper expression" "somewhat as philosophy first construes itself out of the religious form of consciousness and therewith, on the one hand, annihilates religion as such, yet on the other hand still moves positively only in this religious sphere -- idealized and dissolved in thought." (See instead the translation of Theories of Surplus Value, Vol. 1, p. 52.)

On p. 10, she sums up: "The book, like all fundamental works of the Marxian teaching, is not just a scientific accomplishment of the first rank, but a historical deed which can only be appreciated in connection with and in light of the historic struggle of social democracy."

Q

End of page 12 and 13

Class struggle; a turn from pure iron, copper small coin, Marxist daily slogans + theories to the principal goal of the Marxian conception in the total world-dream of world power.

"The book with which Kautsky presents us is meant for them (agitators) above all: for through the high spiritual delight which it affords, it should become the point of departure for a new and zealous cultivation of theory in the ~~EMERGENCY~~ ranks of the party... a more inspired striving for understanding of the historical, philosophic, and economic roots

14459

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

7/15/51

Mehring says that Marx insisted that "when a master has committed the sin of accomodation his philosophical school should not blame him, but seek to explain the accomodation from the inadequacy of the principle in which it must have its roots, thus turning into an advance in knowledge what must appear an advance of consciousness." (p. 56)

Marx calls Epicurus "the greatest Greek enlightener," because he fought "against the tyranny of religion intimidating man with a baleful glance from the heights of heaven" (p. 57)

"As far as Marx was concerned, living always meant working, and working fighting. What turned him against ~~Democritus~~ Democritus therefore was the lack of an 'energizing principle' ". (p. 58)

"What drew Marx to Epicurus was the 'energizing principle' which permitted this philosopher to revolt against and \*defy the crushing weight of religion." (p.59) And he quotes replying to Hermes, the servant of the gods, Prometheus: "For your vile-slavery, -be assured, Never would I change my own unhappy lot." *Understand! this well, I would not change my evil plight for yours.*

Prometheus: "In a word, I detest all the gods."