

9/80

1.

VERY ROUGH DRAFT OF FINAL CHAPTER--

Marx's PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION: *The Dev. of Marx in a Critique of Hegel to the Author of CAPITAL*

"Just as Prometheus having stolen fire from heaven begins to build houses and settle on the earth, so philosophy, having expanded itself to the world, turns against the apparent world. So now with the Hegelian philosophy."

The two most controversial periods in Marx's life in so far as most Marxists have behaved are the first and the

last years of his life. Whereas in our age at least the 1844 Essays are recognized as important even by those who

still cling to the characterization of them as "pre-Marxist," the final few years of his life have become very nearly a total put-down, not even excluding the slander of senility being leveled against him. Thus no one less than Kehr, who had written the most comprehensive (and also the most over-praised biography of him, called this period "a slow death."

To Eszszanak who...

We, on the other hand, will roll back the early works to before he broke with bourgeois society in 1843, to when he was still in the university working on his

Ph.D. Because we think that the greatest two periods are those first 7 years, beginning with the birth of this new

continent of thought in the 1844 Economic-Philosophic MS, All the rest of his life--and of course, the most creative and full original development of all his economic theories,

in no way subtracts from the philosophic vision developed in the period 1844-1850. We will actually roll back

reflection to 1842 because it is there where we can get a glimpse of a new continent of thought turning at him as he considers "nodal points" in the history of philosophy from

14884

3

Theor  
2 Rev  
1819

Handwritten notes on the left margin, including "Evident", "work in", "1842-1843", "1844-1845", "1846-1848", "1849-1850", "1851-1852", "1853-1854", "1855-1856", "1857-1858", "1859-1860", "1861-1862", "1863-1864", "1865-1866", "1867-1868", "1869-1870", "1871-1872", "1873-1874", "1875-1876", "1877-1878", "1879-1880".

This stress on the objective world did not mean either that the subjective thought was totally subordinate, nor that it could do without being tested by reality. It was the early formulation of the relationship of theory to practice as well as the rejection of <sup>the type of</sup> subjectivism that tries to explain away the inadequacy of a principle by "revealing" that the specific philosopher had "accomodated" himself to what is. Thus, he insisted that when Hegel's followers speak of "accomodation," and even should they show that Hegel himself was conscious that he was compromising his principles, it still would not prove that accomodation answered the reason for it, much less that Hegel would have been conscious that the very possibility for accomodation was rooted in the inadequacy of the principle to begin with, and there it was totally up to the new age to work out wherein it was inadequate and how to transend it. In <sup>the</sup> 1844 Essays he will analyze that to be.....

When M. first related the " -- points" to just as

*Begin*  
*5-10-1844*  
*1844*

In a word, just as Hegel in seeing that the preceding philosophers had not met the challenge of the world of the French Revolution, and he declared it to be a "birth-time of history," so now it is up to the new age to see what that birth-time of history demands. As preparation for finding a new continent of thought, one doesn't give up philosophy: "The praxis of philosophy, however, is itself theoretical, it is criticism..." and indeed criticism became the center-point of all of Marx's writings, whether it was the "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" or the Critique of

In returning to the root of his new feeling of the need  
separation from  
for a ~~break~~ Hegel ~~in the same way, this is not a~~  
~~break~~ when he still writes as "pupil", we see the very start  
of the break as well as the never-ending continuation of the  
Hegelian dialectic, and it at once relates itself to the  
actual, the objective world. Thus, in working out the  
"nodal points" in philosophy that result in this continuity  
of the "straight line continuation" it ~~is~~ is due to  
the inability of the "total" philosophy to reflect the present  
reality.

7/20  
1947  
"Necessity is an evil, but there is no necessity  
to live under the control of necessity. . . Everywhere the  
paths to freedom are open..."  
1947

14886

Political Economy or the Critique of Utopian Socialism or the critique of other tendencies within the revolutionary movement or the critique of ~~the party~~ party, as witness the "Critique of the Gotha Program". To put it differently, ~~in~~ in establishing the new, there is a need to ~~see~~ see what had gone before and how total the uprooting must be, before one can create the new, and in <sup>creating the new</sup> creating the new, one first and foremost must see the world as is and know how to uproot it, not to mention to have the will to do so:

"It is a psychological law that the theoretical mind, having become free in itself, turns ~~it~~ into practical energy. Emerging as will from ~~the~~ <sup>Amenhe's</sup> shadow-world, it turns against worldly actuality which exists outside it..."

The following year, April 1842, he began writing for the RZ, the first essay being on the freedom of the press, and the third being ~~the~~ "Debates on the law of punishing wood-theft," which appeared in no less than 5 issues, Oct. and Nov., which is exactly what turned him from law to economics, and which furthermore showed ~~that~~ <sup>his view of</sup> that ~~reality~~ reality was ~~at~~ at one and the same time a rejection of what is and ~~looking~~ at live human beings who were the victims of what is, and ~~looking~~ <sup>view</sup> looking for the live forces of opposition. And even when he is not yet a socialist, he considers it "a new world ~~view~~" that must be discussed ~~seriously~~ seriously rather than treated superficially. Indeed, it is the very next year when his break from Hegel's political views, his critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, is also the first projection of proletariat.

Rosa Luxemburg ~~she~~ did not know the 1844 MS. , and

therefore there would seem to be no way they could have influenced the attitude either to philosophy in general or the man/woman relationship in particular. On the other ~~hand~~ hand, there is no doubt ~~she was more~~ she was more appreciative of <sup>Mehring for his translations of</sup> the few essays ~~from the early works~~ from the early works than she would have been had ~~she~~ she herself paid more attention to philosophy. In any case it is not a question of blame. Rather, it is a question of how deep the dialectic. Thus, she had no criticism of Engels' Origin, though she certainly wasn't afraid to criticize Engels and criticize him severely for the editing of Vol. II of Capital. Indeed, she said one would have to question what Engels did to fulfill Marx's ~~confidence~~ confidence in leaving it all to him, and she certainly was extremely sharp in her criticism of Bebel; she broke ~~with~~ with him as sharply as she broke with Kausky in 1910. And yet Women and Socialism remained the text for the WIM, including her.

Would she have changed if she knew the 1844 Essay on the man/woman relationship as Marx, not Engels, conceived it? We don't know and we don't care to speculate. What we do know is the great contradiction that was ~~pushing~~ pushing at her was on the one hand, the ~~satisfaction~~ satisfaction both with what the women were doing and where they were aiming; on the other hand, her own multidimensionality was certainly not satisfied with so-called equality, or even theoreticians' work. It was as if she had been ~~limited~~ limited by the age in which she lived to ~~be~~ desire no more than ~~the~~ the revolution of overthrow, rather than being able to live in a totally new world.



5A.

And yet when it came to revolution, it was the exact opposite. Far from there being any limitation to the question because this and this is what happened when KM was alive and participated in the 1848 revolutions, <sup>as we saw in</sup> her sharp polemic against the Mensheviks at the 1907 Congress, the greatness of the 1905 Revolution was that it was not the end of the 19th century revolutions, but opened an entirely new epoch of revolutions.

Put otherwise, whether or not one wishes to be as sharp as Lenin ~~was~~ when he called RL's position on the National Question a "half-way dialectic," the point is that RL was definitely an original; definitely did not shy away from polemics, not only with those of her age when she referred to Flekhanov as the ~~type~~ type of great man that you wanted to stick out your tongue at, or even KM himself, even if in that case she would say that it was an age he did not live to see, that is to say, she <sup>not only</sup> disregarded ~~Marx~~ Marx on the National Question, but took the very opposite view, and ~~was~~ in ~~confronting~~ confronting the new age of imperialism which was indeed new, she argued not ~~alone~~ alone on this aspect, but against Lenin's most ~~basic~~ basic fundamental <sup>positions</sup> of relations of production to market.

Lenin, on the other hand, even when he ~~was~~ <sup>mapped out</sup> a sharp point of departure for the 3rd International on the Colonial Question, was most scrupulous in following up the relationship to Marx.

(I wanted to bring in Rosdolsky in relationship both to the Grundrisse and the EN, and especially to dialectics. Take up the post-WWII revolutions in relationship to apartidarismo.)

14889

I am skipping to 3rd point - have a clear  
view of the 2 new points of departure. <sup>5.</sup>

~~Were we to~~ Were we to limit ourselves to even 3 events and thoughts as well as attitudes, it would be impossible to think of the last decade as "a slow death." One single talk at the end of the Paris Commune to the First International where KM declared that it was necessary to go deeper and lower to be with the revolutionary core of the proletariat; that one must not see ~~only~~ the proletariat of one's land as a mere totality, some had definitely been bourgeoisified-- but recognize that ~~the~~ the International rather than the trade unions reflect the newly arrived peasant into the city, or the Jews in the ghetto, and so forth.....

And it is for them that the F.C. lives and it is they indeed who will recreate it on a higher level. Had the 2nd International gotten one whiff of this into their bones, the story of the 2nd Int'l wouldn't have been one more preparation for betrayal.

But then we are ~~not~~ limiting ourselves to the last 7 years. (Look up British socialist relationships of KM) Well, here there were 2 events in a single year that not only show how great KM was, ~~in~~ "in general", but how he reached specifically the two highest developments, theoretically and organizationally. Theoretically he had written an "Afterword" to Capital, Vol. 1, which brought to a conclusion which was really a leap forward, the whole question of the accumulation of capital, adding that were all of capital concentrated in the hands of one man or one corporation, it would change absolutely nothing fundamental in capitalism's law of motion to its collapse. On the contrary, the contradictions would

develop into the general law of capitalist ~~contradiction~~ <sup>accumulation</sup>.\*  
 (As I was to write in 1953, it is therein you can see both and transcendence of  
 Marx's return to/Hegel's Absolutes by splitting the Absolute  
 into 2--capitalism's end and the birth of new passions and  
 new forces for the reconstruction of ~~the~~ society on new ~~and~~  
 foundations. And don't forget, ~~my~~ dear readers, that ~~MM~~  
 asked you to be sure to read that ~~contribution~~ <sup>edition</sup> if even you  
 had read the German because so new and "scientific" were  
 his ~~new~~ additions.)

The one on accumulation was one substantial addition;  
 the other substantial one was the one on commodity-form.  
 Is there anyone today, Existentialist or otherwise,--and  
 the Existentialist Sartre ~~is~~ thought he could improve on  
~~Marx's~~ Marx <sup>who</sup> only "posed" the ~~the~~ question of fetishism  
 --who doesn't feel that Marx is indeed talking to our  
 alienated world and warning that we cannot rid ourselves of  
 these many fetishisms, that only ~~the~~ freely associated  
~~the~~ labor can do that?

187<sup>5</sup> is also the year of the "Critique of the Gotha  
 Program". Think of it. ~~Marx's~~ Here are "just" marginal  
 notes, and they ~~restate~~ not only restate all his fundamentals  
 in the criticism of another, but again project a future that  
 Lenin ~~was~~ was the first ~~to~~ "catch" as he prepared for  
 the Nov. revolution. some 42 years later.



Both those who had KM "buried" and those ~~who~~ <sup>who</sup> portrayed <sup>him</sup> as "autocrat" on the level of Bakunin should look again at the year 1877. The International that had been transferred to the U.S.A. to save it from ~~some~~ a coup by the anarchists had not been able to make much ~~of~~ headway, and had just declared itself dissolved, whereupon there ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> the greatest, ~~most~~ <sup>most</sup> series of railroad strikes, climaxed in one city, St. Louis, in a general strike. KM writes so excitedly to Engels about the great news from America, that he says, at one and the same time, what a great ~~new~~ <sup>new ground for a new</sup> International ~~is~~ and, even if it were defeated, it ~~could~~ <sup>could</sup> lead to the establishment of "a serious working men's party." (July 25, 1877) He was also requesting "a 'blue book' on the Pennsylvania miners." We find out that same year that he had actually written (which he called 3) all 4 volumes, <sup>of</sup> Capital, and the way he had written them: "Confidentially speaking, I in fact began Capital in just the reverse (starting with the third, the historic part) of the order in which it is presented to the public, except that the first volume, the one begun last, was immediately prepared for publication, while the two others remained in that primitive stage of all research at the outset." (Nov. 3, 1877, to Sigmund Schott)

But of course, the most serious, exciting, and yet-to-be probab are the ~~last~~ <sup>in 1879</sup> last ~~1~~ years: ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> was not only studying Kovalesky's work on Russian communal property, ~~and~~ Russian agriculture and Russian fiscal questions,

but also compiled an extensive bibliography on matriarchal law--Bachofen, Morgan, the history of ancient Rome and Greece, <sup>including their taking away the rights of the</sup> English colonial policy, and Traits and <sup>women,</sup> Stories of the Irish Peasantry. At the same time as KM in the years 1880-82 had concentrated on the EN, he was also collaborating with ~~the~~ Guesde and the French Socialist Party in drawing up a questionnaire--101 questions in relation to safety in factories, unemployment, strikes, use of leisure time, and trade unions, but dictated also a theoretical introduction to Guesde's program:

"Considering that the working class, without distinction as to race and sex, ~~it~~ can be free only when it is in collective possession of the means of production, the emancipatory endeavor must be undertaken through the action of an independent political party of the working masses, using all means at their disposal."

In 1881 it was possible to see what conclusions KM was ~~he~~ arriving at as a result of these studies, and ~~they were~~ just one word could cover it all: REVOLUTION. But that one word, both as stated in his answer to Vera Zasulich and as written in the <sup>new preface to the</sup> Russian edition to ~~the~~ CM, was nothing short of a totally new beginning of the relationship of backward to advanced countries, workers to peasantry, and the whole ~~the~~ course of history in the West and in the East; that is to ~~be~~ say, a multilinear view, whether that be on the question of anthropology, on the question of man/woman, on the question of Asiatic mode of production, ~~or~~ <sup>or</sup> on the relationship of the East and the West.