

Part One - entitled Introduction - as together with ...  
95/11  
THE MAKING OF MARX'S CAPITAL by Roman Rosdolsky, Translated by Pete Burgess, Pluto Press, London, 1977 (Published 1968, Frankfurt)

This 581 page book, on which Roman Rosdolsky has worked for some 15 years, has been considered, by established Marxists as the most "authoritative", profound, work on the differences in the structure of Capital. This is certainly the most detailed the relationship of 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 "Methodological Comments on Rosa Luxemburg's Critique of Marx's Schema of Reproduction", which is another 10 pages. Furthermore, we return in great part to methodology when 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) "Critical Excursus" which is over 100 pages. With all that voluminous reference to method -- and, indeed, the reference in those parts I didn't mention is quite pervasively method again, one would think that there really was a confrontation of the Marxian dialectic and the Hegelian, other than the simplistic question of standing Hegel right side up. But, in fact, nothing of the sort happens, as we shall see.

The 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 methodology 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 dialectics and the Grundrisse.

He then takes up the structure, the 9 yer period between 1857 and 1866, which contains the 2 different drafts of Capital, too much of this is just on the question of the 6 books originally intended and the 3 bks actually produced. On p. 17, RR does have a good paragraph against Kautsky's contention that the final chapter ...

Handwritten notes on the left margin, including various numbers and symbols.

Handwritten notes on the right margin, including a large circle and various symbols.



*Verwertung*

Encyclopedia: "The concept as concrete, and in fact any particular is essentially in itself a unity of diverse determinations." But how does ~~it~~ either 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 ~~the~~ 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.

RR does make some important points when he deals with the transition from Capital to landed property and from landed property to wage 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. P. 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 capital carries through its mode of production" even as on page 650-51 Marx had said that conceptually 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 Fowkes' translation of Capital, using the word valorization.)

Appendix to this part, "Methodological Comment 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 ~~and~~ 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

TR

toward  
 part of all of this is that ~~at~~ the ~~very~~ end of this hefty book, RR singles out, as a most important work, Oskar Lange's, who by then was the official Polish Communist greatest economist, but who at the time when he attacked me for ~~writing~~ exposing the Stalinist revision of Marx's law of value and break with the dialectic structure of Capital, was <sup>an American</sup> a professor. That was 1944. It was, indeed, ~~that~~ that year-long debate that had evidently called the German refugees' attention to search me out. Directly after the war, I met RR, and it was in 1948 that we first became acquainted 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. On page 64 (including ftn. 3) RR quotes RL on why she started to develop her work, because Marx's ~~assumption~~ assumption was ~~not~~ "a bloodless theoretical fiction". Again, that is not methodology except insofar as I dealt with it, the contrast between reality and theory. It's also peculiar that RR (p. 66) manages to bring in (ftn. 9) LT's permanent revolution as if that proved that since historically accumulation of capital always involved relations to non-capitalist countries, that proves the correctness of the permanent revolution. I would say it proved the exact opposite unless LT had found in that non-capitalist world new revolutionary forces. On p. 70 RR brings in an important quotation from the Theories of Surplus Value ~~and~~ crises, where Marx ~~definitely~~ definitely relates the question of crises in Vol. I 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 Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, without drawing anything new out of them.

I'm skipping to the section on Rosa Luxemburg, or rather to his critical excursus, where all disputes regarding reproduction are taken up, pp 445 - 505. 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. Again LT is mentioned in a ftn. on p.453 (Reproduction betrayed p.46)

12524

that is the Stalin world end when he took up on it. - you see

TR

RR's critique

RR's

Vol II, ch. 11 - 505

RR's critique of the Grundrisse

And as if that or the other proved anything, RR ends triumphantly with an exclamation point on this sentence: "Their disregard 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 analysis 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 title which states that this is important because these are evidently appended by the Russians to Capital itself "apparently to serve as a kind of official exegeses of Marx's work". This practice began in the 1930s and Lenin would certainly not have tolerated it, if he had been alive." Obviously (p. 477) RR does not accept that reality predominates over all the time. RR also holds that because of this weakness in Lenin's theory of realization, came Lenin's "complete rejection of Rosa Luxemburg's book". Here he quotes (p.480) what Lenin wrote in March 1913 to the publisher: "I have 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 Narodniki in 1899. I intend to write about Rosa in No. 4 of Prosveshchenie." On p. 481 RR returns to the fact that the most important of all of the aspects is methodological, whereupon supposedly Lenin did not understand the methodology because ~~XXXXXX~~ "when the young Lenin wrote his treatise on the realization problem, neither Marx'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 complex 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 "Capital in General" and that consequently 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."

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). ~~RR~~ He says that Lange devotes no less than 3 chapters to the question of methodology. 1) on the economic laws, 2) " contains a (somewhat dubious) presentation of the materialist conception of history; however, since sociology cannot serve as a substitute for political economy, the ~~methodological~~ methodological value of this chapter is very questionable. What remains is the 3rd chapter which deals directly with the 'Method of Pol. Econ.'" 3/1/77  
3/3

*Method*

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): "He 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 fn. 47 on p. 567: "It was in this sense that Hegel characterized 'objective logic' (the Doctrine of Being and Essence) as the 'genetic exposition of concepts' (Subjective Logic). (Science of Logic, Vol. II). cf. Lukacs op cit p. 175; 'This ability to go beyond the immediate ... means the transformation of the objective nature of the objects of action,'"

*Good* 119  
 P. 570, the big climax of RR's claim to concentration on dialectics is that since 1939-40 when Grundrisse was first published, "ONE NO LONGER HAS TO BITE INTO THE SOUR APPLE AND 'THOROUGHLY 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, ~~RR~~ IN THE LIGHT OF THIS, O. LANGE'S OTHERWISE USEFUL AND INTERESTING BOOK, MAKES A REMARKABLY OLD-FASHIONED IMPRESSION!" (This awfully awful and awfully eridite author has all this praise of Lange, even though in a fn. (56, p. 570) he calls attention to the fact that as late as 1959 he was still extolling Stalin for his great contributions to political economy.

Ref. C  
Mel  
NB: clear p477 in date 2 VIII  
Critical Excursions  
Add to class "L" - use  
just that is  
X's alone and  
M's elements

q. 31 / f. / Degree to X's schemes & Report

The main aim to ... on all the ...  
Since Grades ... on this, ... elements

p454 The basic (pre-sufficiency) M's schemes & Reports

at the ...  
for Dial ...  
p457 The ... of the realization ...  
II 460-473 ...  
Mandelstam, Samuelson

Bulgarian Super-Bureau

F's Th & Realization  
p471 FR 90 VII '07' CR II  
p482 - R. T. ...

Hegel's Critique X's Day Hoc  
Because of ...  
some things are "prejudicial" in ...

use of ...  
p493 ...  
did. contents ...  
Hegel's style!

at the ...  
for Dial ...  
p457 ...  
II 460-473 ...  
Mandelstam, Samuelson  
p471 ...  
p482 ...  
Hegel's Critique ...  
Because of ...  
some things are "prejudicial" in ...  
use of ...  
p493 ...  
did. contents ...  
Hegel's style!

Longman  
Scale  
mail

12527