

Rough Notes for Part II, Ch II, Section II P. For

One world-shaking event -- World War I -- and one ~~critique~~  
~~critique~~ which began by being a  
direct challenge to Volume II of Capital, but ended by being a sharp  
critique of the whole form of Volume I, from the very revolutionary who  
had always defended it, Rosa Luxemburg, suddenly called into question:  
whether the greatest work of Marx, Capital, that was unanimously  
recognized by all Marxists as not only the greatest but the most fundamental  
ground on which all of Marxism was based, was really that unanimously  
accepted by all. So far as Lenin was concerned, he now considered  
that none, including himself, had grasped, and furthermore that it would  
have been impossible to do so without having gone through the whole of  
the Science of Logic. And to make absolutely positive that it was neither  
just against the 9<sup>th</sup> International that had betrayed not <sup>only</sup> non-Russian  
Marxists, the dialectic was moved directly into the Will and directed against  
none less than the one who was recognized as the greatest theoretician,  
Bukharin. Since, however, that was all kept very much to himself, ~~the~~  
~~critique~~ the posthumous publication could not possibly have had the  
impact of a declaration made by a live Lenin. The same on a different  
level is true of Luxemburg. That is to say, since she made the remark about  
the fact that ~~the~~ Volume I also annoyed her, in just a letter, we have  
the spectacle of Rosdolsky in his magnum opus, The Making of Marx's Capital,  
~~the~~ considering the remark as if it were made for Volume II, without  
anyone bothering to correct that "factual" error. Needless to say, by now  
when none has any direct claim

The whole question therefore, insofar as our age is concerned is to see what Marx had in mind for Capital which is in fact a great deal more than the work we know as Capital. Thus, whether we are concerned with pre-capitalist formations or unilateralism in regard to feudal production or lack of it in Oriental societies or the single small section of it that was published in RL's day, the Introduction, which certainly did reveal many more than economic factors -- and RL did know that Historical Materialism was a great deal more than economic laws. The ~~two~~ <sup>points</sup> that are crucial are one, a phil. of rev'n; and two, the depth of the uprooting needed; and three, the organizational expression of this phil. of rev'n. She came closest to the latter in the appreciation of spontaneity; unfortunately she also showed the near fatal contradiction of stressing unity above philosophy.

Here, therefore, we return to both the theoretical work as well as the Critique of the Gotha Program.

*Alferade*

*you for -*

~~RE~~ ROUGH DRAFT BEGINNING

The 1860s did, indeed, open a totally new era both objectively and subjectively. Whether you take ~~the~~ <sup>Marx's</sup> point of departure for the new era to be 1860 <sup>John Brown's attack on Harpers Ferry</sup> or the actual Civil War in the U.S., <sup>the 1860s</sup> as a starting point; whether you wait for the 1871 Paris Commune as the point of departure for a true symbol of a new ~~new~~ social order; whether you take the establishment of the First Workingmen's International as the only "concrete" "proof" that we have reached a new stage in working class development only when we have the appearance of an organizational expression of it; or whether you take ~~Marx's~~ <sup>Marx's own work</sup> on which he had labored his whole mature life of a "subjective" manifestation of a new world of thought, the point is that both objectively and subjectively no historian can possibly act towards the 1860s, culminating ~~in the Paris Commune~~ in 1871, there is no way of seeing that decade was a turning point in world thought, in world aspirations. What did that produce in Marx? And how does it happen that this greatest work which has been accepted by "Marxism", Marxists, suddenly, after a near-half century in the exalted place of the centercore of Marxism was dethroned, not by the capitalists but

YP here or leave it for a very much later stage?

*Letter to Schott  
+ feet of Marx  
1 728  
with in CAP  
in  
1871*