

IN VOL. III OF MARX'S COLLECTED WORKS IN RUSSIAN appears a series of unpublished articles by Marx written in 1844-5 and reproduced by Riazanov under the general heading of "Preparatory work for the 'Holy Family'"; this title was given the work by Riazanov who had previously published this work in Archives, Book 3, pp.247-287 (in Mx's collected works they take up pp.615-670), has the following subdivisions: 1. (Private property and Labor) 2. (Private Property and Communism) 3. (What should be our Attitud to the Hegelian Dialectic) 4.(Needs, production and division of labor)

1. (Private property and labor)

"Labor as the essence of private property, (principle of) pol. eco." Marx remarks how correct is Engels's comparison of Adams Smith with Luther since Luther had abolished outer religion, making it the inner essence of man, while Smith abolished wealth existing outside of man" i.e. there is abolished this its outer absurd objectivity thanks to the fact that private property is incarnated in man himself and man himself is recognized as its essence... Labor is the only essence of wealth."

physiocratic teaching is the direct method of the politico-economic disintegration of feudal property as this is the direct method of the politico-economic form of its reconstruction and already the method of expression carried already not a feudal but an economic character. Here all wealth is in agriculture. They already see wealth as labor but only as agricultural labor as that is the only productive labor. The earth is here considered as an element of nature independent of man, and not as capital, i.e. not as a moment of labor itself. 1st wealth--agricultural labor; 2nd wealth--industrial wealth (industrial labor).

"We see how private property can crown its mastery over man and, adopting the most general form, become world-historical force."

All wealth becomes industrial wealth, wealth of labor and industry becomes completed labor just as the factory system is the completed essence of industry, i.e. of labor, and industrial capital ~~xxxxxxx~~ completed (crowned) by the objective form of private property."

2. Private Property and Communism

"But contradiction between absence of property and property is still undifferentiated contradiction, not considered in its active relation but its inner condition, it is not yet a contradiction until it is not considered as a contradiction between capital and labor."

"Finally, communism is the positive expression of the abolished private property, appearing in the 1st instance as universal private property."

Vulgar communism overestimates material ownership to such an extent that it wishes to abolish all that cannot be within reach and the property of every one, such as talent. Immediate physical possession appears as the only aim in life. The form of activity of the working day is not abolished but is made obligatory for all. Such vulgar communism sees collectivity merely as the universality of labor and equality of wages from the collective capitalist.

"Labor as the lot of every member of the collectivity, capital as the recognized universality and force of the collective... Thus the first positive form of abolition of private property, vulgar communism, is only the form of appearance of the lowness of private property, wishing to assert itself as the positive socialization." "Private property, i.e. self-estrangement of man"

"Private property has made us so obtuse and one-sided that an object is ours only then when we possess it, i.e. when it exists for us as capital, when we can immediately master it, eat it, drink it or wear it on our body, live in it. e. when, in a word, we use it. But from the point of view of private property all these immediate forms of ownership are, in their turn, only means to life life for which they serve as means, as the life of private property --labor and its capitalization."

Real Communism. "Communism in the capacity of the positive abolition of private property, considered as man's self-estrangement, and therefore in the capacity of the real appropriation of the essence of man, by man and for man, therefore in the capacity of complete of executing, by conscious method, of the safeguarding of

the whole wealth of previous development, of return to himself as a social, i.e. human being. This communism as the crowning naturalism when it coincides with humanism, as the law of humanism coincided with naturalism. ~~That is the genuine solution of the~~ That is the genuine solution of the conflict with nature and with man, of the strife between existence and essence, objectivation and self-determination, between liberty and necessity, between the individual and the genus. It is the solution of the puzzle of history and it knows that it is that solution."

positive
"That is why the/abolition of private property --of this element in the life of man's actuality--as the adaptation of human life, is the positive abolition of every kind of self-estrangement, i.e. a return of man from religion, family, the state to human, i.e. social being."

"It is especially important to avoid another counterposition of 'society', as an abstraction, to the individual. The individual is the social essence." (p 824)

CAPITAL, Rus. ed. Petersburg, 1872, from 1867 Ger. ed.
(Danielson, tr.)
Marx's preface dated 7/25/1867

Appears in forms of chapters, not parts.

Ch. 1, Commodities and Money has no sub-section on Fetishism of commodities, although the ideas, in briefer form, is included in it. (Includes Exchange Process and Money, or Exchange of Commodities as sub-sections of that chapter.)

Ch. 2 Transformation of Money into Capital
Buying and Selling of Labor Power appears as as sub-section(3).

Ch. 3 Production of Absolute S.V.

Ch. 4 " " Relative S.V.

Ch. 5 Further Research into the Prod. of S.V.

Ch. 6 Process of Accumulation
(Primitive Accumulation appears as a sub-section, thus: 1) Capitalist Accumulation A) Simple Reprod. B) Transformation of s.v. into capital C) General Law of Cap. Accumulation) 2) So-called primitive accumulation 3) Modern Theory of Colonisation.

CAPITAL, Rus. ed., Riazanov, ed., 1923, from Kautsky's translation, Mar. 1914.

In letter of Mx., dated April 25, 1875, Marx states that corrections introduced in French edition have "scientific value" and the German readers should be sure and acquaint themselves with these corrections he has introduced into Capital since it was 1st published in 1867.

Included in these prefaces, is an afterword to the 2nd edition, dated 1/24/1873, London, in which Marx mentioned that when he visited his friend, Dr. Kugelmann in Hanover in the spring of 1867 the proof sheets of his Capital arrived from Hamburg. Dr. Kugelmann convinced him to introduce some changes in order to make the work clearer and simpler to understand. The changes were: Ch. 1, Sec. 5, Form of Value, "completely reworked"; Ch. 3, Sec. 1, The Measure of Value, "carefully gone over" and Ch. 7, Sec. 2, "considerably reworked". Also "The last section of the first chapter, "Fetishism of Commodities" etc. have been changed to a significant manner." (chast)

Engels' preface to 3rd ed., dated 1/7/83 speaks of changes in the "Process of Capitalist Accumulation". 4th preface, dated 6/25/1890. ERRATA ADDITIONS occur (Kerr ed.) pp. 640-644 and pp. 687-689. The pages 640-644 begin with "No matter how severely the capitalist mode of appropriation" etc. to "to the same extent that it continues to develop by its own inherent laws.... into laws of capitalist appropriation." pp. 687-9 begin with "Competition and credit, the 2 most powerful levels of centralization" and end in the middle of the 1st par. on p. 689 "Hence is the progress of social accumulation is mentioned nowadays, it comprizes as a matter of course the effects of centralization."

The Kautsky translation introduced a few more changes than Engels did, due to such changes in Marx's own copy. However, Kautsky does not detail these changes. Riazanov states that this edition is the most complete, really the only complete edition of Vol. 1.

HERE ARE THE DIFFERENCES of the Am. Kerr edition from that of the Kautsky edition: (1) There is no afterword to second ed., 1/24/1873 where Marx speaks of the changes he introduced due to discussion with Dr. Kugelmann. (2) There is no letter of Marx, dated 4/25/1875 which speaks of the scientific value of his additions introduced in French translation (i.e. pp. 640-644 & pp. 687-689). (3) Chs. 4, 5, and 6 are listed as separate chapters, whereas Marx had them put later as subsections of Part Two, Ebt as separate chapters. (4) Part VIII appears as a separate part in Kerr ed. whereas in later editions Marx had "The So-Called Primitive Accumulation put in as part of Part VII, Accumulation of Capital.

IN THE ARCHIVES OF MARX*ENGELS, II, (VII), Adoratsky, ed. 1933 there is reproduced the notebooks of Marx when he was working on Capital, Vol. I. The outline of Vol. I he gives there follows the one actually used through Ch. 5 (Part V in later editions), The Production of Absolute and Relative S.V. HOWEVER, Chapter 6 was not published as originally intended but is the part known as Accumulation of Capital. The original intention was to call it THE RESULTS OF THE IMMEDIATE PROCESS OF PRODUCTION and to include under it the following: I. COMMODITIES AS PRODUCTS OF CAPITAL (which Marx notes in prefatory note that it should really be Section III as it would serve as the transition to Vol. 2 of Capital) II. CAPITALIST PRODUCTION AS THE PRODUCTION OF SURPLUS VALUE

- The Formal Dependence of Labor to Capital
- The Real Dependence of Labor to Capital, or the Specifically Capitalist method of Production
- Supplement to the formal dependence of labor to capital
- Real Dependence of Labor to Capital
- Productive and Non-Productive labor
- Gross and Net product
- Mystification of capital etc.

III. CAPITALIST PRODUCTION IS THE PRODUCTION AND REPRODUCTION OF THE SPECIFICALLY CAPITALIST RELATION OF PRODUCTION.

IV. ODD PAGES

Colliers
 (All this I hope to translate --FP)

Here are a few paragraphs translated from the above. (Very rough translation)

"Real subordination of labor to capital develops all those forms which develop ~~relative~~ relative s.v. in distinction from absolute."

"Production for the sake of production - production as a self-aim - appears, it is true, already under the formal subjection of labor to capital, as in general the immediate aim of production becomes to produce an ever greater s.v. as in general the exchange value of the product becomes the determining aim. However, this immanent tendency of the capitalist relation is realized in an adequate manner and itself become the necessary condition, also technologically-- only then when the specifically-capitalist method of production and together with it the real subordination of labor to capital... production in opposition to what is produced and concerned about it.. Its aim, that the individual product, etc. contain an ever greater unpaid labor and this is realized only by the production for the sake of production. This appears on the one hand as law, insofar as the capitalist, producing on a very small scale, in the products a greater than socially-necessary quantity of labor. This appears consequently as an adequate execution of the law of value, which develops fully only on the basis of the capitalist method of production. But on the other hand this appears as the motive of the individual capitalist who, in order to outsmart this law to his own advantage, tries to lower the individual value of his commodity, lower than its socially-defined value."

"Capitalist production is the production and reproduction of the SPECIFICALLY CAPITALIST RELATION OF PRODUCTION.

The product of capitalist production has not only s.v. but capital. The worker comes out as he entered the labor process --subjective l.p. But capitalist does not come out as he entered it; it not only is the process of reproduction but the process of its production as capital. Formerly the conditions of production confronted the worker as the only insofar as he found them becoming independent in relation to him. Now the product of his own labor (that condition) that he finds it turned into capital, conditions of production counterposing him. That which was a condition is now a result of the process of production."

"Thus the condition that the process of production creates capital is just another expression for the fact that it created s.v....The process of accumulation is the immanent form of the capitalist process of production...Labor produces its condition of production as capital and capital produces labor as a means of its existence in the capacity of capital, as wage labor."

(over)

see note 5/27

PREPARATORY WORKS FOR "HOLY FAMILY" ** (ARKHIV MARKSA Y ENGELSA
Bk. III, Moscow, 1927--)
(Appears as Manuscript 3, in
Okonomishe-Phil. Ms)

pp. 247-286--
(PVT. PROP. & LABOR)

*The
Marxist
that
Marx*

I ad. pag. XXXVI. Subjective essence of private property, private prop
as an activity existing for itself, as subject, as person, is labor.
It is therefore clear that only that pol. eco. which recognized its
principle in labor, --Adam Smith, --i.e. that no longer saw in
pvt. prop. only some kind of condition outside of man, --it is clear
therefore that only this pol. eco. it is necessary to consider both
as a product of the real energy & movement of pvt. prop. (it is
conscious and independent movement of private property, contem-
porary industry as an independence) and as a product of contemporary
industry; on the other hand, it quickened and glorified the energy
and development of this industry, made out of it *a recognized* force
of consciousness. Therefore fetichists and Catholics think this
enlightened pol. eco., arising--under the regime of pvt. prop.--
the subjective essence of wealth, the proponents of the money & mer-
cantile system theory, seeing in pvt. prop. only some sort of
objective essence for people. Therefore Engels justifiably called
Adam Smith the Luther of pol. eco. Just as Luther recognized
religion, belief for the essence of the actual world, & therefore
came out against ^{Catholic} heathenism, just as he eliminated outer religiosity
making out of religiosity the inner essence of man, just as he began
to reject the pope existing outside of the laity, in that he
asserted *inner* pope in the heart of the layman, --so is there abolished
the wealth existing outside of man & ind. of him (i.e. subject to
preservation & ascertainment only by an external method), i.e. there is
abolished this its external, senseless objectivity, thanks to the
fact that pvt. prop. is embodied in man himself & man himself is
recognized as its essence; but precisely because of that man
becomes, under the definition of pvt. prop., the law, as it was with
Luther in the case of religion. And that means that pol. eco.,
whose principle is labor, covered by the recognition of man, is the
more only the consistent carrier thru of the negation of man, the
more man himself no longer finds himself in ^{the} relation of external

All words or phrases set in bold italics are expressions of out-

pressure to the external essence of pvt. prop., but himself because this tense essence of pvt. prop. That which previously was a fact of outer being in relation to self, the real ^{substantive} ~~renunciation~~ ^{of alienation (alienation)} of man, has now become the act of renunciation, alienation. And just as this pol. eco. begins with appearance of recognition of man, his independence, self-activity etc., so, as it places the beginning of pvt. prop. & essence of man himself, and no longer tolerating, local, national, etc. peculiarities of pvt. prop., as ~~sometimex~~ ^{universal} ~~essence existing outside himself,~~ develops general cosmopolitan energy, breaking every limit and ~~max~~, in ~~order~~ to assert itself in the capacity of the single universality of politics, just so, in its further dev., it must throw off this hypocritical countenance and come out in all its cynicism. And it does approach it thus: unconcerned about all apparent contradictions in which this theory becomes entangled, it pushes forward a much more one-sided but therefore sharper and more consistent, labor, as the only essence of wealth, underlines, in counterposition to the noted first conception, the for humanity pernicious character/flowing out of this teaching & finally delivers a mortal blow to the latter, individual, 'natural', expression of feudal prop. (school of Ricardo), ~~independent of the movement of labor existing in the form~~ of pvt. prop. & source of wealth --that is, ground rent, this expression that has already become completely pol.-eco. & therefore capable of counterposing itself to of resisting pol. economy. Cynicism of pol. eco. grows not only relatively, beginning with Smith thru Sey to Ricardo, Millie etc.--to the extent that the latter could see the results to which ind. will bring, in a more devpd. & contradictory form,--they also in a positive sense consciously followed the path of self-estrangement of man further than their predecessors, but only because that their science is more consistent and truthful. To the extent that they transform pvt. prop. in its active form into the subject, i.e. to the extent that they make out of man--and of alienated man at that -- the essence, to that extent do the contradictions observed in reality completely correspond to the contradictory essence recognized by them in the capacity of a principle. The disrupted reality of ind. not only does not deny but, on the contrary, supports their principle disrupted in itself. For their principle is the principle of disruption.

Spuren
/Volun
om
//

Wahr
Labor
Bew.

disruption
disruption

The physiocratic doctrine of Dr. Quesnay is the transitional moment from the mercantilist theory to Adams Smith. The physiocratic doctrine is the direct ^{unmittelbar} ~~isnapam~~ of the pol.-eco. form of the disintegration of feudal prop., but therefore it is as an immediate shape of the pol.-eco. form of the transformation, reestablishment ^{the} and only/method of expression does not carry a feudal, but eco. character. Here all wealth resolves itself into the earth and to agriculture. The ^{earth} earth is not yet capital, it is still only a special form of it which must preserve its force in its natural peculiarity and for the sake of this ^{Reasons} peculiarity. But all the same the earth is the general, natural element at the time that the mercantilist theory knew only *money* noble metals in the form of existence of wealth. Thus, here the subject of wealth, its material, reaches in the frame of nature (to the extent that this wealth, as part of nature is the direct objective wealth) its highest universality. And the earth exists for man only thanks to labor, thanks to agriculture. Thus the subjective essence of wealth is already here placed in labor, but at the same time agriculture is the only productive labor. Consequently, labor is not yet considered in its generality and abstraction; it is linked still, as with its matter, so with the special element of nature. Therefore labor is recognized only in its peculiar, defined, natural form. Therefore labor is still only ^{acknowledged} a definite special form of the renunciation of man, just as his product is examined still some defined wealth, ^{element of nature} more implicating nature than labor itself. The earth is here considered as something independent of man, and not like capital, i.e. not as a moment of labor itself.

On the contrary, ^{labor} it is sooner a moment of the earth. But to the extent that the fetishism of the previous external wealth, existing only as subject is resolved into some altogether simple element of nature, to that extent the essence of wealth is already recognized --although only partially & in a special manner-- in its subjective existence, to that extent there follows inevitably a further step forward, consisting in this that the universal essence of wealth & that labor in its full absolutism, i.e. abstraction

is raised into a principle, The physiocratic theory shows that in an eco., i.e. in the only just, relationship agriculture does not distinguish itself by anything from another form of industry & consequently there is revealed that the essence of wealth is not a definite form of labor, not one linked with a special form of labor, but labor in general.

The physiocratic theory rejects a special external, only objective wealth, declaring it the essence of labor. But in the 1st instance labor is for it only the subjective essence of ground property (its point of departure is the historically reigning & recognized form of property). It only knows ^{For} ~~that~~ *land* property is the ~~renunciation~~ ^{entirely} man. It abolishes the feudal character of land prop. declaring its essence to be industry (agriculture); but it has a negative attitude to the world of industry; it recognizes feudalism, declaring agriculture the only form of industry.

It is clear that to the extent that we consider only the subjective essence of industry constituting in counter-position to land property (i.e. as industry), to that extent this essence includes in itself this counterposition because, to the extent that industry contains in itself the abolished land property, to that extent its subjective essence contains in itself the subj. essence of land prop.

Just as land prop. is the 1st form of pvt. prop., just as ind. appears historicall in the 1st instance against it only in the capacity of a special type of property,--or, more correctly, in the capacity of a voluntarily dismissed slave of land prop.--so this is repeated under the scientific information of the subessence of pvt. prop. to labor; labor appears in the 1st instance only as agricultural labor, but for that appears as labor in general *appearing at the same time in the capacity of the essence of industrial wealth.*

Every wealth became ind. weal th, wealth of labor & ind. is completed labor, just as the factory system is the completed essence of ind., i.e. labor & ind. capital the completed obj. form of pvt. prop.

We see how pvt. prop. can crown its mastery over man & assuming a more general form, because universal historical force.

3) CRITIQUE OF THE HEGELIAN DIALECTIC

...Feuerbach is the only one who has a serious, critical relation to the Hegelian dialectic. He alone has made genuine discoveries in this sphere and ~~was~~, in general, has truly transcended the old philosophy. The greatness of the accomplishment and the quiet simplicity with which Feuerbach has given it to the world stand in a striking contrast to the reverse behavior of the critical movement.*

Feuerbach's feat consists in the following:

1) The proof that philosophy is nothing else than religion, translated into thoughts and worked out logically, that it is but another form and mode of existence of the alienation of human essence, and is, therefore, likewise to be condemned.

2) ~~The foundation of genuine materialism and real science.~~ To the extent that Feuerbach made the social relation of "man to man" the basic principle of theory, he laid

3) The counterposition of the positive which rests on itself and is positively grounded in itself, to the negation of the negation which declares itself to be the absolute positive.

Feuerbach explains the Hegelian dialectic (and thereby justifies the departure from the positive, from sense-certainty) in the following manner:

Hegel proceeds from the alienation of substance (logically: the infinite, the abstractly universal), from the alienation of absolute and fixed-absolute abstraction. Popularly speaking, his point of departure is Religion and Theology.

Secondly, he transcends the infinite, ^{into} the actual, sensuous, real, finite, particular ^{in its place} (Philosophy, the ^{transcendence} ~~analysis~~ of Religion and Theology),

Thirdly, he again transcends the positive, ^{again puts in its place} ~~transcends~~ the ab-

abstract, the infinite. Re-introduction of Religion and Theology.

Thus Feuerbach regards the negation of the negation only as the contradiction of philosophy with itself, as philosophy which affirms Theology (Transcendentalism) after it has denied it, and, accordingly, affirms it in opposition to itself.

The positive, or self-affirmation and self-confirmation which inheres in the negation of the negation, is here conceived as the positive which is not yet certain of itself, and therefore charged with its opposite, something which is doubtful of itself, and therefore in need of proof, something incapable of proving itself through its own existence, and hence unacknowledged. Consequently, ~~it is based on~~ ~~itself~~ ~~he~~ directly and immediately counterposes to it *positive sense-certainly, positive affirmations*

But inasmuch as Hegel comprehends the negation of the negation in accordance with the positive relation, which is immanent in it, as the only truly positive, and in accordance with the negative relation which is immanent in it, as the only true act and act of self-manifestation of all being, to that extent he has only discovered the abstract, logical and speculative expression for the movement of history. This is not yet ^{the} actual history of man as a presupposed subject, but only the act of generation, the history of the origin of man. We shall explain the abstract form ^{of this movement in Hegel} as well as the difference between this ^{process} in Hegel, ~~in contrast to~~ ~~the~~ modern criticism, and the same process ~~and in~~ Feuerbach's "Essence of Christianity." Or, ~~more precisely~~, ~~we~~ shall ^{attempt to} explain the critical form of this movement which is still uncritical in Hegel.

A glance at the Hegelian system. We must begin with ~~the~~ ^{source} Hegel's Phenomenology, the true ~~source~~ and ~~secret~~ secret of the Hegelian philosophy:

COPY

Phenomenology:

A. Self-consciousness

I. Consciousness

- a) Sense-certainty, or ~~the~~ This and ~~the~~ ^{reality.}
- b) Perception or the Thing with its characteristics and illusion
- c) Force and understanding, Appearance and the Supersensuous world.

II. Self-consciousness. The Truth of Certainty of Itself

- a) Independence and dependence of self-consciousness, Lordship and Bondage.
- b) Freedom of Self-consciousness. Stoicism, Scepticism, the Unhappy Consciousness.

III. Reason. Certainty and Truth of Reason.

- a) Observing Reason: Observation of Nature and of Self-consciousness.
- b) Realization of reasoning self-consciousness through itself. Desire and Necessity, the Law of the Heart and the Delusion of Conceit. Virtue and the Course of the World.
- c) Individuality which is real in and for itself. The Spiritual realm of animals and the fraud or the fact itself. The Law-giving Reason. The law-testing Reason.

B. Spirit

I. The True Spirit: Ethics.

II. The Alienated Spirit. Culture.

III. The Spirit sure of itself. Morality.

C. Religion. Natural Religion in the form of Art. Revealed Religion.

D. Absolute Knowledge.

~~Spine~~ Hegel's Encyclopaedia begins with Logic, with pure, speculative thought, and ends with Absolute Knowledge, self-conscious, philosophic, or absolute spirit grasping itself, as philosophic or absolute, i.e., superhuman abstract spirit, therefore the whole Encyclopaedia is nothing but the expanded essence of the philosophic spirit. ~~it is a self-justification~~ Feuerbach still ^{regards} ~~as~~ the negation of the negation. concrete notion, ^{as} transcending in thought and as thought desiring to be ~~the~~ direct contemplation, nature, actuality, the objectification of thought. In ~~the~~ ^{an analogous manner}, the philosophic spirit is nothing but the alienated spirit of the world, thinking

COPY

Student
 and
 Typist
 in the same
 system

within its self-alienation, i.e., grasping itself abstractly. Logic is the money of the Spirit, the abstract expression of the speculative value of the thoughts of man and nature. It has become completely indifferent to all actual determinateness and is, therefore, unactual essence. It is estranged thinking and thus abstracted from nature and actual man. It is abstract thinking. The externality of this abstract thinking is Nature, as it exists for this abstract thinking. Nature is external to this thinking, the loss of itself, and this thinking also grasps Nature merely in an external way, as abstract thought, but as estranged, abstract thought. Finally, there is Spirit returning to its own source. It first asserts itself as anthropological, then as phenomenological, psychological, ethical, artistic, religious, spirit until it finally finds itself as absolute knowledge, and relates the ~~new~~ absolute, i.e., abstract spirit, to itself, and thus attains its conscious and appropriate existence. For its actual existence is abstraction.

There is a double error in Hegel:

The first appears most clearly in the Phenomenology as the ^{source} ~~error~~ of the Hegelian philosophy. When, for example, Hegel considers Wealth, State, Power, etc. as Essences ^{alienated from} ~~Human~~ Human Essence, he does so only in their alienated form. They are alienated essences and, therefore, merely an alienation of pure, i.e., abstract philosophical thought. The whole movement, therefore, ends with Absolute Knowledge. ^{It is precisely} ~~Logic~~ ^{abstract thinking} ~~Logic~~ from which these objects are alienated and to which they stand opposed with their pretension of reality. ~~Logic~~ ^{abstract thinking} ~~Logic~~ The philosopher, who is, himself, an abstract form of alienated man, establishes himself as the yardstick of the alienated world. Therefore the whole history of estrangement, the whole transcendence of this estrangement is nothing else than the history of abstract, that is, absolute thinking, logical, speculative thinking. Hence, the alienation

COPY

which forms the real interest of this externalization, and the transcendence of this externalization, is the opposition between Being-in-itself and Being-for-itself, between consciousness and self-consciousness, between object and subject, i.e., the opposition between abstract thinking and sensuous actuality, or actual sensuousness, within the process of thinking itself. All other oppositions and movements of these oppositions ~~which are only the semblance, the veil, the exoteric form of these oppositions~~ are only the semblance, the veil, the exoteric form of these oppositions which are the solely interesting ones and which constitute the intrinsic meaning of the other ^{of the} ~~worldly~~ oppositions. What is regarded as the essence of alienation, which is posed and to be transcended, is not the fact that human essence materializes itself in an inhuman manner in opposition to itself, but the fact that it materializes itself from, and in opposition to, abstract thinking. Thus the appropriation of the essential capacities of men which have become objects, and alien objects at that, is, in the first place, an appropriation which proceeds in consciousness, in pure thinking, that is, in abstraction. It is an appropriation of these objects as thoughts and as movement of thought. Hence, despite its thoroughly negative and critical character, and despite the criticism actually contained in it, which often far surpasses the later developments, there is already in the Phenomenology, in embryo, latent the potentiality and the secret to ~~the~~ philosophic disintegration and resurrection of extant Empiricism.

Secondly. The ^{vindictive demand for the establishment of} ~~the~~ process of the objective world for men, e.g., the knowledge that the sensuous consciousness is no abstractly sensuous consciousness but a humanly sensuous consciousness, that Religion, Wealth, etc., are only the alienated actuality of human objectification, of the human essential capacities expressed in deeds and, therefore, only the road to true human actuality --this appropriation, or the insight into this process, therefore, appears in Hegel in

COPY

such a way that sensuousness, religion, state power, etc., are spiritual essences. For in Hegel, only the spirit is the true essence of man, and the true form of the spirit is the thinking spirit, the logical, speculative spirit. The humanity of Nature, and of the Nature produced by history, the products of men appear in it as products of the abstract spirit, and thus as spiritual moments, alienated essences.

The Phenomenology is, therefore, the hidden, still unclear even to itself, and mystifying, critical philosophy. However, to the extent that it holds fast the alienation of Man--even if Man appears only in the form of Spirit--to that extent all elements of criticism lie hidden in it and are ^{often} ~~only~~ already prepared and worked out in a manner extending far beyond the Hegelian standpoint. The sections on "Unhappy Consciousness", the "Honorable Consciousness", the fight of the noble and downtrodden consciousness, etc., etc. contain the critical elements--although still in an alienated form--of whole spheres like Religion, the State, Civic Life, etc. Just as the essence is the object, alienated, so the subject is always consciousness, or self-consciousness. Or, rather, the object appears only as abstract consciousness, man only as self-consciousness. The different forms of alienation which appear in the Phenomenology are, therefore, only different forms of consciousness and self-consciousness. Just as abstract consciousness in itself--as that by which the object is grasped--is merely a differentiating moment of self-consciousness, so the identity of self-consciousness with consciousness appears as the result of the movement, Absolute Knowledge, which no longer goes outside, but merely continues within its own process of abstract thinking. That is, the dialectic of pure thought is the result.

The greatness of Hegel's Phenomenology, and of its final results --the dialectic of negativity as the moving and creating principle--lies in this, that Hegel comprehends the self-production of man as a process,

COPY