

October 5, 1950

Dear J:

After the lengthy time it took me to write this, I "should" be able to offer it without apologies, but that is unfortunately not true. Section 3 of this rough draft is particularly rough hewn, and altogether too discursive. But it is the first time I tried to pin down Lassalleism and to do that at all well without knowing Lassalle's work is of course impossible, and until Grace and I get down to these works that part shall have to remain just a bunch of notes. But one thing I do feel about the MS and that is that I finally do have Ch.I of CRITIQUE and Ch.I of CAPITAL, internalized and so some day what is internal will have to externalize itself. This is a down payment for that "some day".

Yours,

1736
1/30/52

J:

Let me give you an idea of one single sentence. Part 2 of a part: Ricardo's method of thought was essentially Kantian. (?)

Part I of same part: is a description of how R looked at masses and value etc.etc.

We do this in the last section of State-Capitalism and World-Revolution.

Party.

Show the exception that R had of workers organizations, all in direct simple, straightforward sentences.

The chief idea is this is what Ric actually did, and this is Kantian.

What you are writing now is a Communist Manifesto. By the time Marx reached the C.M. he struck hard (He must have been through with Ricardo, Hegel, etc.) and you must do through in the same way.

Marx hid it there: he was fumbling like we were from '43-'48. Then he said I will wack.

Party. At every stage when certain organizations form.

You may work with Ric and trade union movement.

You may work with Marx and First International, social rev.

Marx and Engels--2nd Int.

Lenin & Trotsky--3rd Int.

Communist Manifesto. State and Revolution. Imperialism.
None of them tangled up in a lot of value. Don't write on Value, but form 2nd form, etc., talking to some of us like Grace, me, you.

Write for Johny, Si, Everett.

You may find you cannot. Then we'll know. We did it in 560 & WR; Grace had some terrific formulations. Are you satisfied that you said all you wanted to say in 1st session of convention; and its difference with way you said it first in Pittsburgh?

Ricardo thought he got away from the market and Marx in the early draft gave them credit for it, but by the time of the Paris Commune he reconsidered the question and realized, etc.etc. etc.

These were his conceptions at the time of the writing of Capital, 1st ed. However it was the Paris Commune which changed completely his conceptions/ What distinguished the Paris Commune (perhaps a rough page) From this Marx reorganized his work completely and he drew the conclusion. You are now in a DC 6 going 320 miles an hour.

Aim at Johny, Si, Everett. A horrible example of what you should not do is the proposed summation to war pamphlet. Here it is with my notes.

1736

1 7 3 7
1/7/52

Hello;

You will please forgive me for taking up a general question when only the concrete should be our concern till the date. The good reason for that is that it was the concrete--our organisation that made me think of the general--form. It was in fact that which made G & me search for Marx's conception of party and permanent revolution. What we produced as an ending was wrong for the particular pamphlet but some of the ideas will not be wrong for the workers party-workers state pamphlet, so let me expand (while you can feel free to put this away at this point and not read it till after date)

The question of form which as it appears in Capital we have connected with the activity of the Commune has now revealed itself as organisation, party form and it is the problems so concentrated in our first coming to life independently that has brought this out. Watch this development:

(1) the commodity form comes to life in all its complexity and hence simplicity with 2nd, French edition. It does so because the proletariat has revealed in the Commune its form of activity, freedom, not despotic plan. What however was it opposed to? To the commodity, the bourgeois form, i.e. parliamentary democracy, free outside competition and despotic inner plan.

(2) Having finally fully transcended Ricardo, Marx then settled scores also with one aspect of proletarian activity--the First International which he says in the Critique of the Gotha Programme was the first historic form of this activity and no longer suitable. Why? It is clear that the First which under its broadwings sheltered everyone from British trade unions to anarchists must be replaced. By what?

(3) Lenin is the first to answer that. Note that when in 1900 he fought economists and gave a general answer not merely trade union activity but politics--everyone is with him, but when he concretises that answer--definition of party membership, there is the split into Men. and Bol. Now everyone from Karl Kautsky to LT wants to forget that answer. That's small potatoes, they say, an incident, that wasn't what caused the split; deeper, more political reasons, blah, blah, blah. But that was not incident but essence. It disciplined the intellectual by the organisation, the proletarian organisation.

(4) When the Third Int. couldn't write itself a program, it was not because it did not have high politics, but because it didn't have the concrete organisational form of proletarian activity--the party was no longer it.

(5) When organisation is so inherent in 12 year olds as to have a council of war with minister of war et al as gangs do, while our organization is discussing proletarianisation not as sending people into factory but as putting a stamp on the party, making leadership of party, we have reached a new form, a new category and must watch the dialectic of that as the everything of today.

W
Tomorrow I will be back in NY & the concrete work of these ^{things}/you want for pamphlet. I feel rested & calm and ought to say that way till I see you.

1737

1 7 3 8
2/1/52 Mt.V.

Dear Grace:

I doubt I will write any part or any outline of the book this first week, but it is as well we know the new conceptions that will form the underlying assumptions of the present writing as distinguished from the many previous ones.

First there was the convention and the central axis of Capital --cooperative form of labor vs. despotic plan--began to assume concrete form. It was our organization's relationship to its shopmates, as Bolshevik workers with eyes and ears all open to workers in general. What these brought back into the party, and ^{the} embryonic tendencies appeared in concrete organizational revealed for the first time how concentrated a form of proletarian thought & activity is the party.

Secondly, the preparation for the plenum and the plenum itself concretized for me much of Marx's commodity-form ~~and exchange-value~~ that I did not see before. Specifically, that Chapter I of Capital was not only a counterposition of freedom of activity, plan of workers vs. plan of capital or value-form, but a hilarious take-off of the bourgeois political form--parliamentary democracy and the poor, poor genius Ricardo who thought he had done with market economics but couldn't get out from under exchange-value to see labor as more than a "source" of value. I wrote a brief note to our friend on that; here it is typed.

Finally, there is the brief, very brief talk with him before I left; I did not take stenographic notes, but only a sort of resume. This now is the general conception.

I'm thinking of coming into town Sunday to listen to broadcast, and I would like to spend a few hours in Slavic Division before I return. Will you be so good as to find out whether they are open Sunday; if not, will you please call up, and ask them to leave for Mrs. Adams in the ref. division The Chronicle of Marx's Life. (It is listed in their catalogue not under Marx's Collected Works, but buried in section about Mx.) Many thanks.
R

I found with me the minutes of first W.Va. conference. You might wish to use it in paper, or consult with W.Va. on it, so I enclose it.

1738

2/3/52 Mt V

Dear Grace:

Perhaps no prefatory such as I have written is needed. But I needed it before I get down to the concrete mass of material which as yet has assumed no particular form. So let's let it be for the time being.

It appears to me now also that there will be much material on the question of the party which might better belong in the Wkrs Party-Wkrs State pamphlet, but we can shift later. What keeps cropping up as terribly real is the question of Luxemburg, this time not re Acc. of Cap. but her theory of spontaneity. This business of you can't pass a constitutional decree against opportunism; only the class struggle will overcome it is one more way of shifting on to the proletarian shoulders a task that is that of the Marxist theoretician. You see, she who spoke so much of spontaneity rejected the Stewards Movement, and Lenin who spoke so much of vanguard party embraced the Soviets. The development of our own little grouping and the attempts to run to the masses to solve our problems makes all these disputes so very concrete now. And in contrast to a sort of ad hoc proletarianization, note E's plodding way of bringing one concrete proletarian to leadership. AND DON'T LET'S FORGET FROM THE VERY FIRST WRITING THE WKRS PARTY PAMPHLET TO INCLUDE WATKINS. He was not listed originally as an author. He must now become one.

R

1739

1 7 4 0

FIRST ROUGH DRAFT OF THE LENIN BOOK Feb. 1952

PREFATORY NOTE

A few months before the most devastating war the world had ever seen broke out, Karl Kautsky, the leading theoretician of the Second (Marxist) International, published a "popular edition" of Karl Marx's CAPITAL. There is not a single word in that introduction that indicates that the book Kautsky is "popularizing" is anything but a textbook, concerns itself with the proletariat not as an object, a thing, but as a living subject which is actively, every day at the point of production, revolting against it, and has its own thoughts on the whole of bourgeois society, and will be the decisive element in the overthrow of the old and the establishment of the new.

Yet Kautsky wrote with authority as the leading theoretician of Marxism, recognized so by all, including Lenin, who revered him as his teacher. Not only that. Kautsky was no mere theoretician, he was the revolutionary leader of the greatest mass Marxist Party, the Social Democratic Party of Germany. No one disputed that fact, and Lenin openly envied this party, and tried to fashion his own Russian party on that model. Not even the fact that this International had just voted to find ways to bring the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks together into one party shook Lenin's faith in its revolutionary character. Lenin was much ^{wore} aware of the likeness of the ^{European} professional ~~xx~~ revolutionary and the Russian than of the difference.

Then came August 1914. The revolutionary Social Democratic Party of Germany voted for war credits for the Kaiser's Government! The ^{European} society that was being broken to bits included all its institutions, not excluding the one built up by the advanced proletariat to destroy its ~~own, the bourgeoisie~~. This monstrous fact, which shocked Lenin out of his lethargic acceptance of the Second

International as the world party of Marxism, forced him to reorganize his very mode of thought for it was no accident that he had revered Kautsky as his leader. He had not challenged his interpretations of Marxism because those were his own method of thinking.

So now Lenin sat down to reorganize his whole method of thought. He turned to Hegel's SCIENCE OF LOGIC for the first time seriously. Once before he had turned to philosophy. That was in 1907 when the defeat of the Russian Revolution had eaten into the uncompromising Marxist philosophy of class struggle. The result was rather abstruse.* But the situation now was entirely different. This was no period of defeat of the proletariat. This was a break-up of the bourgeois whole of society. The crucial point was why did the Second collapse with it? So now Lenin turned to LOGIC with the concrete break-up of the Second before him, the concrete differences of the Russian Bolshevik Party from that of the Social Democratic Party of Germany predominating over the general likeness. And for the first time he began to understand the concrete dialectic of Marx's Capital. "For the past half century," he would soon write sharply "none of the Marxists understood Marx!! It is impossible fully to comprehend Marx's Capital, and especially its first chapter if you have not studied through and understood the whole of Hegel's Logic."

The revolution that Lenin achieved in his own thinking in 1915 was the only way, the way, the only way which enabled him to conceive the self-activity of the proletariat in the Russian Revolution. The present book concerns itself with how Lenin had arrived at his politics by means of his philosophy.

The landmarks in Lenin's development, 1914-17, are: NOTES ON THE DIALECTIC, IMPERIALISM, A Popular Outline, STATE AND REVOLUTION. The latter Lenin had broken off in the middle in order to participate in the actual November Revolution. Lenin had broken through all Marxist economic categories and placed the proletariat in the center of all problems.

This was his big leap and the great divide in Modern Marxism.

-2-

Lenin's development parallels Marx's own development from the writing of the CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY in 1859 to the writing of CAPITAL, 1867-73.

Both revolutions in thinking were induced, on the one hand, by great historic events--World War I in the one case, and the Civil War in the United States and the consequent great massdemonstrations in England in the other case. On the other hand, by the organizational form the activity of the advanced working took. In the one case it was the fall of the Second International; in the other case the rise of the First International. In both cases there was, besides the primary break in 1914-17 and 1861-7, respectively, which cleared up all the old, ~~was~~ a supplementary division which showed the new in full. The interim period between Imperialism and State and Revolution ~~fall and rise~~ saw the creation of SOVIETS by the Russian masses. No one told them to build these. It was a spontaneous form of activity in which the masses as a whole participated. Its shape was not a creation from above, not even of the advanced workers, but a mass outburst. The interim period between the publication of the first edition of Capital, 1867, and the French edition, 1873, witnessed the creation of the Commune, a spontaneous outburst that not even Marx foreaw and which yet gave shape to the first proletarian state in history.

This too will be dealt with in the book as it seems to contradict the "value" of theory. Suffice it here to state that it is not the activity "as such" which stimulates "theory". It is that when the proletariat moves in revolution it reveals forces and tendencies which accumulated in the previous period. In its clash with capital and the response of capital--that is, the counterrevolution--it gives insight into advanced stage of bourgeois society, giving the theoretician a higher vantage point from which to examine fundamental premises. There is a dialectical relationship between the "advance in study" and the actual creation of the new society by the masses which escaped the theorist of spontaneity, Rosa Luxemburg.

177 4 3
2/5/53

Dear Grace,

Here is the first section. I have no plan. I'm just writing as it "comes out". When I will have finished there ought to be enough for you to be able to write your chapters. Only after that can we introduce some sort of plan, and submit for reading to others than the three of us. Even then we will be a long ways off from a final draft to the membership as a whole, but it ought to be enough to get views from selected people both in Detroit, on the West Coast and in the youth. We have a long, long way to go.

R

1743

I--ORGANIZATION AND SPONTANETTY

Today when the pressure of bureaucratic organization from the governmental apparatus to the trade union bureaucracy bears down upon the worker so that he has no room for any free movement the break-down of an organization may be met with shouts of glee. In 1914, however, when the Second International, the international organization built by Marxists for the inevitable collapse of bourgeois society, itself folded up like a house of cards, the workingclass was stunned. While the Marxists who did not betray and got over the violent shock of the ignominious collapse were in as great disorder as the society in which they lived, and try to bring peace by fighting for the status quo which produced the war. Lenin alone grasped the ^(scope of the) irreversible break-down of European society and all its institutions, including that of the Second International.

Lenin wanted to finish with the Second International as a type of organization. But those Marxists who did not betray were not of one mind with him. Lenin never wavered for a moment either in his total opposition to the imperialist war or in the total opposition to the Second International. But he grasped one other thing: a correct policy alone was insufficient to meet the totality of reorganization needed when all was in pieces about him; not only the bourgeois world but all the categories he had accepted as Marxist. The totality of the crisis compelled a ^{philosophy,} total conception. He turned to Hegel's SCIENCE OF LOGIC while working out a new analysis of imperialism.

The violent shock he experienced when the Social Democratic Party of Germany, with one million members and two and one-half million in trade union under its control, voted for war credits for the Kaiser's Government revealed that the contradiction was in himself.

Today imperialism, imperialist country, imperialist war are on everyone's lips. Russia calls the United States imperialist, and the United States throws the epithet back at Russia. Similarly at the turn of the century, every country but your own was called imperialist.

To this bandying about the word, imperialism, against one's opponent, the liberal added; all big industrialist nations are imperialist. He then proceeded to produce voluminous statistics to prove what the capitalists had already achieved; cartels, trusts, syndicates, existed; the financial oligarchy out of bounds in his homeland is a marauder all over the globe and particularly so over backward lands. The conclusion? We ought to do something to stop the voracious appetites of the oligarchy and see that the masses live in less misery. The first comprehensive study of the new development of imperialism

was the best--Imperialism by Hobson, which was published in 1902. *Card of course
there were always trust-busters, well-meaning - Marxists, from Teddy Roosevelt*
By 1910 the Marxists had added their book to the growing list of exposés.

Rudolf Hilferding's Finance Capital by its very title emphasized what they considered to be the primary feature of the present stage of capitalist development. Hilferding demonstrated how great the capitalist combines were, and how small the financial oligarchy. There was an air about the book, despite all the talk about "dictatorship of the proletariat" as if monopolistic control overcame the anarchy of the market. The air of stability, it is true, is wrapped in talk about the "inevitability of socialism" but inevitability was there because the mass organizations were the ^{only} "to take over". Where there was capitalist disorder, there would be socialist order. Violence may be necessary in the process of "taking over", but there was certainly nothing there about the need to smash up this ubiquitous machine to bits and reorganize totally the relations of man at the point of production, from below and by themselves. The underlying assumption seemed to be that a ruling cadre, labor organizers, would replace the financial oligarchy and do internationally what the bourgeoisie had done nationally; bring in order and abolish anarchy of the market, the international competition. The international solidarity of the

-7-

proletariat was counterposed to international competition. Period. Paragraph. End of thought. On to more statistics.

It is a vulgar materialist analysis. The workers never come out as alive subjects with anything to say. But no one, not even Lenin detected that. In fact when the war had already broken out and the Second International "destined" to take over had capitulated completely and fully and were divided only as the capitalists were divided, geographically, Lenin had finished an Essay on Marx and in the Bibliography ^{cites} Hilferding's book as a work that brings the analysis of Marx's Capital up to date. And as late as December 1915 he introduced favorably Bukharin's World Economy and Imperialism which is distinguished from Hilferding's analysis only by the fact that it is published later and can name the betrayers. The attack is on Kautsky's theory of ultra-imperialism, which holds that politics of imperialism is bad but the economics might develop along the lines of ultra-imperialism, that is the organization of the whole world. But the attack is economist.

Now Lenin more than a decade back had attacked the economists in his country and showed that a reorganization of national capital, far from solving any crisis of capitalism, would deepen it. And he had fought the underconsumptionism of Luxemburg, demonstrating if you move one inch away from the relations at the point of production, you are bound not to see the living worker and so have merely subjectively as a revolutionist drag him by his hair and say well, "long before" the final inevitable exhaustion of capitalism, the proletariat will, etc. etc. But here he was using precisely these words "long before" there will be a single world trust "capitalism will turn into its opposite", by which he meant socialism.

It was clear now that he had been a Russian Marxist concerned with a bourgeois revolution. He had failed to analyze capitalism in an advanced country and yet such a land was the centre of the Second International and that is precisely where it was shattered to bits.

Suddenly something hit him, hit him hard ^{and} he neared the competition

1746

of his Notes on Dialectic he pounded away at aphorism after aphorism:

"Marx didn't leave us a Logic. But he left us the logic of Capital."

"It is impossible to understand Capital, especially its first chapter without understanding the whole of the Logic. Consequently no Marxist for the past half century has understood Capital."

Hegelianism

"Movement and self-movement. That is the core of ~~Marxism~~ That is what we must grasp, purify like Marx did."

"Movement and self-movement. ~~BB~~ independent spontaneous, internally necessary movement. Who would have believed this is the core of Hegelianism?"

"Drive, impulse, self-movement spontaneous activity. That is what we must hold it. This drive it made LEAPS LEAPS LEAPS LEAPS"

~~XX~~

Lenin keeps emphasizing and repeating the dialectic truth that has damned upon him "unity of opposites", "transformation into opposite", "ever-deeper connections" "ever greater contradictions", "self-development", "the transition. TRANSITION TRANSITION TRANSITION." #Abstract and concrete/ Abstract is a weapon in the hands of the ruling class. Concrete, concrete, concrete. The truth is concrete. The dialectic is in the concrete. There is a "relative in every absolute, and an absolute in every relative."

The unity of opposites and development, central to Hegel's objective LOGIC now gives direction to Lenin's study of Imperialism and with the empiric concrete and ever-deeper connections he is off. Later we will meet again the impulse, the drives, the spontaneous activity for the man of organization knows what moves the world.

I. Transformation into opposite

a) Competition and Monopoly

The empiric concrete, imperialism, is the expression of something, the stage of capitalist development. But the concentration and centralization of capital has a new quality. The syndicates, cartels, trusts aren't just a "form" of large-scale production. It is a new absolute, a new category called MONOPOLY. Imperialism is MONOPOLY. Cartels, syndicates, trusts are MONOPOLY. That is its actuality, essence and appearance both. Formerly large-scale

production expressed itself in COMPETITION. Now competition had been transformed into its opposite, Monopoly.

But monopoly has not transcended, overcome competition. They co-exists, and plague each other, and cannot exist without each other. The greater the monopolies the more cut-throat the competition, the fewer the monopolies, the more intense the competition, and yet competition has been transformed into its opposite, monopoly. And the domination of monopoly means STAGNATION, DECAY. Monopoly capitalism is moribund, it is a TRANSITION into something higher, but right now it has itself in a stranglehold so that competition has burst forth as a war for the redivision of the world.

b) Imperialist Economism and Self-Determination of Nations

Now this transformation into opposite applies not only to economics but to politics. Free competition has meant parliamentary democracy. Now monopoly is so corrupting that the ~~the~~ difference between monarchical and republican rule is of very little difference. In fact, both kinds in their imperialist oppression of foreign lands leave absolutely no democracy to the oppressed lands.

Today when bourgeois democracy is totally bankrupt that may seem like no discovery. But in 1914, "the war to end wars", "the war for democracy", that was news not only to "the public" but even to his own colleagues, who from the imperialist state "the piratical state" as they called it, wished immediately to grant it all and not put up a fight. Lenin, on the other hand, this means the proletariat alone is democratic and hence it must fight for the self-determination of the nations oppressed by its rulers. Heretofore self-determination was a principle with Marxists, but it was hardly used in Western Europe. Now said Lenin it required an URGENCY, first because the oppressed nation should be free, secondly because it gives the proletariat a new ally, THE WHOLE POPULATION OF THE OPPRESSED NATION, from the Irish to the Polish to the Negro in America +

who all in their concrete fight for democracy act also as bacilli for the

He writes not only the Russian Revolution but the revolutionary attitude in the State 7/1/15. D. 500-185. D. 1914. D. 1914. D. 1914.

socialist revolution which is nothing if not democratic. Moreover, precisely because the world is divided up among the Big Power and they are fighting now for a re-division, self-determination is not unfeasible; you can take advantage of their divisions. So he fought the imperialist economists of Bukharin and of Rosa Luxemburg whom he told that of course democracy is not "an absolute" but it can now have a new content, now that there is this sharp division between bourgeois democracy which is monopolized and dead, and proletarian democracy. It will mean THE DEMOCRATIC MOBILIZATION OF THE MASSES FOR REVOLUTION. All revolutions, even bourgeois have used "democracy" as method for mobilization, but with the proletariat it will be METHOD, AIM, AND END.

5) Mass and aristocracy of labor

But we must watch out for the aristocracy of labor in the oppressor country. Transformation into opposite applies not only to economics and not only to politics, but to every single phenomenon. That is the great dialectical principle, everything has its opposite. Take labor. There is a split in that category. Labor isn't one abstract mass, or one organized mass. A stratum of labor has been transformed into its opposite, the aristocracy of labor. The superprofits of imperialism has cushioned that aristocracy of labor. This in a word is the deep economic root of the fall of the Second ~~International~~ International. That is what they represent: the aristocracy of labor. That is that leadership and that organization, bourgeois to the core.

Monopoly, the new universal of capitalism, has brought with it the Second International devoted to capitalism. Its opportunism was not due to gradualness, but to the development of capitalism itself, 1889-1914. There was a stratification ~~within~~ within labor itself, thus while we have a new category, Monopoly, we have a split in another category of labor. Everything has its opposite and what is the absolute opposite of Monopoly--Well, it isn't socialization of labor, Monopoly is a TRANSITION when the fundamental features of capitalism have reached their highest point and been transformed into their opposite. But Lenin stops here in his IMPERIALISM and the Notebooks

on Imperialism which are more than 5 times the size of the work itself, 673 pages. He leaves the question open. It is a TRANSITION.

Now let's catch our breath with Lenin, and see how far he had broken with his past.

PRE-1915 Lenin sees nothing new in imperialism; it is a catchword. Syndicates, trusts, cartels are a form of large-scale production.

POST-1915 Lenin has found a new category, MONOPOLY. Imperialism is monopoly. Syndicates, trusts, cartels are monopoly.

PRE-1915 sees socialisation of labor as an end, an aim; he is fighting against semi-feudal Russian and sees it as progressive aspect of capitalism.

POST-1915 sees socialisation of labor as a TRANSITION to something higher he does not define; but he links monopoly and socialization as one.

PRE-1915 sees opportunism of Second International as due to peaceful development of capitalism.

POST-1915 sees opportunism as a stage of development in capitalism itself and the superprofits of imperialism which created an aristocracy of labor and an International to represent it.

PRE-1915 sees proletariat as one abstract mass.

POST-1915 sees category broken into mass, and aristocracy of labor, and further divided between labor of oppressed and oppressor nation.

PRE-1915 sees Self-Determination as a principle of socialism, especially needed in Tsarist Russia, to let Poland, Finland, Ukraine free.

POST-1915 says SELF-DETERMINATION of nations has acquired a NEW URGENCY and applies to Europe. (What East European ^{worker} today wouldn't die to see his country freely self-determine its fate from the Stalinist totalitarian stranglehold, and what "Communist Party" dares grant that principle)

PRE-1915 Lenin sees three constituent elements of Marxism.

POST-1915 Lenin says dialectics is the theory of knowledge, the unity of opposites being not a sum of examples, but as recognition, discovery of contradictory, mutually-exclusive opposites in all phenomena.

The contradiction in Lenin, is the contradiction between the practicing revolution, dialectical to the core, and thinking Kautskyan is the contradiction in Russian society between the singular development from feudal monarchy to bourgeois monarchy through proletarian methods of struggle. The physical and political break with the Second International was immediate. The break in philosophic method took two years of hard work, and concrete, very concrete study and observance of every phenomenon ^{and} movement.

The point to remember is that basic changes in politics and revolution have taken place at the same time as the basic changes have taken place in society. The great leaps in theory require a revolution in the thinking of the theoretician precisely because, even though Marxist, he is not at the point of production and is thus divorced from the real class struggle. Thus the processes of his mind loses sight of the revolutionary intervention of the masses as the only means to resolve the concrete new stage of crisis. Once that is done nothing will save him from approximating the bourgeois solution. That is why the development of Lenin and of Marx is as important ^{rise of the First International,} as the collapse of the Second International, ^{the Russian Revolution or} and the world-shaking events ⁽¹⁹¹⁶⁻¹⁹¹⁷⁾ that face us today.

Crises used to concern only revolutionaries--and counter-revolutionaries.

Today everyone talks about crisis in world history. That is our age which is torn between the intellectual's blue print and the wildcatting workers, United Nations and atomic warfare. Our age has much to illuminate the two divides in the development of Marxism, and much to learn from them.

1 7 5 2

Dear Grace:

It's beginning to assume some sort of shape in my head.

When I get back to Marx I believe I will have also solved the problem of Lassalle. Remember how we tried to pin him down as state-capitalist and make him the real enemy but couldn't because although he was that he was never a theoretician? Well, I got it now, by working through the party. That little party of ours is really something. It is illuminating everything for me.

R

1752

B

II*LENIN, THE RUSSIAN MARXIST

Going deeper lower into the masses is the essence of Marxist movement of liberation. But until the first world war broke out, the Second International feel, the study of Hegel and restudy of Marx had illuminated the analysis of the advanced stage of capitalism ^{in Russia} Lenin had not singled this out as the essence.

But wasnot Lenin a revolutionist and every word and action of his centered around the Russian proletariat? Yes, the Russian ^{backward} Lower and deeper into the masses in/Russia couldn't have meant going to the unskilled as a separate strata. It meant the proletariat as a whole plus the lowest strata of the peasantry. And that is what Lenin aimed at with his slogan "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry."

So backward, so semi-feudal was Russia that he had first to fight the Populists to have the proletariat recognized as the revolutionary force. In Russia Marxism was so popular among the advanced workers and the intelli-
theoretician
gentsia that every ~~man~~ ^{man} donned Marxist clothings, and so did the Populists although they claimed the peasantry to be the revolutionary force, and one that could bring Russia directly from semi-feudalism to communism through the mir, communal village. They would thus escape the miseries of the whole capitalist epoch. Russia in any case, they argued, came too late on the scene to share in the world market which was controlled by the big industrial powers sothat whatever industry Russia does have, it is impossible for it to "realize" the profits ^{therefrom} since it had no market in which to sell its goods and the workers were too poor "to buy it back". They fastened on Volume II of Capital "to prove" their point.

Now nowhere in the voluminous debates around Volume II, the most disputed volume among Marxists, does there exist anything more profound and brilliant than Lenin's answer to these intellectuals. The dialectician shows himself in the fact that he does not limit himself to marshalling the facts to demonstrat that Russia isn't skipping over capitalism. Lenin goes

Cap. II
for
Lenin's
conclusion

Insert p.14 before last par.

At the same time Lenin never moved away from the concrete. The Populists, insofar as it reflected the interests of the peasantry in their struggle against the nobility and the survivals of serfdom, were revolutionary democrats and the Marxist proletarian movement must strenuously support the peasant movement up to the extent of confiscating the landlords' estates. While showing the Populists what nonsense their talk of "people's production" (that's what they called ^{he demonstrated that} the mir, the village commune) was, ~~and~~ ~~was~~ capitalism, far from being "skipped", was growing on the countryside and splitting up the population into on the one hand kulaks or capitalist farmers and, on the other hand, the rural poor and the rural proletariat. Consequently, said he, if you are to remain true to your democratic ideology, stop playing around with the Liberals in the Duma or you will end up betraying the peasantry to the capitalist farmers.

Lenin could be so realistic in his approach to the Populists (later Social Revolutionaries) precisely because from the very start of his study of the agrarian question his solution for the agrarian problem was to lie in the creation of peasant committees. And he could be so bold because, having lived theoretically in Ground Rent in Volume III of Capital, he knew the break-up of agricultural relations capitalism was not reducing, the stratification of the peasant population, and therefore looked for the concrete strata who were most opposed both to the nobility and the kulak and who would therefore have to fight the landlords and the state to get their land, whether it went by the popular American slogan of "forty-acres and a mule" or by the slogan of "black redistribution" as it did in Russia.

The main tasks for the bourgeois revolution he set down concretely as (1) convocation of National Constituent Assembly, (2) arming of the people, (3) political freedom (4) complete freedom and equality of all oppressed nationalities, (5) 8 hour day and (6) formation of peasant committees. This type of ^{he} armed uprising and establishment of a democratic republic/called "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry."

-74

Capital

into the theory of Marx and hence the logic of capitalist development.

(1) the underconsumptionism of workers under capitalism, an undeniable fact, does not affect in any essential manner capitalist production because its law of development is by means of greater and greater masses of machinery (means of production) and lesser and lesser means of consumption. Marx's division of the whole of social production into just these two great departments of production cut through the whole rickshamble of underconsumptionism and proved that production creates its own market. Had the Populists so much as posed the question correctly, asked themselves how surplus value is realized ~~xxxx~~ they would have seen that answer immediately as both fact and reason of existence of capitalism.

(2) World market is entirely extraneous to the fact, is a means of evading the real question, that crises arise from the relations of men in production where they are nothing but cogs in a wheel. Therefore, should there even a redistribution of the national capital nothing would be solved so long as workers remained wage slaves.

Think of it. Lenin, in strict theory as far back as the turn of the century, is predicting that such a phenomenon as Fascism which had the whole control of the national capital and redistributed it "as it pleased", that is according to the/objective law of capitalism compelled it to solved not a single problem but only ended in total collapse!

But brilliant as the polemics were and routed as the Populists were as any tendency deserving to wear the mantle of Marx the tendency as a tendency could not be annihilated. For ^{once there had been no revolutionary program, the society} there is neither caprice nor temperament of men but an expression of an impulse gotten from deep objective forces. Classes or sections of classes will inevitably express that movement and when routed out one door, will reappear in another in a different dress, but still expressing an objective fact. Such and such a development of economy, in this case the beginnings of capitalism in Russia, will have but one true absolute opposite, opponent, the one who is the subordinate element in the relationship, in this case labor.

But the petty bourgeoisie, especially when capitalism is not fully developed, thrives on speculation. So you can understand Lenin's great labors to promote the progressive features of capitalism. The Development of Capitalism in Russia has this as a task and for that reason socialization of labor is a sort of here as opposed to the personal dependence of bonded peasants, and, of course, the development of the productive forces technologically too is counterposed to conservatism in production and parasitism in consumption in Tsarist society. In 1915 as we saw he broke completely with this conception of socialization of labor as an end and it became what it is in advanced capitalist society the TRANSITION.

The genius of Lenin is that he is always concrete in his ultimate aims, his universals, as well as the immediate ones. Precisely because he was so concrete and posed so fundamentally the struggles of the day at the turn of the century he was enabled to reorganize himself in 1915-1917.

1. "Democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry"

The outlandish-sounding slogan, "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" ~~was~~ concerned itself with the living forces that would carry through the bourgeois revolution and replace Tsarism. Before we go condemning these seemingly doctrinaire discussions let us remember that essentially we still have an unsolved agricultural problem in the South. Farm tenancy is a scourge to this day and has not allowed for the full technological, not to say, human revolution needed there. The power that this section of the country wields in Congress is out of all proportion to its actual number and strength only no one dares fundamentally challenge the Rankins and Eastlands by appealing to the great masses of population that to this date are deprived of the vote and live in sub-human conditions. Race relations there are a shame and disgrace to this most advanced capitalist country and not merely blemish its name the world over but are tinderbox which will explode any moment in directions hard to predict. And essentially this problem has

its roots in the failure of the Civil War to come to a full bourgeois conclusion and reorganize totally peasant relations nearly a century back. in the United States Not by accident the most profound study of farm tenancy/in 1913 was made by that Russian Lenin to illuminate the problems he was facing in Russia. It can illuminate our problems to this day. In studying what Lenin thought and why pre-1915 and why and what he changed then we study not an individual but two great social, world problems: the bourgeois revolution which still faces the colonial countries and the socialist proletarian one whose incompleteness has brought the world to the edge precipice where decision can no longer be postponed.

Some Marxists in facing the problem of the overthrow of Tsarism could be abstract, take the easy road out and say "socialism" for it is a fact that ultimately only socialism can solve all problems. But Lenin, because he took the overthrow of Tsarism seriously as a concrete problem, had to be concrete in working out a fighting program. He began with the facts: (1)Tsaris Russia was a semi-feudal country. (2)Only the largest centers have big factories and a concentrated proletariat. (3)The overwhelming

~~the~~ population was peasant and they too had a party--the Social Revolutionary Party. ⁽⁴⁾ Precisely because Russia was an autocracy and restricted also the movement of the capitalists, these also yearned for its overthrow. They had a party of their own--the Cadets--and a program--parliamentary democracy and free competition, like in Western Europe. ⁽⁵⁾ All, from Social Democrat to Cadet, were functioning in the Russian caricature of a parliament called the Duma. (It had only advisory functions and the Tsar could dismiss it at will.)

The question of the road to the revolution therefore posed itself concretely, with whom, with the peasantry, or with the liberals. The Russian Marxists had already theoretically won over the Populists and the Economists, but here they were giving different answers. The Mensheviks, though Marxists, did not flinch from answering, with the liberals. It is a bourgeois revolution and therefore the bourgeois must lead it. The workers, moreover, have much to learn from bourgeois parliamentarism.

Lenin replied the proletariat is indeed being "taught" by the bourgeoisie--in the factory. It has all the "education" it needs for this capitalist mechanism organizes, unites and disciplines the proletariat and gives the impulse to revolt. Once they revolt, they will have nothing to learn from bourgeois democracy; it is the revolt which will reorganize relations in parliament as well as in the factory.

The proletariat is small as yet and will need allies? They have that in the peasantry, the lowest and deepest layers. This is the only way. At this stage of world development the bourgeois is incapable of leading its own revolution? Who will lead it, these Cadets? What bosh! ~~xxx~~ Precisely because the revolution is bourgeois the proletariat must have the hegemony or the revolution will become the counter-revolution, for without that no overturn in agricultural relations, and no solution to the fundamental problems facing us.

Today when India, although it has finally fought loose

the centuries-old stranglehold of British imperialism, and gotten itself a parliament with a great liberal leader like Nehru who talks big not only to the Indian nations but to the whole world, is still faced with the ages-old problem of famine reminiscent of the Middle Ages, we can better understand Lenin's stubbornness on the question of: with the liberals or with the peasantry. But at the turn of the century this sounded quite fantastic to say that only the proletariat can lead the bourgeois revolution --except to Trotsky who made short work of both the Menshevik and the Leninist theory with his theory of the permanent revolution.

Briefly, it was this, the proletariat, though small, must have not only the hegemony of the bourgeois revolution but can proceed directly to the socialist revolution while the peasantry with its attachment to private property is, first, a treacherous ally, and, secondly, not concentrated in any great centers but geographically spread all over the map. It is a chaotic mass.

Lenin would not budge. He said you can say what you wish about the backwardness of the peasantry and his attachment to private property and his disorganization. The point is the stratification within it, and the most revolutionary section has organized. You can't talk the Social Revolutionary Party out of existence; we will have to share power with them and that will be the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. In the meantime, please, answer me this question: why concretely are you so often with the Mensheviks who are with the liberals?

2. The Party

So concretely also was posed the question of the party.

Lenin is known in history for the theory of the party. He has been slandered by everybody, from Marxists to reactionaries, for having created a monster as if Stalin's counter-revolutionary monstrosity, his elite, totalitarian party had anything in common with Lenin's Bolshevik Party. Let us follow Lenin's example and be concrete and see what was the party, 1902-1914 when he was confronted with the total collapse of the world Marxist party, the Second International.

All the tendencies within Marxism had hailed Lenin's triumph over the Populists. Then came the debate with the Economists who simply skipped over all the great debate the Marxists were having as "politics", claiming that since the workers' troubles were economic "therefore" they should not concern themselves with political parties, but limit themselves to building trade unions and fighting there. Lenin hit hard at them and the Mensheviks and Trotsky applauded that, indeed, the proletariat needed a political party of its own. But the minute the question moved from the general one of politics vs. economics to the concrete one: who shall be considered a Party member, they split all ways. [We can see now why in 1915 Lenin clutched so hard onto ~~Hegel~~ ^{Engels} Engels who had written ^{by Kautsky} "General, abstract political questions are put in the foreground and thus obscure immediate concrete questions which will automatically come up on the order of the day at the very first ~~break~~ outbreak of ~~big~~ events in the first political crisis." Lenin's whole discovery in the logic revolves around Hegel's analysis of the contradiction between the abstract, the generalization, though necessary, and the concrete. How that works out stage by stage is the problem ^{between} the abstract revolution ^{revolution} and the concrete, and it is the concrete Lenin we are studying.]

They split all ways because all problems were now concentrated within their party. None of them had disagreed what kind of party: all had said a Marxist, a political party. None of them had disagreed on whether it should "in general" be a centralized party--there was the German Social Democratic Party, their model, and they were building one in the underground against the greatest autocracy in the world. None of them disagreed on the general program for the party, and the only show of disagreement on "centralism" was when the centralism turned out to be the majority ^{Lenin had gotten} (that's what Bolshevik means) against the minority (that's what Menshevik means). No, the split came on the simple problem: what constitutes party membership.

Lenin defined party membership as one who accepts the principles and belongs to a branch, comes to its meetings, that is, is disciplined by the proletarian membership. The others said the acceptance of party principles is sufficient, so that any intellectual who can write or talk glibly is one and need not report to any local. You see who was the democrat--he whom they all called an autocrat! And he was a democrat precisely ^{because} from the first he wanted to put the proletarian stamp on the party, not "in general", but concrete, in everyday life, the Marxist intellectual who does not have the discipline of the factory, must at least have this discipline.

O, how they decried Lenin's daring to bring in the question of the factory. You see, what he is trying to turn our party into --a factory. Lenin replied simply: the worker is subjected to the slavery of the factory but there he also gets the discipline. We get neither the one nor the other: is it wrong to ~~xxxx~~ see that our Marxist party acts as the disciplinarian over us petty-bourgeois, anarchistic intellectuals.

So that was the issue over which so many volumes are written, all wrong, except for what Lenin had to say. And even Lenin did not know he was doing anything contrary to the general line of the German Social Democracy. He thought he was adapting to Russian conditions, and he argued also that the many splits were due to those special conditions. They were facing a bourgeois

revolution and that is why it was all the more necessary to maintain the proletarian hegemony, or it would end in a counter-revolution. The German Social Democracy was facing a proletarian revolution and were a solid majority against the opportunist Bernstein. It was only in 1915 that he will see that the German Social Democracy, Menshevism in Russia, simply gave the bourgeois answer when it was still only a theoretical question while the German variety will give it much later in life, in betrayal.

But Lenin the concrete kept hammering away at Russia and the special problems facing him and keeping the socialist aim as the overriding concept.

in 1917
Now there are many who came over to the Bolshevik side, like Trotsky the great leader of the Red Army, who, when they looked back upon the dispute in 1902, said: Yes, the Bolsheviks were right, and I wrong. But it wasn't the little question of who is a member, but the real big political questions which later proved to be the revolutionary vs. the counter-revolutionary answer. Who could have known that in 1902?

But the ~~truth~~ truth was it wasn't the great political problems. It was just this concrete question. That's what split them, not the other. When the other split them, they were already on opposite sides of the barricades.

When the war broke out and the International collapsed, that's when Lenin turned back to the question of the party: Never again with the Second, that type. His party had been small, and the German was a genuine massparty he had envied. But his was organized for the conquest of power. Then he asked himself a question, when he considered the economic roots of the fall of the Second, is it possible at all to organize mass parties under capitalism for the conquest of power?

Just as MONOPOLY was the transition, and socialisation of labor was the transition to something higher, so now the question of the party. He will not give a full answer until the Soviets appear, but he is now fully prepared by his mode of thought to meet the soon-to-break out Russian Revolution.

III **LENIN AT THE POINT OF TRANSITION

the
Today when/one-party state is a reality which overwhelms everyone and has the man on the street questioning whether it is the inevitable handmaiden of socialism the ex-radical is demanding from the capitalist rulers that they give him the center of the stage "to prove it is so". Since the workers no longer believe what the rulers say, the rulers gladly let the turncoat spout forth abstractions from that weird mass of confusion called the intellectual's mind. The Stalinist party is the Leninist party, full-grown, he pontificates. Proof? Lenin said that the proletariat by his own efforts could reach only trade union consciousness. "Therefore" Lenin's conception of the party was that of an elite organization.

Tsarist
There is no doubt that Lenin, in/Russia, in 1902, was preoccupied with the fact that the/proletariat had no mass organizations of its own as had the German. And he did write that it was the task of the Marxist to bring socialist consciousness to the proletariat "from the outside" as the proletariat would not otherwise gain it. But that is precisely wherein the Kautskyan democrat and the Leninist were alike.

Where they differed was by the proletarian stamp Lenin attempted to put on his party from the start and by virtue of the fact that he wanted it to organize the revolutionary creative instinct of the masses murderously suppressed by Tsarism. The party was to be there when the proletariat burst forth spontaneously and its historic initiative would seek a political organizational form. As capitalism unconsciously organized, disciplined, united the proletariat at the point of production and stimulated it to revolt, the Marxist political organization would do consciously, and with gusto.

The revolt was the point of departure.

The alikeness was the stress on organization.

1763 The Second International collapsed in 1914, and from his study of the dialectic and of the concrete war Lenin knew that a correct policy would lead to revolution only if the living forces are objectively revolutionary.

The Second, representing the aristocracy of labor was not objectively revolutionary. The greatest betrayal was not the subjective capitulation of the leadership of the International to the Kaiser's Government/ The greatest betrayal was that objectively the International was rotten to the core, rotted by the existence within itself of the aristocracy of labor. The ~~main~~ enemy was the aristocracy of labor which had counterposed its skilled, aristocratic, unorganized cultured way of life to that of the unskilled/masses for whom it had nothing but contempt.

By the betrayal Lenin was caught as much off guard as was the German proletariat which had been conditioned to believe that his organizational strength (as witness the growing vote) would of itself prevent war. That ~~excuse~~ excused the proletariat It did not excuse Lenin the Marxist. The ground of meeting of the Kautskyan and pre-1914 Lenin was Lenin's concept of organization as an outside force.

At the same time it was precisely the betrayal, the emergence in the revolutionary proletariat itself of its own opposite is precisely what compelled Lenin to break with his own past, to reorganise himself. He had accepted a series of abstractions--Party. Mass. Revolution. Concretely they had meaning for him only in Russia facing a bourgeois revolution. He had not studied the revolutionary proletariat in an advanced country. He had not heretofore seen the growth of imperialist monopoly and the aristocracy of labor and had failed to grasp that since this phenomenon had objective roots, it was inevitable that it develop. His conclusion insofar as the concept of the party was immediate; he was finished with the Second International as a type of organization because it was the party of the elite, the aristocracy of labor.

Thereupon he denied the Kautsky the very use of the term, "mass organization: (1) it was the sheerest sophistry he wrote to speak of mass organization when Kautsky's party had failed to penetrate lower and deeper into the proletariat; (2) at most his party, though an organization of a million, had organized but one-fifth of the proletariat, that is to say a minority of

the proletariat; and (3) that stratum of the proletariat had become, as Engels had so aptly characterized the results of Britain's monopoly position of his day, a "bourgeois labor party".

Lenin now made his party, adapted to Russian conditions which had a stranglehold over any workers' spontaneous outbursts, into a universal for all Marxist parties. That was not because it was the organization of millions, but because it was the organization that would make sure that the spontaneity of millions had the best opportunity. Where the Second International had become the enemy of the very thing it had been built for--to develop the ~~massive~~ liberating movement of the masses--the Third International became the organization for spontaneity, for social revolution.

That the Third in turn became the class enemy of the revolutionary proletariat is another chapter in history, and another chapter in the dialectic.

1. The economics of pre-1915 Marxism

The great divide in modern Marxism can be traced with such precision in all fields precisely because Lenin was always concrete. In July 1914 he began an Essay on Marx. Heretofore he had limited himself to the problems that confronted him in Russia, and, theoretically, that meant Volume II of Capital and Ground Rent of Volume III. He had refused to even consider a popularization of Volume I, so satisfied was he with Bogdanov's. This essay was however to concern itself with Marxism as a whole. It is the finest achievement in its field. But it belongs to pre-1915 Marxism, that is, an achievement of the Second International.

A reader scanning through the hundreds of books and pamphlets issued by the Second, either "popularizing" Marxism as does Karl Kautsky's Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx, or "extending" it as do Rudolf Hilferding's Finance Capital and Rosa Luxemburg's Accumulation of Capital in their different ways, will soon feel weighted down by one overwhelming consideration, the outstanding feature of all of them: Planlessness characterizes capitalism; plan socialism.

Lenin 28

Although never shared this interpretation in its most vulgar form--
 (Life as a Russian Marxist in Volume II of Capital compelled concentration on production, as against underconsumptionism)--he was nevertheless essentially
 of the Second International and saw socialism as an organization of economy.
 Capitalism meant anarchy and socialism meant order. Not by accident was Kautsky
 revered as a teacher. This Essay is permeated with an analysis of the
 inevitability of socialism tied to the inevitability of capitalist ~~collapse~~
 collapse ^{the fact} that arises from/socialization of production is "bound to lead"
 to "expropriation of the expropriators". The proletariat is neither the
 smasher-up nor reorganiser of social relations on a total scale, but merely
 "the intellectual and moral driving force and physical executant" of this ~~new~~ *new*
 transformation of capitalism into socialism. There is violence of course,
 but the organisation of economy rather than the smash-up of monopolies and
 the new energy of new millions is the perspective. There is in fact not
 a single word said about monopoly except in agriculture!

Now one incident around its publication reveals what a tremendous leap
 Lenin made since its submission in November 1914 to its publication in 1915.
 On January 17, 1915 he writes to the publishers, asking whether it isn't pos-
 sible to introduce some correction since it is only "in the last six weeks"
 that he had made a serious study of dialectic. Since that was not possible,
 Lenin in his Notebooks on Dialectic, settled scored with himself.

A rereading of the Essay side by side with his writings 1915-16 will
 reveal at once what these were:

1) There is not a single serious word about the unity of opposites in
 the Essay. In 1915 however, he makes the dialectic the comprehension of the
 unity of opposites and his concrete study of Imperialism has this as its heart.
 Far from being a direct development of capitalism, imperialism is the develop-
 ment of capitalism at a stage when its fundamental features become transformed
 into their opposites: competition into monopoly, a stratum of labor into the
 aristocracy of labor. Lenin's Imperialism is thus distinguished from all
 those of the Second. It allows him to draw a sharp class line between the

the Second and the Third.*

2) There is nothing in the Essay of decay, stagnation, rotting alive features of monopoly capitalism which is listed here merely as "large-scale production" and hence no serious analysis of democracy as the opposite to comp. capitalism at this stage of its transformation into opposite, mon. capitalism.* In 1915-16—the distinction between proletarian and bourgeois democracy will be so compact that victorious socialism will have to achieve complete democracy.

3) The Essay separates the question of tactics from the economic doctrines of Marxism, and a distinction is drawn between it and earlier materialisms which did not see the need of practical revolutionary work. In 1915 Lenin will see practice as a "link in the analysis of cognition and a transition" and hence Marx clings to Hegel's criteria of practice. The coup de grace to the false division established in 1914 was dealt by the publisher who omitted that section entirely. Lenin complained: But without revolutionary tactics, Marxism is nothing. That is absolutely true but the question is: how did it

*This brought him into conflict not only with the Second International that betrayed but with the Bolshevik Bukharin who wanted to be rid of the "piratical imperialist state" with one blow and have nothing more to do with statism. Bukharin's semi-anarchism stemmed from his incapacity to grasp the dialectical relationship between competition and monopoly and hence his opposition to the slogan of Self-Determination. General, abstract political questions were put in the foreground by him and such revolutionary actual struggles of oppressed nations as the Irish Rebellion of 1916 obscured. At first glance it would appear as if Lenin and Bukharin were one on the economic analysis and at completely opposite ends on the political conclusion which seem to run indeed opposite to the economic movement. In truth, Lenin's 1916 analysis is wholly and entirely different from Bukharin who sees the economic movement from monopoly to state-monopoly and takes the easy road out with the catchword: Plan. Lenin's analysis, on the other hand, from the start, by analysing monopoly as the transformation into opposite of competition, sees bourgeois democracy bankrupt, and sees the concrete opposite to monopoly: the oppressed nation as a nation. So that the inner dialectics of bourgeois democracy at this stage of imperialism reveals that full democracy is the opposite to capitalism. Bukharin does not see it and with many ultra-left phrases opposes Self-Determination. This is the first of many battles the two have which culminate in 1920-1 in the trade union debate and the economics of the transition period. Bukharin theoretically represents the last foothold of the counter revolution in the workers state, and Stalin becomes its physical embodiment. Part III will deal completely with Bukharin. ~~xxxxxxxx~~

-27-

happen that the revolutionary conclusions which are an integral part of Capital were dealt with there only abstractly, but concretely were shifted into a section on "tactics"? When the ~~Second International~~ ^{Second International} applies this division of revolutionary tactics from economic doctrines, Lenin called upon the world proletariat to consider Kautsky the greatest enemy, greater than the direct murderers, Scheidemann and Noske.

4) The Essay had also separated philosophy from economics as if Marx merely took the mysticism out of Hegelian dialectics and then went on to make his economic ~~theory~~ ^{theory} without regard to dialectics, as "the proof of his theory of class struggle". In 1915-16 ^{for example} the indivisibility of dialectics from any ~~part~~ ^{part} aspect of Marxism is by (1) considering dialectics the theory of knowledge of Hegel and Marx, and (2) ~~showing~~ ^{showing} that Marx applied the dialectic of Hegel in its rational form to political economy and that therefore the principle of self-movement was the core of Hegelianism and of revolutionary Marxism.

5) The Essay, in analyzing the economic doctrines of Marx, puts its greatest emphasis on the law of value and surplus value. In his Notes on Dialectic however the greatest stress is on the form of value. In the Essay the form of value is dealt with because it reveals the historical process of exchange. In the Notes, the analysis of the form of value is stressed because of its duality: (1) logical and (2) historical. In the Essay he fairly apologises for the first chapter of Capital by assuring the public that what seems abstract and purely deductive is in reality "a gigantic collection of factual material" especially In the Notes he says that comprehension of the first chapter of Capital is impossible without the understanding of the whole of the logic. ^{Marx} ~~Lenin, he~~ said, did not leave us a Logic but he left us the logic of Capital. It is to that precisely to which we must turn to understand the logic of the whole social movement. Lenin's development is part of the objective development of capitalism and its absolute opposite, labor, from the latter's being a mere critic of the bourgeois revolution, to reorganizer of society on human beginnings.

1768

7 6 7
PART TWO --KARL MARX'S CAPITAL, 1843-1883

I--Forms of the Class Struggle

In 1844 in Silesia the weavers revolted, broke up machines, and tore up the titles to workshops. The sympathy of the public for these displaced weavers was so strong that the absolutist state did not dare call out the troops to restore order. Immediately there also appeared a division among the intellectuals. The three major attitudes to the weavers' revolt were:

(1) Arnold Ruge, a bourgeois democrat who was engaged in the high politics of the fight against Prussian absolutism, and was, with Marx an exile in France at the time wrote that the weavers' uprising was not more than a "hunger revolt of a meagre handful of artisans." It could in no sense be considered a true social revolution since it had no political core.

(2) Ferdinand Lassalle, who was still a student in Berlin but already moving leftward to socialism, nevertheless looked with disdain at the actual revolt of what he called "the mob".

(3) Karl Marx, on the other hand, a young man in his twenties hailed the uprising in these words: "The Silesian revolt began where the French and English insurrections ended with a consciousness of the proletariat as a class. The whole action was of this character. Not only did it destroy machinery, the rival of the workers, but also the merchants' records, their property titles."

At the same time Marx struck out against the attempt to introduce a false division between a political and social revolution. Even a partial phenomenon such as the weavers' revolt, he wrote, meant incalculably more than the fight for abstract political liberties, "just as a human being was more than a citizen and a human life more than political life." ~~The overthrow of the old, he concluded, is of course~~

The three different views around a single action of the young proletariat revealed as sharp a division in thought between the bourgeois democrat, the aristocratic proletarian type, and the revolutionary Marxist as there were in fact in the open class struggle.

From the start of his break with bourgeois society the year before, Marx had his feet solidly on the ground and placed the proletariat in the center of all his thinking. He hailed therefore both the uprising itself and the appearance in the intellectual field of one Wilhelm Weitling, a journeyman tailor:

"If one compares the drab dejected mediocrity of German ^{political} literature with the boundless and brilliant debut of the German workers," wrote Marx of Weitling's writing, "if one compares these gigantical children's shoes of the proletariat with the dwarf proportions of the worn-out political shoes of the bourgeoisie, one must prophesy an athlete's figure for this Cinderella."

As it turned out, both the striking weavers and the journeyman tailor were members of a conspiratorial society known as the League of the Just. Without joining it, Marx watched closely its whole development and kept in contact with it. Since ^{revolutionary} books were forbidden in Monarchical Prussia, these journeymen tailor were the carriers of socialist ideas across the borders. In less than three years this utopian socialist society would transform itself into a political party with a scientific socialist program, rename itself the Communist League, and commission Marx and Engels to write its Manifesto.

Heretofore the turbulent forties looked as if they had united the bourgeois democrat and the young proletariat in the fight against Prussian absolutism. Now the young proletariat would issue its independent challenge on the very eve of the bourgeois revolution.

Previously the break from bourgeois society had meant for Marx, as an intellectual, the clearing out of the cobwebs from his own thinking. He wrote, first, a criticism of bourgeois law. He turned next to economics and wrote a critique of bourgeois property. And, in turning against his philosophic past, he turned against the intellectual as a whole. In making the revolutionary discovery of what is known as a materialist conception of history--in seeing all history as the history of class struggles and the forward leaps in it made not by great men but by great masses of men rebelling against exploitative production relations--Marx naturally turned to view the real forms of the class struggle in his particular epoch. Marx always had his eyes wide open for what he called the spontaneous class organization of the proletariat. That is why ~~thinking~~ he saw immediately the significance of the struggle of the weavers. That is why he rejected utopian plans and followed instead such development of actual class antagonism as the Chartist movement which combined the struggle for political reform with the fight for the ten hour day. And that is why he was active in seeing that the various correspondence committees and workers educational societies that he and his life-long collaborator Friedrich Engels had organized should dissolve into a communist party when once such a party had arisen. But now that the party was here, and all the dialectic was concentrated in it, what did the various tendencies mean and how should the challenge be hurled at the bourgeoisie?

From 1843 to 1847 he was searching, but he was still more or less talking to himself and a few others like him. How much of the past was still in them can be seen from the first draft of Manifesto, written by Engels in the form of a Catechism as if they were still "educating".

Then Marx leapt forward with the organization and issued the challenge which to this day has not been surpassed. For us who are

tracing the origins of Capital, the historic pamphlet has the following significance:

(1) Marx counterposes the "spontaneous organization of the proletariat" to the fantastic "plans" of the utopian and petty-bourgeois socialists: "Future history resolves itself in their eyes into the propagandistic and practically carrying of their social plans." He then throws at them a savage accusation: people concerned with plans instead of the actual movement of the proletariat are bound to end up with the conclusion that the best possible plan of this best possible society is the bourgeois plan. This is the first rough sketch of what will become the axis of Capital--the despotic plan of capital as against the plan inherent in the cooperative form of labor.

(2) Among the bourgeois socialists Marx mentions "the economists". To free himself completely from his heritage of classical bourgeois economics will take him beyond the next stage of the development of Capital, "The Critique of Political Economy". But already now he posed the problem.

(3) Marx's thesis that all history is the history of class struggle is inseparable from the distinguishing mark of the particular class struggle of the proletariat under capitalism. What distinguishes its struggle from that of the slave or the serf is that the conditions of production in the modern factory is such that, to emancipate itself, it must emancipate humanity as a whole and break once and for all with exploitation of man by man. This is a political manifesto of these conditions, but to analyse these conditions fully will lead him into the factory itself and the labor process itself will thus become the heart of the whole of Capital. Only thus will finally end the division between politics, economics and philosophy which plagued him in his break from bourgeois society.

1 4 1 3
3/27/52

Dear Grace:

Please note the not very correct way I'm handling CRITIQUE. It is good that my love for Marx just wouldn't let me put down "vulgar materialism" as a characterization when we really come to face the public. That made me turn back to the CRITIQUE much as I dislike the work and I realize how spoiled we have become by knowing the Marx of GUELLER—even so great a discovery as the dual nature of labor has us snigger when it is first posed just because it lacks the clarity and profundity of the later development. Moreover, just because we're all so smart with Marxism and "know" what money is, we fail to realize that that was the precise link to the great split-up in the category of labor.

I'm taking time out to say all this because I know that you care for Feuerbach less than I for the CRITIQUE but we must not miss any intermediary link and just as the nature of labor came through money analysis, so the Marxian dialectic came not direct from Hegel but through from Hegel through Feuerbach to Marx.

Of course you realize that the GRUNDRISSE which I do not even mention will be dealt by you just before we reach the CRITIQUE.

R

1773

II--MARX AND RICARDO

1. Living vs. Dead Labor

In breaking from bourgeois society Marx had also broken with classical political economy which had matured as a science before the full establishment of the factory system that produced crises and violent class struggles as the way of life of the new modern industrial system.

The underlying assumption of the great bourgeois theorist who had given classical political economy its final imprint was the concept that "Economic Man" would know how to achieve maximum advantage for himself and society if he were only freed from feudal restrictions and governmental interference, and allowed to function within the framework of free competition. Yet this new economic man seemed not to be the result of a historic process--the dissolution of the feudal order--but the starting point of the natural order David Ricardo saw about him. This economic man was the ideal of this eternally run world which had unfurled new forces of production.

The greatest force of production was labor. With this epoch-making discovery that the source of all wealth was not something outside man, like precious metals, land, or foreign trade, but the activity of man himself--labor, classical political economy brought out the inner contradictions of the economic system, thereby revealing the class relationship between capital and labor. In fact, the greatest flaw in this bourgeois economics was that it could ^{and always could be were there to give a hand} not explain the revenue of the capitalist. What gave Ricardian theory the imprint of science was his singling out of the economic law of value and proving that it was as compelling a phenomenon as the outward forms of regulation of feudalism. It thus gave an integrated view of the economic system called capitalism and which to Ricardo was "the natural order of society".

Ricardo systematized economic thinking but left the laborer out

of the analysis. He never once entered the factory to see this laborer at the point of production. In revolutionizing the concept of wealth from precious metal to labor, Ricardo had revealed the inner contradictions of the economic system and thereby the relationship of capital and labor. But in reducing the concrete relationship to an abstraction--value--dead labor, he left no room for further development.

Marx at once put his finger on the limitations of bourgeois science: "But having recognized labor, the function of man, as

-34-

its principle," wrote the young Marx in the Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts. "political economy in actuality rejected man because precisely he consistently developed all contradictions of private property."

Ricardo had looked at the results of man's labor--goods, property,-- Marx turned to look at the activity itself. He isolated labor from property and began to search for the contradiction in labor itself. He was completely and thoroughly opposed to vulgar communism which thought that a mere transcendence of private property--changing around the haves and have-nots--would liberate the laborer. No, what was needed was the abolition of the capitalistic form of labor--alienated labor. It wasn't only the products of labor that were alienated from him, but his very activity was an alien activity. To be a cog in a machine isn't human. By 1847, in Wage-Labor and Capital, Marx had further concretized this concept of labor, showing that behind the mastery of capital over labor, was the mastery of dead labor over living labor. Thus:

(1) it was not nature that faced man as an alien power. It was an alien power he himself had created, materialized, accumulated labor;

(2) it was not the machine, but man's relation to it, that was the moving principle. Concretely, the contradiction between the productive forces and the capitalistic production relations .

By placing this contradiction in the center of everything, by including the wage laborer himself in the science of economics he transformed political economy from a study of things, such as wages, money, profits, to ^{social} and analysis of/relations, the relation of wage-labor and capital.

1775

To Ricardo, however, labor was not living subject, but mere substance. He never moved from the spot where labor was the source of value. It was as if the function of man could be disembodied from man himself.

who the more wealth he created the poorer he became
 If Ricardo ever looked at the laborer more than once it was only to speak with the voice of the industrialist anxious to sweep away ~~to sweep away~~ all restrictions of the market and the supply of labor.

But, although he was not bothered by the fact that the worker had to sell his capacity to labor or starve, he at the same time didn't doubt that inequalities, hardships, discomforts would "disappear" once there was production and yet more production. Ricardo attributed any irrationalities in his rational system either to left-overs from feudalism or because of government interference.

Ricardo took his freedom, free competition, free trade seriously. His democracy however, was strictly outside production, at the polls, before the law, in the market. He favored parliamentary reform, and the Poor Law. He urged repeal not only of the Corn Laws which favored the monopolistic landlord but also the Combination Laws which forbade labor to unite and favored the industrialist. He was at one and the same time menace and main prop of the bourgeoisie.

Ricardo never doubted that unhampered production would eliminate all evils left from former regimes and right all things in this natural world of his. It is true that in the second edition of his Political Economy (1821) he did pose the contradiction between the science of the machine and the actual redundancy of labor. But that wasn't a contradiction that dominated his thought or compelled him to place the contradiction squarely in the center of his world. His thinking was essentially Kantian.

In separating himself from classical political economy Marx had also separated himself from the utopian socialists who thought the theory of value "socialist" and should be "used". Development, he told the utopians, takes place not through intellectual schemas, but through actual REVOLTS of living man against the conditions of production which are not at all eternal, but historic, transitory. What that movement, and you will see the way, the only way to abolish wage slavery.

The flaw in the Ricardian theory--the fact that it left only implicit that if labor was the source of all value he was thereby the source of surplus value (profit)--made it "natural" that those intellectuals who placed themselves on the side of the proletariat, seized on the contradiction already set up for them theoretically." But, continued Marx, there was no substitute for the historic movement it produced. Labor isn't something static, although Ricardo looks at it as such, and capitalism isn't what he thinks either. It is not undreamed of expansion of the productive forces by means of more and more machines, but by means of machines which are placed in a factory in which there is barrack-line discipline of labor, and long hours of it. Its unhampered production ~~is unrestricted~~ ^{may be} unrestricted by feudalism or government, but it is restricted by child labor, unsanitary, foul working conditions, and early death. Because he sees freedom as freedom of competition, democracy as vote to cut special privileges of monopolistic landlords he sees harmonious progress. But the truth of capitalism is the subjection of the laborer to the means of production and hence there is not harmonious progress, but constant crises and revolts. without which in fact capitalism itself cannot develop. The revolutionary feature of that system of production is precisely that it must constantly revolutionize the means of production and with it the relations of production and society itself is in constant turmoil.

The 1848 revolutions once and for all put an end to the dreams

of compromise of the bourgeois democrats, the plans of the utopian socialists for the masses themselves entered the historic stage and would not listen to these intellectual planners of far-away utopias. They would rather have mass power here.

But with the defeat of these first mass proletarian outbursts, a new crop of planners came into the socialist movement. Marx returned to a further study of the contradictions within labor itself from whence the next movement would come. He was soon able to split that category, not abstractly and philosophically as in his concept of alienated labor, nor as product, accumulated labor. But the innermost dialectic of labor, its self-development revealed that within alienated labor itself there is the concrete positive form for its abolition--concrete/^{human}labor versus abstract capitalistic labor. This new break-up in the category of labor would not reveal all its inner facets until the proletariat burst forth in a new organizational revolutionary form--the Paris Commune, and we will not see it clearly theoretically till Capital is published. But already in the quiescent 1850s, wrapped in the theory of money, Marx ~~posed~~ the question in his CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.

A good way to view the CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY is from the vantage point of Lenin's IMPERIALISM. In 1914-16 the predominant phenomenon that confronted Lenin was monopoly imperialism. In 1857-9 the predominant phenomenon was money. Just as the war made monopoly the transition point, so the financial crisis made money the transition point. Because neither in 1916 nor in 1859 had the proletariat burst forth in a form absolutely opposite to the capitalistic one, it was not clear/^{to} what these transition points would move.. When in/1917 the Soviets ~~appeared~~ these great revolutionary theorists would move with 7 league boots. But as it was they knew not so much concretely what they were for as what they were against. Lenin, in fighting against Kautskyism, was laying the groundwork also for the later fight against Bukharin. Marx, in fighting against Proudhonism, was laying the groundwork for the fight against the state socialism of Lassalle.

2. Money for all

Nothing creates quite so many strange notions in the mind of the petty bourgeois as the dazzling sight of gold. Proudhon, to whom contradiction was merely "an abstract idea" rather than the actual class struggle, conceived of the notion that to find equilibrium between opposing forces all one need do is discover the "right idea". The "right idea" was somehow to make money available to all--"free credit". Capitalist private property in its most monstrous form of the factory could be preserved, and extended, and this be dubbed "socialism". In all seriousness Proudhon had proposed that the workers save up small shares, set up workshops by giving up "interest and profit" could soon "buy" all capital of the bourgeoisie. As Engels put it, "Rothschild & Co. are mere amateurs compared to these colossal sharks."

Indicuous as these ideas sound today, in industrially-retarded France of the early 1850's, where the typical establishment was the small shop; the typical industrialist, petty; the typical peasant, small; and the typical but a semi-proletarian, an handicraft workers; and where innumerable small artistic industries in little workshops still existed, Proudhonian socialism took root and had quite a following. Marx set out to destroy this purious socialism, and, in turning to the question of money, found he must again come to grips with Ricardo whose theory of money he had heretofore followed.

Ricardo's great discovery that the value of a commodity was the labor (past and present) incorporated in it and the resultant conclusion that gold, like any other commodity, was equal to the labor-time it took to mine it, was phenomenal enough to have had Marx overlook where Ricardo went off this straight but hard path and take a devious, very opposite point of view. Marx first did this in the '50s and found that Ricardo had in the question of money dragged in the market--international circulation. Ricardo himself had thought he had get away from the surface manifestation.

-38-

of the market, and Marx had up till then certain given him credit for it. In returning to the question of money, however, it became clear that Ricardo had brought the market straight back in through the international door. "It will be easy to prove, however," wrote Marx, "that the apparent magnitude of the scale does not make his fundamental ideas less diminutive."

Ricardo the scientist had capitulated to Ricardo the banker who had thrown aside the theory of value as it applies to gold and in the stock-market acted according to capitalistic horse-sense until of course, periodically the stocks came tumbling down. Nevertheless financial crises in Ricardo's times were more or less isolated economic phenomena. But the 1825 and 1836 crises proved to be "the great storms of the world market in which the conflict of all the elements of the capitalist process of production were discharging themselves. The 1857 panic should have made clear even to Proudhon that where labor has created no value, not even Jay Gould could ~~make~~ transform falling railroad stocks into money. But the petty-bourgeois intellectual who was not subjected to the despotism of the factory refused to ~~return~~ to the process of production where all crises originate. He not only would not turn to look at the labor process but he continued with schemes "to organize exchange" while leaving the commodity intact as a "thing".

Yet, as Marx shows, it is precisely the duality of this "thing", the fact that it is at one and the same time a use-value and a value, that has produced the division of commodities into commodities and money. For his commodity, the capitalist wants to buy not another use-value, but money which buys all "things". Money is the "mediating movement" between the duality in the commodity. Yet precisely because the duality in the commodity is itself but a reflection of the basic contradiction--the two-fold nature of labor itself--the capitalist finds that this instrument of circulation does not get him out of the battle in the factory where the concrete laborer is in constant revolt against being TIMED and made to produce not according

to his ability but according to value standards--so many per day, per hour, per minute. In our age any "backward workers" from whom these intellectual planners are always weaving fantastic schemas would be able to tell these Proudhons as they tell their authors: "If you don't get that time-study man off my neck, I cannot work as I please, I cannot work at all."

So long as that continues, the vicious circle of money, commodity, more money will continue to express itself in:

- 1) inequality, the inequality between what a worker is forced to produce and what he gets,
- 2) difference, the difference between the fact that one and only one commodity, labor power, is embodied in a living person and all others commodities whose value is static because it is materialized labor,
- 3) contradiction, the contradiction between the concrete labor which is a natural function of man and the abstract labor which is a capitalistic forcing of all concrete labors into one abstract mass of value and surplus value.

The deficiency in CRITIQUE is that, in proving its point about the duality of the commodity, abstract labor appears more like an intellectual deduction than the capitalistic REDUCTION of all concrete labors which Marx will so masterfully describe in CAPITAL. What Marx has accomplished is posing the/^{basic}question of the two-fold nature of labor, and bringing us back from ~~that~~ glittering money to the every-day commodity. The fetishism of the commodity-form, however, has not yet fully released its grip from all who live in the commodity-world until the proletariat outburst of 1871 will arise to overthrow that world.

III**MARX AND LASSALLE

One hundred years after the publication of the COMMUNIST MANIFESTO the bourgeois economists were forced to turn to it to see how it is that Marx could call the cards on every major problem that faces us today from high prices to low wages, from monopoly to unemployment to stultification of production, from ever-recurrent crises to ever-recurrent plans to soften the impact of these businesscycles only to have all end in planned wars and unplanned revolutions. The bourgeois theoreticians that call themselves "academic economists" were full of apologies for turning to this "non-economic document" on the ground that, although a political manifesto, it was a prelude to CAPITAL, an "economic work". But they no sooner uttered that designation than off they went all over again to complain that that too is over-weighted by the "social vision" of the Manifesto that that an actual social class, living, fighting, and constantly revolting is present in all Marx's "economic categories." These snug bourgeois were belaboring the fact that it was hard to peg Marx's theory for he had included in his economics everything from free trade and world market, to the labor movement and party politics, to revolutions--all revolutions, industrial, political social. He had thus turned economic theory into historical analysis and this into "prophesy". It needs hardly be added that it isn't a social vision that keeps them poles apart from Marx--they all have their social vision. What alienates them, and rightly, is the social vision that says the workers and the workers alone are the ones, the only ones, who could overcome the contradictions, crises and wars of capitalism. To this social vision they will not bow, although civilization as we know it be threatened. They are ever ready with new plans of their own, all which end that the workers continue to work while the radical intelligentsia continue to "lead" and "plan".

This movement of capital to plan is the mark of our age, although, as we have seen, in embryo it has been the characteristic of all petty-bourgeois. But it has never had the directly counter-revolutionary

-42-

Suffrage....To make the workingclass its own employer, that is the way, the only way, by which this cruel and iron law (of unchangeable minimum wages,r)can be set aside. Once the workingclass is its own employer, the contrast between wages and profit disappears. It is therefore the task of the State to facilitate the great cause."

Thousandsof workers responded to the call and the formal organization of the General German Workers Association was founded in May 1863. In June Lassalle sent the statutes adopted (unbeknowst to the workers, it need hardly be added) to Bismarck with the following note: "...this will be enough to show you how true it is that the workingclass is instinctively inclined to dictatorship if it feels that such will be exercised in the workingclass interests. "

Now Lassalle was no ordinary traitor. He could not have been bought. He fought for his principles and would have been ready to die for them. But he simply wasincapable of conceiving that they(the workers) could rule. He felt called upon to rule "for" them. He would lead. They would continue to labor in the factories.

Marx naturally knewnothing of the letter to Bismarck. But words and thoughts/^{like actions}have a logic of their own and Marx, reading Lassalle's works, characterized him thus: "His attitude is that of a future workers' dictator. He resolves the question between labor and capital as easily as play. The workers are to agitate for universal suffrage and then send people like himself armed with the shining sword of science into Parliament. They will establish workers' factories, for which the State will put up capital, and by and by these institutions will embrace the whole country."

Think of Marx's statement "future workers dictator" and remember that this was written not in the age of Stalinist totalitarianism, but in 1863 which everyone considered the age of "science and democracy". Marx didn't know about Lassalle's machinations with Bismark, either. But he did know Lassalle's illusion about this being the age of "science and

1784

1 7 8 5
-43-

the worker", with science being incorporated all in the intellectual,
the leader, and the machine and the workers remaining in the factory.
It is this factory that Marx turned to study, rejecting entirely Lassalle
"puerile stuff". "When I look at this work of mine and see how I have
had to turn everything round, how even the historical part is based on
the material, some of which was quite unknown, Itzig (Lassalle) and his
economic system all ready in his pocket seems rather funny...."

(To be continued: MARX TURNS EVERYTHING AROUND)

1785

PART III--CAPITAL'S DEVELOPMENT AND MARX'S CAPITAL, 1863-1868

1. The Civil War in the United States and the
International Workingmen's Association

There were a few stupid Marxists in the United States who, when the Civil War broke out, contented themselves with signing a statement that they were opposed to "all" forms of slavery, wage slavery as well as chattel slavery. Marx would have nothing to do with those who were quick to make a "general" attack on slavery but remained nothing but disinterested bystanders in the actual civil war that broke out. As he was to write in CAPITAL: "Labor in the white skin cannot be free so long as labor in the black skin is enslaved." This was not an agitational statement but the simple truth. The trade union movement in America developed first on a national scale after the Civil War and the giant steps labor will take activity of the then will bring it up to the level of the First International.

There were thousands of workers in England, non-Marxists, who held a monster demonstration against their Government's attempt to intervene in the Civil War in the United States on the side of the pro-slavery South. This movement Marx was interested in and followed very closely.

In 1863 there was an insurrection in Poland against the Tsarist Russian imperialist domination over them. "This much is certain," wrote Marx to Engels, "The era of revolution at length has been reopened in Europe."

The turbulent '60s also engulfed France. Napoleon III's regime was shaken by the many strikes and "combinations" (unions) which kept springing up despite the strictest anti-Combination laws and harshest prison terms for the strikers. Louis Bonaparte conceived the idea of gaining the support of the workers by giving amnesty to a few of the thousands of those imprisoned for participation in strikes. At the same time he announced that the workers could elect their own delegates to attend the World Exhibition to be held in London in 1862 where the capitalists would display not only their machines, raw materials and finished products, but also

their technicians, statisticians and manual operatives in order "to inspire" them to ever greater production. 200,000 workers voted in the French election and sent delegates to the English capital. Once there the delegation split and contacted the British trade unions. These workers had other ideas than to continue to work as the capitalists ordered. Out of the contact with the British trade unions, there grew, first, joint action in favor of the Polish insurrections who had been bloodily put down, and then the decision to establish an "international workmen's association". To that meeting in 1864 Marx was invited.

Many write as the historic significance of the International Workingmen's Association or, as it is now known, the First International is that Marx "organized" it. Nothing could be further from the truth. It was Marx who recognized at once the historic significance of this crystallization of the empiric acts of labor into a new formation. At every critical stage in the objective development of capital, the subjective development of the opposing element in capitalism--labor--tells the specific stage the proletariat has reached in its attempt to reorganize society. Thus the organizations formed at every stage tell the concrete stage of development of labor. It was one thing when ~~they~~^{it} created utopian societies, quite something else when it built Chartism and unions, and something else again when it reached the stage of an international organization. Marx was always looking at the revolts of the workers and the organizations they formed. He said the one merit of utopianism was that it reflected the first instinctive desire to reorganize society. It became a reactionary sect precisely when this universal aim to establish a new social order gained new impulses from the concretely developing capitalism and its revolt now took the form of the fight for the normal working day while the utopians insisting on preserving the old type of organization. Marx, on the other hand, prided himself because what he had written out for the first congress was precisely what the workers in Baltimore had already concluded by "correct instinct": "The first and great

"That the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the workingclasses themselves; that the struggle for the emancipation of the workingclasses means not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties, and the abolition of all class rule;

"That the economical subjection of the man of labor to the monopoliser of the means of ~~production~~ labor, that is the sources of life, lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation and political dependency;

"That the economical emancipation of the working classes is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means...."

~~But what about Marx's CAPITALS~~
was ~~discussing everything about~~.

2. The Working Day and Marx's Capital

Marx had been laboring on the theory of surplus value. To scientifically extricate it from being a mere implication in Ricardo's theory of value Marx found he had to study the ~~division~~ working day: how was it divided between that part which was necessary to produce the value of labor power to pay the laborer his wages and that which produced the surplus value which the capitalist appropriated. But there was nothing static about this working day. The struggle to establish a normal working day was a veritable civil war between capital and labor. Thus to the revolutionary theoretician wrestling with the theory of surplus value the "mere historic connexion" disclosed:

1) that capitalism's "single life impulse" to create surplus value had led to such unlimited expansion of the working day at the long birth of capitalism, from the 14th to the 17th centuries, that it produced the premature exhaustion and death of labor power itself, ~~1789~~

It was only labor's struggle against its self-destructive nature of capitalist production that saved society.

2) But with the industrial revolution the last third of the 18th century broke all bounds--moral and natural, age, sex, day, night-- 24 hours was the day of the machine and was to be the day of labor. Again it took the REVOLT of the working class, this time united and organized by the mechanism of production itself, to infuse capitalist society with a social consciousness which made it a life and death question for bourgeois society as a whole compulsorily to shorten the working day.

3) However, once the limits of the working day were set the capitalist's "wore-wolf hunger for surplus value" which is in the very nature of production sought a way to extract within the same working day ever greater amounts of surplus value. Through constant revolutions in the method of production and through the intensity of labor the capitalist was able to force more surplus out of labor within the limited working day

Thus what Marx called "the mere historical connexions" revealed the general groundwork of capitalism to be the prolongation of the working day beyond the limits necessary to produce the value of the labor power.

That is not a peaceful process in the factory where the surplus is forced out of the worker through the domination of the machine and the factory clock. And it most certainly is not a peaceful dispute in the open class struggle where it takes the proportions of a veritable ^{That} civil war./ Ricardo's "bourgeois skin" didn't let him see this struggle is understandable. But Marx himself didn't have a section on the Working Day in the first draft of Capital/ ~~Marx's theory of surplus value~~ When he began to study the science of the machine and the degradation of the laborer, it is then that he also how inelastic were the limits of the working day. The working out of the theory of surplus value led him to the struggle of the division of the working day and that division into the division of labor into concrete and abstract. When he wrote

in the CRITIQUE,
about abstract labor, it looked as if it were an intellectual deduction.
Now the dominance of the machine over man showed what a reduction
of all human faculties this was. For there is no such animal as an
abstract laborer. One is either a tailor, a miner, an assembly line
worker. It is the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ dominance of the machine that forces all
concrete labor to produce so much in such a such a time, no matter what
the individual skill or ability is, into one abstract mass. The struggle
then at the point of production between concrete and abstract labor is
what is reflected in the struggle of labor against capital for the
normal working day:

"In place of the pompous catalogue of the 'inalienable
rights of man', " Marx wrote in CAPITAL, "comes the modest Magna Charta of
a legally limited working-day which shall make clear 'when the time
which the worker sells is ended and when his own begins.' Quantum mutatus
ab illo."

Marx's full transcendence of Ricardo proved that it wasn't a
question of not "understanding". There are no "misunderstandings" in
history. ~~The~~ Historic differences are class differences. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~
~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Production for production's sake without regard to the
birth-roots of wealth produces one theory, and blinds one as to its
implications. Production which includes the self-development of man
produces the opposite theory and reveals the other's "blind spots".
There is no mediating ground where "good men" can clean up "misunderstand-
ings". The revolt clears them all up by overthrowing the conditions
which create the birth-roots and the ideology.

The turbulence of the '60s, his close observance of the
revolts and the organizational forms illuminated his theoretic work with
a light no intellectual deductions can substitute for. He was now ready
for his great work. CAPITAL, as it was published in 1867, is substantially
the structure we now have. But there are two deficiencies: (1) the

law of concentration and centralization is not developed to its ultimate form, and, above that, (2) the fetishism of the commodity, although it has taken some giant advances over the CRITIQUE where it appeared a simple matter, has still failed to explain the WHY of this fantastic form of appearance of a production relationship. He said that "only freely-associated labor" can tear the veil off. But there he stopped for freely-associated labor had not yet torn off the veil.

3. The Paris Commune Destroys the Fetishism
of Commodities

Social revolution broke out in Paris on March 18, 1871 when the Republic of France showed itself as ready as Napoleon III to capitulate to Bismarck. The spontaneous mass outburst took the form of the Commune of Paris and was the first historic attempt of the workers to establish a workers state. It lasted only two months before the Parisian workers were massacred by the bloodiest terror in history. But in those two short months the workers accomplished more miracles than capitalism in as many centuries in (1) realizing full democracy, and (2) releasing all the potentialities of the proletariat so that the world could see ^{how} ~~that~~ fully-sized human beings manage their lives. Within two days after its fall, Marx delivered an address to the First International on the Historic Significance of the Commune. It is this description of the struggle of the proletariat for a new social order which reveals also the essence of CAPITAL in its final classic form. I add emphasis when the specific point is one that shows its dialectic relationship to CAPITAL and thereby finally tears off the veil of bourgeois fetishisms.

First and foremost the Paris Commune did not take over but SMASHED the centralized state power with its ubiquitous organs of standing army, police, officialdom, "organs wrought after the plan of a systematic and hierarchic division of labor." In doing so it got rid not only of the absolutist Empire but "the parliamentary republic, the proper form of

a joint-stock government."

In its place it established the armed people, officials at workmen's wages and subject to immediate recall, and a working, not a parliamentary body of bureaucrats. The Commune thus superseded not only monarchical rule but class rule itself. It was the "self-government of the producers."

In contrast to all previous forms of political rule which were always repressive, it was a thoroughly expansive political form, "the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of labor. Except on this last condition the Communal Constitution would have been an impossibility and a delusion. The political rule cannot coexist with the perpetuation of his social slavery."

The Commune thus established the inseparability of politics and economics and hence the first step to abolishing the most monstrous division of all which comprises the whole history of capitalism--the division between mental and manual labor. Capitalist parliamentarism kept this division alive and could do so because while the bourgeois government the workers kept on working. But a workers state aiming at the abolition of classproperty and transforming the means of production into mere instruments of "free and associated labor" could not. Every one becomes a worker and the "plain worker" becomes the ruler. Thus while work loses its class stigma and becomes a way of life and self-development no form of production, not even cooperative production, is left out from under "workers control". With no officialdom, no standing army, no police, the workers themselves would work it out. Nobody else can.

Marx then add that it/~~offerad~~ ^{did not} and could not have offered a blueprint of the future. It merely "set free the elements of the new society." Here then is what the Commune was:

- 1) direct and active participation of the masses in controlling

a new social order. That the theoretic achievement of the Paris Commune.

4. The Structure and Logic of Capital

(Now, that I've finally gotten to this, Grace, I'm shivering all over, and must take a rest. Incidentally, I mean also to add a postscript on the Stalinists and Chapter I not so much from the theoretic point of view, as the actual commodity form that has them in a vice. It really is hilarious; No one knows better than the Stalinists that the only wealth is that which the workers produce, but between the backwardness of their economy and the pressures of the world market, they are in a whirl more than Ricardo was. I never did a piece on their inflation as I did on plan. But when I get around to dealing with the devaluation of the ruble, it ought to serve as a very nice postscript to the question of form.)