

Chapter 1 : Marxist philosophy - Wikipedia

DOWNLOAD BASIC PROBLEMS OF MARXS PHILOSOPHY basic problems of marxs pdf In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: BOOK REVIEWS The idiosyncratic criticisms.

If this claim which Marx originally intended as a criticism of German Idealism and the more moderate Young Hegelians is still more or less the case in the 21st century, as many Marxists [who? Much sophisticated and important thought has taken place after the writing of Marx and Engels ; much or perhaps even all of it has been influenced, subtly or overtly, by Marxism. Simply dismissing all philosophy as sophistry might condemn Marxism to a simplistic empiricism or economism , crippling it in practice and making it comically simplistic at the level of theory. Such problems might include a too-simple economic determinism , an untenable theory of ideology as " false consciousness ," or a simplistic model of state power rather than hegemony. So Marxist philosophy must continue to take account of advances in the theory of politics developed after Marx, but it must also be wary of a descent into theoreticism or the temptations of idealism. However, "Althusser never ceased to put in question the images of communism that Marxist theory and ideology carried on: Balibar observes that, in the end, Althusser enjoined the most sober definition of communism, exposed by Marx in *The German Ideology*: Communism is "not a state of the future, but the real movement which destroys the existing state of being. There are endless interpretations of the "philosophy of Marx", from the interior of the Marxist movement as well as in its exterior. English political economy , French republicanism and radicalism , and German idealist philosophy. Although this "three sources" model is an oversimplification, it still has some measure of truth. On the other hand, Costanzo Preve has assigned four "masters" to Marx: Epicurus to whom he dedicated his thesis, *Difference of natural philosophy between Democritus and Epicurus*, for his materialism and theory of *clinamen* which opened up a realm of liberty ; Jean-Jacques Rousseau , from which come his idea of egalitarian democracy ; Adam Smith , from whom came the idea that the grounds of property is labour ; and finally Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel Marx developed a comprehensive, theoretical understanding of political reality early in his intellectual and activist career by means of a critical adoption and radicalization of the categories of 18th and 19th century German Idealist thought. On the contrary, Hegel argues for the organic unity between universal and particular. Observing an acorn on its own, we can never deduce that it is an oak tree. To figure out what the acorn is - and also what the oak tree is - we have to observe the line of development from one to the other. Looked at purely formally, human society has a natural line of development in accordance with its essence just like any other living thing. This process of development appears as a succession of stages of world history. It is delivered by means of the actions of men which spring from their needs, passions, and interests. Some accident from the outside might come along to interrupt this process of development, but if left to its own devices, it proceeds in a relatively straightforward manner. Spirit is constantly at war with itself. When change in the essence takes place, as it does in the process of evolution, we can understand the change mostly in mechanical terms using principles of genetics and natural selection. The historical process, however, never attempts to preserve an essence in the first place. In the historical process, however, what exists, what is actual, is imperfect. What is trying to come into existence - freedom - inherently negates everything preceding it and everything existing, since no actual existing human institution can possibly embody pure human freedom. So the actual is both itself and its opposite as potential. Having achieved his thesis on the *Difference of natural philosophy between Democritus and Epicurus* in , the young Marx progressively broke away with the Prussian university and its teachings impregnated by German Idealism Kant , Fichte , Schelling and Hegel. Along with Engels, who observed the Chartist movement in the United Kingdom , he cut away with the environment in which he grew up and encountered the proletariat in France and Germany. Max Stirner claimed that all ideals were inherently alienating , and that replacing God with Humanity, as did Ludwig Feuerbach in *The Essence of Christianity* , was not sufficient. Marx also criticized Proudhon , who had become famous with his cry " Property is theft! Marx, "stood Hegel on his head," in his own view of his role, by turning the idealistic dialectic into a materialistic one, in proposing that material circumstances shape ideas, instead of the other way around. In

this, Marx was following the lead of Feuerbach. But Marx also criticized Feuerbach for being insufficiently materialistic, as Stirner himself had pointed out, and explained that the alienation described by the Young Hegelians was in fact the result of the structure of the economy itself. But the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In reality, it is the ensemble of the social relations. He claimed that individualism was the result of commodity fetishism or alienation. Some critics have claimed that meant that Marx enforced a strict social determinism which destroyed the possibility of free will. Criticisms of the "human rights"[edit] In the same way, following Babeuf , considered as one of the founder of communism during the French Revolution , he criticized the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen as a "bourgeois declaration" of the rights of the "egoistic individual", ultimately based on the "right to private property", which economism deduced from its own implicit "philosophy of the subject", which asserts the preeminence of an individual and universal subject over social relations. Alongside Freud , Nietzsche , and Durkheim , Marx thus takes a place amongst the 19th century philosophers who criticized this pre-eminence of the subject and its consciousness. According to Marx, the recognition of these individual rights was the result of the universal extension of market relations to all of society and to all of the world, first through the primitive accumulation of capital including the first period of European colonialism and then through the globalization of the capitalist sphere. Such individual rights were the symmetric of the "right for the labourer" to "freely" sell his labor force on the marketplace through juridical contracts, and worked in the same time as an ideological means to discompose the collective grouping of producers required by the Industrial Revolution: The creation of a normal working-day is, therefore, the product of a protracted civil war, more or less dissembled, between the capitalist class and the working-class It must be acknowledged that our labourer comes out of the process of production other than he entered. In the market he stood as owner of the commodity "labour-power" face to face with other owners of commodities, dealer against dealer. The contract by which he sold to the capitalist his labour-power proved, so to say, in black and white that he disposed of himself freely. The bargain concluded, it is discovered that he was no "free agent," that the time for which he is free to sell his labour-power is the time for which he is forced to sell it, that in fact the vampire will not lose its hold on him "so long as there is a muscle, a nerve, a drop of blood to be exploited. In place of the pompous catalogue of the "inalienable rights of man" 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! The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production , produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labor of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation. This does not re-establish private property for the producer, but gives him individual property based on the acquisition of the capitalist era: Instead, Marx aspired to give ontological priority to what he called the "real life process" of real human beings, as he and Engels said in *The German Ideology* In direct contrast to German philosophy, which descends from heaven to earth, here we ascend from earth to heaven. That is to say, we do not set out from what men say, imagine, conceive, nor from men as narrated, thought of, imagined, conceived, in order to arrive at men in the flesh. We set out from real, active men, and on the basis of their real life process we demonstrate the development of the ideological reflexes and echoes of this life process. The phantoms formed in the human brain are also, necessarily, sublimates of their material life process, which is empirically verifiable and bound to material premises. Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this, their real existence, their thinking, and the products of their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life. This opposition between various subjective interpretations given by philosophers, which may be, in a sense, compared with *Weltanschauung* designed to legitimize the current state of affairs, and effective transformation of the world through praxis , which combines theory and practice in a materialist way, is what distinguish "Marxist philosophers" with the rest of philosophers. A year before the Revolutions of , Marx and Engels thus wrote *The Communist Manifesto*, which was prepared to an imminent revolution, and ended with the famous cry:

Marx thereby modified his theory of alienation exposed in the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 and would later arrive to his theory of commodity fetishism , exposed in the first chapter of the first book of Das Kapital This abandonment of the early theory of alienation would be amply discussed, and several Marxist theorists, including Marxist humanists such as the Praxis School , would return to it. Others, such as Althusser, would claim that the " epistemological break " between the "young Marx" and the "mature Marx" was such that no comparisons could be done between both works, marking a shift to a "scientific theory" of society. In 1845, when Marx was starting to settle his account with Hegel and the Young Hegelians in his writings, he critiqued the Young Hegelians for limiting the horizon of their critique to religion and not taking up the critique of the state and civil society as paramount.

Chapter 2 : - Basic Problems of Marx's Philosophy by Nathan Rotenstreich

1. Marx's Life and Works. Karl Marx was born in Trier, in the German Rhineland, in Although his family was Jewish they converted to Christianity so that his father could pursue his career as a lawyer in the face of Prussia's anti-Jewish laws.

I bought an apple for 5 cents, spent the evening polishing it, and sold it the next day for 10 cents. With this I bought two apples, spent the evening polishing them, and sold them for 20. And so it went until I amassed 1000. What does it all mean? Karl Marx sought the answers to these questions by trying to understand how our capitalist society works for whom it works better, for whom worse, how it arose out of feudalism and where it is likely to lead. Some socialist ideas can be traced as far back as the Bible, but Marxism has its main intellectual origins in German philosophy, English political economy, and French utopian socialism. It is from the German philosopher, Hegel, that Marx learned a way of thinking about the world, in all its fluid complexity, that is called "dialectics. From the French utopians, especially Charles Fourier and the Comte de Saint-Simon, Marx caught a glimpse of a happier future that lay beyond capitalism. Along with the paradox of an Industrial Revolution which produced as much poverty as it did wealth, these are the main ingredients that went into the formation of Marxism. With dialectics, changes and interaction are brought into focus and emphasized by being viewed as essential parts of whatever institutions and processes are undergoing change and interaction. In this way, the system of capitalism, the wider context, is never lost sight of when studying any event within it, an election or an economic crisis for example; nor are its real past and future possibilities, the historical context, ever neglected when dealing with how something appears in the present. The actual changes that occur in history are seen here as the outcome of opposing tendencies, or "contradictions", which evolve in the ordinary functioning of society. How do the ways in which people earn their living affect their bodies, minds and daily lives? In the theory of alienation, Marx gives us his answer to this question. These are owned by the capitalists to whom the workers must sell their "labor power", or ability to do work, in return for a wage. Someone else, the capitalist, also sets the conditions and speed of work and even decides if the worker is to be allowed to work or not, i. Through labor which alienates them from their activity, product and other people, workers gradually lose their ability to develop the finer qualities which belong to them as members of the human species. The cutting of these relationships in half leaves on one side a seriously diminished individual physically weakened, mentally confused and mystified, isolated and virtually powerless. On the other side of this separation are the products and ties with other people, outside the control and lost to the understanding of the worker. Unknowingly, the worker has constructed the necessary conditions for reproducing his own alienation. Smith and Ricardo used the labor theory of value to explain the Cost of commodities. For them, the value of any commodity is the result of the amount of labor time that went into its production. Marx took this explanation more or less for granted. His labor theory of value, however, is primarily concerned with the more basic problem of why goods have prices of any kind. Only in capitalism does the distribution of what is produced take place through the medium of markets and prices. In slave society, the slave owner takes by force what his slaves produce, returning to them only what he wishes. While in feudalism, the lord claims as a feudal right some part of what is produced by his serfs, with the serfs consuming the rest of their output directly. In both societies, most of what is produced cannot be bought or sold, and therefore, does not have any price. In accounting for the extraordinary fact that everything produced in capitalist society has a price, Marx emphasizes the separation of the worker from the means of production whereas slaves and serfs are tied to their means of production and the sale of his or her labor power that this separation makes necessary. To survive, the workers, who lack all means to produce, must sell their labor power. In selling their labor power, they give up all claims to the products of their labor. Hence, these products become available for exchange in the market, indeed are produced with this exchange in mind, while workers are able to consume only that portion of their products which they can buy back in the market with the wages they are paid for their labor power. Rather than a particular price, value stands for the whole set of conditions which are necessary for a commodity to have any price at all. It is in this sense that Marx calls value a product of capitalism. The ideal price "exchange value" of a commodity and the ways in which it is meant to be used

"use value" likewise exhibit in their different ways the distinctive relationships Marx uncovered between workers and their activities, products and other people in capitalist society. Through alienation, the relations between workers has been reduced to the quantity of labor that goes into their respective products. Only then can these products exchange for each other at a ratio which reflects these quantities. Surplus-value, the third aspect of value, is the difference between the amount of exchange and use value created by workers and the amount returned to them as wages. However, workers can make in, say, five hours products which are the equivalent of their wages. In the remaining three or more hours an amount of wealth is produced which remains in the hands of the capitalist. Because of the competition among capitalists, workers are constantly being replaced by machinery, enabling and requiring capitalists to extract ever greater amounts of surplus value from the workers who remain. Because only part of their product is returned to them as wages, the workers cannot buy a large portion of the consumables that they produce. Under pressure from the constant growth of the total product, the capitalists periodically fail to find new markets to take up the slack. He stresses the contradictions that arose through the growth of towns, population, technology and trade, which at a certain point burst asunder the feudal social and political forms in which production had been organized. Relations of lord to serf based on feudal rights and obligations had become a hindrance to the further development of these productive forces; over an extended period and after a series of political battles, they were replaced by the contractual relation of capitalists to workers. With capitalists free to pursue profits wherever they might take them and workers equally "free" to sell their labor power to the capitalists however they might use it, the productive potential inherent in the new forces of production, especially in technology and science, grew to unmeasured proportions. However, if maximizing profits leads to rapid growth when rapid growth results in large profits, then growth is restricted as soon as it becomes unprofitable. The periodic crises which have plagued capitalism from about on are clear evidence of this. Since that time, the new forces of production which have come into being in capitalism, their growth and potential for producing wealth, have come increasingly into contradiction with the capitalist social relations in which production is organized. The capitalists put the factories, machines, raw materials, and labor power all of which they own into motion to produce goods only if they feel they can make a profit, no matter what the availability of these "factors of production", and no matter what the need of consumers for their products. The cost to society in wealth that is never produced and in wealth which is produced but in forms that are anti-social in their character continues to grow and with it the need for another, more efficient, more humane way of organizing production. Within this framework the actual course of history is determined by class struggle. According to Marx, each class is defined chiefly by its relation to the productive process and has objective interests rooted in that relation. In capitalism, the state is an instrument in the hands of the capitalists that is used to repress dangerous dissent and to help expand surplus value. This is done mainly by passing and enforcing anti-working class laws and by providing the capitalists with various economic subsidies "capitalist welfare". And, finally, the state is an arena for class struggle where class and class factions contend for political advantage in an unfair fight that finds the capitalists holding all the most powerful weapons. An adequate understanding of the role of the capitalist state as a complex social relation requires that it be approached from each of these three angles: In order to supplement the institutions of force, capitalism has given rise to an ideology, or way of thinking, which gets people to accept the status quo or, at least, confuses them as to the possibility of replacing it with something better. For the most part, the ideas and concepts which make up this ideology work by getting people to focus on the observable aspects of any event or institution, neglecting its history and potential for change as well as the broader context in which it resides. For example, in capitalist ideology, consumers are considered sovereign, as if consumers actually determine what gets produced through the choices they make in the supermarket; and no effort is made to analyze how they develop their preferences history or who determines the range of available choices larger system. As the attempted separation of what cannot be separated without distortion, capitalist ideology reflects in thought the fractured lives of alienated people, while at the same time making it increasingly difficult for them to grasp their alienation. As the contradictions of capitalism become greater, more intense, and less amenable to disguise, neither the state nor ideology can restrain the mass of the workers, white and blue collar, from recognizing their interests becoming "class

conscious" and acting upon them. The overthrow of capitalism, when it comes, Marx believed, would proceed as quickly and democratically as the nature of capitalist opposition allowed. Out of the revolution would emerge a socialist society which would fully utilize and develop much further the productive potential inherited from capitalism. Through democratic planning, production would now be directed to serving social needs instead of maximizing private profit. The final goal, toward which socialist society would constantly build, is the human one of abolishing alienation. Marx called the attainment of this goal "communism". Workers, for example, may earn more money now than they did in the last century, but so do the capitalists. Consequently, the wealth and income gaps between the two classes is as great or greater than ever. From its beginnings, Marxism has been under attack from all sides, but the major criticisms have been directed against claims that Marx never made. Viewed as an "economic determinism", Marxism has also been criticized for presenting politics, culture, religion, etc. This would be undialectical. Viewed as a claim that labor is the only factor in determining prices equated here with "value", the labor theory of value has been wrongly attacked for ignoring the effect of competition on prices. Some, finally, point to the anti-democratic practices of many Communist countries and claim that authoritarianism is inherent in Marxist doctrine. Marxism, as defined here, has had its main influence among workers and intellectuals in capitalist countries, especially in Europe, who have used it as a major tool in defining their problems and constructing political strategies. In the Communist countries, selected doctrines of Marx have been frozen into abstract principles to serve as the official ideology of the regimes. The influence of these three varieties of Marxism is as different as their content. The most powerful nation in history cannot erase poverty, provide full employment, guarantee decent housing or an adequate diet or good health care to its people. Meanwhile, the rich get richer. Only Marxism, as an account of the rational unfolding of a basically irrational capitalist system, makes sense of our current chaos. In class struggle, it also points the way out. The rest is up to us.

Chapter 3 : Karl Marx (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Marx, in some significant sense, construed the two concepts, human and social, as identical. "He said that man is socially active in so far as he is active as man. Social man is a human man" (p. 76).

The beginning of the main argument, essentially, is the Third Thesis: Nature has willed that man shall produce wholly out of himself everything that goes beyond the mechanical ordering of his animal existence; and that he should partake of no other happiness or pleasure. We are given the opportunities and capacities in general to make of ourselves what we will: Securing his own food, shelter, safety and defence for which Nature gave him neither the horns of the bull, nor the claws of the lion, nor the fangs of the dog, but hands only, all amusement which can make life pleasant, insight and intelligence, finally even goodness of heart – all this should be wholly his own work. The risks are various. But noting the fact that massive development has in fact taken place, Kant had to explain the motive force behind change and human social growth. In a statement that has all the appearance of paradox, Kant writes: The means employed by Nature to bring about the development of all the capacities of men is their antagonism in Society, so far as this is, in the end, the cause of a lawful order among men. Without going into the whole explanation and argument, in fact, the resolution of the paradox consists in the following. Kant sees social life as the precondition of being human at all. He talks of the tendency to socialise as making man more than in I Kant, On History. Library of Liberal Arts, 13 I am, nonetheless, condensing the argument which I have dealt with at length elsewhere; so some problems and possible objections are left out. But the anti-social tendency is not of a Hobbesian sort; it is not a tendency to disengage from society, rather it is a tendency to a specific form of antagonistic social relations. These constitute a specific way of becoming human. But the antagonism is not instinctual or rooted in any basic human nature. It comes from the limited experience of any particular individual, who therefore confronts the world with only a partial understanding. The antagonistic social relations are those in which each individual attempts to make use of other individuals to his own end. And that is attempted because the world beyond the individual appears governed by social laws which are alien to him or her. In that, he gives as a prime version of the Categorical Imperative that we should never treat others merely as means to an end only, but always as ends-inthemselves. The substantive implications of this need disentangling, but it certainly is very important in seeing how he now understands history. By application of his ethical theory, we can see how antagonistic social relations are decidedly immoral. But that does not lead Kant to a simple condemnation. On the contrary, first we must recognise their naturalness; and having done that, he applauds the antagonisms for the most interesting reason: Thanks be to Nature, then, for the incompatibility, for heartless competitive vanity, for the insatiable desire to possess and to rule! For his model of history, deriving from his general philosophy, now admits the naturalness, but not the inevitability, of competitive social relations; recognises the evil they embody, and also generate; but nonetheless develops from his conception a theory of social development. The theory, crudely put, is that even in 18 I Kant. Exploitation can increase, rather than reduce, social interdependence; can be the mechanism for the development of human capacities, rather than the source simply of mutual destruction. But not only does Kant see this vital logic, he also adds the last dimension which is required to make him useful to Marxism. He posits as an essential element, both practically in terms of our acting in the present with an orientation to the future, and theoretically in terms of our capacity to grasp the essential nature of the present, that social antagonism can be superseded: The differences between a cooperative society and the present antagonistic society need restating. This has the effect of enforcing human development; we become increasingly socialised, and therefore in one sense more humanised, because humanity requires social relationships. But the cause of unsociable, antagonistic relations is not any innate drive; rather, it is that our understanding of the world is limited to the world as it appears. And it appears that any progress on my part requires the subjection of you to my will. But the very fact of this reveals a paradox which reason can disentangle. For in subjecting you to my will, it becomes evident that both I and you are conscious agents, more than mere objects of mechanical causation. Therefore, the greater the degree of antagonistic social development, the greater the possibility of reason discovering the fact that all this

antagonism is at the. Thus reason can show us the possibility of human mutual development on the basis of cooperation: Man is an animal which, if it lives among others of its kind, requires a master. For he certainly abuses his freedom with respect to other men, and although, as a reasonable being he wishes to have a law which limits the freedom of all, his selfish impulses tempt him, where possible, to exempt himself from them. He thus requires a master, who will break his will, and force him to obey a will that is universally valid, under which each can be free. But whence does he get his master? Only from the human race. But then the master is himself an animal, and needs a master. Let him begin it as he will, it is not to be seen how he can procure a magistracy which can maintain public justice and which is itself just, whether it be a single person or a group of several people. For each of them will always abuse his freedom if he has none above him to exercise force in accordance with the laws. The highest master should be just in himself, and yet be a man. Kant in the end finds the practical achievement of it impossible, or nearly so. He posits its possibility as a necessary condition of living; but finds the difficulties of realisation overwhelming. It is in fact quite noticeable how his certainty diminishes at the end of the article, as he tackles the transformation issue. Statements become questions; questions become hesitant, even querulous: For what enabled Kant to discover the dimensions of this? This interpretation of reason is also a signal for a whole reinterpretation. That is hereby to make reason a faculty for grasping what is materially possible. He lacked all the derived categories of labour, production, and class which gave Marx his solution. The principal difficulty is that the resolution of the problem of free will and determinism as well as the other problems of speculative metaphysics require a good deal. But just from what I have indicated, relation to the totality. But reason is here specifically limited to the faculty of desire, that is, to man the following points can, I think, be gained. He is wrong because he has in part reason, but of practical reason this is something misunderstood what Kant was attempting in his Marx instinctively grasped. He saw the Critique of Critiques. And he insists right at the start of his Practical Reason that the whole is. We should expect from this a theoretical imbalance between the possibilities of knowledge of the of reason is practical. His own preferences were clearly stated: And Benton is only partially right in his consequential comment: The moral philosophy was the heart of Kantianism; and it was a very special moral philosophy. Not at all the formal, contentless Puritan self-flagellation most interpreters would have us believe. On the contrary, as Cassirer notes: What is truly permanent in human nature is not any condition in which it once existed and from which it has fallen; rather it is the goal forw. Kant looks for constancy not in what man is but in what he should be. The problem therefore is to trace the way the distinction are not purely philosophical. For it was his phrasing of the distinction that enabled Kant in which reality appears. This is in Marxist terms to see the possibility of a free, rational world. For none other than the problem of ideology. As I argued before, I believe that the end proposed by its laws. And it is not accidental that Kant discovers the problem, ity of knowledge of the noumenal character of nonand has at his disposal the theoretical means to human nature, with his idealism: If we agree with Critique, called in a general way that of Pure Lukacs that Marxism is the theo: In the same way, reason, which contains 30 I Kant, op cit, p4 31 I Kant, letter to Herz, quoted in F van de Ptte; Kant as Philosophical constitutive a priori principles solely in respect Anthrolog1st, Martinus Nijhoff, p Who put them on him? Who can take them off? Marxism as the theory of the liberation of the working class supplied the answers to these questions. For the working class is the creator, in a crucial sense, of its own exploitation, and therefore has the potential capacity to end it and thereby free the whole of humanity. But if Marxism is the theory of that, it has to work as a theory, not simply as an assertion. Kant supplied the essential premises to make it work. These premises lie within the distinction, and the relation, that Kant draws between noumenon and phenomenon. For Kant sees freedom in man as both ground and end; ground, in that, as he says, freedom is the ratio essendi of morality: The possibility and realisability of a moral social order is what gives content to freedom, turns it from a mere absence of instinctual determination to a freely constructed social system. What is needed therefore is the materialist equivalent of the concept of freedom in this Kantian sense. In empiricism, the present judges the future. On the contrary, if we take two highly perceptive post-Kantians who make use of Kant in entirely contrary ways we find that it is possible to understand their pessimism and conservatism, and opposition to Marxism only on the basis of tracing their rejection of the Kantian distinction and relation between noumenon and

phenomenon These are claims, and I am not trying to substantiate them here. But, even if there were no other reasons for re-evaluating the tradition of Kantian interpretation, this would surely be more than enough. But space obviously forbids its inclusion here. Since Marxism is opposed to all variants of empiricism, one of whose chief tenets is the preconceptual availability of the world, Marxism needs a theory of concepts, of understanding. As Gramsci put it: But what is this criterion of choice to be, if not something superior to each single fact under enquiry? An intuition, a conception which must be regarded as having a complex history. I think that one of the lessons from Kant is the requirement of systematic structure. That, it seems to me, is the unrecovered heritage of Kant. To conclude in two ways then. Kant is wrongly regarded as a fatalist; he regarded freedom not merely as a Regulative Idea, guiding our penetration of the world of appearance, but also as a material possibility imposing on us the duty to try to realise it. Kant did not distinguish fact and value; he worked theoretically to merge them.

Chapter 4 : Karl Marx > By Individual Philosopher > Philosophy

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Photograph, Introduction Karl Heinrich Marx - was a German philosopher, political theorist and revolutionary of the 19th Century. Both a scholar and a political activist, Marx is often called the father of Communism , and certainly his Marxist theory provided the intellectual base for various subsequent forms of Communism. Marxism , the philosophical and political school or tradition his work gave rise to, is a variety of radical or revolutionary Socialism conceived as a reaction against the rampant Capitalism and Liberalism of 19th Century Europe, with working class self-emancipation as its goal. Among other things, he is known for his analysis of history particularly his concept of historical materialism and the search for a systemic understanding of socioeconomic change. His father, Heinrich Marx, was descended from a long line of Jewish rabbis, but converted to Lutheran Christianity in order to continue practicing law; his mother was Henriette Pressburg. Marx was educated at home until the age of thirteen, when he attended the Trier Gymnasium. In , at the age of seventeen, he enrolled in the University of Bonn to study law his father would not allow him to study philosophy and literature, as Marx would have preferred, for practical career reasons , However, he did not pursue his studies very diligently at one point serving as the president of the Trier Tavern Club drinking society , and his father moved him the next year to the more serious and academically orientated Humboldt University in Berlin. At Humboldt, he began to absorb the atheistic philosophy of the Young Hegelians the more radical left-wing followers of G. Hegel who were prominent in Berlin at the time. He earned his doctorate in with a thesis entitled "The Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature", although he had to submit his dissertation to the University of Jena as he was warned that his reputation among the faculty as a Young Hegelian radical would lead to a poor reception in Berlin. In , he married Jenny von Westphalen, the educated daughter of a Prussian baron, despite the objections of both families. However, the next year he met Friedrich Engels - , and began the most important friendship of his life and arguably one of the most important in history. The same year, Marx himself became a communist , and set down his views in a series of writings known as the "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of " which remained unpublished until the s , in which he outlined a humanist conception of Communism , influenced by the philosophy of the Young Hegelian Ludwig Feuerbach - , and based on a contrast between the alienated nature of labor under Capitalism and a communist society in which human beings freely developed their nature in cooperative production. There, Marx devoted himself to an intensive study of history and elaborated on his idea of historical materialism, particularly in a manuscript published posthumously as "Die Deutsche Ideologie" "The German Ideology". He was invited to return to Paris by the radical movement that had seized power from King Louis-Philippe in France, and he witnessed the revolutionary "June Days Uprising" first hand. The paper was suppressed and Marx, after two arrests and acquittals, returned to Paris again, but was forced out yet again. This time, in May , he sought refuge in London, where he was to remain for the rest of his life. During the first half of the s, the Marx family lived in poverty and constant fear of creditors in a three room flat in Soho, London. They already had four children and three more were to follow although only three survived to adulthood. Throughout the s and s, Marx continued the laborious task of writing his huge works on political economy, spending day after day in the reading room of the British Museum. The most important of these was his masterwork "Das Kapital" "Capital" , the first volume of which was published in , well behind schedule. Volumes II and III remained mere manuscripts upon which Marx continued to work for the rest of his life, and which were published posthumously as were several of his other works by Engels. However, Marx was also devoting much of his time and energy during this period to the First International, to whose General Council he was elected at its inception in He was particularly active in preparing for the annual Congresses of the International, and in leading the struggle against the anarchist wing led by Mikhail Bakunin - One of the most important political events during the existence of the International

was the Paris Commune of 1871, when the citizens of Paris rebelled against their government and held the city for two months. Marx wrote one of his most famous pamphlets, "The Civil War in France" in enthusiastic defense of the Commune after its bloody suppression. Following the death of his wife, Jenny, in 1881, Marx developed a catarrh that kept him in ill health for the last fifteen months of his life, and that eventually brought on the bronchitis and pleurisy from which he died in London on 14 March 1883. He died a stateless person and was buried in Highgate Cemetery, London, his tombstone carved with the final line of "The Communist Manifesto": This was the work in which he first noted that the nature of individuals depends on the material conditions determining their production, and in which he traced the history of the various modes of production and predicted the collapse of the present one industrial and its replacement by Communism. Material conditions and social relations are therefore historically malleable because developments and changes in human societies are dependent on the way in which humans collectively produce the means to live. It was first published on 21 February 1848 as the manifesto of the Communist League, a small group of European communists who had come to be influenced by Marx and Engels. He believed that the Capitalist mode of production enables the bourgeoisie or owners of capital to exploit the proletariat or workers, and that a socialist revolution must occur in order to establish a "dictatorship of the proletariat" with the ultimate goal of public ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, and the self-emancipation of the working class. In 1849, he produced the "Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", his first serious economic work to be published. In the early 1860s, he worked on three large volumes of the "Theories of Surplus Value" also published posthumously, one of the first comprehensive treatises on the history of economic thought, which discussed the classical theoreticians of political economy such as Adam Smith and David Ricardo - In 1867, well behind schedule, the first volume of his masterwork "Das Kapital" "Capital" was published, which analyzed the capitalist process of production arguing that the alienation of human work and the resulting "commodity fetishism" was the defining feature of Capitalism, and in which he elaborated his labor theory of value and his conception of surplus value and exploitation which he argued would ultimately lead to a falling rate of profit and the collapse of industrial Capitalism. Volumes II and III remained mere manuscripts upon which Marx continued to work for the rest of his life, and which were edited and published posthumously by Engels.

Chapter 5 : Marxism - By Movement / School - The Basics of Philosophy

Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.

A precocious schoolchild, Marx studied law in Bonn and Berlin, and then wrote a PhD thesis in Philosophy, comparing the views of Democritus and Epicurus. On completion of his doctorate in Marx hoped for an academic job, but he had already fallen in with too radical a group of thinkers and there was no real prospect. Turning to journalism, Marx rapidly became involved in political and social issues, and soon found himself having to consider communist theory. Of his many early writings, four, in particular, stand out. The German Ideology, co-written with Engels in , was also unpublished but this is where we see Marx beginning to develop his theory of history. This was again jointly written with Engels and published with a great sense of excitement as Marx returned to Germany from exile to take part in the revolution of With the failure of the revolution Marx moved to London where he remained for the rest of his life. He now concentrated on the study of economics, producing, in , his Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy. In what follows, I shall concentrate on those texts and issues that have been given the greatest attention within the Anglo-American philosophical literature. Bauer had recently written against Jewish emancipation, from an atheist perspective, arguing that the religion of both Jews and Christians was a barrier to emancipation. In responding to Bauer, Marx makes one of the most enduring arguments from his early writings, by means of introducing a distinction between political emancipation “essentially the grant of liberal rights and liberties” and human emancipation. However, pushing matters deeper, in an argument reinvented by innumerable critics of liberalism, Marx argues that not only is political emancipation insufficient to bring about human emancipation, it is in some sense also a barrier. Liberal rights and ideas of justice are premised on the idea that each of us needs protection from other human beings who are a threat to our liberty and security. Therefore liberal rights are rights of separation, designed to protect us from such perceived threats. Freedom on such a view, is freedom from interference. What this view overlooks is the possibility “for Marx, the fact “ that real freedom is to be found positively in our relations with other people. It is to be found in human community, not in isolation. Accordingly, insisting on a regime of rights encourages us to view each other in ways that undermine the possibility of the real freedom we may find in human emancipation. Now we should be clear that Marx does not oppose political emancipation, for he sees that liberalism is a great improvement on the systems of feudalism and religious prejudice and discrimination which existed in the Germany of his day. Nevertheless, such politically emancipated liberalism must be transcended on the route to genuine human emancipation. Unfortunately, Marx never tells us what human emancipation is, although it is clear that it is closely related to the idea of non-alienated labour, which we will explore below. Just as importantly Marx here also considers the question of how revolution might be achieved in Germany, and sets out the role of the proletariat in bringing about the emancipation of society as a whole. Precisely what it is about material life that creates religion is not set out with complete clarity. However, it seems that at least two aspects of alienation are responsible. One is alienated labour, which will be explored shortly. A second is the need for human beings to assert their communal essence. Whether or not we explicitly recognize it, human beings exist as a community, and what makes human life possible is our mutual dependence on the vast network of social and economic relations which engulf us all, even though this is rarely acknowledged in our day-to-day life. After the post-Reformation fragmentation of religion, where religion is no longer able to play the role even of a fake community of equals, the state fills this need by offering us the illusion of a community of citizens, all equal in the eyes of the law. Interestingly, the political liberal state, which is needed to manage the politics of religious diversity, takes on the role offered by religion in earlier times of providing a form of illusory community. But the state and religion will both be transcended when a genuine community of social and economic equals is created. Of course we are owed an answer to the question how such a society could be created. It is interesting to read Marx here in the light of his third Thesis on Feuerbach where he criticises an alternative theory. The crude materialism of Robert Owen and others assumes that human beings are fully

determined by their material circumstances, and therefore to bring about an emancipated society it is necessary and sufficient to make the right changes to those material circumstances. However, how are those circumstances to be changed? By an enlightened philanthropist like Owen who can miraculously break through the chain of determination which ties down everyone else? Indeed if they do not create the revolution for themselves – in alliance, of course, with the philosopher – they will not be fit to receive it. However, the manuscripts are best known for their account of alienated labour. Here Marx famously depicts the worker under capitalism as suffering from four types of alienated labour. First, from the product, which as soon as it is created is taken away from its producer. Second, in productive activity work which is experienced as a torment. Third, from species-being, for humans produce blindly and not in accordance with their truly human powers. Finally, from other human beings, where the relation of exchange replaces the satisfaction of mutual need. Essentially he attempts to apply a Hegelian deduction of categories to economics, trying to demonstrate that all the categories of bourgeois economics – wages, rent, exchange, profit, etc. Consequently each category of alienated labour is supposed to be deducible from the previous one. However, Marx gets no further than deducing categories of alienated labour from each other. Quite possibly in the course of writing he came to understand that a different methodology is required for approaching economic issues. Nevertheless we are left with a very rich text on the nature of alienated labour. Both sides of our species essence are revealed here: It is important to understand that for Marx alienation is not merely a matter of subjective feeling, or confusion. In our daily lives we take decisions that have unintended consequences, which then combine to create large-scale social forces which may have an utterly unpredicted, and highly damaging, effect. For example, for as long as a capitalist intends to stay in business he must exploit his workers to the legal limit. Whether or not wracked by guilt the capitalist must act as a ruthless exploiter. Similarly the worker must take the best job on offer; there is simply no other sane option. But by doing this we reinforce the very structures that oppress us. Several of these have been touched on already for example, the discussions of religion in theses 4, 6 and 7, and revolution in thesis 3 so here I will concentrate only on the first, most overtly philosophical, thesis. Materialism is complimented for understanding the physical reality of the world, but is criticised for ignoring the active role of the human subject in creating the world we perceive. Idealism, at least as developed by Hegel, understands the active nature of the human subject, but confines it to thought or contemplation: Marx combines the insights of both traditions to propose a view in which human beings do indeed create – or at least transform – the world they find themselves in, but this transformation happens not in thought but through actual material activity; not through the imposition of sublime concepts but through the sweat of their brow, with picks and shovels. Economics Capital Volume 1 begins with an analysis of the idea of commodity production. A commodity is defined as a useful external object, produced for exchange on a market. Thus two necessary conditions for commodity production are the existence of a market, in which exchange can take place, and a social division of labour, in which different people produce different products, without which there would be no motivation for exchange. Marx suggests that commodities have both use-value – a use, in other words – and an exchange-value – initially to be understood as their price. Use value can easily be understood, so Marx says, but he insists that exchange value is a puzzling phenomenon, and relative exchange values need to be explained. Why does a quantity of one commodity exchange for a given quantity of another commodity? His explanation is in terms of the labour input required to produce the commodity, or rather, the socially necessary labour, which is labour exerted at the average level of intensity and productivity for that branch of activity within the economy. Thus the labour theory of value asserts that the value of a commodity is determined by the quantity of socially necessary labour time required to produce it. Marx provides a two stage argument for the labour theory of value. As commodities can be exchanged against each other, there must, Marx argues, be a third thing that they have in common. Both steps of the argument are, of course, highly contestable. Capitalism is distinctive, Marx argues, in that it involves not merely the exchange of commodities, but the advancement of capital, in the form of money, with the purpose of generating profit through the purchase of commodities and their transformation into other commodities which can command a higher price, and thus yield a profit. Marx claims that no previous theorist has been able adequately to explain how capitalism as a whole can make a profit. The cost of this commodity is determined in the same way as the

cost of every other; i. Suppose that such commodities take four hours to produce. Thus the first four hours of the working day is spent on producing value equivalent to the value of the wages the worker will be paid. This is known as necessary labour. Any work the worker does above this is known as surplus labour, producing surplus value for the capitalist. Surplus value, according to Marx, is the source of all profit. Other commodities simply pass their value on to the finished commodities, but do not create any extra value. They are known as constant capital. Profit, then, is the result of the labour performed by the worker beyond that necessary to create the value of his or her wages. This is the surplus value theory of profit. It appears to follow from this analysis that as industry becomes more mechanised, using more constant capital and less variable capital, the rate of profit ought to fall. For as a proportion less capital will be advanced on labour, and only labour can create value. In Capital Volume 3 Marx does indeed make the prediction that the rate of profit will fall over time, and this is one of the factors which leads to the downfall of capitalism. A further consequence of this analysis is a difficulty for the theory that Marx did recognise, and tried, albeit unsuccessfully, to meet also in Capital Volume 3. It follows from the analysis so far that labour intensive industries ought to have a higher rate of profit than those which use less labour. Not only is this empirically false, it is theoretically unacceptable. Accordingly, Marx argued that in real economic life prices vary in a systematic way from values. Although there are known techniques for solving this problem now albeit with unwelcome side consequences, we should recall that the labour theory of value was initially motivated as an intuitively plausible theory of price. But when the connection between price and value is rendered as indirect as it is in the final theory, the intuitive motivation of the theory drains away. Any commodity can be picked to play a similar role. Consequently with equal justification one could set out a corn theory of value, arguing that corn has the unique power of creating more value than it costs. Formally this would be identical to the labour theory of value. Nevertheless, the claims that somehow labour is responsible for the creation of value, and that profit is the consequence of exploitation, remain intuitively powerful, even if they are difficult to establish in detail. However, even if the labour theory of value is considered discredited, there are elements of his theory that remain of worth. Both provide a salutary corrective to aspects of orthodox economic theory. Theory of History Marx did not set out his theory of history in great detail. Accordingly, it has to be constructed from a variety of texts, both those where he attempts to apply a theoretical analysis to past and future historical events, and those of a more purely theoretical nature. However, *The German Ideology*, co-written with Engels in 1845, is a vital early source in which Marx first sets out the basics of the outlook of historical materialism.

Chapter 6 : Karl Marx - Wikipedia

Basic problems of Marx's philosophy. A. James Gregor. Journal of the History of Philosophy 4 (4) () Abstract This article has no associated abstract.

Themes, Arguments, and Ideas Mode, Means, and Relations of Production Marx used the term mode of production to refer to the specific organization of economic production in a given society. A mode of production includes the means of production used by a given society, such as factories and other facilities, machines, and raw materials. It also includes labor and the organization of the labor force. The term relations of production refers to the relationship between those who own the means of production the capitalists or bourgeoisie and those who do not the workers or the proletariat. According to Marx, history evolves through the interaction between the mode of production and the relations of production. The mode of production constantly evolves toward a realization of its fullest productive capacity, but this evolution creates antagonisms between the classes of people defined by the relations of production—owners and workers. Capitalism is a mode of production based on private ownership of the means of production. Capitalists produce commodities for the exchange market and to stay competitive must extract as much labor from the workers as possible at the lowest possible cost. The economic interest of the capitalist is to pay the worker as little as possible, in fact just enough to keep him alive and productive. The workers, in turn, come to understand that their economic interest lies in preventing the capitalist from exploiting them in this way. As this example shows, the social relations of production are inherently antagonistic, giving rise to a class struggle that Marx believes will lead to the overthrow of capitalism by the proletariat. The proletariat will replace the capitalist mode of production with a mode of production based on the collective ownership of the means of production, which is called Communism.

Alienation In his early writings, which are more philosophical than economic, Marx describes how the worker under a capitalist mode of production becomes estranged from himself, from his work, and from other workers. By working on and transforming objective matter into sustenance and objects of use-value, human beings meet the needs of existence and come to see themselves externalized in the world. However, capitalism, the system of private ownership of the means of production, deprives human beings of this essential source of self-worth and identity. The worker approaches work only as a means of survival and derives none of the other personal satisfactions of work because the products of his labor do not belong to him. These products are instead expropriated by capitalists and sold for profit. In capitalism, the worker, who is alienated or estranged from the products he creates, is also estranged from the process of production, which he regards only as a means of survival. Estranged from the production process, the worker is therefore also estranged from his or her own humanity, since the transformation of nature into useful objects is one of the fundamental facets of the human condition. Finally, the capitalist mode of production alienates human beings from other human beings. The alienation of the worker from his work and of the worker from capitalists forms the basis of the antagonistic social relationship that will eventually lead to the overthrow of capitalism.

Historical Materialism As noted previously, the writings of the German idealist philosopher Hegel had a profound impact on Marx and other philosophers of his generation. Hegel elaborated a dialectical view of human consciousness as a process of evolution from simple to more complex categories of thought. According to Hegel, human thought has evolved from very basic attempts to grasp the nature of objects to higher forms of abstract thought and self-awareness. History evolves through a similar dialectical process, whereby the contradictions of a given age give rise to a new age based on a smoothing over of these contradictions. In other words, Hegel believed that ideas are the primary mode in which human beings relate to the world and that history can be understood in terms of the ideas that define each successive historical age. Marx, on the other hand, believed that the fundamental truth about a particular society or period in history is how that society is organized to satisfy material needs. Whereas Hegel saw history as a succession of ideas and a working out of contradictions on a conceptual level, Marx saw history as a succession of economic systems or modes of production, each one organized to satisfy human material needs but giving rise to antagonisms between different classes of people, leading to the creation of new societies in an evolving

pattern. The Labor Theory of Value The labor theory of value states that the value of a commodity is determined by the amount of labor that went into producing it and not, for instance, by the fluctuating relationship of supply and demand. Marx defines a commodity as an external object that satisfies wants or needs and distinguishes between two different kinds of value that can be attributed to it. Commodities have a use-value that consists of their capacity to satisfy such wants and needs. For the purposes of economic exchange, they have an exchange-value, their value in relation to other commodities on the market, which is measured in terms of money. Marx asserts that in order to determine the relative worth of extremely different commodities with different use-values, exchange-value, or monetary value, must be measurable in terms of a property common to all such commodities. The only thing that all commodities have in common is that they are a product of labor. Therefore, the value of a commodity in a market represents the amount of labor that went into its production. In the simplest form of exchange, people produce commodities and sell them so that they can buy other commodities to satisfy their own needs and wants. In such exchanges, money is only the common medium that allows transactions to take place. Capitalists, in contrast, are motivated not by a need for commodities but by a desire to accumulate money. Capitalists take advantage of their power to set wages and working hours to extract the greatest amount of labor from workers at the lowest possible cost, selling the products of the workers at a higher price than the capitalists paid for them. Marx pointed to the abject poverty of industrial workers in places like Manchester for proof of the destructive effects of this exploitative relationship. Commodity Fetishism The word fetish refers to any object that people fixate on or are fascinated by and that keeps them from seeing the truth. According to Marx, when people try to understand the world in which they live, they fixate on money—“who has it, how is it acquired, how is it spent”—or they fixate on commodities, trying to understand economics as a matter of what it costs to make or to buy a product, what the demand for a product is, and so on. Marx believed that commodities and money are fetishes that prevent people from seeing the truth about economics and society: In capitalism, the production of commodities is based on an exploitative economic relationship between owners of factories and the workers who produce the commodities. In everyday life, we think only of the market value of a commodity—in other words, its price. But this monetary value simultaneously depends on and masks the fact that someone was exploited to make that commodity. The concept of commodity fetishism applies both to the perceptions of normal people in everyday life and to the formal study of economics. Economists, both then and now, study the economy in terms of the movements of money, goods, and prices, which is essentially the point of view of the corporation. From this point of view, the social dimension of economic life is considered unscientific and unworthy of discussion. Marx argues that this commodity fetishism allows capitalists to carry on with day-to-day affairs of a capitalist mode of production without having to confront the real implications of the system of exploitation on which they depend.

Chapter 7 : DIALECTICAL MARXISM: The Writings of Bertell Ollman

Basic Problems of Marx's Philosophy (review) A. James Gregor Journal of the History of Philosophy, Volume 4, Number 4, October , pp. (Review).

Biography Childhood and early education: The family occupied two rooms on the ground floor and three on the first floor. A classical liberal , he took part in agitation for a constitution and reforms in Prussia, then governed by an absolute monarchy. Lion Philips was a wealthy Dutch tobacco manufacturer and industrialist, upon whom Karl and Jenny Marx would later often come to rely for loans while they were exiled in London. By employing many liberal humanists as teachers, Wyttenbach incurred the anger of the local conservative government. Subsequently, police raided the school in and discovered that literature espousing political liberalism was being distributed among the students. He became engaged to Jenny von Westphalen , an educated baroness of the Prussian ruling class who had known Marx since childhood. As she had broken off her engagement with a young aristocrat to be with Marx, their relationship was socially controversial owing to the differences between their religious and class origins, but Marx befriended her father Ludwig von Westphalen a liberal aristocrat and later dedicated his doctoral thesis to him. Hegel , whose ideas were then widely debated among European philosophical circles. Marx was also engaged in writing his doctoral thesis, *The Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature* , [57] which he completed in It was described as "a daring and original piece of work in which Marx set out to show that theology must yield to the superior wisdom of philosophy". Marx decided instead to submit his thesis to the more liberal University of Jena , whose faculty awarded him his PhD in April There they scandalised their class by getting drunk, laughing in church and galloping through the streets on donkeys. Marx criticised both right-wing European governments as well as figures in the liberal and socialist movements whom he thought ineffective or counter-productive. Initially living with Ruge and his wife communally at 23 Rue Vaneau , they found the living conditions difficult, so moved out following the birth of their daughter Jenny in Based in Paris, the paper was connected to the League of the Just , a utopian socialist secret society of workers and artisans. Marx attended some of their meetings, but did not join. This work was published in as *The Holy Family*. Simon and Charles Fourier [85] and the history of France. Still Marx was always drawn back to his economic studies: However, to stay in Belgium he had to pledge not to publish anything on the subject of contemporary politics. Engels had already spent two years living in Manchester from November [] to August In *German Ideology*, Marx and Engels finally completed their philosophy, which was based solely on materialism as the sole motor force in history. This was the intent of the new book that Marx was planning, but to get the manuscript past the government censors he called the book *The Poverty of Philosophy* [] and offered it as a response to the "petty bourgeois philosophy" of the French anarchist socialist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon as expressed in his book *The Philosophy of Poverty* While residing in Brussels in , Marx continued his association with the secret radical organisation League of the Just. Accordingly, in June the League was reorganised by its membership into a new open "above ground" political society that appealed directly to the working classes. No longer a secret society, the Communist League wanted to make aims and intentions clear to the general public rather than hiding its beliefs as the League of the Just had been doing. Proceeding on from this, the Manifesto presents the argument for why the Communist League, as opposed to other socialist and liberal political parties and groups at the time, was truly acting in the interests of the proletariat to overthrow capitalist society and to replace it with socialism. Designed to put forward news from across Europe with his own Marxist interpretation of events, the newspaper featured Marx as a primary writer and the dominant editorial influence. Despite contributions by fellow members of the Communist League, according to Friedrich Engels it remained "a simple dictatorship by Marx". With his wife Jenny expecting their fourth child and not able to move back to Germany or Belgium, in August he sought refuge in London. The headquarters of the Communist League also moved to London. However, in the winter of 1847 a split within the ranks of the Communist League occurred when a faction within it led by August Willich and Karl Schapper began agitating for an immediate uprising. Willich and Schapper believed that once the Communist League had initiated the uprising, the entire working

class from across Europe would rise "spontaneously" to join it, thus creating revolution across Europe. Marx and Engels protested that such an unplanned uprising on the part of the Communist League was "adventuristic" and would be suicide for the Communist League. Marx maintained that this would spell doom for the Communist League itself, arguing that changes in society are not achieved overnight through the efforts and will power of a handful of men. In the present stage of development circa 1848, following the defeat of the uprisings across Europe in he felt that the Communist League should encourage the working class to unite with progressive elements of the rising bourgeoisie to defeat the feudal aristocracy on issues involving demands for governmental reforms, such as a constitutional republic with freely elected assemblies and universal male suffrage. In other words, the working class must join with bourgeois and democratic forces to bring about the successful conclusion of the bourgeois revolution before stressing the working class agenda and a working class revolution. In London, without finances to run a newspaper themselves, he and Engels turned to international journalism. The Tribune was a vehicle for Marx to reach a transatlantic public to make a "hidden war" to Henry Charles Carey []. The journal had wide working-class appeal from its foundation; at two cents, it was inexpensive; [] and, with about 50,000 copies per issue, its circulation was the widest in the United States. Marx had sent his articles on Tuesdays and Fridays, but, that October, the Tribune discharged all its correspondents in Europe except Marx and B. Taylor, and reduced Marx to a weekly article. Between September and November 1848, only five were published. After a six-month interval, Marx resumed contributions in September until March 1849, when Dana wrote to inform him that there was no longer space in the Tribune for reports from London, due to American domestic affairs. In all, 67 Marx-Engels articles were published, of which 51 written by Engels, although Marx did some research for them in the British Museum. After the "failures" of 1848, the revolutionary impetus appeared spent and not to be renewed without an economic recession. Contention arose between Marx and his fellow communists, whom he denounced as "adventurists". Marx deemed it fanciful to propose that "will power" could be sufficient to create the revolutionary conditions when in reality the economic component was the necessary requisite. Yet, this economy was seen as too immature for a capitalist revolution. Moreover, any economic crisis arising in the United States would not lead to revolutionary contagion of the older economies of individual European nations, which were closed systems bounded by their national borders. When the so-called "Panic of 1847" in the United States spread globally, it broke all economic theory models, [] and was the first truly global economic crisis. Financial necessity had forced Marx to abandon economic studies in 1847 and give thirteen years to working on other projects. He had always sought to return to economics. However, the departure of Charles Dana from the paper in late 1848 and the resultant change in the editorial board brought about a new editorial policy. The new editorial board supported an immediate peace between the Union and the Confederacy in the Civil War in the United States with slavery left intact in the Confederacy. Marx strongly disagreed with this new political position and in 1849 was forced to withdraw as a writer for the Tribune. In response to the bloody suppression of this rebellion, Marx wrote one of his most famous pamphlets, "The Civil War in France", a defence of the Commune. This work was intended merely as a preview of his three-volume Das Kapital English title: Critique of Political Economy, which he intended to publish at a later date. The work was enthusiastically received, and the edition sold out quickly. No longer was there any "natural reward of individual labour. Each labourer produces only some part of a whole, and each part having no value or utility of itself, there is nothing on which the labourer can seize, and say: By the autumn of 1848, the entire first edition of the German language edition of Capital had been sold out and a second edition was published. The Process of Circulation of Capital. The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole.

Chapter 8 : Marx's Philosophy Summary

Karl Heinrich Marx (-) was a German philosopher, political theorist and revolutionary of the 19th Century. Both a scholar and a political activist, Marx is often called the father of Communism, and certainly his Marxist theory provided the intellectual base for various subsequent forms of Communism.

Chapter 9 : Natan Roá¹-enshá¹-raikh (Author of Basic Problems Of Marx's Philosophy)

Marx developed a view of history similar to Hegel's, but the main difference between Marx and Hegel is that Hegel is an idealist and Marx is a materialist. In other words, Hegel believed that ideas are the primary mode in which human beings relate to the world and that history can be understood in terms of the ideas that define each.