

Chapter 1 : Marxism - Wikipedia

Karl Marx was a German economist whose ideas and works generated much controversy. He is known to have inspired revolutionists and has been considered a threat to national governments.

We have taken on a dangerous assignment in commemorating Karl Marx and Frederick Engels on the th anniversary of the publication of "The Communist Manifesto. Because history has a tendency to render great historical figures-especially revolutionary fighters who were despised, ridiculed, and repressed by their ruling classes while they lived-into harmless icons after their death. Karl Marx was hated and demonized by the ruling classes of Europe because he was above all else a revolutionary. He dedicated his life to revolution. A genius from the ranks of the bourgeoisie, Marx and his family led a life of great poverty and destitution so that he could devote all of his energies to the movement for the liberation of the working class. Marx brought forth a new theory of revolution. And because so many workers from China to Russia to Cuba to South Africa have upheld the banner of Marxism as they overthrew oppressing classes, Marx and his theory of revolution continue to be the focus of great hatred by the bosses, bankers, landlords and land owners everywhere. The only historical event in the United States that is characterized as a revolution was in fact not a revolution: Revolution was not a social revolution because it did not change the existing property forms. The slave owners were still the slave owners after the revolution. In fact, they led the revolution. And the slaves were still the slaves. It was a political revolution in the sense that a new form of government was created. The British colonial government was replaced by a new coalition government of slave-owners and a new merchant class or bourgeoisie. In fact, Thomas Jefferson-the author of the Declaration of Independence, the great spokesperson for liberty and equality-owned human beings as slave laborers. In addition, between and he assisted Napoleon on the naval blockade, sanctions and later invasion of Haiti in an attempt to crush the great slave revolution that had abolished slavery in the Western Hemisphere for the first time. There has only been one real revolution in United States history-what we know as the Civil War. The Civil War was a genuine social revolution. The economic power of the old slave-owning class-including its legal property rights to own slaves-was crushed. Chattel slavery was replaced with capitalist wage slavery. The reason the Civil War was so bloody was that it was a real revolution. It took a struggle of that magnitude to dispossess the slave-owning classes of their property. This was not simply a political revolution-a change in the form of government. It was a social revolution because it ushered in a profound readjustment in class rule. The character of this momentous struggle should not obscure the fact that the property-owning capitalists in the North betrayed Black freedom within a decade. The Northern industrialists restored the old slave owners to power-but as partners in capitalist rule. And the former slave owners, in turn, introduced the apartheid police state that dominated the Southern part of this country for the following years. But chattel slavery had been ended for good. In a letter he wrote to his friend and comrade Joseph Wedemeyer on March 5, , Marx described his contribution in the most succinct possible way: Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this struggle of the classes, and bourgeois economists had discovered the economic anatomy of those classes. What I did that was new was to prove: But Marx was not using the word dictatorship as a pejorative. He used the word in a scientific sense. Marx considered all class societies to be the dictatorship of its dominant class. If Marx were alive today he would not conclude that the United States is one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. He would characterize it as a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. And his solution to the suffering brought about by capitalism in the United States would be to replace the iron-fisted rule of the bankers and bosses with the dictatorship of the proletariat-the working class. Liberals and conservatives alike will howl: There is no dictatorship in the United States. This is a democratic form of government. Was this decision made by voting? The board of directors of IBM voted to lay the workers off. The masses of workers got to vote for the president of the United States. But the bosses exercised a dictatorship over "their property, their company. How many poor people are judges? How many rich people are on death row? How many acts of police brutality are there against millionaires and billionaires? How many tenants are evicted from their homes because they can no longer afford rent? Tens of thousands each week.

How many landlords are evicted from their homes because they rob and cheat their tenants or refuse to make repairs? How many times in U. This is the law of the land. This is all an exercise of dictatorship. And this use of force in the interest of one class for its domination and its profit extends to the realm of foreign policy. The decisions to use these levels of force and coercion are reserved for the state apparatus that pursues a policy to defend the global interests of U. The policy in the Middle East is designed exclusively to serve the interests of Exxon, Mobil, Texaco, not the workers in the United States. Power to the people! Marx believed that this dictatorship of the bourgeoisie takes a myriad of political forms: In some cases even a monarchy. But beneath the form of government rests a system of coercion and repression that serves and protects the interests of the bourgeoisie. Marx wanted to get rid of this dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. He saw the need to replace it with a dictatorship of the proletariat. And he saw this form of state as a necessary transition to the abolition of all classes into a classless society. Like the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the dictatorship of the proletariat could assume a myriad of political forms. It could be very democratic. Or it could be less democratic-the way the Soviet Union became during the Stalin period. But the dictatorship of the proletariat is in its essence the use of state power to defend the interests of the working class, the poor, the formerly oppressed. It defends collective ownership of property as a right. It defends the right to a job, the right to universal health care. The dictatorship of workers and oppressed peoples is required to make racism illegal and to use the state apparatus to decisively eradicate racism. And to abolish anti-woman violence, gay bashing and all other reactionary forms of violence perpetrated against oppressed people. The dictatorship of the proletariat will ensure that no landlord will ever evict a tenant again. That no group of capitalists can own all the property created by the collective labor of the working class. And no boss can ever again exercise the authority to lay off the workers. This article is copyright under a Creative Commons License. Workers World, 55 W.

Chapter 2 : Monthly Review | Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution Series

Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution Series on Monthly Review. This fifth volume in Hal Draper's magnificently lucid account of Marx's politics is just as enlightening, tough-minded, and encyclopedic as the volumes that preceded it.

In the first place, they at best examined only the ideological motives of the historical activity of human beings, without grasping the objective laws governing the development of the system of social relations. All constituent features of a society—social classes, political pyramid, ideologies—are assumed to stem from economic activity, an idea often portrayed with the metaphor of the base and superstructure. The base and superstructure metaphor describes the totality of social relations by which humans produce and re-produce their social existence. The base includes the material forces of production, that is the labour and material means of production and relations of production, i. Conflicts between the development of material productive forces and the relations of production provokes social revolutions and thus the resultant changes to the economic base will lead to the transformation of the superstructure. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes". Accordingly, Marx designated human history as encompassing four stages of development in relations of production: Criticism of capitalism Further information: Exploitation has been a socioeconomic feature of every class society and is one of the principal features distinguishing the social classes. The power of one social class to control the means of production enables its exploitation of the other classes. In capitalism, the labour theory of value is the operative concern; the value of a commodity equals the socially necessary labour time required to produce it. Under that condition, surplus value—the difference between the value produced and the value received by a labourer—is synonymous with the term "surplus labour", thus capitalist exploitation is realised as deriving surplus value from the worker. In pre-capitalist economies, exploitation of the worker was achieved via physical coercion. In the capitalist mode of production, that result is more subtly achieved and because workers do not own the means of production, they must voluntarily enter into an exploitive work relationship with a capitalist in order to earn the necessities of life. However, the worker must work or starve, thus exploitation is inevitable and the "voluntary" nature of a worker participating in a capitalist society is illusory. Alienation is the estrangement of people from their humanity—German: *Gattungswesen*, "species-essence", "species-being", which is a systematic result of capitalism. Under capitalism, the fruits of production belong to the employers, who expropriate the surplus created by others and so generate alienated labourers. Social classes See also: Social class, Class conflict, Classless society, and Three-component theory of stratification Marx distinguishes social classes on the basis of two criteria: Following this criterion of class based on property relations, Marx identified the social stratification of the capitalist mode of production with the following social groups: They subdivide as bourgeoisie and the petite bourgeoisie. Petite bourgeoisie are those who work and can afford to buy little labour power. i. Marxism predicts that the continual reinvention of the means of production eventually would destroy the petite bourgeoisie, degrading them from the middle class to the proletariat. Having no interest in international or national economic affairs, Marx claimed that this specific sub-division of the proletariat would play no part in the eventual social revolution. Class consciousness denotes the awareness—of itself and the social world—that a social class possesses and its capacity to rationally act in their best interests, hence class consciousness is required before they can effect a successful revolution and thus the dictatorship of the proletariat. Without defining ideology, [23] Marx used the term to describe the production of images of social reality. According to Engels, "ideology is a process accomplished by the so-called thinker consciously, it is true, but with a false consciousness. The real motive forces impelling him remain unknown to him; otherwise it simply would not be an ideological process. Hence he imagines false or seeming motive forces". In *The German Ideology*, he says "[t]he ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i. In Marxism, political economy is the study of the means of production, specifically of capital and how that manifests as economic activity. Marxism taught me what society was.

Through working class revolution, the state which Marxists see as a weapon for the subjugation of one class by another is seized and used to suppress the hitherto ruling class of capitalists and by implementing a commonly-owned, democratically controlled workplace create the society of communism, which Marxists see as true democracy. An economy based on co-operation on human need and social betterment, rather than competition for profit of many independently acting profit seekers, would also be the end of class society, which Marx saw as the fundamental division of all hitherto existing history. Marx saw work, the effort by humans to transform the environment for their needs, as a fundamental feature of human kind. Additionally, the worker is compelled by various means some nicer than others to work harder, faster and for longer hours. While this is happening, the employer is constantly trying to save on labor costs: This allows the employer to extract the largest amount of work and therefore potential wealth from their workers. The fundamental nature of capitalist society is no different from that of slave society: Through common ownership of the means of production, the profit motive is eliminated and the motive of furthering human flourishing is introduced. Because the surplus produced by the workers is property of the society as whole, there are no classes of producers and appropriators. Additionally, the state, which has its origins in the bands of retainers hired by the first ruling classes to protect their economic privilege, will disappear as its conditions of existence have disappeared. According to orthodox Marxist theory, the overthrow of capitalism by a socialist revolution in contemporary society is inevitable. While the inevitability of an eventual socialist revolution is a controversial debate among many different Marxist schools of thought, all Marxists believe socialism is a necessity, if not inevitable. Marxists believe that a socialist society is far better for the majority of the populace than its capitalist counterpart. Prior to the Russian revolution of 1917, Lenin wrote: "This conversion will directly result in an immense increase in productivity of labour, a reduction of working hours, and the replacement of the remnants, the ruins of small-scale, primitive, disunited production by collective and improved labour".

Classical Marxism "Classical Marxism" denotes the collection of socio-economic-political theories expounded by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. The Great Misunderstanding argues that the source of such misrepresentations lies in ignoring the philosophy of Marxism, which is dialectical materialism. In large, this was due to the fact that The German Ideology, in which Marx and Engels developed this philosophy, did not find a publisher for almost one hundred years. Gordon Childe Marxism has been adopted by a large number of academics and other scholars working in various disciplines. The theoretical development of Marxist archaeology was first developed in the Soviet Union in 1929, when a young archaeologist named Vladislav I. Ravdonikas published a report entitled "For a Soviet history of material culture". Within this work, the very discipline of archaeology as it then stood was criticised as being inherently bourgeois, therefore anti-socialist and so, as a part of the academic reforms instituted in the Soviet Union under the administration of Premier Joseph Stalin, a great emphasis was placed on the adoption of Marxist archaeology throughout the country. Gordon Childe, who used Marxist theory in his understandings of the development of human society. During the 1920s, the Western Marxist school became accepted within Western academia, subsequently fracturing into several different perspectives such as the Frankfurt School or critical theory. Due to its former state-supported position, there has been a backlash against Marxist thought in post-communist states see sociology in Poland but it remains dominant in the sociological research sanctioned and supported by those communist states that remain see sociology in China. Marxian economics refers to a school of economic thought tracing its foundations to the critique of classical political economy first expounded upon by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Although the Marxian school is considered heterodox, ideas that have come out of Marxian economics have contributed to mainstream understanding of the global economy. Certain concepts of Marxian economics, especially those related to capital accumulation and the business cycle, such as creative destruction, have been fitted for use in capitalist systems. Marxist historiography is a school of historiography influenced by Marxism. The chief tenets of Marxist historiography are the centrality of social class and economic constraints in determining historical outcomes. Marxist historiography has made contributions to the history of the working class, oppressed nationalities, and the methodology of history from below. Marxist historiography suffered in the Soviet Union, as the government requested overdetermined historical writing. While some members of the group most notably Christopher Hill and E. P. Thompson are

considered the founding fathers of Marxist historiography. Today, the senior-most scholars of Marxist historiography are R. Panikkar , most of whom are now over 75 years old. Marxist criticism views literary works as reflections of the social institutions from which they originate. According to Marxists, even literature itself is a social institution and has a specific ideological function, based on the background and ideology of the author. Marxist aesthetics is a theory of aesthetics based on, or derived from, the theories of Karl Marx. It involves a dialectical and materialist , or dialectical materialist , approach to the application of Marxism to the cultural sphere, specifically areas related to taste such as art, beauty, etc.

Chapter 3 : Workers World Nov. 19, Marx's theory of revolution

This series, Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution, represents an exhaustive and definitive treatment of Marx's political theory, policy, and practice. Marx and Engels paid continuing attention to a host of problems of revolution, in addition to constructing their "grand theory."

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 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 [1]. The journal had wide working-class appeal from its foundation; at two cents, it was inexpensive; [2] 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, [3] 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 4 : Monthly Review | Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution, Vol. I: State and Bureaucracy

The first letter, by Marx, makes clear that the editors are for a revolution of some kind; the second letter, a reply by Ruge, is a ululating elegy or funeral dirge (as Marx calls it) on the impossibility of revolution in the fast-frozen political wasteland of Germany.

During the lifetime of great revolutionaries, the oppressing classes constantly hounded them, received their theories with the most savage malice, the most furious hatred and the most unscrupulous campaigns of lies and slander. After their death, attempts are made to convert them into harmless icons, to canonize them, so to say, and to hallow their names to a certain extent for the "consolation" of the oppressed classes and with the object of duping the latter, while at the same time robbing the revolutionary theory of its substance, blunting its revolutionary edge and vulgarizing it. Today, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the labor movement concur in this doctoring of Marxism. They omit, obscure, or distort the revolutionary side of this theory, its revolutionary soul. They push to the foreground and extol what is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie. And more and more frequently German bourgeois scholars, only yesterday specialists in the annihilation of Marxism, are speaking of the "national-German" Marx, who, they claim, educated the labor unions which are so splendidly organized for the purpose of waging a predatory war! In these circumstances, in view of the unprecedentedly wide-spread distortion of Marxism, our prime task is to re-establish what Marx really taught on the subject of the state. This will necessitate a number of long quotations from the works of Marx and Engels themselves. Of course, long quotations will render the text cumbersome and not help at all to make it popular reading, but we cannot possibly dispense with them. All, or at any rate all the most essential passages in the works of Marx and Engels on the subject of the state must by all means be quoted as fully as possible so that the reader may form an independent opinion of the totality of the views of the founders of scientific socialism, and of the evolution of those views, and so that their distortion by the "Kautskyism" now prevailing may be documentarily proved and clearly demonstrated. We have to translate the quotations from the German originals, as the Russian translations, while very numerous, are for the most part either incomplete or very unsatisfactory. Summing up his historical analysis, Engels says: Rather, it is a product of society at a certain stage of development; it is the admission that this society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself, that it has split into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to dispel. The state is a product and a manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. The state arises where, when and insofar as class antagonism objectively cannot be reconciled. And, conversely, the existence of the state proves that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable. It is on this most important and fundamental point that the distortion of Marxism, proceeding along two main lines, begins. On the one hand, the bourgeois, and particularly the petty-bourgeois, ideologists, compelled under the weight of indisputable historical facts to admit that the state only exists where there are class antagonisms and a class struggle, "correct" Marx in such a way as to make it appear that the state is an organ for the reconciliation of classes. According to Marx, the state could neither have arisen nor maintained itself had it been possible to reconcile classes. From what the petty-bourgeois and philistine professors and publicists say, with quite frequent and benevolent references to Marx, it appears that the state does reconcile classes. According to Marx, the state is an organ of class rule, an organ for the oppression of one class by another; it is the creation of "order", which legalizes and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the conflict between classes. In the opinion of the petty-bourgeois politicians, however, order means the reconciliation of classes, and not the oppression of one class by another; to alleviate the conflict means reconciling classes and not depriving the oppressed classes of definite means and methods of struggle to overthrow the oppressors. For instance, when, in the revolution of 1905, the question of the significance and role of the state arose in all its magnitude as a practical question demanding immediate action, and, moreover, action on a mass scale, all the Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks descended at once to the petty-bourgeois theory that the "state" "reconciles" classes. Innumerable resolutions and articles by politicians of both these parties are thoroughly saturated with this petty-bourgeois and philistine "reconciliation" theory. That the state is an organ of the rule of a definite class which cannot be reconciled

with its antipode the class opposite to it is something the petty-bourgeois democrats will never be able to understand. Their attitude to the state is one of the most striking manifestations of the fact that our Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks are not socialists at all a point that we Bolsheviks have always maintained , but petty-bourgeois democrats using near-socialist phraseology. On the other hand, the "Kautskyite" distortion of Marxism is far more subtle. But what is overlooked or glossed over is this: As we shall see later, Marx very explicitly drew this theoretically self-evident conclusion on the strength of a concrete historical analysis of the tasks of the revolution. And -- as we shall show in detail further on -- it is this conclusion which Kautsky has "forgotten" and distorted. This special, public power is necessary because a self-acting armed organization of the population has become impossible since the split into classes This public power exists in every state; it consists not merely of armed men but also of material adjuncts, prisons, and institutions of coercion of all kinds, of which gentile [clan] society knew nothing What does this power mainly consist of? It consists of special bodies of armed men having prisons, etc. We are justified in speaking of special bodies of armed men, because the public power which is an attribute of every state "does not directly coincide" with the armed population, with its "self-acting armed organization". Like all great revolutionary thinkers, Engels tries to draw the attention of the class-conscious workers to what prevailing philistinism regards as least worthy of attention, as the most habitual thing, hallowed by prejudices that are not only deep-rooted but, one might say, petrified. A standing army and police are the chief instruments of state power. But how can it be otherwise? From the viewpoint of the vast majority of Europeans of the end of the 19th century, whom Engels was addressing, and who had not gone through or closely observed a single great revolution, it could not have been otherwise. They could not understand at all what a "self-acting armed organization of the population" was. When asked why it became necessary to have special bodies of armed men placed above society and alienating themselves from it police and a standing army , the West-European and Russian philistines are inclined to utter a few phrases borrowed from Spencer or Mikhailovsky, to refer to the growing complexity of social life, the differentiation of functions, and so on. Such a reference seems "scientific", and effectively lulls the ordinary person to sleep by obscuring the important and basic fact, namely, the split of society into irreconcilable antagonistic classes. Were it not for this split, the "self-acting armed organization of the population" would differ from the primitive organization of a stick-wielding herd of monkeys, or of primitive men, or of men united in clans, by its complexity, its high technical level, and so on. But such an organization would still be possible. It is impossible because civilized society is split into antagonistic, and, moreover, irreconcilably antagonistic classes, whose "self-acting" arming would lead to an armed struggle between them. A state arises, a special power is created, special bodies of armed men, and every revolution, by destroying the state apparatus, shows us the naked class struggle, clearly shows us how the ruling class strives to restore the special bodies of armed men which serve it, and how the oppressed class strives to create a new organization of this kind, capable of serving the exploited instead of the exploiters. In the above argument, Engels raises theoretically the very same question which every great revolution raises before us in practice, palpably and, what is more, on a scale of mass action, namely, the question of the relationship between "special" bodies of armed men and the "self-acting armed organization of the population". We shall see how this question is specifically illustrated by the experience of the European and Russian revolutions. He points out that sometimes -- in certain parts of North America, for example -- this public power is weak he has in mind a rare exception in capitalist society, and those parts of North America in its pre-imperialist days where the free colonists predominated , but that, generally speaking, it grows stronger: We have only to look at our present-day Europe, where class struggle and rivalry in conquest have tuned up the public power to such a pitch that it threatens to swallow the whole of society and even the state. The turn towards imperialism -- meaning the complete domination of the trusts, the omnipotence of the big banks, a grand-scale colonial policy, and so forth -- was only just beginning in France, and was even weaker in North America and in Germany. Since then "rivalry in conquest" has taken a gigantic stride, all the more because by the beginning of the second decade of the 20th century the world had been completely divided up among these "rivals in conquest", i. Since then, military and naval armaments have grown fantastically and the predatory war of for the domination of the world by Britain or Germany, for the division of the spoils, has brought the

"swallowing" of all the forces of society by the rapacious state power close to complete catastrophe. The free, voluntary respect that was accorded to the organs of the gentile [clan] constitution does not satisfy them, even if they could gain it. The question of the privileged position of the officials as organs of state power is raised here. The main point indicated is: We shall see how this theoretical question was answered in practice by the Paris Commune in and how it was obscured from a reactionary standpoint by Kautsky in . By way of exception, however, periods occur in which the warring classes balance each other so nearly that the state power as ostensible mediator acquires, for the moment, a certain degree of independence of both. Such, we may add, is the Kerensky government in republican Russia since it began to persecute the revolutionary proletariat, at a moment when, owing to the leadership of the petty-bourgeois democrats, the Soviets have already become impotent, while the bourgeoisie are not yet strong enough simply to disperse them. In a democratic republic, Engels continues, "wealth exercises its power indirectly, but all the more surely", first, by means of the "direct corruption of officials" America ; secondly, by means of an "alliance of the government and the Stock Exchange" France and America. At present, imperialism and the domination of the banks have "developed" into an exceptional art both these methods of upholding and giving effect to the omnipotence of wealth in democratic republics of all descriptions. Since, for instance, in the very first months of the Russian democratic republic, one might say during the honeymoon of the "socialist" S. Palchinsky obstructed every measure intended for curbing the capitalists and their marauding practices, their plundering of the state by means of war contracts; and since later on Mr. Palchinsky, upon resigning from the Cabinet and being, of course, replaced by another quite similar Palchinsky , was "rewarded" by the capitalists with a lucrative job with a salary of , rubles per annum -- what would you call that? Direct or indirect bribery? An alliance of the government and the syndicates, or "merely" friendly relations? What role do the Chernovs, Tseretelis, Avksentyevs and Skobelevs play? Are they the "direct" or only the indirect allies of the millionaire treasury-looters? Another reason why the omnipotence of "wealth" is more certain in a democratic republic is that it does not depend on defects in the political machinery or on the faulty political shell of capitalism. A democratic republic is the best possible political shell for capitalism, and, therefore, once capital has gained possession of this very best shell through the Palchinskys, Chernovs, Tseretelis and Co. We must also note that Engels is most explicit in calling universal suffrage as well an instrument of bourgeois rule. Universal suffrage, he says, obviously taking account of the long experience of German Social-Democracy, is "the gauge of the maturity of the working class. It cannot and never will be anything more in the present-day state. They themselves share, and instil into the minds of the people, the false notion that universal suffrage "in the present-day state" is really capable of revealing the will of the majority of the working people and of securing its realization. A detailed exposure of the utter falsity of this notion which Engels brushes aside here is given in our further account of the views of Marx and Engels on the "present-day" state. Engels gives a general summary of his views in the most popular of his works in the following words: There have been societies that did without it, that had no idea of the state and state power. At a certain stage of economic development, which was necessarily bound up with the split of society into classes, the state became a necessity owing to this split. We are now rapidly approaching a stage in the development of production at which the existence of these classes not only will have ceased to be a necessity, but will become a positive hindrance to production. They will fall as they arose at an earlier stage. Along with them the state will inevitably fall. Society, which will reorganize production on the basis of a free and equal association of the producers, will put the whole machinery of state where it will then belong: Even when we do come across it, it is mostly quoted in the same manner as one bows before an icon, i. In most cases we do not even find an understanding of what Engels calls the state machine. We shall quote the whole argument from which they are taken. But thereby it abolishes itself as the proletariat, abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, and abolishes also the state as state. Society thus far, operating amid class antagonisms, needed the state, that is, an organization of the particular exploiting class, for the maintenance of its external conditions of production, and, therefore, especially, for the purpose of forcibly keeping the exploited class in the conditions of oppression determined by the given mode of production slavery, serfdom or bondage, wage-labor. The state was the official representative of society as a whole, its concentration in a visible corporation. But it was this only insofar as it

was the state of that class which itself represented, for its own time, society as a whole: When at last it becomes the real representative of the whole of society, it renders itself unnecessary. As soon as there is no longer any social class to be held in subjection, as soon as class rule, and the individual struggle for existence based upon the present anarchy in production, with the collisions and excesses arising from this struggle, are removed, nothing more remains to be held in subjection -- nothing necessitating a special coercive force, a state. The first act by which the state really comes forward as the representative of the whole of society -- the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society -- is also its last independent act as a state. State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies down of itself. The government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of processes of production. To prune Marxism to such an extent means reducing it to opportunism, for this "interpretation" only leaves a vague notion of a slow, even, gradual change, of absence of leaps and storms, of absence of revolution. The current, widespread, popular, if one may say so, conception of the "withering away" of the state undoubtedly means obscuring, if not repudiating, revolution. Such an "interpretation", however, is the crudest distortion of Marxism, advantageous only to the bourgeoisie. In the first place, at the very outset of his argument, Engels says that, in seizing state power, the proletariat thereby "abolishes the state as state". It is not done to ponder over over the meaning of this.

Chapter 5 : What is communism |Definition,theories and Russian revolution|Karl marx

Hal Draper's extremely long and expansive series "Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution" is definitely the highest point achieved so far in systematic exegesis of the work of Marx (and Engels).

Marxism and political organization This was the version of history that Karl Marx encountered as a student in Germany in the 1840s, and his first attempts to explain the principles of scientific socialism began with standing this view of the world right-side up. Marx called his approach "the materialist conception of history"--"materialist" because it starts with concrete material conditions rather than ideas, "history" because it recognizes that those conditions and the social relationships that spring from them change. FOR THE vast majority of human history, human beings lived in small groups that provided for their basic necessities by hunting and gathering their food. These early hunter-gatherers had to be nomadic to find more food. The Magna Carta would have been inconceivable in these circumstances, and not just because written language had not yet developed. The idea that one member of the group would claim to rule by "divine right," much less that another minority within it would seek to limit that rule for its advantage, would have seemed utterly foreign--likewise, with the ethic of individualism promoted by capitalism. Human history began to change only when the basic means of providing food, shelter and other necessities began to change. This transformation in material circumstances took place in different parts of the world at different times--first, apparently, around 12,000 years ago in the Levant region east of the Mediterranean Sea, where Syria and northern Iraq lie today. The most likely explanation is that favorable climatic conditions made food supplies more abundant, so it became possible for hunter-gatherer bands to be less on the move, and to start investigating how to cultivate plants, rather than gather them. The cultivation of plants and the domestication of animals to replace hunting made it possible for the first time for humans to produce a consistent surplus--slightly more than was needed to feed, cloth and shelter everyone. This advance in turn reshaped everything about how human beings lived. Societies built around growing and raising food, rather than gathering and hunting it, had to be stable, not nomadic. The size of the groups could increase. Instead of a need to limit births, there was a need for more children, since each would eventually contribute their labor. This led to a new distinction in society--women, who had equal standing in hunter-gatherer bands, were burdened with the responsibilities of greater child-rearing and consigned to a subordinate status. If more food could be grown than was necessary for immediate needs, then that food had to be stored. Because of greater abundance, it became possible for individuals to be freed from the immediate work of producing so they could make these tools and come up with new techniques for producing even more. A basic division of labor--and with it, another social distinction--could take shape. At first, from what we know of early societies, these individuals would have been those who worked the hardest to increase food production--who gained prestige because of their ability to provide more for everybody. But over generations and centuries, such individuals and groups came to see their own place in society as superior. The specific economic form in which unpaid surplus labor is pumped out of the direct producers determines the relations of rulers and ruled Upon this is founded the entire formation of the economic community which grows up out of the conditions of production itself, and this also determines its specific political shape. It is always the direct relation of the owners of the conditions of production to the direct producers which reveals the innermost secret, the hidden foundation of the entire social construction, and with it of the political form of the relations between sovereignty and dependence, in short, of the corresponding form of the state. He particularly described three kinds of class societies: Marx described the way that each form of class society went through a process of development. In a preface to a book called *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, he summarized the dynamic: In the social production of their life, men enter into definite, necessary relations which are independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis on which a legal and political superstructure rises, and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of production conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is

not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. In the early stages, the "relations of production" contribute to advances for society--they make it easier to produce more and to develop new and better techniques of production. Eventually, the possibility of developing still more efficient methods of producing are blocked--because putting them into effect requires new ways of organizing society, and the old forms of exploitation have become an obstacle. At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or and this is simply a legal expression of the same thing, with the property relations within which they have operated up to that time. These relations change from forms of development of the productive forces into their fetters. There then begins an epoch of social revolution. For an example, take feudalism as it arose in Europe over the centuries following the decline of the Roman Empire. Specifically, by giving peasants their own land to cultivate--in return for peasants paying a tribute--the exploiters were able to preside over a much more widespread system of production than was possible by exploiting slaves at the end of a lash. After a period of centuries, however, new ways of producing began to develop--in the towns, which had previously been centers of trade. This conflict between the new possibilities and the structure of the old order showed itself in terrible crises. The old ways of organizing society became a block--a fetter--on the potential for further developments in production. And the conflict could only end, as Marx and Engels put it starkly in *The Communist Manifesto*, "in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes. We live in a world with the potential to feed everyone in the world, to provide a roof over their heads, to use the latest advances in health care to increase the length and quality of every life, and much more besides. The fundamental obstacle to a new world of abundance, organized around solidarity and freedom, is the old order--capitalism. The word "begins" is an important one. Marxism is commonly criticized--including among academics and those on the left who should know better, or would know better if they read some Marx--for being mechanical. The complaint is that Marxists see the progress of society toward socialism as inevitable. That outcome depends on the class struggle. Because the ruling class controls not only the way production takes place, but all the other institutions and relationships in society, whose structure helps the exploiters maintain their power. As Marx described, all class societies produce a legal, political and ideological "superstructure" that operates to freeze the existing relations of production and protect the rulers from the ruled. The most obvious example is what Engels called "bodies of armed men"--the armies and police that the exploiters rely on to counter challenges to their authority. But in most times, an even more important weapon for the ruling class is ideology--systems of ideas that portray the established order as natural and beneficial to everyone, whatever its self-evident flaws. On the other side of the conflict is the social class associated with the possibility of reorganizing society--the force capable of carrying out a "revolutionary reconstitution in society. While the class struggle is fundamentally about this conflict in the economic base of society, it gets expressed in all kinds of ways--not only battles over different aspects of economic conditions, but, as Marx put it, the "ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure--political forms of the class struggle and its results, to wit: There is an interaction of all these elements in which, amid all the endless host of accidents that is, of things and events whose inner interconnection is so remote or so impossible of proof that we can regard it as non-existent, as negligible, the economic movement finally asserts itself as necessary. The critics of Marxism who claim that socialists care only about economics and expect social change as inevitable have it wrong. And the outcome of the class struggle determines whether society moves forward or backward. The victory of the class associated with the new productive forces is far from inevitable--in fact, there are many examples in history of its defeat, leading to stagnation or even regression. For example, the Sung Dynasty that began in China in the 10th century saw a number of technological innovations, like iron foundries, firearms, moveable type for printing and others, that were centuries in advance of Europe. As a result, Chinese society had changed little even a whole millennium later--compare that to the transformation of Europe from the Dark Ages to the era of industrial capitalism. THE MARXIST view of history is a radical challenge to the prevailing ideology in society that capitalism is natural and the highest social expression of the basic characteristics of human beings

through all time. By contrast, according to the materialist conception of history, capitalism is only the latest form of social relationships, and not the last one either. But Marx and Engels did believe that capitalism was unique among all previous forms of class societies. As they wrote in the Communist Manifesto: The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. In the first place, it has raised human knowledge and technology to the point where society could be reorganized around the world on the basis of abundance--of every person getting enough to eat, a sturdy roof over their head and everything else they need. At every point in history, the oppressed and exploited have dreamed of such a world of equality and abundance. But the creation of such a society only became possible in the last several hundred years. As Marx and Engels wrote: The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. For the first time in human history, the possibility exists of a society with enough to go around for all--and therefore one that abolishes the differences between rich and poor, exploiter and exploited. But whether there will be a "revolutionary reconstitution of society" on this basis depends on the class struggle--on the social forces associated with a new way of organizing society overcoming the power of the old ruling class. This is the other unique aspect of capitalism: It produces a gravedigger--the proletariat, or working class--with the power to overturn the old system and, because it is the vast majority in society, to establish a new society not divided between haves and have-nots. Marx and Engels did believe that the formation of this class--forced into conflict with the rulers of society and with the potential to confront the whole system--was inevitable. The workings of capitalism itself form a new laboring class with a different kind of economic power--the power to withhold its labor and shut off the source of wealth in the system--and the instinct to use that power collectively. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalized, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labor, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level Thereupon, the workers begin to form combinations trades unions against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there, the contest breaks out into riots. Now and then, the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their battles lies not in the immediate result, but in the ever-expanding union of the workers. Does this year-old description of the working class fit the world today? These criticisms, though, mostly rely on a stereotype of the working class--that it is made up of predominantly male, blue-collar workers employed in factories. But from the beginning, Marx defined the working class not by the kind of work people did, but by their position in society--as "a class of laborers who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labor increases capital. In fact, one of the most important trends of the past few decades is the way that people in jobs once considered privileged and "above the working class," such as teachers, certain office workers, nurses and even doctors, have been "proletarianized"--that is, their conditions of work have been subjected to a degree of discipline and subordination more typical of factory work. And of course, the idea that the working class has shrunk on a world scale flies in the face of reality. Actually, the "conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat" have been "equalized" to an extraordinary degree, even between countries that are half a world away. When Marx and Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto, a working class of real size and significance existed in only a few countries of northern and western Europe, and along the Eastern coast of North America. Today, the working class exists in every country, and is incomparably more powerful in even the poorest regions of the world, where it has been brought together in large numbers by globalized capitalism. At most times, in fact, that potential seems distant--or at least uncertain to be realized. In *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Marx stressed the distinction between a "class in itself" and a "class for itself": Economic conditions had first transformed the mass of the people of the country into workers. The combination of capital has created for this mass a common situation, common interests. This mass is thus already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself. In the struggle, of which we have noted only a few phases, this mass becomes united, and constitutes itself as a class for itself. The interests it defends become class interests. Other aspects of the system drive workers apart. One obvious example of this are the divisions within the working class, created and promoted by capitalism, that pit workers against each other on the basis

of race, gender, nationality and other differences. But workers are set against one another in another fundamental way because everyone in a capitalist society, at the top and at the bottom, is forced to compete.

Chapter 6 : Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution, Volume 1: State and Bureaucracy by Hal Draper

Two hundred years since Karl Marx was born and years since his most famous work, The Communist Manifesto, was published, Eddie McCabe looks at Marx's theory of class struggle and assesses its relevance for today.

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 7 : Karl Marx - Simple English Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Marx's entire theory of working-class revolution is built around the centrality of struggle--and in all the forms that struggle takes, from the class struggle at the base of historical development.

Karl Marx was born in Germany. He studied law and philosophy at university in Germany. See image 1 Marx associated with the influential philosopher Friedrich Engels. Together they developed and built on theories of capitalism, socialism and historical change. He settled in Paris, Brussels and finally London. See image 2 Capitalism describes an economic system in which the means of production such as factories are privately owned. They have economic and political power. They own land and run businesses. The proletariat provide labour on the land or work in the businesses owned by the bourgeoisie. The proletariat are, according to Marx, exploited by the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie employ proletarians in their factories and farms. The proletarians are paid money for their labour. The bourgeoisie then use the proletarian labour to produce goods that are sold for more money than the wage of the proletarian. The bourgeois businessman keeps the profit and becomes wealthy from the labour of the proletariat. According to Marx, the proletarians would eventually tire of their exploitation and oppression and overthrow the capitalist bourgeoisie. The end result of the revolution would be the establishment of a Communist society, a classless state where all means of production and property are shared among all citizens. The Industrial Revolution visibly divided society into the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The bourgeoisie enjoyed the luxury of wealth and a monopoly on land ownership, business and politics. The proletariat worked on the land and in the factories owned by the bourgeoisie. The proletariat enjoyed few economic, social or political freedoms. They were kept neatly under the thumb of the capitalist bourgeoisie. See image 3 The work of Karl Marx caught the attention of members of the intelligentsia. In he founded the first Marxist organisation in Russia. He has been called the father of Russian Marxism. The Populists believed that the peasants had to be provoked into revolution through education. Members of the Populist party ventured into the countryside to educate the peasants about their oppression. The Populists met with little success. The Social Revolutionaries widened the base of revolutionaries to include, not only unhappy peasants, but workers, members of the intelligentsia and other Russians disillusioned by the Tsarist regime. When their ideologies failed, they carried out a number of political assassinations and other violent actions. The proletariat would realise that they were oppressed and disadvantaged. A revolution, led by members of the disgruntled working class, would be staged. Capitalism would be overthrown. The government would be replaced by a socialist society where classes and private property were abolished and all citizens would be equal. See image 5 Lenin and Plekhanov disagreed over the nature of revolution in Russia. Plekhanov believed that the plight of the proletariats should be improved by political reform. Lenin was disillusioned with the political process and believed that revolution should be instigated by a small, dedicated group of the intelligentsia. This disagreement, action versus reform, led to a split within the Social Democratic party in

Karl Marx's theories were central to the party ideology of Lenin's Bolsheviks and had a key role to play in the revolution and the establishment of the Russian Communist state. Other Chapters The Tsarist regime.

When it has arisen and how many countries are following. What is its actual meaning and how much effective for normal living people?. What is the concept of Marxism and Leninism and how much impact it has on India? What are the theories of the great thinker Karl Marx and Lenin behind communism?. Everyone countrymen should know about communism. They will be the equal owner of that group. One thing is most important that communism is not said anything about distribution. Communism is the way to getting equal benefits of the total share which is derived from the labor class. As a financial model, the need of which is obvious, since both generation and the beneficial automatic assembly should be made to total with the social need, the main thing which can in any case serve is the work time utilized in the creation of products. Where on the one hand it started the socialist movement and international organization was often reduced to pieces, on the other hand, between the communist revolution in Russia October-November and the foundation of the first successful socialist state in the world, There was a deep impact on socialist movements. Before the First World War, the opinion of the socialist parties was that the capitalist system is responsible for the wars and if the world war started. Every socialist party should have the duty to oppose the war strategy of its capitalist government and to strive to establish socialism through civil war. Only a negligible minority of socialists opposed the war, and in the future, some of them became supporters of Vladimir Lenin and his communist international organization. But the conflict between socialist movements of different countries. As per Marx, a genuinely idealistic culture would be accomplished just when a solitary stateless and rude society exists. He even describes three periods of activity to represent such a state. Second, the absolute ruler needs to come to power and go about the single expert on all issues including the individual issues of people in general. The ruler would be in charge of influencing everybody to take the goals of communism and furthermore guarantee that no property or riches is exclusive. At last, the last stage would be the accomplishment of an idealistic state in spite of the fact that this stage has never been accomplished whereby renowned correspondence would be fulfilled and everybody would eagerly and joyfully share their riches and advantages with others in the public. As marked out by Marx, in a perfect communist society, keeping money would be brought together, the assembly would control instruction and work. All infrastructural offices, farming means, and enterprises would be government-consumed. Private property and legacy rights would be annulled and overwhelming management expenses would be required at all. Slideshare When a large number of the nations of the world were moving towards majority rules system, Russia was as yet a government where the ruler ruled with supreme power. For a considerable length of time, the needy individuals of the nation had extremely brave and were very nearly breaking into next. Along these lines, the Ruler who kept on living in the center of the house. This pressure and confusion, therefore, trigger the February Revolution on February when laborers of a shut manufacturing plant and officers in uprising together raised trademarks against the out of line administration. The insurgency spread like out of control fire and constrained the ruler to resign his honored position. An immediately shaped Russian Provisional Government presently succeed the ruler. Accepting the open door of the confusion winning in Russia, Vladimir Lenin who had been excluded from the nation for bringing forth against ruler plots currently came back to Russia and with the assistance of Leon Trotsky, another Russian progressive who went about as his right-hand man, established the Marxist, a professional Communism party. The Russian Revolution of hugely affected legislative issues on a worldwide scale for some decades. Nothing approached it in significance – a reality recognizes at the time and which keeps on demonstrating pushing an entire century. At the point when individuals express on the notable effect, they are almost continually referred to the October Revolution, by this Lenin and the communist caught control in triggered and broadcasted the beginning of another period in human issues. They arrested to convey socialism to the whole world. However, the prior revolution in February was renowned at the time as an occasion of central universal influence in the light. Which brought the destruction of the Romans government. The Russian political framework was

generally blamed by the political response in Europe, and Nicholas II was removed as a processor of the people groups in his field. When he resigned in March There were glad festivals in Russia as well as in Paris and London. Group pushed to welcome the possibility of a majority rules system. There had been comparative feeling in when the destruction of cool applicants outside the Winter Palace was trailed by open shows all through the urban communities of the Russian field. This concession, separated from the afraid war was joined by the crude caution of the progressive association. Before the finish of , Nicholas II had settled his power "yet at a value. Also, finished the following couple of years. He aspires to curve back the forces that he had acquired upon the departure of his old man in Co-worker pioneers of the nation investigated every possibility. The implement utilized by Lenin to fulfill his objectives included man-influenced hunger, to slave work camps, and killing of spoilers middle the Red Terror. Hungriness were designed by interesting laborers to pitch their harvests without benefits to Lenin inspire forced to end in edit generation. Millions died in such camps. He likewise removed land from laborers that Lenin has offered back to the early prevention by the workers and bigger scale hungriness. He likewise intensely industrialized Russia to support the economy with a definitive objective of spreading socialism to whatever is left of the world. The two powerhouses of the world currently occupied with creating retaliatory weapons should the need emerge to battle against each other. The primary atomic weapons contest was in this manner imagined and the feelings of worries of a dangerous World War III posed a potential threat. The Soviet Union and the US likewise busy with the space race. The Cold War likewise brought forth the Korean and the Vietnam War, and other political and economic emergency. At long last, in the race to archive the matchless quality. The tremendous money related spendings in the arms and space race contributed to the Soviet economy changed. Along these lines when Mikhail Gorbachev came to control in He embraced new standards to revive the Soviet economy and decrease pressures with the US. The Cold War finished. The comrade governments in the side nations of Russia began to flop because of the more tolerant approaches of Mikhail Gorbachev activist. At last, in , among the administration of Boris Yeltsin, the Soviet Union formally broke separated into Russia and a few sovereign nations. The two most important types of non-Marxist Communism are not obeying socialism and Christian socialism. Revolutionary socialism differences from Marxism in that it rejects the requirement for a state communism stage. Christian socialism, then again. Today, Russia is never again a Communist state yet an organization semi-presidential republic. He has revealed an unprecedented change to an industrialist fundamental economy. Be that as it may. China is the best and the best Communist state existing today. In any case, Maoism is never again in every practical sense here and however some giant endeavors are controlled by the state, privatization and the foundation of a pass on feature economy is the present precedent found in China. The Communist Party of China, in any case. He has guaranteed the steady leadership of the get-together in the nation since Slideshare communism Cuba and Vietnam are additionally entirely single-party comrade states on the planet today. Since the fall of the Soviet Union. The nations have quit accepting sponsorship and funding. Which they used to get from the Soviet Union, and consequently are strategically connecting for help from different countries. The two nations are looking for outside guess and their economies are winding up developing publicize situated. At last, North Korea is the main nation following the old-Soviet style socialism. The legislature of the nation marked as exceptionally insulting nature. The nation limited from whatever left of the world. The standards and the individuals who locate the common sense execution of socialism incomplete in the present-day world. Numerous have denied the supportable strategies actualized by the socialist pioneers to build up their political and ideological objectives. They eagerly condemned by political and social activists over the world. In this day and age, Soviet-style socialism thought to be for all intents and purposes outdated. The truth will surface eventually where another development will prompt the working of another comrade society on Marxist lines. This is my deep research on communism. I tried to give all the information about communism in an easy and learning way. I hope this post will be very illuminating for you. It all knows to be good at knowing you and motivates me to write. For more such an article stay tuned with TimesEra.

Chapter 9 : Karl Marx - Wikipedia

Karl Marx (German: [ˈkaʁl ˈmaʁks]; 5 May - 14 March) was a German philosopher, economist, historian, sociologist, political theorist, journalist and socialist revolutionary. Born in Trier, Germany, to a Jewish middle-class family, Marx studied law and philosophy at university.

At that time, I was more dismissive of the project than I now care to recall. Having recently had the occasion to re-read the first volume, and now also the pleasure of reading the second. Hal Draper is not producing marxology, but scholarly marxism of the highest order. The scholarship is simply amazing. Draper has read everything there is to read, and has organised his resulting mass of material into a wonderfully clear and systematic presentation of the political ideas of Marx and his comrade Fred Engels. I noted the indispensability of the first volume as a reference work, and can only reiterate that point again. But something more must be said, about the politics of the work. Hal Draper is well-known and some publisher should make him still better known by a re-issue of a marvellous short pamphlet of the s: The Two Souls of Socialism. Hal Draper is a marxist. His Marx and his Engels defiantly quoted over hundreds of pages are consistent, red revolutionaries, ever concerned with the expansion of popular freedoms, and with an expansion of freedom and control won by the working classes themselves, by their own efforts and their own power. True, they were intellectuals, but intellectuals whose whole lives were organised around the principle of struggle, of political engagement, whose intellectual work aimed always at the central point: They were acid in their condemnation of idiots, not out of love of their own cleverness as we find in so many latter-day academic marxoids but because the truth mattered to the working class, because ignorance and muddle were impediments to their struggle. For them, reason and freedom went hand in hand. Hal Draper aims to recover Marx and Engels as revolutionary activists and thinkers. In this volume, he discusses the anatomy of classes, the role of the modern proletariat as the key agent in the overthrow of capitalism, and the relation defined in struggle of the working class to other classes and strata. Initially, one further volume was planned, but the author now announces that the remaining materials will occupy two further substantial tomes. Despite the massive scope of the work, and its integrated conception, the various separate parts are themselves a whole series of smaller pleasures. This is a hook to dip into, as well as to read right through. If you want to know why marxists emphasise the working class before all others, the materials are all here. Academics should ponder what Marx and Engels thought of them. The Marxist attitude to trade unionism is clearly spelled out, together with the issues of reformism, the need for an independent revolutionary party of the working class, and so on. Over and over again. Draper shows the theoretical founders of our movement insisting on the central and revolutionary role of the modern working class, as the class which alone hears within its forms of life the seeds of the future society. I cannot do this book justice. The publishers should be urged to rush out a paperback edition of the second volume. This work should be welcomed, read, studied, used.