

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a manuscript sent to us for publication and microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. Pages in any manuscript may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. Manuscripts may not always be complete. When it is not possible to obtain missing pages, a note appears to indicate this.
2. When copyrighted materials are removed from the manuscript, a note appears to indicate this.
3. Oversize materials (maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or in black and white paper format.*
4. Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, all photographs are available in black and white standard 35mm slide format.*

*For more information about black and white slides or enlarged paper reproductions, please contact the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

U·M·I Dissertation
Information Service

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

8614650

Abdul-Wahhab, Waa'iz Muhammad

REVOLUTION, BARBARISM AND MARTYRDOM. (VOLUMES I AND II)

City University of New York

PH.D. 1986

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1986

by

Abdul-Wahhab, Waa'iz Muhammad

All Rights Reserved

REVOLUTION, BARBARISM AND MARTYRDOM

by

WAA'IZ MUHAMMAD ABDUL-WAHHAB

VOLUME I

**A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Sociology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Sociology,
The City University of New York.**

1986

© 1986

WAA'IZ MUHAMMAD ABDUL-WAHHAB

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

3-12-86
date

Michael E Brown
Chairman of Examining Committee

3-12-86
date

William K. Brown
Executive Officer

Bogdan Denitch

George Fischer

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

REVOLUTION, BARBARISM AND MARTYRDOM

by

Waa'iz Muhammad Abdul-Wahhab

Adviser: Professor Michael E. Brown

A contextual investigation and interrogation of Marx's writings was pursued in order to determine two incompatible revolutionary efformations. One effomation specifies and details productive forces and productive/economic relations within the material base of society, and it is set in the dynamic of structural requirements. The other efformation specifies and details class political struggle at the material superstructure of society, and it is set in the dynamic of the voluntarism of "human nature in general."

This investigation and interrogation concluded with the discovery of "a complete revolution" that conjoins the base and superstructural efformations. Although our initial hypothesis had to be abandoned, the discovery of "a complete revolution" resulted in a more startling and momentous discovery; namely, that capitalism arose in Western Europe not, as bourgeois thought would have it, in the throes of a revolution that brought down feudalism; rather it arose in the throes of barbarism, and it arose because the capitalists managed to emerge as conquerors by means of a super-structuralization of an even greater and more

coercive barbarism: i.e., state barbarism. Barbarism constituted the antecedent and wherewithal for capitalist development in later Western Europe.

This lead to our theory of bourgeois colonialism and imperialism: the bourgeoisie forced and facilitated the emigration of their barbarian adversaries to Asia, Africa, the Americas, etc., so as to set in place and in motion the conditions of existence for the introduction of capitalist development--the bourgeoisie globally reproduced the sequence of events that fostered their hegemony in Western Europe.

Barbarous conquest--not the megamaze of revolution, history, civilization, culture, technology and progress--is the origin and source of global capitalism and its inversion: socialism. Thus capitalism is the rule of bourgeois barbarism from above and socialism is the rule of proletariat barbarism from above.

Martyrdom, which encompasses the martyr's transcendent passion, is the fundamental organizing principle and instrument of mass mobilization against the colonialism and imperialism of the capitalist and proletarian classes: martyrdom is the strategic factor in the mass struggle against classes.

Ultimately, capitalism-socialism are co-modes for the production, seduction and deification of barbarous lusts. The progenitor of these co-modes is the First Barbarian, the Grand Barbarian, the Great Satan.

Allah, the Glorious, is the Absolute,
the Transcendence
Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him) is the
Relative, the Horizontal...
the martyr is the transfixion by
death of the leap across
the Relative towards the Absolute

Acknowledgments

Michael E. Brown contributed his openness, courage and encouragement to this work.

Bogdan Denitch created the opportunity and setting in which this dissertation could develop.

George Fischer's challenges and compassion shaped and informed this work.

William Kornblum's support and presence was invaluable throughout this entire effort.

Hamid Algar, whose dedication and concern, provided direction and completion to the research and materials involved.

Special thanks is due Collette Amoda who articulated the contextual configuration in which this work is situated, Danette Green who watched over the entire production of this dissertation, Donal Malone who helped with the everyday problems of producing this work, Mahmoud Ibrahim who listened so well and Bahiya Nabila who typed with care and efficiency.

Finally, this is an acknowledgment of all my martyred Brothers and Sisters: this dissertation stands as a marker on their collective grave.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii

PART I. REVOLUTION: MARX'S
BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION

CHAPTER

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	11
	Marx the Revolutionist	11
	A Survey of the Literature.....	17
2.	RESEARCH PROCEDURE: DECORTICATION WITHIN THE CONTEXTUAL PARADIGM.....	54
3.	THE MARXIAN REVOLUTION AND THE SECRET THEREOF.....	59
4.	THE COMPLEX OF REVOLUTIONS.....	78
	Revolutionary Efformation I: Base Revolution.....	82
	Revolutionary Efformation II: Superstructural Revolution.....	150
5.	PRIMITIVE ACCUMULATION OF BARBARISM.....	290
6.	SUPERSTRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE BASE	398

PART II. BARBARISM: FROM POST-FEUDAL
ACCUMULATION TO CAPITALIST-
SOCIALIST IMPERIALISM

7.	ALL THAT IS SOLID DOES NOT MELT INTO AIR:...A MODERN THEORY OF BARBARISM	433

8.	THE ROLE OF FORCED EMIGRATION AND VIOLENCE (CONQUEST) IN BOURGEOIS TRANSFORMATION, CIVILIZATION AND PROGRESS.....	468
9.	THE PROLETARIAT: BOURGEOIS BARBARISM FROM BELOW.....	498
10.	BARBARIAN SOCIOLOGY.....	509
11.	CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM?.....	521

PART III. MARTYRDOM: MASS AGAINST
CLASS

12.	MARTYRDOM: THE ULTIMATE PASSION.....	531
13.	MARTYROLOGY: THE CONJUNCTURE OF THE MARTYR, THE MASSES AND CLASSES.....	559

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	599

PART I
REVOLUTION :
MARX' S BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Marx the Revolutionist

In his speech at Marx's graveside, Engels described Marx thus:

For Marx was before all else a revolutionist. His real mission in life was to contribute, in one way or another, to the overthrow of capitalist society and of the state institutions which it had brought into being, to contribute to the liberation of the modern proletariat, which he was the first to make conscious of its own position and its needs, conscious of the conditions of its emancipation. Fighting was his element. And he fought with a passion, a tenacity and a success such as a few could rival.¹

The key word in Engels' speech is "revolutionist." The word specifies that the life's work of Marx was revolution. Marx the "revolutionist" is the subject of this proposed thesis. The main texts and all the writings of Marx--be the subject technological, economic, political, humanistic, philosophical, religious, anthropological, sociological or "scientific"--are all to be viewed as being pregnant with his "real mission in life," if we are to take seriously Engels' depiction of Marx.

To elucidate and elaborate upon Marx's material production is to present an ubiquitous revolutionary mosaic,

for Marx's symbolic universe is a kaleidoscope in which revolution bursts forth. In general terms, this writing will deal with the theoretical side of Marx's lifework as a revolutionist, and it will approach Marx's revolutionary discourse through a contextual framework that emphasizes structures, categories and concepts.

Here a problem must be addressed. How much, and how well, has the voluminous literature on Marx dealt with this topic already? As long as this problem is not addressed, the validity of the writing may well be in doubt. In recent years the Marxian revolutionary complex has been dismissed by a growing number of Western scholars. Critical theorists, non-Marxist "structuralists" and the European and American new left, for example, have accepted the "dialectical method": i.e., an analytical discourse grounded in contradiction, correspondence and reciprocal determinism, but they reject much of the "Marxian revolution" as an explanatory or predictive model. This conformation of dismissals and rejections annexed to the previously established academic model/monolith that repudiates completely the revolutionary notions and terms of Marx completes the tombstone marking the death of Marx's the "revolutionist." In approximately 100 years since the death of this

"revolutionists" the celebrated citadels of legitimate thought--right, center and left--have laid most of the Marxian body of revolution to rest.

Hence, the question of the necessity of another exploration into the fossilized and decaying Marxian body of revolution appears to elicit a negative response. However, beneath this apparently withering and antiquated body there lurks the possibility of a peculiar and strange discovery: are there two different and distinct revolutionary bodies lying beneath this tombstone--two revolutionists? If this is so, what is the nature of each revolutionary body conceived by Marx?

To seize upon this kind of possible discovery, an aggressive and forthright investigation and interrogation will be launched. The Marxian body of revolution will be laid out structurally (relationships and configurations of all parts are taken together, so that each part is considered in relation to every other part as well as in relation to the whole), categorically (a rigorous ordering and classification of propositional predicates and subjects will be set forth) and conceptually (thought patterns will be arranged so as to demonstrate higher order concurrence or discordance); such a structural, categorical and conceptual format will, according to

our argument, make transparent the contextual framework that organizes and integrates Marxian revolutionary textual production. In turn this contextual framework will remove any opacity that may enshroud Marx's textual work, and, thereby, bring to light a construction (or reconstruction) of Marxian revolutionary writings that presents two kinds/types or efformations.

Upon the display of these two revolutionary efformations. it will be argued further that these efformations can in no way be collapsed into one "complete revolution," i.e., one grand revolution; which is to say, these two revolutionary efformations are incompatible and contradictory.

It is to be expected that this mode of investigative and interrogative research into Marx's revolutionary textual production will inevitably provoke some discussion upon the global entourage of imperialism and colonialism.

What is being proposed herein will constitute, for many, a radically different treatment of Marx. As will be seen below, there are widely divergent opinions and views relating to "what Marx really said" about revolution: e.g., 1) there is a revolutionary ontology in his work, 2) Marx offers a moral philosophy and an ethic of "distributive justice," 3) the Marxian revolution is an expression of human subjectivity and freedom, 4) his writings compose a science of history and social change, 5) Marx developed a revolutionary method for a liberated science, 6) dialectical materialism is the law of change in civilization and nature, 7) economic transformation is the cornerstone of the Marxian edifice, 8) his theory is one of proletarian political revolution, 9) he speaks as a technological determinist and 10) he is a proponent of a radical variant of mystical humanism.

What is striking about so many of the Marxian pundits is their lack of candor concerning their own 1) confusion, bewilderment or perplexity about "what Marx really said" and 2) selective omissions of variegated Marxian materials that are antithetical to what they are proposing Marx really said. Such lack of candor may not be the consequence of intellectual dishonesty or perceptual myopia, nor would the muddle and multiplicity of perspectives be the

necessary product of poor scholarship, error or misreading. To the contrary, the glaring problems surrounding the interpretations of Marxian revolutionary texts may be due to their forced fitting of the Marxian revolution into a singular, universal and harmonious unity that bespeaks of the "real Marx."

The "real Marx" will bespeak of, if this writing realizes its objectives, two particularized and disharmonious revolutions. Perhaps, the jumble, exclusions and unwieldy diversity will be overcome by a frank and open engagement with Marx speaking the language of two revolutions.

A Survey of the Literature

Any inquiry that lays out as its project a comprehensive probe into Marxian revolutionary materials, cannot help but to proceed in a manner that will detail the theoretical panorama created by non-Marxists and Marxists. What is encountered in the works on Marxian revolutionary texts are, on the one hand, the celebrated claims against Marx's presentation, and, on the other hand, the myriad of exuberant praises for Marx's genius and contribution.

Not surprisingly, mainstream social science tackles Marx's revolutionary formulations. The British philosopher H.B. Acton pinpoints, in his critical study, The Illusion of the Epoch, a negative relationship between revolution and religion; a relationship which solution is found in the revolutionary surpassing of "the religious illusion."

The lesson to be drawn, therefore, from the criticism of religion is the need for a revolution in the social conditions that produce the religious illusion... Marx asserts that it is the proletariat... which will carry out this revolution.... Thus the proletariat was to be the "passive element," the "material basis" for the realization of a just social order.²

Thus, Acton, in part, finds fault with Marx's assignment of religion to the categories of illusion and social harm.

Raymond Aron, in a fashion similar to Acton, juxtaposes the emergence of revolution in Marx to the religious question: "Marx progressed from atheism to revolution by way of a dialectic of history."³

Again, in Robert Tucker's exposition Marx's intellectual formation is ground in religious metaphors and parlance.

As Engels put it, German philosophy's discovery that "God is man" called for a rearrangement of the world that would make it possible for man to experience himself in it as a god-like being. This world-revolutionary inference from Hegelianism was Marx's first premise too, and started him off on the path to the creation of Marxism as a doctrine of world revolution.⁴

Sidney Hook raises a different set of questions. He inquires into the relationship between history, economics, class struggle and revolution.

If, as the Communist Manifesto declares, "all history is the history of class struggles," it certainly is not true that all class struggles have been economic.... Nor is it true that all history is the history only of class struggle.⁵

From the perspective of historical analysis, a series of viewpoints have emerged; for example, Karl Popper's refutation of Marx takes the form of decrying him as being one of many modern historicists blinded by the "sheer mythology" of believing that his brand of

historicism is the last and boldest achievement of humanity. Hook states, "Important revolutions have occurred before our time, and since the days of Heraclitus, change has been discovered over and over again."⁶

In a highly praised work G.A. Cohen provides a defense of Marxian revolutionary theory based upon a re-emphasis of productive forces: "The function of revolutionary social change is to unlock the productive forces. With the focus on the development of productive forces, history becomes a coherent story. Perhaps history is not really coherent, but Marx thought it was, and he said the development of material power made it so."⁷

Cohen's position is not commonly shared. Perhaps more typical of historical investigation into Marxian revolutionary production is Maurice Mandelbaum's discussion of whether or not Marx differentiates between a "functional law" and a "directional law" in his doctrine of historical transformation. In brief, Mandelbaum holds that Marx confuses the forces of the immediate situation with the forces of historical necessity.⁸

David McLellan has also joined in on the controversy about the "real Marx," the real "revolutionist." McLellan agrees with Engels, and our own assessment, that Marx's

texts and writings are to be understood and grasped as being imbued with revolutionary transformation.

Thus Marx could call the revolution, "the driving force of history," and all his studies in other fields were devoted to uncovering the springs of that "driving force."⁹

On the other hand, Shlomo Avineri delves into what for him is the main internal weakness in the revolutionary theorizing of Marx. Avineri's political interpretation finds Marxian revolutionary work centered upon, if however poorly, a "praxis" possessing a historical subject.

Endowing the present generation with such eschatological significance...points to the internal tension of a system that combines eschatology and dialectics...[and] the intellectual achievements of Marx's philosophy cannot provide without modification an ideological basis for a political movement possessing organizational continuity and experiencing the normal ups and downs of political life.¹⁰

Finally, in this genre, Richard Hunt in The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels speaks to an erroneous Marxian conclusions deduced from the plausible extropolation of social currents encircling Marx; namely, Marx's mistaken identification of the "birth pangs of industrialism for the death of capitalism."¹¹ Hunt comes to the conclusion that at least three elements characterize "the revolution Marx and Engels had in mind...: the proletarian revolution

would be a just cause, supported by the majority, where no other means were open."¹²

Generally speaking, established American sociologists have questioned the empirical validity and/or the conceptual clarity of Marx's effort. For example, Talcott Parsons has this to say:

...it is difficult to believe that structural injustices are really as great as those proclaimed as justification for the coming proletarian revolution by Marx and Engels just over a century ago in the Communist Manifesto. Yet... we cannot but be impressed that "the revolution," in the classic sense, has not occurred in a single industrially advanced country but has been confined to relatively "underdeveloped" societies--of which the Russia of 1917 was surely an example--and those under the military domination of such societies, as were Poland and Czechoslovakia after 1945.¹³

Another top figure in the field, Robert K. Merton, comments on Marx's empirical descriptions of revolutionary phenomena; Merton holds that Marx confounds his empirical descriptions with his theoretical explanation.

...both Marx and Engels, repeatedly and with increasing insistence, emphasize that the ideologies of a social stratum need not stem only from persons who are objectively located in that stratum....But if we cannot derive ideas from the objective class position of their exponents, this leaves a wide margin of indeterminacy. It then becomes a further

problem to discover why some identify themselves with the characteristic outlook of the class stratum in which they objectively find themselves whereas others adopt the presuppositions of a class stratum other than "their own."

Merton, by focusing in on the "objective class position" and "class stratum," previewed what was to become, for American sociologists, the recurring point of contention within the Marxian revolution: the "analytical conception of social class." Robert A. Nisbet speaks to the same issue.

Class struggle is for Marx a principle, the principle of history: comparable in scope and force to Comte's law of three stages, to Tocqueville's political organization, to Weber's rationalization. Class struggle is the most fundamental social manifestation of the dialectical in history; it is the "efficient cause" of the movement of society from one stage to another. The modern emergence of the bourgeoisie is the consequence of "a series of revolutions in the modes of production and exchange .

...Despite the fact that social class is the very basis of Marxian sociology, and despite the abundance of general references to social class--most notably to the bourgeoisie and the proletariat--a clear, analytical conception of social class is not easy to derive from the reading of Marx.¹⁵

Lewis A. Coser should be mentioned in closing out this section on established American sociologists' response to Marxian revolutionary works. Cosier is less disapproving of Marx's conceptual endeavors and more observant of the

interconnections of sociological analysis and sociological prophecy: "The sociologist does well to distinguish prophecy from analysis, but he needs always to keep in mind that in Marx's case the second would not have been realized without the first."¹⁶

At this juncture, we will turn to the Marxists' depictions of their "revolutionist." Here is located, perhaps, the most interesting, rich and fragmented corpus. Space does not permit a comprehensive review of this inexhaustible literature, so a brief glimpse at the Marxist vista overlooking what was "really said" by their "revolutionist."

In The Permanent Revolution Leon Trotsky focuses in on the relationship between revolution and the proletariat. He is concerned especially with eliminating "a prejudice of 'economic' materialism simplified to absurdity," and a "hopeless formalism" that attempts to convert historically relative positions of Marx into supra-historical axioms.

The proletariat grows and becomes stronger with the growth of capitalism. In this sense the development of capitalism is also the development of the proletariat toward dictatorship. ...when power will pass into the hands of the working class depends directly not upon the level attained by the productive forces but upon relations in the class struggle, upon the

international situation and...upon...
 the traditions...initiative and the
 readiness to fight of the workers....
 To imagine that the dictatorship of the
 proletariat is in some way automatically
 dependent on the technical development
 and resources of a country is a prejudice
 of "economic" materialism simplified to
 absurdity. This point of view has nothing
 in common with Marxism....

Marxism is above all a method of
 analysis--not analysis of texts, but
 analysis of social relations....Is it true
 that in Russia, the weakness of capitalism
 inevitably means the weakness of the labor
 movement? It is true, for Russia, that
 there cannot be an independent labour
 movement....to put these questions to
 see what a hopeless formalism lies
 concealed beneath the attempt to convert
 an historically-relative remark of Marx
 into a supra-historical axiom.¹⁷

Trotsky's development of Marx's revolutionary work as
 a "method of analysis...of social relations," as against
 its development as an "economic materialism," may be seen
 as reaction to the "economists." The "economists" have
 centered Marx's revolutionary work upon the material base
 of social relations; to wit, revolution is the consequence
 of economic development. George Plekhanov is one such
 Marxist who frames class revolution as "determined by
 necessity": as determined by economic necessity.

When a social revolution is brought
 about by a class striving for its
 liberation, that class acts in a way
 that is more or less expedient in
 achieving the aim desired; in any
 case its activities are the cause of
 that revolution. However, together

with all the aspirations that have brought them about, these activities are themselves a consequence of a definite course of economic development, and therefore are themselves determined by necessity.¹⁸

Living and writing in a non-Western, non-industrialized and non-urbanized China, comprised primarily of peasants and not the urban proletariat, Mao looked through the window of Marx and saw "war itself" (guerrilla warfare would be more exact) as the "central task and the highest form of revolution."

"War is the continuation of politics."
In this sense war is politics and war itself is a political action....Every Communist must grasp the truth, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."...
The seizure of power by arm force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution.¹⁹

A seminal work within the Marxist tradition is that of Lukacs, History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics. Here the impact of Hegel makes its appearance in the form of Lukacs' placement of the dialectical process not along the economic axis but along the historical axis. The movement of the dialectic along the historical axis produces historical materialism--whereas the movement of the dialectic along the economic axis produces "economic materialism." Out of historical materialism, class, class interests and class consciousness come into existence; class-for-itself comes into existence as the subject and agency of historical change.

For a class to be ripe for hegemony means that its interests and consciousness enable it to organize the whole society in accordance with those interests. The crucial question in every class struggle is this: which class possesses this capacity and this consciousness at the decisive moment?...

It must not be thought, however, that all classes ripe for hegemony have a class consciousness with the same inner structure. Everything hinges on the extent to which they can become conscious of the actions they need to perform in order to obtain and organise power. The question then becomes: how far does the class concerned perform the actions history has imposed on it "consciously" or "unconsciously?" And is that consciousness "true" or "false."²⁰

One of the critical issues raised by Lukacs' formulation of Marxian materials is that of the relationship between political organization and class consciousness. Class consciousness is a prerequisite for the organization of the revolutionary party within Lukacs' presentation, or, said differently, political organization is a reflexive response to class consciousness. Lukacs sets class interests, class consciousness and class struggle, i.e., the political organization of class, in a developmental arrangement that takes the problematic of humanism and history and makes it the problematic of Marx's revolutionary labors.

Before we turn directly to the problematic of humanism and history that is associated with Lukacs, let us look at Antonio Gramsci's views, for his thoughts have been used to bolster a Marxist project

aimed at humanism and history.

Gramsci is seen by some Marxists as having produced a genuinely creative work that offers the relationship Marx drew out between the societal superstructure and the base structure in the "real dialectical process."

Structures and superstructures form a "historical bloc." That is to say the complex, contradictory and discordant ensemble of the superstructures is the reflection of the ensemble of the social relations of production.... This reasoning is based on the necessary reciprocity between structure and superstructure, a reciprocity which is nothing other than the real dialectical process. 21

Gramsci appears to be the first Marxist who claims to have captured and embraced "the authentic...Marx" by citing Marxian texts as bearing witness to the relative penetration and autonomy of the superstructure with reference to the base structure.

The claim, presented as an essential postulate of historical materialism, that every fluctuation of politics and ideology can be presented and expounded as an immediate expression of the structure, must be contested in theory as primitive infantilism, and combated in practice with the authentic testimony of Marx, the author of concrete political and historical works. Particularly important from this point of view are the 18th Brumaire and the writings on the Eastern Question, but also other writings (Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany, The Civil War in France and lesser works). 22

Building upon Gramsci's "real dialectical process"/ "the authentic testimony of Marx," and in opposition to Lukacs' coupling of humanism and history, i.e., class as the agency and subject in history, Althusser argues that an "epistemological break" and a "theoretical anti-humanism" is critical to any grasp of Marx. By arguing that humanity is the embodiment of history and not its subject or its agency of change, Althusser develops the position that the "real dialectical process" of historical materialism is "without a subject."

...History is the Spirit, it is the last moment of the alienation of a process which "begins" with Logic, continues with Nature and ends with the Spirit,...i.e., what can be presented in the form of "History." For Hegel, quite to the contrary of the erroneous view of Kojève and the young Lukacs...who are ashamed of the Dialectics of Nature, the dialectic is by no means peculiar to History, which means that History does not contain anywhere in itself, in any subject, its own origin. The Marxist tradition was quite correct to return to the thesis of the Dialectics of Nature, which has the polemical meaning (among others) that history is a process without a subject.²³

Furthermore, Althusser carries forward Gramsci's depiction of the superstructure as a complex ensemble by forging relationships between science, philosophy and revolutionary politics.

Everything revolves around this double relation....philosophy is a certain continuation of politics, in a certain domain, vis-a-vis a certain reality.

Philosophy represents politics in the domain of theory, or to be more precise: with the sciences--and vice versa philosophy represents scientificity in politics, with the classes engaged in class struggle.²⁴

Althusser's "epistemological break," "theoretical anti-humanism" and "double relation" are the means by which he is advancing a contrasting and contrary Marx to the Marx we discover in Lukacs' materials. Such an advance is, in large measure, an intervention into philosophy by representing politics in the domain of theory/science--an intervention into philosophy by representing the politics of "classes engaged in class struggle." The Althusserian intervention is a project of 1) removing class, class interests and class consciousness as the subject and agency of history and change, 2) removing class interests and consciousness as prerequisites of revolutionary organization, 3) replacing the signs class, class interests and class consciousness as used by Lukacs with the sign philosophy, class struggle "in the domain of theory," and 4) replacing the sign and axis of history, as used by Lukacs, with the sign and axis of theory/science. Ultimately, the Althusserian project moves towards establishing philosophy as the science of the proletarian class engaged in class struggle. Consequently, philosophy--not class, class interests and class consciousness--and theory/science--not history--are the hallmarks and

achievements of the "authentic" Marx, the "real dialectical process" and revolutionary proletarian politics. Success or failure of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, and thereby the failure or success of capitalism, is dependent upon the success or failure of proletarian philosophy and theory/science.

In view of Bertell Ollman's contention that Marx loaded his revolutionary descriptions with the wants, needs, "conditions," "interests" and consciousness of the working class, his Marx bears some resemblance to the Marx found in Lukacs' texts.

It was only because Marx believed that the workers wanted (or were on the verge of wanting) what they needed, and that they were conscious (or were on the verge of becoming so) of their conditions and interests that he remained forever optimistic regarding a socialist revolution.²⁵

Ollman's depiction of Marx's eternal optimism with reference to a socialist revolution conjures up images and questions about the "incipient state of war" between antagonistic classes. Ralph Miliband suggests the possibility of class antagonism without violence and bloodshed.

In political terms...the more important question is how far Marx was right in speaking of society as "splitting up into two great hostile camps"; indeed, whether he was right about this at all. For it would be possible to think of capitalist society "simplifying" class

arrangements without necessarily turning the different classes into mutually hostile ones...in other words to accept that antagonisms will occur between classes and social aggregates of different kinds with producing "hostile camps," an imagery that significantly conjures up an actual or incipient state of war. This of course raises the whole question of the validity or otherwise of Marx's and Engel's belief in the inevitability of revolution, in other words of a decisive settlement of accounts between bourgeoisie and proletariat, out of which a new social order and mode of production, namely socialism, would emerge.²⁶

Concerning "the whole question of the validity or otherwise of Marx's...belief in the inevitability of revolution," Marxists have responded with their work on the state and the part it plays in halting or advancing the "inevitability of revolution." This work, both in theory and praxis, has taken two courses of development: the categorization and treatment of the state as 1) a neutral or hollow phenomenon or 2) a type of phenomenon having a particular "historical role and meaning." Hence, the twofold categorization of 1) "the state in capitalist society" and 2) "the capitalist state."

Under the first categorization the state in capitalism is, for example, essentially neutral and empty, a hollow apparatus, that needs to be "captured" by the forces (party or other agency(ies)) of the working class, and then it can be directed or occupied so that it serves the working class. Under the second categorization the capitalist state is, for example, an apparatus not compatible with direction

or occupancy by the forces (party or other agency(ies)) of the working class because it is inherently capitalistic in its operation, structure and role; therefore (as well as hence) it must be smashed by revolution, for it cannot be effectively or realistically "captured" and then directed or occupied so that it serves the working class.

Representatives of capturing the state in society as an instrument for radical change of the conditions of direct labor include, amongst others, Ralph Miliband (in his earlier writing, The State in Capitalist Society), William Domhoff and C. Wright Mills. This categorization demonstrates the state as subject to variant modalities of power and control: class, elites, social stratum, bureaucrats, etc.

... There is nothing about history that tells us that a power elite cannot make it. To be sure, the will of such men is always limited, but never before have the limits been so broad...The problems of the nature and the power of this elite is now the only realistic and serious way to raise again the problem of responsible government....

...the decisions they make and fail to make carry more consequences for more people than has ever been the case in the world history of mankind.²⁷

Representatives of the state as a location or structure for articulating a systematic totality: the Asiatic state, the feudal state, the capitalist state, etc., and thereby a placement or structure inimical to instrumental use by direct labor to radically change their conditions, include, amongst others, Althusser, Vladimir Lenin and

Nicos Poulantzas.²⁸ Lenin develops this position in the following manner:

...the basic idea of Marxism with regard to the historical role and meaning of the state. The state is the product and a manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonism. The state arises where, when and insofar as class antagonisms objectively cannot be reconciled. And, conversely, the existence of the state proves that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable.²⁹

Insofar as the state is the material specificity of irreconcilable class antagonism, Lenin goes on to say, proletarian revolutionaries are to smash this specificity of "irreconcilability."

The words [of Marx] "to smash the bureaucratic-military machine," briefly expresses the principle lesson of Marxism regarding the task of the proletariat during a revolution in relation to the state.³⁰

This coverage of what Marxists have expounded on the universe of revolution contained within Marxian texts brings forth the symbolic confrontation that has developed between and amongst Marxists. This development is tantamount to a propositional, categorical and conceptual struggle which has lead one Marxists to comment,

Marx's political ideas have not generally interested "marxology"...except as incidental appendages to the "grand theory."...

The "philosophic" side of Marx's development has been covered more copiously than any other aspect of Marx's activity or thought, from a multiplicity of viewpoints. This imbalance is striking; even some books purporting to deal with his social and political thought are largely concerned with philosophical concepts involved or read into it. The imbalance is also symbolic, for it represents a tendency to turn Marx into an abstract savant.³¹

This assessment by Hal Draper is contained within his copious work, Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution, given to correcting the "imbalance" in Marxist literature. Pulling together a multitude of Marxian sources, Draper constructs an elaborate amalgamation of Marxian thought.

We can now narrow our focus to what tends to be called a social revolution in Marx's theory. It is most clearly used for a political revolution that expresses a social-revolutionizing drive toward the transference of state power to a new class....

For Marx, then, revolution is defined by the nature of the change involved, by sociopolitical relations.³²

Draper's "focus" entails refining and defining the terms, propositions, categories and concepts in Marx's writings; which is to say, Draper's method is arranging, ordering and classifying the elements and factors of change.

The revolution that concerns Marx is defined by the nature of the social change it entails, by the class relationships in that change. It is a political revolution which is the immediate manifestation of a social revolution....

Proletarian revolution is, then, a short form for proletarian social revolution--transference of state power to a new ruling class, the proletariat.³³

Draper's methodizing results in Marxian concerns being organized into class-based social change focused upon the seizure of state power as the means by which to "revolutionize the socioeconomic foundation."

Social revolution means that the new class in power does not limit itself to change within the framework of the old social system, but tends to put its new state power into basic conflict with the former ruling strata.... the new political power must proceed to revolutionize the socioeconomic foundation.³⁴

Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution may surpass any comparable work that deals with the revolutionary substance in Marx's endeavor. In terms of its scope, detail and documentation this text is singular; nevertheless, Draper's scholarship is overshadowed by his lock step conformity to the Marxist march that disassociates text from context. In general, Marxists have deliberately disengaged the concrete and particular political, social and economic context in which Marx was embedded, i.e., the bourgeois European formation, from his textually given revolutionary politics, and therewith they have separated out the origin and source of Marxian revolutionary politics. In this manner, it is made to appear that these revolutionary politics are the product of Marxian texts and not the product of the bourgeois European formation. In other words,

revolution is presented as a product of Marx textually contained instead of as a product of bourgeois society contextually contained.

This disjoining of text and context has lead to the masking of the contextual revolution of bourgeois society with the Marxian textual revolution. According to this argument Marxism is, in large measure, the successful establishment of 1) the disjunction of the actual context that was the locus of and for Marxian revolution texts from the texts themselves coupled with and followed by 2) the screening of this context by the use of these texts as the locus of and for revolution. For example, Draper's entire formulation of revolutionary change is in fact a disarticulation of the revolutionary occurrences that took place in bourgeois Europe from bourgeois Europe and their relocation as occurrences that took place in Marxian texts and requiring systematic treatment and clarification. Thus, Draper sets out to isolate, identify and order the elements and factors of revolutionary change: class, state and socioeconomic foundation. These factors and elements of revolutionary change Draper sets out are not, it must be borne in mind, the properties or ingredients of Marxian texts in themselves; to the contrary, they are the properties or ingredients of bourgeois society. What Draper does is, in effect, isolate, identify and order (some of) the factors and

elements of change within bourgeois Europe--the very factors and elements that were forming, shaping and impacting upon Marx's textual production of change.

Marxism, the successful establishment of the bourgeois context of change hidden beneath the Marxian texts on change, can be illuminated as bound to and by bourgeois specificities and peculiarities in the light of the answers suggested by the following questions: Why is change predicated upon 1) the proletariat or any other class, 2) the state and its seizure and 3) radically altering the socioeconomic foundation? Are classless and/or stateless social formations to be considered devoid of change? What meaning, validity or reality does Marxian change have in social formations where politics (the superstructure) is the foundation of economics (the base structure)? What is the application, if any, of Marxian change to contexts where politics and economics are inseparable and/or they are both based upon kinship networks?³⁵

What is going on here is an operational shift from textual bounds to contextual bounds; a shift to the expatiation and protraction of the bourgeois context so that it emerges as the substance, framework and cement that unites the Marxian textual revolution. At issue here is the Marxists' subsumption, consumption and obfuscation

of the events, circumstances and struggles of the bourgeois European context--those social formations in Europe having a predominance of capitalist relations--during the eighteenth and nineteenth century (C.E.)* by means of Marxian texts; at issue here is the shift from the successful establishment of these events, circumstance and struggles as bound textually by Marx to the establishment of these events, circumstances and struggles as bound contextually by bourgeois society and given expression by Marx. This is a shift that does not bind Marx's theorizing textually; rather it is a shift that binds Marx's theorizing to capitalist European formation.

One Marxist in particular, it must be noted, was sensitive to certain features of this issue. Chairman Mao spoke out against the incorporation of Euro-centrism, Euro-logic and the "Europeanization" of Asia motif found in the Marxian revolutionary formulation. Mao's sensitivity was manifested in the theme and slogan he employed to cast the Chinese people as revolutionaries:

*Unless specified otherwise, all dating will be in accordance with the Christian calendar. The notation C.E., Christian Era, indicates such dating; consequently C.E. will be omitted to avoid redundancy.

"they are poor and blank."

Apart from their other characteristics, the outstanding thing about China's 600 million is that they are "poor and blank." This may seem a bad thing, but in reality it is a good thing. Poverty gives rise to the desire for change, the desire for action and the desire for revolution. On the blank sheet of paper free from any mark, the freshest and most beautiful characters can be written, the freshest and most beautiful pictures can be painted.³⁶

Mao's "'poor and blank'" characterization entails the rejection of Marxian (and Marxist) textual content as the context of revolution, for this textual content located Asian and African transformations as subordinate, inferior and rear-guard actions. Marxian (and Marxist) textual content as the context of revolution would have set in place and in motion an implicit and explicit structuring of the Chinese revolution within a European design, so Mao argued. Mao questioned and dismissed the implications of revolutionary leadership being tied to the technical, industrial and economic advancements materialized in the Soviet Union, Europe or America;³⁷ to wit, Mao challenged and discredited the subsumption, consumption and obfuscation of the revolutionary events, circumstances and struggles in China into a pattern arising out of the stages and sequences of Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. The philosophy/ideology/discourse of "poor and blank" went beyond the development of Mao's model of political, military and structural transformation of Chinese society;

it articulated Mao's contextualization of revolution, so that it met the concrete, particular and specific conditions of China. In contradistinction to the concrete, particular and specific conditions of revolutionary change in Europe that informed Marx and Marxists, Mao worked towards a process of revolutionary change that was liberated from European prejudices as well as informed by the Chinese context.

Whereas Mao argued that Marx situated revolution in a prism of Euro-centrism, Euro-logic and "Europeanization," our argument is much more accurate and precise, in that it situates Marx (in particular, and Marxism in general) in the bourgeois prism of Europe, and, thereby, it situates Marxian revolutionary change as bourgeois change--what is reflected in Marx's texts (and Marxism) is the revolutionary changes of the bourgeois context not the revolutionary changes of Marx. Given this contextualization of Marx and his texts by way of the concrete, particular and specific aspects of the bourgeois setting, the categorizations of Marx (and Marxism) as Euro-centric, or as manifesting Euro-logic or as promoting "Europeanization" are perceived as errant and overly generalized. These characterizations ensconce the more exact and definitive context that is being exported and globalized by Marx (and most Marxists) as the context of revolution, namely the bourgeois context. Bourgeois society and not European

society is what stands out as the contextual embodiment of revolution; the European context in and of itself, with its diversity and heterogeneous complexity, is not what looms large in Marxian revolutionary materials; what looms large in these materials are those areas of Europe where the bourgeoisie had risen to power and had established capitalistic relations. Marxian texts are not suffused with ethnocentrism, nationalism or racism--although these realities must be taken into account in any review of inquiry germane to Marxian revolutionary literature. The issue at hand is the wrapped ordination of the bourgeois context within Marxian revolutionary texts. Which means that any universalization of the Marxian revolution is in actuality the universalization of the bourgeois context in particular and not the universalization of the European context in general. Put directly, the Marxian revolution, stripped of its disjunction from the bourgeois context, its successful textual camouflage and its mischaracterization as Europeanized, can be observed most accurately and precisely as located and fixed in the bourgeois context: the centrality, logic and hegemony of productive development and class formation. Mao and the Chinese people were not, it is our argument, being sucked into the diversity and complexity of the many different

countries in various stages of preservation and change that compose Europe; rather Marxian revolution content was sucking Mao and the Chinese people into a textual excrescent covering the contextual core of bourgeois life.

We have argued that Marxian revolutionary texts constitute a textual excrescent that serves to conceal, and thereby protect, a bourgeois contextual core. This line of argumentation carried us through a process of decortication that left us with the perceptions of Marxian revolutionary texts as contextually given, arranged and bound.

At this place in our contextual construction the question of a historical analysis and explanation must be encountered head-on. This question brings to our attention the possibility of viewing Marxian revolutionary texts as historically given, arranged and bound. Let us begin to address this whole question contextually by asserting that our contextual construction of Marxian materials is antithetical to any historical construction of Marxian materials, and let us begin our contextual address by developing our construction into a paradigm that is counter-historical.

Revolution takes the form, shape substance of its surroundings; actions, struggle and change are rooted firmly in circumstance. With these statements our contextual paradigm is founded; a paradigm, therefore, which method precludes the possibility or existence of revolutionary actions, struggles or change disconnected from, unrelated to or devoid of a context. Such a contextual methodology requires that the dynamics of the Marxian revolutionary mosaic be encountered situationally, i.e., as situational dynamics that given credence, meaning and validity to Marxian texts. Consequently, when Marxian texts are located within this contextual paradigm their form, shape substance can be apprehended as derived from bourgeois space, and their roots can be traced directly back to bourgeois circumstance.

Upon this paradigmatic groundwork is established two primary relationships that hold between text and context: 1) context holds the text together, context gives content its points of reference, but 2) the text does not hold the context together, content does not give context its points of reference. Accordingly, 1) whatever logic, organization or rationality is discoverable in Marxian content is a function, an outcome, of bourgeois society and not Marxian texts and 2) whatever logic, organization or rationality discoverable

in bourgeois society is not a function, an outcome, of Marxian content. Stated simply, bourgeois society is the context for Marxian text and not the converse.

To continue, Marxian revolutionary contents may be used for substantiation, demonstration, documentation or illustration; when so employed they effectuate a cite as well as a site, a citation as well as a situation. To cite Marxian revolutionary texts is to cite the site of capitalistic relations and the rule of the bourgeoisie.

The elucidation of our contextual paradigm can be further advanced by juxtaposing and contrasting it to the historical paradigm that predominates in Marxist and non-Marxist literature on revolution (and most other issues). Upon examination, the historical paradigm includes, in all its variations, the chronicle, narrative, historiography and histeriology as vehicles for displaying time as a material stream generally carrying within it or serving as a conduit for some principle or design: be it technological development, progress, human change, structural integration and disintegration, consciousness, growth and decay or class struggle; taken together this material stream and principle/design forge epochs, periods, cycles, era, ages, movements, conjunctures, etc. It follows from this that revolution is a material event/ happening governed by the intrinsic characteristics of time

as well as the intrinsic characteristics of some principle or design. In this way, revolution is a determined manifestation of diachrony and principle/design.

On the other hand, internality--be it a diachronic process and/or the operation of some principle or design--is absent from our exploration of revolution; contextually speaking, revolution lacks any inherent material characteristics of its own: it is "poor and blank," void and empty, and those material characteristics usually associated with revolution are collocated as circumstantial. In contradistinction to the historical presentation of revolution as a manifestation of diachrony and some principle or design, the contextual presentation of revolution is that of revolution as a situational reflection.

What follows from all of this is that 1) the historical mode establishes revolutionary essentialism: revolution as having a diachronic and a principled/designable essence, substance or interiority, 2) the contextual mode is antithetical to the establishment of revolutionary essentialism, 3) the contextual mode establishes revolution as vacant and 4) the contextual mode locates the form, shape, substance and essence of revolution in its surroundings. In short, the antagonism between the historical and the contextual derives from

the disagreement as to whether or not materiality is internal or external to time itself and the principle or design that is being conveyed by or is surging through time.

To illustrate the tension between the historical and the contextual let us turn again to Marx, Mao and China. Let us turn to discover that the materiality in the revolutionary texts can be traced to and located in situ and is not in and of revolution itself.

Mao's take-off on the revolutionary texts of Marx, with its theme of "poor and blank" and its stratagem of guerrilla warfare, images the confluence of bourgeois society with its class framework and Chinese society with its enormous amount of unattached human capital and sprawling rural environs. The Maoist take-off from the materiality of class guerrilla warfare waged primarily by peasants bands in rural areas, can be traced directly back to and located in the concurrence of bourgeois and Chinese contexts. It is our argument that this materiality is not the property of Mao or Maoists, i.e., it is not indwelling or intrinsic to the elements and factors of change in Mao or his followers; rather this materiality is indwelling and intrinsic to the assembly of the bourgeois and Chinese contexts (or contexts highly resemblant to China).

The Marxian revolution and the Maoist derivative are vacant; their material furnishings are contextually supplied; they have no content other than textual, but because the historical mode lays down a material content for revolution, Marx and Mao (and for that matter Lenin, Trotsky, etc.) become holders of revolutionary property instead of contextual place holders. By wedging the historical mode into sociology, economics, political science, psychology, anthropology and linguistics a body of social science is created in which revolution is textually bound around a material essence. The emplacement of this wedge means the displacement of the contextual enclosure that would relieve social science of its revolutionary essentialism and fill it instead with the matter of circumstance and the void of revolution. By emplacing the contextual mode and displacing the historical mode, revolution would be rendered immaterial and vacuous: without form, shape, substance and essence. To station the contextual mode in the social science of revolution is to station a social science that would

- 1) negate revolution as in any way disclosing, indicating or articulating the textures and contours of a material time and principle/design and
- 2) affirm revolution as adhering to the form, shape, substance and essence of its material setting and locale. Revolution positioned in a

contextual enclosure would dictate to a body of social science and textual production that revolution does in every way disclose, indicate and articulate the textures and contours of a material place.

The question that has to be asked is why the historical paradigm is emplaced and the contextual paradigm is displaced from the body of social science literature on revolution? We have two answers to this question, one that is general and one that is particular, and both answers are germane to our topic.

The historical mode brings forth an arrangement of materialized time and principle/design that instructs revolutionary absence, onset, fluctuation and finale. Through a process of contraction and expansion, intensification and enervation, and enhancement and impairment this arrangement informs the revolutionary phase. The historical mode constructs this material arrangement of material properties into the stuff of revolution. For revolution to be nonexistent this arrangement must be lacking, for revolution to start this arrangement must begin, for revolution to fluctuate this arrangement must vacillate and for revolution to make its exit this arrangement must egress.

Consequently, this arrangement becomes the focus of revolution, and because it is the revolutionary focus,

revolution as the arrangement of situations, the founding of areas and the transportation of environments is forced into a blind spot. Which is to say, the historical mode accomplishes 1) the development of revolution as having to do with the stuff of time and principle/design and 2) the envelopment of revolution as having to do with the stuff of territory. Our general answer to the question of why the installation of the historical mode has taken place in the social science of revolution is plain, simple and straightforward: the historical mode is a de-territorialized mode. There can be no installation of the contextual mode in the social science of revolution unless and until the wraps on the territorial basis of revolution are removed. By exposing just the material properties of revolution and their arrangements the territorial arrangements of revolution can be concealed. As long as the locus, placement and environment of revolution remains covered, conquest, usurpation and domination cannot be revealed as the territorial arrangements of revolution, the revolutionary context.

This thesis is an endeavor to unwrap the territorial basis of revolution, and thereby demonstrate the historical paradigm of revolution as a de-territorialized envelopment of conquest, usurpation and domination. This is our general answer which will be demonstrated,

hopefully, by way of our particular answer; namely that Marxian textual content contains two antithetical revolutions: one set in structural requirements and the other set in voluntarism. Thus this thesis will display these contradictory revolutions contextually: as textual content that takes the form, shape, substance and essence of bourgeois territory and two of its contradictory phenomena; to wit, it will display these antithetical revolutions as a de-territorialized envelopment of bourgeois conquest, usurpation and domination.

Notes

¹Engels, Fredrick, "Speech at The Graveside of Karl Marx," Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Selected Works, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1973, III, p. 163.

²Acton, H.B., The Illusion of The Epoch, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955, pp. 123-124.

³Aron, Raymond, The Opium Of The Intellectuals, trans., Terence Kilmartin, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1957, p. 48.

⁴Tucker, Robert, Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972, p. 77.

⁵Hook, Sidney, Marx And The Marxists, New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1955, p. 39.

⁶Popper, Kral. R., The Poverty of Historicism, New York: Harper & Row, 1961, p. 160.

⁷Cohen, G.A., Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978, p. 150.

⁸Mandelbaum, Maurice, "Social Laws," Philosophical Analysis and History, ed., William H. Dray, New York: Harper & Row, 1966, pp. 340-346.

⁹McLellan, David, The Thought of Karl Marx: An Introduction, New York: Harper & Row, 1971, p. 196.

¹⁰Avineri, Shlomo, The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970, pp. 250-251.

¹¹Hunt, Richard N., The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels: Marxism and Totalitarian Democracy, 1818-1850, Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1974, I, p. 142.

¹²Ibid., p. 146.

¹³Parsons, Talcott, The System of Modern Society, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall; 1971, p. 142.

¹⁴Merton, Robert K., Social Theory and Social Structure, New York: Free Press, 1968, pp. 517-518.

¹⁵Nisbet, Robert A., The Sociological Tradition, New York: Basic Books, 1966, p. 202.

¹⁶Coser, Lewis A., Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context, 2nd ed., New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977, p. 87.

¹⁷Trotsky, Leon, The Permanent Revolution and Results And Prospects, New York: Pathfinder, 1969, pp. 62-64.

¹⁸Plekhanov, George V., Fundamental Problems of Marxism, New York: International Publishers, 1971, p. 96.

¹⁹Mao, Tse-Tung, Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-Tung, ed., Stuart R. Schram, New York: Bantam Books, 1967, pp. 32-34.

²⁰Lukacs, Georg, History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics, trans., Rodney Livingstone, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1976, pp. 52-53.

²¹Gramsci, Antonio, Selections From The Prison Notebooks Of Antonio Gramsci, eds. and trans., Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, New York: International Publishers, 1980, p. 366.

²²Ibid., p. 407.

²³Althusser, Louis, Lenin And Philosophy and other Essays, trans., Ben Brewster, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971, p. 122.

²⁴Ibid., p. 65.

²⁵Ollman, Bertell, Alienation: Marx's Conception Of Man In Capitalist Society, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, p. 245.

²⁶Miliband, Ralph, Marxism and Politics, London: Oxford University Press, 1977, p. 21.

²⁷Mills, C. Wright, The Power Elite, London: Oxford University Press, 1956, pp. 25-28.

²⁸See Poulantzas, Nicos, Classes in Contemporary Capitalism, trans., David Fernback, London: Verso, 1978; Political Power and Social Classes, trans., Timothy O'Hagan, London: Verso, 1978 and Facism And Dictatorship, trans., Judith White, eds., Jennifer and Timothy O'Hagan, London: Verso, 1979.

²⁹Lenin, V.I., The State and Revolution: The Marxist Theory of the State and the Tasks of the Proletariat in the Revolution, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977, pp. 10-11

³⁰Ibid., p. 39.

³¹Draper, Hal, Karl Marx's Theory Of Revolution, New York: Monthly Review Press, I, Book 1, 1977, pp. 11-12.

³² Ibid., II, pp. 19-20.

³³ Ibid., p. 21.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 23.

³⁵ These questions and other pertinent matters that indicate, directly or indirectly, the contextual specificity and peculiarity of Marxian texts on change and transformation can be gleamed from Clastres, Pierre, Society Against The State, trans., Robert Hurley, New York: Urizen Books, 1977; Terray, Emmanuel, "Long Distance Exchange and the Formation of the State: the case of the Abron Kingdom of Gyaman," Economy and Society 3 (1974): 315-345; Scott, James C., The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977; Scott, James C., "Hegemony and the Peasantry," Politics & Society 7 (1977): 267-296; Scott, James C., "Revolution In The Revolution: Peasants and Commissors," Theory and Society 7 (1979): 97-134 and Scott, James C., "Protest and Profanation: Agrarian Revolt and the Little Tradition: Parts I and II," Theory and Society, 4 (1977): 1-38 and 211-246.

³⁶ Mao, op. cit., pp. 19-20.

³⁷ A more detailed discussion of Mao's reactions to the trends in Marx and Marxism that reflect and/or superordinate the European experience can be found in Schram, Stuart R., The Political Thought Of Mao Tse-tung, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977; Mao, Tse-Tung, Chairman Mao Talks to the People Talks and Letters: 1956-1971, ed., Stuart Schram, New York: Pantheon Books, 1974 and Schram, Stuart, Mao Tse-Tung, Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1975.

CHAPTER TWO

RESEARCH PROCEDURE: DECORTICATION
WITHIN THE CONTEXTUAL PARADIGM

1. Parameters

a. Only those works authored by Marx will find their way into the purview of this rigorous research. The secondary and tertiary reconstructions of Marx's materials by Marxists and non-Marxists will be omitted. In line with this, no inference will be accepted that Engels is, because of his long-term intimate association with Marx, the embodiment or repository of an accurate, refined, fully developed or true representation of Marx. Nor will any contention of a theoretical confluence or identity between Marx and Engels be given merit. References will include, of course, works coauthored by Marx and Engels, but works authored solely by Engels will not be cited.

b. Appearing in this research purview will be as many of Marx's writings as the demands of documentation and argumentation dictate. Marxian literature will not be dichotomized and placed under the convenient and artificial signs of "young Marx" and "mature Marx." Both the "young" and "mature" Marx will be eschewed by examining his textual production as it pertains to revolution: adequate

documentation and argumentation presumes coverage of all periods in Marxian literature.

c. What is not being pursued in this thesis is an investigative or interrogative assault upon the workings of Marx's mind, his personal idiosyncrasies or an identity profile. To the contrary, this thesis is a probe into and a stripping away of Marxian textual production in search of its contextual pith; a psychological framing of Marx will be shunned. Even such questions as whether or not Marx was aware of the circumabience impinging upon his being will be avoided scrupulously.

2. Social Theory: Textual and Contextual

Modern social theory contains alternative methods, theoretically defined, for investigating and interrogating texts. Robert K. Merton considers the method of critical and interpretative reading of classical texts and writings. He mentions this method as part of a larger "scientific practice of extending antecedent theory." This extension of "antecedent theory" is, Merton holds, associated with "fresh perceptions" that consolidate the old, half-formed insight with newly developing inquiry."¹

On the other hand, Lazarsfeld dwells upon the elucidation and "clarification" of the terms, categories and concepts used in classical texts, so that they may

become available for the scientific research method: testable hypotheses, common denotative references, verification, disproof, generalizability, etc.

Availability for the scientific research method requires, Lazarsfeld stresses, that the terms, categories and concepts of texts and writings be reducible to propositional forms, analytical categories and conceptual dimensions.

According to Lazarsfeld:

It is instructive to examine the work of a classical writer...and see how his statements might be translated into the language of modern research procedures. It will be found on the one hand, that such writings contain a great richness of ideas which could be profitably infused into current empirical work; on the other hand, it will be found that such a writer tolerates great ambiguity of expression. By proper explication we can bring out the more precise meanings which might be imputed to him; and we would be interested to see which of his² statements permit verification.

This writing will be channelled through a conflation of Merton's and Lazarsfeld's positions on the use of texts and writings; furthermore this conflation will be adapted to the special demands of this dissertation. Which is to say, whereas both Merton and Lazarsfeld approach texts and writings as (possible) theoretical and scientific resources, we envision herein an approach to (Marxian) texts and writings as 1) research sources for pursuing the milieu of revolution (in which Marx was lodged)

and 2) situational resources (of the bourgeois entourage): texts and writings as an environmental resource.

Merton and Lazarsfeld speak for a communication with texts and writings through the language of social scientific terms, categories, concepts and theories, and this type of communication is performed in the interest of empirical social science. Our dissertational approach speaks for a communication with texts and writings through a language of terms, categories, concepts and theories that transcends empirical social science and its historical mode, and our type of communication is performed in the interest of imparting and establishing a contextual social science: a trans-empirical, counter-historical social science.

3. A Non-Reading: Decortication of Content to Reveal Context

This thesis is a decortication of the terminological, categorical, conceptual, theoretical and structural shell of Marxian material; a decortication that will work its way through Marxian revolutionary content in search of its contextual kernel. Moreover, this contextual kernel will be sought out contextually by means of investigation and interrogation, i.e., this search is informed and guided by the contextual mode and proceeds through an investigation and interrogation of the revolutionary texts in Marxian literature.

This is not a "reading" of Marx; his texts and writings will not undergo the hermeneutic method of critical analysis and interpretation. Rather, Marxian texts and writings will be opened up and then peeled to make transparent their previously hidden and camouflaged conformation of irreconcilable revolutions--revolutions of the bourgeois context that are obscured textually by Marx. Hence, this thesis is not a passive encounter with Marxian content: it is not a text; it is a highly aggressive and invasive operation on Marxian content: it is contextual surgery upon Marx, if you will. We are not reading or textualizing Marx. We are contextualizing Marx: opening him up and exposing his contextual textures and contours.

In the language of Marx, this is a de-fetishizing of the fetishism of the Marxian revolution and the secret thereof.

Notes

¹Merton, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

²Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Morris Rosenberg, eds., The Language of Social Research: A Reader in the Methodology of Social Research, New York: Free Press, 1955, p. 2.

CHAPTER THREE

THE MARXIAN REVOLUTION AND THE SECRET THEREOF

In order to de-fetishize the fetishism of the Marxian revolution a contextual decortication will unfold. Slowly and in stages, the complex Marxian textual sheath will be divested of its contextual pith. Such a procedure turns investigation and interrogation into a highly charged series of actions: probing, scraping and penetrating the surface of Marxian revolutionary textual patterns in order to divulge the deep-laid habitat and ecology. In order to de-fetishize the fetishism of the Marxian revolution, the territorial arrangements that initiate, animate and consolidate it must be divulged, so that the Marxian revolutionary textual patterns can be exposed as coverings/appearances that veil the reality of their habitat and ecology.

Marx developed a conceptual methodology that has within its means the capacity for uncovering what lies at the bottom of forms and appearances. With this in hand he attempted to grasp the relationship between the apparent and hidden in social life.

Man's reflections on the forms of social life, and consequently, also, his scientific analysis of those forms, take a course directly opposite to that of their actual historical development.

He begins, post festum, with the results of the process of development ready to hand before him. The characters that stamp products as commodities, and whose establishment is a necessary preliminary to the circulation of commodities, have already acquired the stability of natural, self-understood forms of social life, before man seeks to decipher, not their historical character, for in his eyes they are immutable, but their meaning. Consequently it was the analysis of the prices of commodities that alone led to the determination of the magnitude of value, and it was the common expression of all commodities in money that alone led to the establishment of their characters as values. It is, however, just this ultimate money-form of the world of commodities that actually conceals, instead of disclosing, the social character of private labour, and the social relations between the individual producers.¹

Marx identifies, first, the "forms of social life," and then suggests that a historical analysis and deciphering of these "forms" and appearances would result in the disclosure of their "historical character"; in the case of commodities, the "social character of private labour, and the social relations between the individual producers" would be disclosed by such an analysis and deciphering. Marx utilizes the commodity category as his avenue for approaching and breaching the exterior thought of "bourgeois economy" and arriving at its interior: its "historical character."

The categories of bourgeois economy consists of such like forms. They are forms of thought expressing with social validity the conditions and relations of a definite, historically determined mode of production, viz., the production of commodities. The whole mystery of commodities, all the magic and necromancy that surrounds the products of labour as long as they take the form of commodities, vanishes therefore, so soon as we can come to other forms of production.²

Marx moves from a suggestion of historical analysis and deciphering of commodities to a methodizing of historically determined modes of production as the means by which to enter the forms and appearances of social life and discover the internal workings of the material foundation underlying these forms and appearances; e.g., the capitalist mode of production is the pathway into bourgeois social and intellectual forms that mask its production process: "the social character of private labour, and the social relations between the individual producers." Said differently, Marx advanced historical analysis and deciphering into a conception of time periodization marked and characterized by productive modes in which these modes are methodized as categories of analysis and deciphering.

Given this conceptual method of categorical analysis, Marx could apprehend commodity production, to wit, he could capture the "mystery," "magic" and "necromancy"

expressed in and through "forms of social life" and "forms of thought" that make commodities opaque. With the capitalist mode of production employed as a category of analysis and deciphering and with a contradistinction between it and all other "forms of production," the "Fetish character" of commodities could not only be seized but also seen through.

The mode of production in which the product takes the form of a commodity, or is produced directly for exchange, is the most general and most embryonic form of bourgeois production. It therefore makes its appearance at an early date in history, though not in the same predominating and characteristic manner as now-a-days. Hence its Fetish character is comparatively easy to see through.³

Having set out this conceptual methodology, Marx then turns to setting out the limitations of bourgeois "Political Economy" by way of its being "misled" by the forms and appearances of commodity production and social labor.

Political Economy has indeed analysed, however incompletely, value and its magnitude, and has discovered what lies beneath these forms. But it has never once asked the question why labour is represented by the value of its product and labour-time by the magnitude of that value....

To what extent some economists are misled by the Fetishism inherent in commodities, or by the objective

appearance of the social characteristics of labour, is shown, amongst other ways, by the dull and tedious quarrel over the part played by Nature in the formation of exchange-value.⁴

From here Marx proceeds to an explanation of why bourgeois political economy--"Vulgar economy"--limits itself, accomodates itself, to the "estranged" outward forms of capitalistic relations; that is, why bourgeois political economy conforms to the "Fetishism inherent in commodities."

Vulgar economy actually does no more than interpret, systematise and defend in doctrinaire fashion the conceptions of the agents of bourgeois production who are entrapped in bourgeois production relations. It should not astonish us, then, that vulgar economy feels particularly at home in the estranged outward appearances of economic relations in which these prima facie absurd and perfect contradictions appear and that these relations seem the more self-evident the more their internal relationships are concealed from it, although they are understandable to the popular mind.⁵

If "some economists are misled" and if "vulgar economy feels particularly at home in the estranged outward appearances" that conceal the "internal relationships" of bourgeois production, then what is it about Marxian methodology that enabled him to discover and remove the intellectual mist engulfing the notion that "the social character of labour appears to be an objective character of the products themselves"? If we accept that by means

of a conceptual methodology that analyzed and decoded social and intellectual forms and appearances Marx was able to evaporate the "Fetishism Of Commodities" and with that come vis-a-vis with its secret thereof, if we accept that these forms and appearances articulate the "conditions and relations of a definite, historically determined mode of production, viz.," capitalism, and if we accept bourgeois, "vulgar," economists and their terms, categories, concepts and theories as part and parcel of the "estranged outward appearances of economic relations" under capitalism, then what is unique about Marxian methodology is its utilization of the concept of historically determined modes of production as a category for analyzing and decoding social relations and formations.

From this it follows that (only) if we employ the conception of historically determined modes of production as a category of analysis and decoding will we have the methodology necessary for divesting the bourgeois establishment of its illusory and misleading manifestations, e.g., market relations between commodities, and with that expose its exploitative internal relations.

Marx has termed the methodizing of this conception the "materialist conception of history": the conception of history as composed of the materiality in the form of modes of production necessary and sufficient for analyzing

and decoding the dislocation between external phenomena and internal relations ingenerated in human society. It is to this essential conceptual methodology and its application to capitalism that we now turn our attention.

Marx could, if we accept all of his assertions, broach and then pierce both the gestalt and inner logic of "bourgeoisdom" through the methodological inroad provided by "the materialist conception of history." More than this, Marx declares that this conception transported him onto a new and revolutionary terrain of ideas, principles and theorems, an intellectual ground outside the boundaries of bourgeois political economy, and that upon this new and revolutionary ground he was competent for and capable of surpassing the cerebral blindness and myopia engendered by disjointed and doctrinaire "vulgar" political economy. For example, Marx took on the treatises of the giants in bourgeois political economy, Adam Smith and David Ricardo, and using their works as a springboard he vaulted beyond the limits of classical bourgeois thought and landed in the realm of radicalism, so he states:

It is one of the chief failings of classical economy that it has never succeeded, by means of its analysis of commodities, and, in particular, of their value, in discovering that form under which value becomes exchange-value. Even Adam Smith and Ricardo, the best representatives of the school, treat the form of value as a thing of no importance, as having no connection with the inherent nature of commodities.... If then we treat this mode of production as one eternally fixed by Nature for every state of society, we necessarily overlook that which is the differentia specifica of the value form.... vulgar economy, which deals with appearances only...and there seeks plausible explanations of the most obstrusive phenomena, for bourgeois daily use... confines itself to systematising in a pedantic way...proclaiming for everlasting truths, the trite ideas held by the self-complacent bourgeoisie with regard to their own world, to them the best of all possible worlds.⁶

Whatever he accomplished with reference to a radical break from classical bourgeois economy, Marx does not suggest that it was the consequence of cognitive insights, intellectual acumen or economic interpretative skills. He makes it clear that the materialist "conception" and its "method" was what carried him to the other side--the break from "the bounds of the bourgeois horizon,"⁷ "the narrow horizon of bourgeois right,"⁸ "the bourgeois limitations"⁹ and "the narrow bourgeois [economic] form."¹⁰ This conceptual methodology, which reportedly liberated Marx, creates its own "bounds," narrowness and "limitations,"

viz., the "intellectual," "juridical" and "political" are determined by and/or "correspond" to the "economic structure of society."

There was, however, an important fact which prevented Aristotle from seeing that to attribute value to commodities, is merely a mode of expressing all labour as equal human labour, and consequently as labour of equal quality. Greek society was founded upon slavery, and had, therefore, for its natural basis, the inequality of men and of their labour-powers. The secret of the expression of value...cannot be deciphered until the notion of human equality has already acquired the fixity of a popular prejudice. This, however, is possible only in a society in which the great mass of the produce of labour takes the form of commodities, in which, consequently, the dominant relation between man and man, is that of owners of, commodities. The brilliance of Aristotle's genius is shown by this alone, that he discovered, in the expression of the values of commodities, a relation of equality. The peculiar conditions of the society in which he lived, alone prevented him from discovering what, "in truth," was at the bottom of the inequality.¹¹

The conclusion Marx draws is lucid: in Greek society the slave mode of production "prevented" Aristotle from decoding the secret of commodity production. Given this profound conclusion, how was it possible for Marx to break through the "barrier" imposed upon the "character of social, political and intellectual life in general" by the historical determined mode of production in which he dwelled:

capitalism. According to Marx, this "barrier" is eventually subverted under capitalism for the reason that capitalism ushers in the conditions in "which the great mass of the produce of labour takes the form of commodities," and capitalism develops a "certain material groundwork or set of conditions of existence" upon which production can, finally, be treated as a process engaged in "by freely associated men, and is consciously regulated by them in accordance with a settled plan." In other words, Marx, unlike Aristotle, was located in the "life-process of society" under capitalism where the material conditions of existence did not prevent but helped "strip off" the "mystical veil" on commodity production in particular and material production in general.

The life-process of society which is based on the process of material production, does not strip off its mystical veil until it is treated as production by freely associated men, and is consciously regulated by them in accordance with a settled plan. This, however, demands for society a certain material groundwork or set of conditions of existence which in turn spontaneous product of a long and painful process of development.¹²

Let us summarize what our argumentation and documentation have, in combination, demonstrated:

- 1) Fetishism adheres to the commoditification of products of (social) labor under capitalism.

2) Fetishism which "attaches itself to the products of labour" is such that the social character of labor is made visible as a social relation, existing not between the producers of labor, "but between the products of their labour."¹³

3) Attending the development of capitalism's "material groundwork," a "spontaneous product of a long and painful process of development," was the possibility of stripping off the mystical veil of the life-process of society by means of treating it "as production by freely associated men" who consciously regulate it "in accordance with a settled plan"; Marx's imputed rupture with the bourgeois order of things by way of the materialist conception and method was situated in this possibility.

4) The fetishism of commodities was de-mystified as a consequence of the conceptual methodology of categorical analysis and decoding that entails the establishment of "the economic structure of society" as the "real basis on which the juridical and political superstructure is raised, and to which definite forms of thought correspond";¹⁴

to wit, the de-mystification of capitalism, in particular, and modes of production, in general, is possible within the proper structural arrangement of society: "the materialist conception of history."

5) The fetishism of commodities was de-mystified as a consequence of the conceptual method of designating labor as a "process in which both men and Nature participate, and in which man of his own accord starts, regulates and controls the material re-actions between himself and Nature....By thus acting on the external world and changing it, he at the same time changes his own nature. He develops his slumbering powers and compels them to act in obedience to his sway."¹⁵ In other words, "The writing of history must always set out from these natural bases [the physical nature of human beings, geology, climate, etc.] and their modification in the course of history through the action of men."¹⁶ Thus, the de-mystification of capitalism and other modes of production was made possible due to the extent of modification of the natural world realized by human action is "a long and painful process of development" culminating in the capitalistic

"set of conditions of existence." The capitalistic life-process stripped "off its mystical veil" because of its "set of conditions of existence," and with that Marx could treat production in a de-mystified manner: "by freely associated men...."

6) Therefore, in conclusion, the Marxian analysis and decoding of the fetishism of commodities based upon modes of production was the fulfillment of the proper structural arrangement of society, and this, "however, demands for society" that it be the "spontaneous product of a long and painful process of development" of the natural world by human action, i.e., Marxian analysis and decoding was the fulfillment of capitalism. Thus, Marxian analysis and decoding of all non-capitalist modes of production demands capitalism. Marxian analysis and decoding is tautological, for this analysis and decoding of non-capitalistic modes of production could not have taken place without capitalism; all analysis and decoding of non-capitalist modes of production is developed in and through capitalism. The "materialist conception of history" is not a conceptual methodology of "historically determined modes of production" used a category of analysis and decoding;

it is, more precisely, a capitalistic conceptual methodology of capitalistically determined modes of production used as a category of analysis and decoding. Which is to say, 1) there would be no conceptual methodology of a category of analysis and decoding built around productive modes without capitalism and 2) there would be no history, i.e., the periodization of time in terms of productive epochs--"historically determined modes of production"--without capitalism. History and productive modes are employed as linguistic substitutes for capitalism, or, stated logically, the Marxian "materialist conception of history" establishes analysis and decoding of history and modes of production upon the basis and existence of the conditions of capitalism such that discovering their "truth" is not possible without capitalism. In short, "the materialist conception of history" is a conceptual methodological mystification of capitalism by means of "historically determined modes of production" used as an "enigmatical," "mysterious," "fantastic" and "mist-enveloped" category.

We are now prepared to fix the revolution in Marxian literature within the compass of analysis, deciphering and de-mystification of "the materialist conception of history" --i.e., to extend our contextual decortication by way of using Marxian literature to strip away Marxian literature in order to bare its bourgeois corpus; we are now prepared to fix a Marxian circle not to snare Marx but to snare the bourgeoisie.

Marx states that one of his essential projects was to turn the Hegelian dialectic from "standing on its head" to "right side up again" in order to "discover the rational kernel with the mystical shell."¹⁷ We, on the other hand, will turn the Marxian dialectic on itself in order to discover and excoriate the "mystical shell" from the "kernel" of revolution.

If the entirety of the argument being developed is correct, then we will observe a mystical and fetishized shell wrapping the contextual "kernel" of revolution as we have already observed the "hieroglyphic" and "illusion" wrapping "the materialist conception of history." Which is to say, revolution will be seen in the same light as the materialist conceptual methodology: they are both accommodations, coverings and defenses of capitalism.

Whereas the materialist conceptual methodology wraps capitalism in general, revolution wraps in particular the "kernel" of capitalism: two sets of contradictory forces and pressures generated by structural requirements and voluntarism; Marxian revolutionary materials are the "mystical shell" wrapping the "kernel" of two antagonistic revolutions born of a structural and voluntaristic contradiction within capitalism.

These two antagonistic revolutions born of a contradiction within capitalism are composed as follows: one revolution is articulated in productive-economic terms, categories, concepts and theories that operate within the constraints and limits of structural requirements and the other revolution is articulated in class and political terms, categories, concepts and theories that operate within the drama of voluntarism (and spontaneity). One revolution is base-centered and the other is superstructure-centered, i.e., one revolution churns upward from the base of capitalism and the other revolution churns downward from the superstructure of capitalism.

Therefore, our task entails a threefold demonstration. First we have to demonstrate the existence of these two antithetical revolutions in Marxian literature; second we have to demonstrate that although these two antithetical revolutions are part of a single, unified and consistent

textual production, they can in no way be joined to form one eclipsing concurring holistic revolutionary entity and third we have to demonstrate that Marxian revolutionary production is a mystifying sheath over its antagonistic bourgeois core enveloping conquest, usurpation and domination.

Notes

¹Marx, Karl, Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production, trans., Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, ed., Frederick Engels, New York: International Publishers, 1967, I, pp. 75-76.

²Ibid., p. 76.

³Ibid., p. 82. We take issue with Marx's presentation of the commodity form, viz., a product "produced directly for exchange." To the extent that "some economists are misled by the Fetishism inherent in commodities" is the extent to which Marx tries to "mislead" others, or is "misled" himself by "the Fetishism inherent in commodities." It is our position that the commodity form is not a product produced directly for exchange, but is a product produced directly for domination and control by a conquering and hegemonic power; exchange, the exchange relationship, merely serves as the situation for the product to assert the domination and control of its producers. The matter of capitalism and conquest, which is what is being alluded to, is dealt with in detail in later sections; this note on the commodity form has been interjected here as an early warning signal: the Marxian de-mystification of the commodity form may itself be a form of mystification.

⁴Ibid., pp. 80-82.

⁵Marx, Karl, Capital: The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole, ed., Frederick Engels, New York: International Publishers, 1967, III, p. 817.

⁶Marx, Capital, I, pp. 80-81 fn.

⁷Ibid., p. 14.

⁸Marx, Karl, Critique of the Gotha Programme, ed., C.P. Dutt, New York: International Publishers, 1977, p. 10.

⁹Marx, Karl, The 18th Brumaire Of Louis Bonaparte, New York: International Publishers, 1981, p. 16.

¹⁰Marx, Karl, Karl Marx: Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations, trans., Jack Cohen, ed., E.J. Hobsbawm, New York: International Publishers, 1980, p. 84.

¹¹Marx, Capital, I, pp. 59-60; emphasis added. Marx briefly touches upon the conception of labor power. This conception is the linchpin of the labor theory of value, which in turn is a crux in his use of historically determined modes of production for analyzing and deciphering material production, especially and particularly capitalist production. This is not the place to enter into a full-scale discussion of labor power, and the commodification thereof under capitalism, and the labor theory of value. Suffice it to say, if the author were to offer a conception of spiritual power and define it as "the aggregate of those mental and physical capabilities existing in a human being, which he exercises whenever he produces a use-value of any description," most likely the author would be spoken of as a religious mystic. Marx, on the other hand, has given this very definition for labor power (Marx, Capital, I, p. 167), yet he is characterized as a serious, relatively coherent and practical, if not misguided, scholar in the literature survey given above. Why? Is it because the labor power conception is couched in productive-economic terminology surrounded by a historical frame? Which is to say, is mysticism tolerated, better still accepted, in social science to the extent that it is supported by professional/academic jargon and circumscribed by agreed upon boundaries?

¹²Ibid., p. 80.

¹³Ibid., p. 72.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 82 fn., see also Marx, Karl, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, ed., Maurice Dobb, New York: International Publishers, 1972, pp. 20-21.

¹⁵Marx, Capital, I, p. 177.

¹⁶Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, The German Ideology, Part 1, ed., C.J. Arthur, New York: International Publishers, 1977, p. 42.

¹⁷Marx, Capital, I, p. 20.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE COMPLEX OF REVOLUTIONS

Our contextual decortication of revolution began with what was newly demonstrated within the Marxian project of materialist history,¹ and now we will move directly to Marxian revolutionary literature so that it may service the exposure of Marxian revolutionary literature as a textual wrap.

Any presentation on textual revolutionary efformations runs the risk of being overbearing, rigid and formalized in its construction; further, it may force the textual material into an arbitrary contrivance in which the impression created is one of revolutionary efformations establishing the textual material instead of the other way around. To preclude this risk and related drawbacks, from the outset it will be made pellucid what is meant by a revolutionary efformation so that our task of demonstrating a discordant revolutionary complex is facilitated.

A revolutionary efformation will be defined textually: a textually given unit of transformation having its own differentiated, dissimilar, non-overlapping

and self-contained terminological, categorical, conceptual and theoretical structure and process. In brief, a textual revolutionary efformation means nothing more, or less, than the designation of its components, design and operation as well as the justifications that constitute its creation and/or establishment as a revolutionary efformation. Consequently, the complex of revolutions will be demonstrated by means of textual givens.

Before actually advancing to the revolutionary efformations, an important question should be addressed, viz., does a contextual paradigm dispossess or deny the achievements of Marx, or any other individual for that matter, by attributing them to or defining them as environmental inputs? Stated differently, is it possible for Marx, or any other individual or group, to affect genuine contributions or/and creative challenges, or are these contributions and challenges reduced to contextual contributions and challenges?

Marxian, or any other individual or group, achievements, contributions or challenges are not dispossessed by, denied by, attributed to, defined as or reduced to contextual realities. Rather, Marxian, individual or group, achievements, contributions and challenges are contextual points of reference: a point that makes reference to and for a context. Our argument

is that contextual achievements, contributions and challenges have been dispossessed by, denied by, attributed to, defined as or reduced to individual or group realities --most especially and particularly by social science and the historical paradigm. The task laid out by both Marxist and non-Marxist social science is to investigate and determine which individuals or groups are points of reference for specific achievements, contributions and challenges. Our task, on the other hand, is to investigate and interrogate individual or group achievements, contributions and challenges as points of reference that mark and are marked by a particular context.

Hence, our task, stated specifically, is to determine/discover the contextual points of reference that indicate and are indicated by the revolutionary textual achievements, contributions and challenges of Marx. Suffice it to say at this juncture, Marx wove together multifarious and multiform textual patterns to create varying brilliant revolutionary configurations and hues. Marx sewed together and gave thread to a fabric never before manufactured. Sizes and shapes were displayed which were fitted perfectly to the society that he clothe and that clothe him. The genius of Marx is manifested in the entire wardrobe he fashioned for the body and soul of the bourgeois context, and the genius

of the bourgeois context is manifested in the entire wardrobe it fashioned for the body and soul of Marx. Again, these statements harbor no implications concerning Marx's motivations or intentions; these statements are concerned only with Marxian manifestations.

Revolutionary Efformation I

Base Revolution: Productive-Economic Transformation Due to Structural Requirements

Preface

Engels' comment, "Marx was before all else a revolutionist" will serve as the point of departure for this section.

Marx approached the bourgeois social formation through his conceptual methodology of a mode of production --an articulate combination of forces and relations of production--employed as a category of analysis and decoding; consequently, this social formation was characterized as having a capitalist mode of production (CMP). By turning his conceptual tools every which way, Marx worked to penetrate the material substance of the bourgeois formation. The prime and best example of Marx working his way into "bourgeoisdom" via his conceptual tools is discoverable in the volumes of Capital.

With greater and greater movement into the "bowels" of the bourgeois social body, through the conceptual methodology of categorical analysis and decoding, Marx's attention turned to 1) revolution as the means by which to eliminate the class society under bourgeois control and 2) the set of productive forces and relations that would be the possible aftermath of a successful struggle

against capitalism.

This materialist journey of Marx into and beyond the bourgeoisie and capitalism constitutes a, if not the, significant portion of his textual travels; on this journey Marx garnered the substance and structure of bourgeois society and this gathering is most noteworthy for its revolutionary contents. If our argument is correct, this collection of bourgeois substance and structure should contain and be suffused with a complex of bourgeois confusions, a complex of conflicting revolutions. In other words, Marxian literature, in the apparent pursuit of bringing down the bourgeoisie and terminating the space where the CMP was hegemonic, materialized an authentic collection and successful amassing of the differing and oppositional bourgeois revolutions that raised the capitalistic context.

Above we turned the apocalyptic language of Capital upon "the materialist conception of history"; now we are prepared to materialize a hopefully authentic and successful amassing of the differing and oppositional revolutions that are raised in Marxian content. Stated in the language of Capital, we seek to discover that this complex of revolutions is "nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind [of Marx],"² and that the "contradictions inherent in the movement of

capitalist society impress themselves"³ upon Marxian textual forms of thought by way of incongruous revolutions.

Productive-Economic Efformation of Structural Requirements

In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or--this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms--with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure.... Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never

replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.⁴

This lengthy citation taken from the "Preface" conveys the character and movement of the base revolution; that is, a transformation of society carried out through a structural rearrangement generated by the "conflict" between the productive (technological) and economic components within the foundation of the "mode of production of material life." This revolutionary variant is predicated upon and proceeds from the development of productive forces, so let us begin our investigation and interrogation of this revolutionary efformation with a detailed discussion on productive forces.

We will begin with an interesting, albeit a highly mechanistic and all encompassing, formulation Marx develops around his incorporation of "the history of the productive organs of man" into a "critical history of technology."

A critical history of technology would show how little of any of the inventions of the 18th century are the work of a single individual. Hitherto there is no such book. Darwin has interested us in the history of Nature's Technology, i.e., in the formation of the organs of plants and animals, which organs serve as instruments of production for sustaining life. Does not the history of the productive organs of man, of organs that are the material basis of all social

organization, deserve equal attention?
 ... Technology discloses man's mode of
 dealing with nature, the process of
 production by which he sustains his
 life, and thereby also lays bare the
 mode of formation of his social relations,
 and of the mental conceptions that flow
 from them.⁵

What is under consideration here is a history of Human's Technology (similar to Darwin's history of "Nature's Technology"), i.e., in the formation of human "productive organs...that are the material basis of all social organization." Thus, for Marx, human productive organs "serve as instruments of production," i.e., as part of the process of production by which humanity sustains its life. It is for these reasons that a critical history of Human Technology is in opposition to the "abstract materialism of natural science"; this is because a critical materialism includes "history and its process" as well as a "material basis...the actual relations of life" while "abstract materialism" excludes the historical process and the material relations of life.⁶

Why does Marx go through the effort of establishing human "productive organs" as part of the forces of production, as productive instruments within the productive process? The answer is central to the revolutionary efformation Marx speaks of above in the "Preface." Productive technological "discloses man's mode of dealing with nature,...and thereby also lays bare" human development

and change: humanity's "real nature."

The forming of the five senses is a labor of the entire history of the world down to the present....But natural science has invaded and transformed human life all the more practically through the medium of industry....Industry is the actual, historical relationship of nature, and therefore of natural science, to man.... The nature which develops in human history--the genesis of human society--is man's real nature; hence nature as it develops through industry...is true anthropological nature....All history is the preparation for "man" to become the object of sensuous consciousness....History itself is a real part of natural history--of nature developing into man. 7

Although "nature developing into man," represents, it could be argued, a mystical materialism, this idea of human evolution--"human history"--as a "real part of natural history" is located within a technological-productive organization, and therewith human evolution is re-established in a critical materialism. With human evolution lodged in a critical materialism, the move to establish and lodge human revolution within the same technological-productive organization is both consistent and logical for Marx.

Nor will we explain to them that it is only possible to achieve real liberation in the real world and by employing real means, that slavery cannot be abolished without the steam-engine and the mule and spinning-jenny, serfdom cannot be abolished without improved agriculture, and that, in general, people cannot be

liberated as long as they are unable to obtain food and drink, housing and clothing in adequate quality and quantity. "Liberation" is an [sic] historical and not a mental act and it is brought about by historical conditions, the development of industry, commerce, agriculture, the conditions of intercourse....⁸

To say "human history," in it is evolutionary and revolutionary content, is framed by productive technology, is to say humanity is, in large part, the historical issue of the accumulation of productive forces over time.

History is nothing but the succession of the separate generations, each of which exploits the materials, the capital funds, the productive forces handed down to it by all preceding generations.⁹

Marx illustrates this point, by opining that a critical history of technology would reveal that "two material bases" of bourgeois development "were inherited from the ancients."

The re-reading of my excerpts on history of technology has led me to the opinion that apart from the discovery of gunpowder, the compass and printing--those necessary prerequisites of bourgeois development--the two material bases on which the preparations for machine-operated industry proceeded within manufacture during the period from the sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century...were the clock and the mill.¹⁰ Both were inherited from the ancients.¹⁰

From this development of technical-history Marx arrives at three overarching axioms on productive-structural revolution.

1. Humanity itself is a productive instrument in the totality of productive forces; humanity, however, has to obtain a particular and specific organizational form in order for it to acquire its "greatest productive power."

Of all the instruments of production, the greatest productive power is the revolutionary class itself.¹¹

2. The particular and specific organization of productive potency "supposes" the existence of all the possible productive forces in a society.

The organisation of revolutionary elements as a class supposes the existence of all the productive forces which could be engendered in the bosom of the old society.¹²

3. Emancipation of the "oppressed class," the revolutionary class, "thus implies necessarily the creation of a new society. For the oppressed

class to be able to emancipate itself it is necessary that the productive powers already acquired and the existing social relations should no longer be capable of existing side by side."¹³

The "greatest productive power" in the totality of productive instruments is the "revolutionary class," the organization of the revolutionary elements in society, and this organization assumes the existence of optimum productive forces.

The emancipation of this class "implies necessarily" the founding of a new society; such emancipation requires a juxtapositional discordance between acquired productive forces and existing social/productive relations. This is, in a concise presentation, revolution in a productive-economic efformation.

This efformation weds evolution and revolution into a productive anthropology: humanity, in general, rises within a productive matrix (to be taken literally as a productive womb), and humanity, in its revolutionary class mode, is caught in a productive matrix from which it is released only through the structural tension and breakdown generated by the incompatibility of productive forces and relations. Put differently, humanity is a productive/technical species born in a productive womb; humanity's evolutionary and revolutionary advancement

supposes and is natured by the material productive conditions of society; historical evolution and revolution follows and flows within the course of material production: the "material production of life" is the "basis of all history."

This conception depends upon our ability to expound the real process of production, starting from the material production of life itself, and to comprehend the form of intercourse connected with this mode of production (i.e., civil society, in its various stages), as the basis of all history....¹⁴

Thus, Marx's message is that the organization and emancipation of a revolutionary class occurs where (and if) the necessary structural decomposition takes place in the material base of history. This textual message which has the technical-productive womb giving birth to revolutionary organization and emancipation, also has, paradoxically, the same womb bringing on the disintegration of non-revolutionary classes.

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.¹⁵

What has to be underscored in this message is the critical proposition of structural correspondence between social relations and productive forces: social/productive

relations correspond "to a definite stage of development of the productive forces."¹⁶ This structural fit is impaired when a form of social/productive relations becomes a shackle upon developing productive forces.

These various conditions, which appear first as conditions of self-activity, latter as fetters upon it, form in the whole evolution of history a coherent series of forms of intercourse, the coherence of which consists in this: in the place of an earlier form of intercourse, which has become a fetter, a new one is put, corresponding to the more developed productive forces and, hence, to the advanced mode of the self-activity of individuals--a form which in its turn becomes a fetter and is then replaced by another.¹⁷

The point at which the forces and relations of production longer maintain a structural fit, is the point at which a structural contradiction occurs.

This contradiction between the productive forces and the form of intercourse, which, as we saw, has occurred several times in past history, without, however, endangering the basis, necessarily on each occasion burst out in a revolution, taking on at the same time various subsidiary forms, such as all-embracing collisions of various classes, contradiction of consciousness, battle of ideas, etc., political conflict, etc. From a narrow point of view one may isolate one of these subsidiary forms and consider it as the basis of these revolutions;

and this is all the more easy as the individuals who started the revolutions had illusions about their own activity according to their degree of culture and the stage of historical development.¹⁸

The point of structural contradiction between productive forces and relations, "or--this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms--with property relations," is the point of revolution; class collisions are a subsidiary form of revolution--it is not the "basis" of revolution.

Revolutionary class formation supposes optimal productive forces, and class collisions suppose--"have their origin"--in the conflict between forces of production and the "form of intercourse," i.e., the form of ownership and control of the means of production: "property relations."

Thus all collisions in history have their origin in, according to our view, in the contradiction between the productive forces and the form of intercourse.¹⁹

Revolution, according to the Marxian view, is an explosive eruption/disruption in the base; a conflict in the productive sphere that creates a structural misfit. Class struggle and collision are not revolution per se; they are "subsidiary forms" of revolution because they are auxillary to the bursting of the base.

Let us pause so as to not overlook a vital new linkage in our material. We have just introduced into

the Marxian view the identification of "form of intercourse" and "social relations" with property relations; that is, when the Marxian view turns to the "contradiction between productive forces and the form of intercourse," Marx is turning to the contradiction between the level of development of productive forces and the cogent ownership, or the lack thereof, of productive instruments within the totality of productive forces. It is for this reason that Marx attacks Proudhon; Proudhon has tried to obscure, according to Marx, the very relation Marx is constructing as the "basis" of revolution, namely, "the relation between production itself and the distribution of the instruments of production."

M. Proudhon affirms that there is something mystical and mysterious about the origin of property. Now to see mystery, in the origin of property--that is, to make a mystery of the relation between production itself and the distribution of the instruments of production--is, not this, to use M. Proudhon's language, a renunciation of all claims to economic science?²⁰

To fully probe the relation between productive forces and the effective ownership of the means of production or the absence of such ownership, a discussion of labor is most essential. It is our argument that the productive-economic efformation of structural requirements and its attendant class struggle, class struggle as an

appurtenance to a productive-economic disjunction, has labor instructing its arrangement and reasoning.

Workers are "revolutionary elements" who can be organized into a class, given the optimum expansion of productive power, because they are located as direct-labor in social production and value materialization; for example, the workers can become the revolutionary proletarian class--class in itself and class for itself--under the CMP because they produce real value that is objectified in commodities, the hallmark of the CMP. The Marxian nexus of revolution, production and labor, or better the Marxian grounding of a revolutionary class in productive labor, will be made transparent in our postulation of four types of labor in Marxian writing.

Within Marxian literature there is posited explicit and implicit labor; within this framework each type of labor is synonymous with a particular class formation.

Four Types of Labor*

<u>Explicit</u>	<u>Implicit</u>
Type 1 Direct-Labor	Type 3 Non-Labor
Type 2 Accumulated-Labor	Type 4 Zero-Labor

Type 1 labor is the direct-labor of the producers of surplus value under the CMP and surplus product under pre- and non-capitalist modes. Type 2 labor is the accumulated-labor of the owners and controllers of the conditions of production who extract the surplus value or surplus product. Type 3 labor is the non-labor of those who perform, for example, spiritual, service, domestic, ecological, craft, small retail and peasant (peasant labor is performed by those who farm the land,

* With this typology the labor theory of value enters the present discourse. Space and time preclude the kind of presentation that would fully document the universe of human labor and value given in Marxian literature; some of the most important material on the labor theory of value is found in the following: Marx, Capital, Vols. 1-3; Marx, Grundrisse; Marx, Critique Of Political Economy; Marx, Manuscripts of 1844; Karl Marx, Theories of Surplus-Value, Parts 1-3, trans., Emile Burns, ed., S. Ryazanskaya, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1963-71 and Karl Marx, Wage-Labour and Capital & Value, Price and Profit, New York: International Publishers, 1933 and 1935.

are independent and self-sufficient and their production is consumed in the immediate and local surroundings by themselves and those tied directly to this economy), labor which does not generate or lead to the accumulation of surplus value under the CMP; some of these non-laborers, e.g., peasants, are direct-laborers under pre- and non-capitalist modes because they produce a surplus product, but under the CMP they are non-laborers because they do not produce surplus value. Type 4 labor is the zero-labor of those who are, for example, beggars, bandits, swindlers, vagabounds, gamblers, pimps, prostitutes, drug dealers, organized criminals and street peddlers; they refuse, relinquish or subvert the performance of labor that engenders or accumulates surplus product or value within the sanctioned and established market and institutionalized economy.

Direct-laborers compose the revolutionary class inasmuch as their labor generates a social product and the embodiment of value. They are, therefore, the thesis of social production and value, and the revolutionary class is the collective organization of this thesis. Those who are the accumulated-laborers compose the ruling classes inasmuch as they exploit the social product and value produced by the direct-laborers, and with that they are well off even though they do not directly produce any

product or value. Furthermore, accumulated-laborers are oppressors of direct-laborers, for they must control and persecute direct-laborers to maintain and perpetuate exploitation. Lastly, accumulated-laborers, by requiring a mode of exploitation and oppression and conditions calling for the status quo, are, in essence and effect, the antithesis of social production and value and those who directly produce them. The ruling classes are, therefore, the collective organization of this antithesis, or, stated otherwise, accumulated-laborers compose the counterrevolutionary classes.

On the margin of this contradictory and hostile--dialectical--relation between the direct-producing and accumulating classes is the non-laboring class. Non-laborers as a class neither exploit directly the product or value engendered by the direct-laborers nor oppress directly the direct-laborers, and they do not as a class exploit and oppress directly the class of accumulated-laborers. Non-laborers are unnecessary and ornamental to social production and value materialization; they are, therefore, the a-thesis of social production and value, and those who directly produce them, or, stated otherwise, they "are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative." Nevertheless, given the historical movement within the CMP, non-laborers become "reactionary, for they try to

roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat."²¹ Non-laborers compose the reactionary class under capitalism, and they would compose, it would appear, the conservative class under pre- and non-capitalist modes; thus, the conservative/ reactionary class is the collective organization of this a-thesis.

Whereas non-laborers are on the margin of the antithetical relation between direct and accumulated labor, zero-laborers are also on the margin of this relation as well as on the margin of the entire society. Here again, zero-laborers do not as a class engage in the direct exploitation and oppression of another class. Zero-laborers are the nihilists of social production and value; they are, therefore, the dis-thesis of social production and value and those who produce them. Zero-laborers are the "'dangerous class,' the social scum [the "lumpen proletariat"], that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society";²² they "may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution"; nevertheless this class is more likely and readily available "for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue."²³ Zero-laborers compose the lumpen proletariat, a class in the service of reaction

under the CMP; thus, the lumpen proletariat is the collective organization of this dis-thesis: "its members felt the need of benefiting themselves at the expense of the labouring nation."²⁴

When examined closely the labor theory of value as developed by Marx, and accepted by most Marxists, postulates value as being created solely by human labor, human labor as the singular source of value; such a postulate defines value as the materialization of human labor in a social product and commodity. This is most evident in implicit labor where non-laborers and zero-laborers, especially zero-laborers, are in fact viewed as creating no value, because their labor is not absorbed in social production and commodities. Given this understanding, the "materialist conception of history" and the labor theory of value can be witnessed as conjoined and related by human labor; that is, history is the objectification of human labor in material form, or, stated more accurately, material history is the development of modes of production for the objectification of human labor in its most total, complete and expressive forms.

The consequence of conjoining materialist history and value theory by means of human labor is that Marx has, in the revolutionary pursuit of human freedom and fulfillment, defined and confirmed, in every epoch and

context, the valuelessness of humanity engaged in implicit labor; humanity not engaged in explicit labor has no value: the absence of labor absorbed in social production and commodities means the absence of humanity with historical and revolutionary value. Humanity given over to implicit labor is emptied of historical and revolutionary value for the reason that their labor--e.g., prayer, childbirth, housekeeping, protecting the environment, caring for the differently-able and elderly, begging and banditry--does not necessarily result in those forms that materialize value as defined and confirmed by the labor theory of value.

Even more than this, the labor theory of value, when it is thrown back on its basic premise, renders humanity not engaged in explicit labor as fundamentally without their own intrinsic value. Value is inherent in lifeless materiality, non-human materiality, and those humans who do not produce materiality that has value inherent in it, do not have value inherent in themselves: you are only inherently valuable if your product is inherently valuable. Where there is the objectification of human labor in the form of social production or commodity, the labor theory would have it, there is material value and valuable humanity; where there is the absence of the objectification of human labor in the

form of social production or commodity, the labor theory of value would have it, there is the absence of material value and valuable humanity.

Materialist history conjoined with the labor theory of value impacts upon the productive-economic efformation as follows. This combination assumes, exhibits and concludes with human classes who are adjuncts to, hostile towards, removed from or destructive of historical movement and revolution. It should be apparent that the classes of humanity who perform accumulated-labor, non-labor and zero-labor are against, divested of and destructive to historical movement and revolution, respectively. The class of humanity whose labor contributes directly to the production of value is nevertheless an appendage to historical movement and revolution because it is a mere appendage to the "forms of development of productive forces"; that is, the direct-labor class is a revolutionary appendage to the "relation between production itself and the distribution of the instruments of production": a "subsidiary" form to the "basis" of revolution.²⁵ Stated more precisely in Marxian discourse, proletarian class struggle, the class struggle of direct-labor in and for itself, is a response to the "changes in the economic foundation," so that direct-labor revolutionaries are passive

respondents to the revolutionary upheavals brought ultimately and "inevitably" into historical reality by "material productive forces": the base--the rock bottom--of the "economic foundation."

To conclude this section let us say that Marx posed value as the standard against which humanity, history and revolution were measured. By asserting this material standard of value, humanity, historical development and revolution were all fettered by tools, machines, techniques and human labor: productive forces.²⁶ Thus if human populations were not directly involved in the production of value, i.e., in the production process, they were worthless: human, historical and revolutionary dung, and as we shall observe Marx treated them accordingly.

Now that we have brought to light the importance of labor in the productive-economic efformation we can address the revolutionary transformation of the CMP.

Marx situated the impending appearance of the "complete existence of all the productive force which could possibly develop in the womb of" capitalism; consequently, revolutionary transformation loomed as a real and present possibility for Marx. The direct/immediate producers would be organized into the revolutionary proletariat by the complete existence of capitalist productive forces. This projected

transformation which includes the molding together of workers as a revolutionary class is predicated upon the maximum production of value; the maximum production of social wealth under capitalism means the maximum production of surplus-value by way of the maximum production of surplus labor: an increase in the 1) output of direct/immediate producers, 2) labor time of direct/immediate producers and 3) the number of direct/immediate producers, and it means, most importantly, an extensive and intensive growth of the conditions of production, e.g., technology, industry and science.²⁷

Such maximization of production, such maximization of value, would lead eventually to a disruption between productive forces and economic/property relations. This disruption would be resolved with the dissolution of private property relations.

...the cooperative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labour into instruments of labour only usable in common, the economising of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market, and with this, the international character of the capitalist regime....with this...grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united,

organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. Thus [sic] integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.²⁸

When the logic of the combine of materialist history and human labor as the source of value is driven to its completion, the productive-economic revolution is fully penetrated; the outward complementary class struggle rests upon the inward maximization of value production and its jarring effect upon established ownership of the means of production, or, expressed in the converse and relative to the CMP, "The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production....[the] capitalist integument...is burst asunder...the expropriators are expropriated."

The productive-economic efformation locates the bursting asunder of the economic integument as emanating from the productive strata in this integument, and this bursting asunder rises upward onto the next level, the "political superstructure," by way of class struggle.

...every class struggle is a political struggle.²⁹

Let us summarize, revolutionary class struggle is lodged in a positional arrangement, i.e., it is allocated to a superstructural level, that reflects the agitation generated by the maximization of production, the maximization of value production, at the base structure. Those classes who perform implicit labor, non-labor and zero-labor, are superfluous to humanity, history and revolution. Those classes who perform explicit labor, direct and accumulated labor, which is directly involved in the process of the production of value, are not superfluous to humanity, history and revolution; their struggle is ancillary to the production of revolution because it comes as a consequence of a maximum level of productive forces within society; revolutionary class struggle is adjacent, an adjunct, to the structural strain between the forces and relations of production brought on by advances in productive conditions and instruments.

Accordingly, proletarian revolution is a "reflex" to the explosion within the productive-economic structural configuration, so that proletarian revolutionaries are revolutionary adjuncts to the base of revolution. The important point is that class struggle is neither the generator nor the seat of revolution; that distinction is reserved for the productive-economic base.

Economic Structure of Society--
Productive Relations/Property Relations--
and Class

What can be gleamed from our presentation is that productive forces are the critical as well as the determinate feature of a historical mode of production, productive relations are the essential as well as the dominate feature of a historical mode of production and class political relations arise from the pattern of productive relations. Marx illustrates this in his discussion of the bourgeois mode of production.

The "injustice in property relations" which is determined by the modern division of labor, the modern form of exchange, competition, concentration, etc., by no means arises from the political rule of the bourgeois class, but vice versa, the political rule of the bourgeois class arises from these modern relations of production....If therefore the proletariat overthrows the political rule of the bourgeoisie, its victory will only be temporary... as long as in the course of history, in its "movement," the material conditions have not yet been created which make necessary the abolition of the bourgeois mode of production and therefore also the definitive overthrow of the political rule of the bourgeoisie.³⁰

As we read on in Marx we discover that one of the ways the essentiality and dominance of productive relations/property relations manifests itself within historical modes of production is as the vital issue for class.

The question of property, depending on the different levels of development of industry, has always been the vital question for a particular class. In the 17th and 18th centuries, when the point at issue was the abolition of feudal property relations, the question of property was the vital question for the bourgeois class. In the 19th century, when it is a matter of abolishing bourgeois property relations, the question of property is a vital question for the working class.³¹

Property relation patterns are mode specific, and what is blatant in Marx's writings is his concern for this pattern in the context of the bourgeois productive mode: private ownership and control over the means and conditions of production, for it is this property pattern that leads to the formation of the classes of accumulated-labor and direct-labor (as well as the formation of the classes of non-labor and zero-labor) and their struggles. The formation of the bourgeoisie as the accumulating class and the workers as the laboring class is at the same time the formation of a wealthy class requiring stability and an impoverished class being advanced to revolution. That is, capitalist private property relations set in motion the revolutionary struggle between capital and wage-labor.

The essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeois class, is the formation and augmentation of capital;* the condition for capital is wage-labour. Wage-labour rests exclusively on competition between the labourers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination. The development of modern industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces...are its own grave-diggers.

* In the German original this sentence reads: "The essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeois class, is the accumulation of wealth in the hands of private individuals, the formation and augmentation...." 32

As we continue our exploration of Marxian production we also discover that private property relations establish, inform and shape the totality of class relations and class revolution within capitalism. Let us observe how profoundly true this is in Marxian work.

There is a division of wealth amongst classes; poverty and wealth are attributes of class. That is poverty and wealth are linked to class differences and distinctions, and class differences and distinctions manifest the "kind of participation in production" each class assumes. Class poverty or class wealth is grounded, constituted and given detail by the type of labor performed

in, out of or on the margin of the production process. Focusing in on direct and accumulated labor, we see direct-labor as the "exclusion of property" and accumulated labor as the "exclusion of labor." In short, there is an active and developed antithesis between poverty and wealth, an active and developed antithesis between the lack of property class and the property class, which is composed by the contradiction between labor and capital.

The antithesis between lack of property and property, so long as it is not comprehended as the antithesis of labor and capital, still remains an indifferent antithesis, not grasped in its active connection, with its internal relation--an antithesis not yet grasped as a contradiction....But labor, as the subjective essence of private property as exclusion of property, and capital, objective labor as exclusion of labor, constitute private property as its developed state of contradiction--hence a dynamic relationship moving to its resolution.³³

This sets the stage for a comprehension of class within the configuration of property relations; this stage is one of historical epochs: each epoch is identifiable by the configuration of property relations it has developed. In this manner, class enters history above the sign of property.

In each history epoch, property has developed differently and under a set of entirely different social

relations. Thus to define bourgeois property is nothing else than to give an exposition of all the social relations of bourgeois production.³⁴

Private ownership of the means of production during the epoch of bourgeois domination is at the core of the contradiction in production and serves to animate class antagonism. The property relations, the economic conditions, which actively connect the bourgeoisie and proletariat, classes built around capital and wage labor, are identifiable by their particular configuration: private ownership of the means of production.

By linking poverty and wealth to class, class to property and property to the cogent ownership of the means of production, Marx accomplishes a definition of class rising out of economic conditions; this definition contrasts the "'Grobianist'" common sense definition of class. The "'Grobianist'" definition transforms 1) class distinction into a distinction "'between the size of purses'"--class is change into the status of wealth and poverty--and 2) class contradictions into "'craft-bickering'"--class is changed into labor opposition due to different modes of labor.

The size of one's purse is a purely quantitative distinction whereby any two individuals of the same class may be incited against one another at will. That the medieval guilds opposed each other, "according to their craft" is common knowledge. But it is equally common knowledge that modern class distinctions are by no means based upon "craft" but rather that the division of labour brings about very different modes of work within the same class.³⁵

More than a definition of class distinction and contradictions woven upon an economic property design, Marx's work articulates, as we had suggested beforehand, a view of class struggle located at the political level and woven upon the same economic/property design.

It follows from this that all struggles within the State, the struggle between democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy, the struggle for the franchise, etc. are merely the illusory forms in which the real struggles of the different classes are fought out among one another....Further, it follows that every class which is struggling for mastery, even when its domination, as is the case with the proletariat, postulates the abolition of the old form of society in its entirety and of domination itself, must first conquer for itself political power in order to represent its interest in turn as the general interest, which immediately it is forced to do.³⁶

As we continue along we find the design of property relations serves to distribute political power as well as

configure political relations along class lines. True to the principles of Marxian analysis, the stage of the historical epoch onto which the modern classes enter is such that "the political rule of the bourgeois class arises from these modern relations of production,"³⁷ and the specification of the locus of politics, "the modern State," is "but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie."³⁸

What is the "common business of the whole bourgeois class" that "the modern State" manages? Which is to ask, what is so vitally and necessarily common to a whole class, and thereby serves as the factor defining a whole class, that a state must be erected to administer it? The vital and necessary commonality to class existence, distinctions and contradictions which is directed, guarded and preserved by the state is property: "The present bourgeois property relations are 'maintained' by the state power which the bourgeoisie has organized for the protection of its property relations."³⁹

Repeatedly Marx speaks to the state as an organizational conduit for "property interests."

...the State has become a separate entity, beside and outside civil society; but it is nothing more than the form of organisation which the bourgeois necessarily adopt both for internal and external purposes,

for the mutual guarantee of their property interests.⁴⁰

This line of reasoning materializes economic and political intercourse as well as relations of domination and subjugation as structural representations and expressions of the "innermost secret, the hidden basis"; and the "innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social structure" is the "productive relations themselves." In other words, economic, political and hierarchical forms and relations are structural manifestations that serve to conceal property relations: the superstructure conceals the economic base structure.

The specific economic form, in which unpaid surplus-labour is pumped out of direct producers, determines the relationship of rulers and ruled, as it grows directly out of production itself and, in turn, reacts upon it as a determining element. Upon this, however, is found the entire formation of the economic community which grows up out of the production relations themselves, thereby simultaneously its specific political form. It is always the direct relationship of the owners of the conditions of production to the direct producers--a relation always naturally corresponding to a definite stage in the development of the methods of labour and thereby its social productivity--which reveals the innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social structure, and with it the political form of sovereignty and dependence, in short, the corresponding specific form of state.⁴¹

From this we can gather that out of production grows the specific economic form that determines hierarchical relations, and upon the unity of correspondence --production and the specific economic form/design of property relations--is located the entire economic community and thereby the specific political form; from this we gather that out of this unity of production-property arises the "entire social structure," the entirety of class relations.

In this way, class in all its economic, political and hierarchical components and manifestations is a superstructural shroud over property relations, so that the base structural unity of correspondence formed by production and property has its own corresponding superstructural shroud.

What is society, whatever its form may be? The product of men's reciprocal action. Are men free to choose this or that form of society? By no means. Assume a particular level of development of men's productive forces and you get a particular form of commerce and consumption. Assume particular stages of development in production, commerce and consumption and you will have a corresponding social system, a corresponding organisation of the family, of social estates or of classes, in a word, a corresponding civil society. Assume such a civil society and you will get a political system appropriate to it, a system which is only the official expression of civil society.⁴²

What is being examined here is that class as well as the entire social superstructure serve as a structural encoding of property relations; class as well as the superstructure furnish the means and materiality that makes possible an entire social structure with an "innermost secret": "The specific economic form, in which unpaid surplus-labor is pumped out of direct producers" by accumulated producers, "the owners of the conditions of production."

The encoding by class of the "direct relationship of the owners of the conditions of production to the direct producers" is accomplished by way of transposition within and palliation of the actual proximate relationship between property and the social division of labor. What we have in mind is the concrete productive relations that produce a social division of labor having its own corresponding class divisions; for example, it is productive relations which generate a division of labor that confines labor-power, i.e., a labor-power class, to a specific detailed function. Thus, class social division of labor is a consequence of property constraints, yet it is made to appear as though class social division of labor is the determinate or origin of property constraints.

Class creates the illusory relationship that fabricates a social division of labor as generating property constraints; for example, it is a class division of labor which confines labor-power to a specific detailed function and, thereby, generates property relations. In other words, the actual relationship of the ownership of the conditions of production that situates the type and place of class work is inverted; a chimerical relationship is fostered in which the type and place of class work situates the ownership of the conditions of production. Class creates the illusory relationship that labor locates production ownership.

Class cloaks, by way of the social division of labor, the effective ownership, or lack thereof, of productive conditions. Under the wrap of class, property relations--the specification of the nature and extent of the ownership and control of the means of production "in the real world"--are shifted and magically appear as the product of the class division of labor. Accordingly, the class division of labor then specifies the nature and extent of ownership and control of productive means; the division of labor which mediates the role property plays in the formation, organization and structuring of class becomes a mediation within class for the formation, organization and structuring of property relations, so that class

is part of a world of "metaphysical or legal illusion."

The mystification of social relations, which entails property appearing as 1) a derivative of class and 2) a factor of the social division of labor that articulates ownership contingencies, is attacked by Marx in his rebuke of Proudhon.

Finally, the last category in M. Proudhon's system is property. In the real world...division of labour and all M. Proudhon's other categories are social relations forming in their entirety what is known today as property; outside these relations bourgeois property is nothing but a metaphysical or legal illusion....

He imagines that division of labour, credit, machinery, etc., were all invented to serve his fixed idea, the idea of equality....

...Mr. Proudhon...has not perceived that as men develop their productive forces ...they develop certain relations with one another and that the nature of these relations is bound to change with the change and growth of productive forces.⁴³

Division of labor is, then, the mediating category between productive relations and class. In its role of mediation the division of labor takes part in not only the class screening and mystifying of property relations, but it also serves class in the step prior to property screening and mystification: the inversion of the relationship between property and class such that property is perceived as arising out of class, and with that

property becomes visible as a superstructural factor and class becomes the revelation of the "innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social structure."

To sum up, class and the social division of labor are a double-edge reality; their exposure conceals the mystification and reversals within actual social relations.

As a preface to what is to come in this work, it will suffice to say that the substantive relationship between property and class is so extremely important in Marx's writings. As an example, the Asiatic mode of production (AMP) constructed in Marxian literature sets out three primary and significant conclusions: 1) there is no private property in land, 2) there is a predominance of possession in contrast to property and, as a result of 1) and 2), 3) there are no classes. This gestalt of property and class reveals a Marxian truism: the sum, substance and essence of class is located upon the foundation of property. Thus, private property, in all its variant forms, is the basis of class, and in its absence there is a corresponding absence of class.

We are left with a view of class as a veil that serves to obscure and mis-present the 1) contours of economic exchange, 2) shape of the distribution of

political power, 3) arrangement of domination and subjugation and 4) pattern of property through the mediation of the social division of labor. In addition, we are informed that modes of mentation are part of the superstructural covering upon "different forms of property," and that this superstructural covering of social consciousness and intellectual production is created and formed by class.

Upon the different forms of property, upon the social conditions of existence, rises an entire superstructure of distinct and peculiarly formed sentiments, illusions, modes of thought and views of life. The entire class creates and forms them out of its material foundations and out of the corresponding social relations.⁴⁴

In other words, we are informed that the hegemony of particular thoughts can be traced and attributed to the hegemony of a particular pattern of productive ownership once the superstructural covering and class intricacies are penetrated. Consequently class is the material tangle through which property relations can be obfuscated and at the same time given intellectual force: the "ruling ideas" comport with existing property constraints.

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal,

has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it.⁴⁵

To conclude this lengthy and somewhat complicated section on production property and class, we furnish a reminder that production has, as with everything else in Marxian work, its own differences, distinctions and determinates.

There is in every social formation a particular branch of production which determines the position and importance of all the others, and the relations obtaining in this branch accordingly determine the relations of all other branches as well.⁴⁶

There is then in every social formation a particular branch of property relations that determines all other such relations.

* * *

... The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operatives of one trade ...against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them....

against the instruments of production themselves.*...

At this stage the labourers still form an incoherent mass....

...But with the development of industry the proletariat not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more....The unceasing improvement of machinery... makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. 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 provisions beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there the contest breaks into riots.

* In the German original, this sentence reads: "...against the bourgeois conditions of production;..."

* The words "(trades' unions)" are not in the German original.⁴⁷

As can be seen, the formation, organization and structure of a Marxian class "goes through various stages of development" on the way to class struggle and revolt. Having its origin and source in the contradiction between lack of property and property, class antagonism obtains its "pure form" when there is "pure political" class "expression": state power struggles.

As long as the rule of the bourgeois class had not been organized completely, as long as it had not acquired its pure political expression, the antagonism of the other classes, likewise, could not appear in its pure form, and where it did appear could not take the dangerous turn that transforms every struggle against the state power into a struggle against capital.⁴⁸

Class birth, contest, antagonism, struggle and revolt are tantamount to the various stages of class development, and, as is indicated, these various stages arrive at, culminate at, the superstructural political "reflex": "...the struggle of class against class is a political struggle,"⁴⁹ or, again, the "organisation of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party...." ⁵⁰

From class birth to political class struggle, the superstructure is the site of this class developmental movement, but it must be borne in mind that all class developmental movement, especially revolutionary political struggle, is a concretization, a crystallization, that takes place two levels up from the productive elaboration going on below, i.e., a concrete response, built upon the economic tier, to the elaboration of productive forces: the bottom tier of "material conditions necessary for emancipation...."

So long as the proletariat is not yet sufficiently developed to constitute itself as a class, and consequently so long as the very struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie has not yet assumed a political character, and the productive forces are not yet sufficiently developed in the bosom of the bourgeoisie itself to enable us to catch a glimpse of the material conditions necessary for the emanipation of the proletariat and for the formation of a new society....51

Having elucidated the structural arrangement that composes production-economics-class-politics, we can capture the full meaning of Marx's statement: "The organisation of revolutionary elements as a class supposes the existence of all the productive forces which could be engendered in the bosom of the old society"; to wit, class "political movement," the fulfillment and acme of class, grows out of "economic movement" which grows out of production movement.

The ultimate object of the political movement of the working class is, of course, the conquest of political power for this class, and this naturally requires that the organisation of the working class, an organisation which arises from its economic struggles....

...For instance, the attempt by strikes, etc., in a particular factory or even in a particular trade to compel individual capitalists to reduce the working day, is a purely economic movement. On the other hand the movement to force through an eight-hour, etc., law is a political movement. And in this way, out of the separate economic movements of the workers there grows up everywhere a political movement, that is to say, a class movement.⁵²

Not only does the antagonism of class "political movement" grow out of "economic movement," it also corresponds to the rate and degree of "economic movement": "class antagonism keeps even pace with the development of industry, the economic situation."⁵³ Which is to say, the fit between political/class antagonism and struggle and economic/property patterns is, without any doubt, hesitation or reservation, predicated upon and corresponds to the more basic and fundamental fit between economic/property patterns and the production conditions.

If therefore the proletariat overthrows the political rule of the bourgeoisie, its victory will only be temporary, only an element in the service of the bourgeois revolution itself, as in the year 1794, as long as in the course of history, in its "movement," the material conditions have not yet been created which make necessary the abolition of the bourgeois mode of production and therefore also the definitive overthrow of the political rule of the bourgeoisie. The terror in France could thus...only serve to spirit away...the ruins of feudalism from French soil....In the same way, the overthrow of the absolute monarchy would be merely temporary if the economic conditions for the rule of the bourgeois class has not yet become ripe. Men build a new world for themselves, not from the "treasures of this earth,"...but from the historical achievements of their declining world. In the course of their development they first have to produce the material conditions of a new society itself, and no exertion of mind or⁵⁴ will can free them from this fate.

The line of Marxian thought being investigated and interrogated is that of the relationship between the superstructure and base, specifically the relationship between the political superstructure and the economic relations of the base, as well as the relationship between economic relations and production conditions, specifically the relationship within the base between property relations and the material conditions of production. It is our argument that this line of thought unfolds a three-tier formation of history and society constructed with the

terminological, categorical, conceptual, theoretical and structural materials of base-superstructure. History and society are composite emergents within the human condition; "Men build a new world for themselves" out of the developments, changes, correspondences and lack of correspondences in the base-superstructure, "...and no exertion of mind or will can free them from this fate." Thus to speak of history and society is to speak of the developments, changes, correspondences and lack of correspondences on the superstructural tier, where class "political movement" takes place, as a reflex and reflection of the developments, changes, correspondences and lack of correspondences in the basic tiers, and it is to speak of the developments, changes, correspondences and lack of correspondences between property--the outer and upper economic tier--and production--the inward and bottom tier of productive conditions--in the base as reflexed and reflected in the developments, changes, correspondences and lack of correspondences at the superstructural tier.

In short, history and society are the collected accumulation of the fits and misfits between the base and superstructure, the fits and misfits between basic economic conditions and the political superstructure, and the fits and misfits within the base, the fits and

misfits between productive forces and economic relations. Revolution is, accordingly, a consequence of the misfit between new, developed and powerful productive forces and outmoded restrictive property relations; revolution is a consequence of one form of relationship--a misfit--within history and society between production and property; class antagonism and struggle at the political superstructure are merely a refluece, so that in a broad and comprehensive analysis of revolutionary transformation involving the movements through feudalism and capitalism, class antagonism and struggle, at any location, are not even cited.

We see then: the means of production and exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces;* they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes....

For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces, against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the

existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule...The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property,* on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder, into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property.

* In the German original, the sentence ends here. Then follows: "They hindered production instead of promoting it. They became so many fetters...."

* In the German edition of 1848, the words "development of the conditions of bourgeois property" read "development of bourgeois civilisation and the conditions of bourgeois property." In the German editions of 1872, 1883 and 1890, the words "bourgeois civilisation and" are omitted.⁵⁵

It is our position that we confront in Marxian literature a formation of history, society and revolution couched in a structural arrangement with spacial dimensions. There is no uncertainty concerning the structural arrangement and spacial order between the base and superstructure; the superstructure is the most upward and outward tier, and therefore the political superstructure is the most upward and outward tier and class political antagonism and struggle are the most upward and outward manifestation

of revolution. Given this, economic and productive conditions are certainly the more downward and inward tiers, the more foundational tiers: the basis of revolution. This leaves open to question only the structural arrangement and spacial ordering of these foundational tiers.

We have addressed this question by presenting Marxian material that structurally, spacially, terminologically, categorically, conceptually and theoretically arranged, ordered and set property relations, the economic tier, directly below the superstructural tier, and directly above productive forces, the production tier. We have done this by evincing productive forces and property relations as situated in such a fashion that property relations are always "fetters upon" productive forces. Let us add the following to the "fetters upon" material.

What appears accidental to the later age...is a form of intercourse which corresponded to a definite stage of development of the productive forces. The relation of the productive forces to the form of intercourse is the relation of the form of intercourse to the occupation or activity of the individuals....

These various conditions, which appear first as conditions of self-activity, later as fetters upon it, form in the whole evolution

of history a coherent series of forms of intercourse, the coherence of which is this: in the place of an earlier form of intercourse, which has become a fetter, a new one is put, corresponding to the more developed productive forces and, hence, to the advanced mode of the self-activity of individuals--a form which in its turn becomes a fetter and is then replaced by another.⁵⁶

Within the framework of base-superstructure "fetters upon" could be described, by those who would oppose our views, as a simple metaphorical expression. But this is not just a simple metaphorical expression; to the contrary, these terms imply, if not convey,--within a terminological edifice--a structurally and spatially organized image of fetters up, on (upward, onto) and outside of productive forces; "fetters upon"--within a materialist paradigm--is much more than a linguistic/rhetorical device; it suggests, if not carries with it, the format and substance of structure and space as well as suggests, if not carries with it, the categorical, conceptual and theoretical format and substance of concrete/material property restraints placed upon the concrete/material development of productive forces. Accordingly, property/economic restraints can keep "down" burgeoning productive forces: i.e., the outmoded upward, over and outer property/economic tier suppresses the newly developing lower, under and inner (the bottom)

production tier.

At a certain stage of development it [feudalism] brings forth the material agencies for its own dissolution. From that moment new forces and new passions spring up in the bosom of society; but the old social organisation fetters them and keeps them down. It must be annihilated; it is annihilated. Its annihilation, the transformation of the individualized scattered means of production into socially concentrated ones, of the pigmy property of the many into the huge property of the few, the expropriation of the great mass of the people from the soil, from the means of subsistence, and from the means of labor, this fearful and painful expropriation of the mass of the people forms the prelude to the history of capital.⁵⁷

Let us further counter any argument that we have taken a metaphorical expression beyond its normal usage or limits by stating that Marx has taken materialism in the form of the base-superstructure beyond its normal usage or limits; i.e., Marx has structured, made spacial, categorized, conceptualized and theorized bourgeois materialism in the form of base-superstructure into a textual efformation of history, society and revolution.

This whole detailed and intricate section on Marxian base-superstructure has been drawn out so as to make these conclusions inelutable: 1) class and its

revolution is rooted in--and is a reflex and reflection of--
the economic foundation of individual private property
and 2) by bursting asunder this economic foundation by
means of a productive explosion, class and its struggle
would cease to exist.

The Fulfillment and Completion of
the Productive-Economic Revolutionary Efformation:
The Realm of Freedom

The entire scenario of productive-economic conflict/misfit, its attendant crystallization of revolutionary elements into a class and the culmination of class at the political superstructure reaches its tumultuous finale with the arrival of the "realm of freedom," the social formation to which corresponds the communist mode of production.

The actual wealth of a society and the possibility of constantly expanding its reproduction process, therefore, does not depend upon the duration or surplus-labor, but upon its productivity and the more or less copious conditions of production under which it is performed. In fact, the realm of freedom actually begins only where labour which is determined by necessity and mundane considerations ceases; thus in the very nature of things it lies beyond the sphere of actual material production.⁵⁸

It would follow, from all that has been said thus far, that the "realm of freedom," as the fulfillment and completion of the fits and misfits within the base efformation, is the fulfillment and completion of history and human society; in this way, its appearance would signal a modern productive capacity approaching the production of abundant value/wealth, i.e., human labor

would no longer be determined by mundane necessity, leading to 1) the dissolution of bourgeois private property relations, 2) classless relations inasmuch as class relations would no longer be necessary for framing revolutionary elements, which would cease, as well as no longer be necessary for clouding the reality of the base and, as a consequence of 1) and 2), 3) the disappearance of "political power," the state as its purest expression, inasmuch as "political power" would no longer be necessary as the "official expression" of class relations: i.e., class antagonism and struggle. Said differently, the misfit within the base between the production of abundant value/wealth and bourgeois private property relations generates the post-capitalist "realm of freedom" in which there will be "the abolition of all classes" and "no more political power."

Does this mean that after the fall of the old society there will be a new class domination culminating in a new political power? No.

The condition for the emancipation of the working class is the abolition of all classes, just as the condition for the emancipation of the third estate, of the bourgeois order, was the abolition of all estates and all orders.

The working class, in the course of its development, will substitute for the old society an association which will exclude classes and

their antagonism, and there will be no more political power properly so-called, since political power is precisely the official expression of antagonism in civil society....

It is only in an order of things in which there are no more classes and class antagonisms that social evolutions will cease to be political revolutions.⁵⁹

In order to accomplish the aims of this chapter, let us perceive the "realm of freedom" and its corresponding productive mode as Marx does: as the post-revolutionary formation of communist production which has as its "distinguishing feature" the disintegration of the fetters of bourgeois private property relations upon the historical accumulation of productive abundance.

The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property....

In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in a single sentence: Abolition of private property.⁶⁰

In addition to the abolition of private property, the realm of communism entails the abolition of the class division of labor owing to the social ownership of the means of production; which is to say, the revolutionary abrogation of bourgeois private property under communism simultaneously 1) abrogates class relations and their

division of labor and 2) establishes the mode of social property. With this, labor will cease to be fractionalized along class lines. The class division of labor which restricts and allocates work based upon the effective ownership of the means of production, or the lack thereof, will be brought to an end under communism; the class labor of capitalism will be no more, and communism will usher in, with its individualized labor at the site of socially owned productive means, the society of freedom with its banner of individual development: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!"

In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour, from a mere means of life, has itself become the prime necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-around development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly--only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs! 61

"In a higher phase of communist society," to restate this issue in the terms of the productive-economic

efformation, the structural dislocation produced by the misfit between optimum productive forces and bourgeois property relations has disappeared, and with this basic structural contradiction dissolved, revolution can make its exist from history and society and the "springs of co-operative wealth"/value can "flow more abundantly."

Class is part of the structural sheath upon a delimited--non-social, non-cooperative--property form that inhibits the production of abundant wealth/value for individual development/freedom. The "realm of freedom" is that social formation with its corresponding communist mode of production which has overcome the last "realm of necessity," the bourgeois formation with its corresponding CMP, in which labor is a physical necessity: "a mere means of life." Class, bourgeois society and capitalism required a delimited property form that makes wealth/value non-social, non-cooperative and non-abundant: scarce for the non-bourgeoisie; in the stead of abundant wealth/value, class, bourgeois society and capitalism emplace an abundance of misery amongst the direct producers.

It follows therefore, that in proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of the labourer, be his payment high or low, must grow worse. The law, finally, that always equilibrates the relative

surplus-population, or industrial reserve army, to the extent and energy of accumulation, this law rivets the labourer to capital more firmly than the wedges of Vulcan did Prometheus to the rock. It establishes an accumulation of misery, corresponding with accumulation of capital. Accumulation of wealth at one pole is , therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that produce its own product in the form of capital.⁶²

By reason of capitalism's particularization of wealth/value and human development and freedom to the bourgeois class, there is a corresponding universalization of the "objectification of total estrangement" from wealth/value and individual development and freedom.

It is specifically the delimited bourgeois property form that requires class formation and development, and together bourgeois property and class make human development and freedom impossible.

In fact, however, when divested of the narrow bourgeois [property] form, what is wealth, if not the universality of the individual's needs, capacities, enjoyments, productive powers, etc., produced in the course of universal exchange? If not the full development of human control over the forces of nature--both those of what is known as nature and those of his own nature?...

In bourgeois economics--and in the epoch of production to which it corresponds--this complete elaboration of the human essence appears as its complete emptying, the universal objectification of total estrangement....⁶³

In summary, the "realm of freedom" and the epoch of communist production to which it corresponds will be brought into historical and social reality by means of the revolutionary impact of expanding productive power and might upon the "narrow" bourgeois property form, i.e., upon narrow bourgeois economics; in other words, human development and freedom under communism is the result of the revolutionary impact of massive productive forces upon bourgeois society, and the epoch of capitalist production to which it corresponds, such that it will be divested of its "narrow" property form and the class shield that serves as a cover and protection for this form.

This summary illustrates well two fundamental axioms running throughout Marxian writings; viz.,
 1) class is "only bound" to a particular articulate combination of productive forces and relations and
 2) this particular articulate combination is one of limited productive conditions and a delimited (private) property form; this summary illustrates the "realm of freedom" as a classless society correspondong to an

articulate combination of productive forces and relations in which there is the production of abundant wealth/value and an extensive and comprehensive social, cooperative property form.

Our introduction to these fundamental axioms by way of the "realm of freedom" and communism presents us with the core of what Marx claimed was his innovative contribution to the work on class and class struggle--and presents us with the core of his projective technique for casting a post-capitalist, a post-bourgeois, setting.

What I did that was new was to demonstrate: 1) that the existence of classes is merely linked to particular historical phases in the development of production, 2) that class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society.⁶⁴

The course of history and society is, then, the continuous progression of productive development "bursting" one epochal economic form--mode of property relations--after another; within this course the existence of classes is the superstructural manifestation, superstructural "mirror," indicating--and concealing--a basic private property form. The continuous progression of economic "bursting" due to productive explosions terminates with the arrival of the free and developed communist society;

a free and developed communist society signals the arrival of the transcendence of class-ruled economic modes that reached their summit and culmination with the bourgeoisie and their variant of individual private property.

All the preceding classes that got the upper hand, sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation. The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurance of, individual property.⁶⁵

The termination of the conditions of class existence, the transcendence of class-ruled economic modes, is, in the final analysis, predicated upon the termination, transcendence, of private property relations. Private property termination, transcendence, will give rise to social and cooperative property relations: "common property,...the property of all members of society..."⁶⁶

Which is not to say, "personal property" is transformed or converted into social and cooperative "common property," and, with this, the conditions of existence of class existence are abolished. To the contrary, what happens is "the social character of...property...is changed. It loses its class character"⁶⁷: by removing the

personal/individual character from property its class character is also removed; property is, therefore, not personal, it is social, collective, cooperative and common, and it can be seen as such only when the veil of class is removed: only when the necessary conditions for class existence are removed will property stand naked as social.

You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property....You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property, the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society....

From the moment when labour can no longer be converted into capital, money, or rent, into a social power capable of being monopolized, i.e., from the moment when individual property can no longer be transformed into bourgeois property...⁶⁸

What is the nature of "the moment" that brings to a close the necessary conditions of class: the conversion of labor into capital, money or rent by means "of the power to subjugate the labour of others" through appropriating the products of society?⁶⁹ It is "the moment" of the "Communist revolution"; "the moment" of the extreme break in private/personal/individual property relations: "The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations...."⁷⁰

Which is to say, "the moment" when the necessary conditions for class existence are removed is "the moment" when property will stand naked as communistic.

This exposition of historical materialism, more correctly the "materialist conception of history," typifies the "Preface." Therein is found in unequivocal and explicit terms an identification of relations of production with property relations. In Capital, Vol. 1, and elsewhere, e.g., German Ideology, is laid out the historical and social interconnections and interactions between productive forces and technology--also set forth are some suggestions for a Human Technology: an evolutionary conception of the formation of human productive organs.

Our investigation and interrogation reveals that early on within the development of a discrete social formation the relations and forces of production are conjoined in a compatible relationship, an articulate combination, to form a mode of production. Attending the growth of productive power this relationship, combination, shifts to become one of conflict/misfit. "At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society [this discrete social formation] come into conflict

[they no longer fit] with the existing relations of production...with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto."

The dissolution of this conflict/misfit takes the form of a revolution during which new property relations arise that conform to, that fit, the new stage of productive development within the framework of a discrete social formation.

To state this whole line of thought in more concrete terms we must first call attention to property relations as constituting "the economic structure of society," the economic base of society, and a pattern/form of productive forces as constituting, along with other productive conditions, the production structure of society, the production base of society; a set of base structures--an economic structure corresponding to a production structure--composes a mode of production. A structural misfit between the economic structure and the production structure generated by the production structure initiates revolution. To avoid confusion and to further clarity, we have referred to the economic structure as the economic tier and the production structure as the production tier; thus a two-tier base of production and economics is at the root of revolution.

Revolution, within the productive-economic efformation is, then, the structural rearrangement of the basic two-tiers, i.e., the structural rearrangement of the more upward and outward, top, economic tier so that it corresponds to the structural changes within the more downward and inward, bottom, production tier. Accompanying this revolutionary readjustment is a transformation at the superstructural tier--the tier overarching the base tiers--that locates class formation and political institutions.

The revolution that is the transition from the capitalist mode of production to the communist mode of production within a discrete social formation is one in which productive growth shatters the narrow binds of bourgeois private property. The revolution results in a newly expanded and extensive production tier capable of producing abundant wealth/value and to which corresponds, i.e., there is a new fit,, a new pattern/form of social, cooperative, collective and common property relations; this newly established correspondence, fit, within the base is joined by a superstructural transformation that corresponds to, that fits, the new base of production-economics. The superstructural transformation that corresponds to, that fits, the new basic correspondence is one of class abolition and the dissolution of

political power, i.e., the state as its purest form.

The words of Marx provide an appropriate conclusion to this section on the productive-economic revolutionary efformation with its structural requirements. He makes transparent that what we have learned about the history or social science of revolution in general and its "economic categories" in particular "presupposed" the "context" of "contemporary bourgeois society."

Just as in general when examining any historical or social science, so also in the case of the development of economic categories it is always necessary to remember that the subject, in this context contemporary bourgeois society, is presupposed both in reality and in the mind, and that therefore categories express forms of existence and conditions of existence--and sometimes merely separate aspects--of this particular society, the subject; thus the category, even from the scientific standpoint, by no means begins at the moment when it is discussed as such.⁷¹

Which is to say, we are arguing that in any Marxian examination of revolution in general, the subject of his and our study, and "economic categories " in particular, within a historical or social science presupposed--"both in reality and the mind"--the context of bourgeois society.

Furthermore, we are arguing that in any investigation

and interrogation of Marxian materials, "it is always necessary to remember" that revolution--its categories as well as its terms, concepts, theoretical work and structures--expresses the "forms of existence and conditions of existence--and sometimes merely separate aspects--of this particular society."

Thus, revolution, "even from the scientific standpoint, by no means begins at the moment when" Marx discussed it as his subject. Revolution in general and the productive-economic revolutionary efformation with its structural demands, notably and mainly from the standpoint of our study, begins with bourgeois society and has Marx as its contextual spokesperson: revolution has a bourgeois mouthpiece--"The writer may very well serve a movement of history as its mouthpiece, but he cannot of course create it."⁷²

Revolutionary Efformation II

Superstructural Revolution: Class Political Transforming Owing to Voluntarims

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an 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 class.⁷³

With this thunderous introduction in the Manifesto we are greeted by the second variant of Marxian revolution. Here the dynamic is not structural but the voluntarism of class. Whereas before the base of historical materialism (the "materialist conception of history") explodes upward, here the explosion is at the (political) superstructure and flows downward. Thus, there is a base variant with a structural dynamic and a superstructural variant with a voluntaristic class dynamic that enter into the composition of the Marxian revolutionary complex.

Our task, again, is to demonstrate 1) two revolutions 2) that are discrete and 3) contradictory, and therewith demonstrate the failure and insufficiency of the possible criticism to the effect that there is a single multifarious Marxian revolution containing different emphases and concerns that mark different periods. In other words, our task is to overcome any criticism that Marxian publications and writings mark different historical episodes each having their own revolutionary emphasis and concerns.

This animadversion lacks credibility and explanatory competence as it is negligent in its ability to perceive and recognize that these so called differing revolutionary emphases and concerns cannot be attributed to different historical events punctuating the period of Marxian production. Why not?

The base variant of revolution is constructed with the terms, categories, concepts, theory and structures of a conflict/misfit between forces and relations of production, and is, therefore, applicable to all social formations and their corresponding modes: it has universal contextual application and reference; the base revolution has also an universal contextual source and origin: it can be said to occur in any formation and mode. On the other hand, the superstructural revolution is constructed, as we shall observe, with the terms, categories, concepts, theory and structures of class political struggle voluntarily inspired, and is, therefore, only applicable to class social formations and modes and is not applicable to classless social formations and modes: it has a particular and specialized contextual application and reference; the superstructural revolution has also a particular contextual source and origin: it can be said to occur, by definition, solely in specific formations and modes. For example, in those societies which correspond to the AMP where there is no cogent private ownership of productive means--an essential condition of existence for class--Marx, we can surmise, applied the superstructural revolution as his point

of reference, for he said these societies were to be noted for their absence of revolution.⁷⁴

In short, Marx established separate and contrary points of application and reference for revolution, separate and contrary contextual points of revolution, which cannot be reduced to or rendered as differing revolutionary emphases and concerns within a single unitary historical formulation said to be affecting Marx. Put otherwise, a single Marxian historical frame of differing emphases and concerns is fractured, disjoined and deranged by a revolution with a universal context--a base revolution in which class is neither essential nor necessary--and a revolution with a particular context--a superstructural revolution in which class is both essential and necessary; that is, a historical presentation of an integrated Marxian revolution having different components is fractured, disjoined and deranged by the fact that this revolution is applicable or makes reference to its own context in a discriminating, partial or selective manner. A historical framing and explanation of Marxian revolution which applies or makes reference to its own context in a differential manner is one that indicates the arbitration of the historian not the unity of a Marxian revolution generated by some historical process.

A Marxian revolution contained within a single history cannot encompass, be built around, distinct and

contrary contextual grounds; either there is a particular contextual ground of a class driven revolution or there is an universal contextual ground of a revolution driven by production: two separate, distinct and contrary contextual grounds of revolution cannot coexist in one intact historical frame.

This leaves those advocates of a historical analysis fusing the universal and particular Marxian revolutions, or as they would want to say, the universal and particular aspects of a Marxian revolution, with three options.

(1) They could acknowledge that history is an arbitrary construct in which the historian determines where and to what extent its materials apply or make reference to its own or any other context. This is what we alluded to when the mention was made of Marx's determination of the AMP societies as lacking in revolutionary transformation, and this conception of history is implied and can be inferred in some of our earlier comments. Consequently, if our thesis is not acceptable within this historical construct it is as a result of the determination of the historian irrespective of the possibility of separate, distinct and contrary revolutionary contextual grounds forming the basis of bourgeois society that may be reflected and reflexed in Marxian content. (2) They could acknowledge history as a contextual crap-shoot:

a description and ordering of events such that their application and reference to their own or any other context is determined by chance, luck or fate. History as a contextual crap-shoot could not rule out or take objection to our thesis of randomly placed, discontinuous and contradictory Marxian textual revolutions rooted in haphazard, discontinuous and contradictory revolutionary parts or tendencies of bourgeois contextual ground.

(3) The third alternative is that they could acknowledge two historical frames: one universal and one particular; the universal frame encloses a base revolution driven by structural tension and the particular frame encloses a revolution driven by class voluntarism along (and at) the (political) superstructure. Two historical frames enclosing these two contradictory revolutions suggest the possibility of contradictory histories: two historical frames enclosing two separate, distinct and contradictory revolutionary parts or tendencies in bourgeois society given literary expression by Marx. This formulation of two historical forms, i.e., two contradictory historical frames, is most certainly compatible with our thesis.

Before exploring in detail the political class struggle variant of Marxian revolution one additional point is apropos. We are only searching out two Marxian revolutions; this should not be taken to mean that there

are only two Marxian revolutions. We are of the suspicion that there are more than two, each a reflection and reflexion of parts or tendencies in bourgeois society.

With the articulation of the superstructural revolution of political class struggle Marx does more than establish points of contextual application and reference that run counter to the base revolution of productive-economic transformation. He constitutes a full-blown antithetical revolutionary whole.

Classes and Their Revolutionary Struggles

When examining a given country from the standpoint of political economy, we begin with its population, the division of its population into classes....

It would seem to be the proper thing to start with the real and concrete elements, with the actual pre-conditions, e.g., to start in the sphere of economy with population, which forms the basis and the subject of the whole social process of production. Closer consideration shows, however, that this is wrong. Population is an abstraction if, for instance, one disregards the classes of which it is composed. These classes in turn remain empty terms if one does not know the factors on which they depend, e.g., wage-labour, capital, and so on.⁷⁵

Obviously Marx is not concerned with abstract terms and categories or with skirting the issue of class, he also wants not to avoid the factors that are prerequisite to class in modern society. His ultimate purpose in "examining a given country from the standpoint of political economy," is to discover the economic laws of development of modern society so that the "birth-pangs" generated by the new society can be shortened and lessened.⁷⁶ This ultimate purpose and its effects upon the "birth-pangs" of society's transformation to a new order turns upon revolutionary class struggle.

For almost forty years we have emphasised that class struggle is the immediate driving power of history, and in particular that the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and proletariat is the great lever of the modern social revolution...."

Consequently, revolutionary class struggle predominates in Marxian discourse. Revolutionary class struggle is "the immediate driving power" in the creation of the "birth-pangs" of the new society in the womb of the old society. This information on revolutionary class struggle facilitates our understanding of Marx the "revolutionist." His role as revolutionary was to emphasize class struggle and therewith shorten and lessen the "birth-pangs" in the old society; Marx the "revolutionist" was concerned with emphasizing that "class struggle...is the great lever of the modern social revolution": the great lever that would pry open the womb of the old society and release the embryonic new society and therewith shorten and lessen the birth-pangs.

With this understanding of Marx's role as it relates to revolutionary class struggle, we can start to grasp the differences, distinctions and opposition between the productive-economic efformation and the revolutionary efformation of voluntaristic political class struggle.

Above revolution was the consequence of a structural conflict/misfit effectuated by a lack of correspondence between productive forces and economic/productive relations; class struggle was manifested as a conjoint superstructural response to the structural stress and dislocation lodged within the productive-economic base. Here we can aver that the structural rupture between the forces and relations of production is neither the "driving power of history" nor the "great lever of the modern social revolution," and, as we shall discern, revolution is the consequence of a voluntarily established matrix in which class formation, antagonism and struggle drives material history and social change: e.g., "a change in the relationship of classes is a historical change..."⁷⁸

* * *

Since private property, for instance, is not a simple relation or even an abstract concept, a principle, but consists in the totality of bourgeois relations of production--for it is not a question of subordinate or extinct but of existing bourgeois private property--since all these bourgeois relations of production are class relations, an insight which any novice must have acquired from his Adam Smith or Ricardo--, a change in, or even the abolition of, these relations can only follow from a change in these classes and their relationships with each other.⁷⁹

Before us are two critical and significant state of affairs: 1) property/productive relations are class relations and 2) change in property/productive relations "can only follow from a change in" classes and their relations. This constitutes a departure from and an inversion of the rationale and order found in the productive-economic efformation; viz., 1) property/productive relations are class relations whereas above the converse held and 2) changes in property/productive relations can only follow from class changes whereas above the converse held. The design, emphasis and dynamic locus has been altered and/or transposed. Above the structural demands of the productive-economic base provide the givens of revolutionary transformation; here the givens of revolutionary transformation are class struggle played out on the superstructural field.

This is not just or simply a shift but an inversion in the nature and organization of affairs, things and sites. Changes in productive forces do not disrupt property/productive relations which fashions structural tension all of which in turn accentuate revolutionary class struggle; rather, revolutionary class struggle affects property/productive relations and the property/productive relation effects generate alterations of the productive forces: class struggle engenders changes in the economic

and this engenders changes in the production-technological base.

In England, strikes have regularly given rise to the invention and application of new machines. Machines were... the weapon employed by the capitalist to quell the revolt of specialised labour. The self-acting mule, the greatest invention of modern industry, put out of action the spinners who were in revolt. If combinations and strikes had no other effect than that of making the efforts of mechanical genius react against them, they would still exercise an immense influence on the development of industry.⁸⁰

Class struggle resulting in changes in the economic and productive base is another way of saying that in the first analysis, political class struggle makes revolutionary changes:

And we, as socialists, tell you that...you will continue... to be workers, and the masters will still continue to be the masters, just as before. So no combination! No politics! For is not entering into combinations engaging in politics? The economists want the workers to remain in society as it is constituted and as it has been signed and sealed by them in their manuals.⁸¹

Emerging from this material is the outline of a superstructural efformation of revolution such that political class struggle is radicalized and seen as the driving force of historical and social change as well as seen as the lever that releases transformation in the

base-superstructure, and based upon this outline we have asserted that the superstructural efformation has as its substantive content voluntarism.

This outline and its claimed content raises a number of issues all of which logically revolve around class as the agency of voluntaristic change. First and foremost of these issues is the one raised by Nisbet (in the Introduction): what is Marx's "analytical concept of social class," or, stated in the terms of the evolving discourse, 1) what are Marx's constituent categories of class? Next in the line of issues raised are 2) the nature of the differences between a revolutionary and a non-revolutionary class and 3) the occurrences that must take place in order for a non-revolutionary class to take on the role and status of a revolutionary class?

It has been our position throughout this thesis that revolution and now the issues of class have to be dealt with contextually; thus, our approach to the first issue of class requires a determination of the context to which corresponds the formation and organization of Marx's constituent categories of class, and with such a determination issues 2) and 3) will be resolved--will fall into place, their contextual place. In other words,

in order to arrive at a determination of Marxian constituent categories of class, the nature of revolutionary class struggle and the evolution (and for that matter the devolution) of a revolutionary class, we need to know the constituent categories of the context in and from which Marx derived class, in all its details, aspects and features.

Marx makes it quite apparent and obvious that he comes to the totality of class through his study of bourgeois society which "categories...provide an insight into the structure and the relations of production of all formerly existing social formations...although...they may contain them...with substantial differences." (emphasis added).

Bourgeois society is the most advanced and complex historical organisation of production. The categories which express its relations, and an understanding of its structure, therefore, provide an insight into the structure and the relations of production of all formerly existing social formations the ruins and component elements of which were used in the creation of bourgeois society. Some of these unassimilated remains are still carried on within bourgeois society, others, however, which previously existed only in rudimentary forms, have been further developed and have attained their full significance,...

...although it is true that the categories of bourgeois economy are valid for all other social formations, this has to be taken cum grano salis, for they may contain them in an advanced, stunted, caricatured, etc., form, that is always with substantial differences.⁸²

This inquiry into the Marxian totality of class has its investigative and interrogative primacy and concentration being attached to the constituent categories of class; it is, then, an inquiry into the categories of bourgeois society, for it is this context to which corresponds Marx's formation and organization of class in all its details, aspects and features.

The owners merely of labour-power, owners of capital, and landowners, whose respective sources of income are wages, profit and ground-rent, in other words, wage-labourers, capitalists and land-owners constitute then the three big classes of modern society based upon the capitalist mode of production.

In England, modern society is indisputably most highly and classically developed in economic structure. Nevertheless, even here the stratification of classes does not appear in its pure form....We have seen that the continual tendency and law of development of the capitalist mode of production is more and more to divorce the means of production from labour, and more and more to concentrate the scattered means of production into large groups, thereby transforming labour into wage-labour and the means of production into capital. And to this tendency... corresponds the independent separation of landed property from capital and labour,

or the transformation of all landed property into the form of landed property corresponding to the capitalist mode of production.⁸³

After having said this in the unfinished chapter 52 of Capital, Vol. 3, Marx raised our "first question to be answered... What constitutes a class?" We know that his contextual point of reference is bourgeois society; accordingly, "the reply to this follows naturally from the reply to another question, namely: What makes wage-labourers, capitalists and landlords constitute the three great social classes?"⁸⁴ The reply to the question on the "three great social classes" is not what it may appear to be at first glance, i.e.,

...the identity of revenues and sources of revenue. There are three great social groups whose members, the individuals forming them, live on wages, profit and ground-rent respectively, on the realisation of their labour-power, their capital, and their landed property.

However, from this standpoint, physicians and officials, e.g., would also constitute two classes, for they belong to two distinct social groups, the members of each of these groups receiving their revenue from one and the same source. The same would also be true of the infinite fragmentation of interest and rank into which the division of social labour splits labourers as well as capitalists and landlords--the latter, e.g., into owners of vineyards, farm owners, owners of forests, mine⁸⁵ owners and owners of fisheries.

No matter what may fill our initial perception, here is additional evidence to buttress our stance that Marx's inquiry into "What constitutes a class" is predicated upon what constitutes/"makes" the three great social classes of modern bourgeois society. Therefore, his analysis, albeit incomplete, of the "identity of revenues and sources of revenue" turns on wages, profits and ground-rent, respectively.

At work in chapter 52 are two vital discursive trends: direct and diagonal.

First, direct Marxian discourse. To say that "wage-labourers, capitalists and landowners constitute ...three big classes of modern society," then raise the question, "What constitutes a class?" and then say that the answer to this question "follows naturally from the reply to another question,...: What makes wage-labourers, capitalists and landlords constitute the three great social classes?", is to say that the question concerning the components of class is to be answered by an inquiry into the "three great social" components of bourgeois society, viz., wage-labor, capital and "the form of landed property corresponding to the" CMP. Which is to say, "What constitutes a class" (emphasis added), any class, are the constituent components of modern bourgeois

society--with the proviso that if a class is not located within modern bourgeois society it will be in "an advanced, stunted, caricatured, etc., form" ; in this manner of discourse the constituent categories of class follow "naturally from," are predicated upon, the constituent categories of bourgeois society. To the theme of the bourgeois groundwork of Marxian discourse and analysis we will return repeatedly throughout this thesis.

Second, diagonal Marxian discourse. This discursive trend cuts across the direct discourse and registers an additional layer of meaning to what is being voiced. To say in direct discourse that class is composed of the constituent categories of bourgeois society is to say diagonally, obliquely, that class is the higher order category--the categorical embodiment of bourgeois society --encompassing property and the social division of labor. Which is to say, class is the categorical assemblage of property and its corresponding social division of labor: "all these bourgeois relations of production are class relations."

If our diagonal analysis of Marxian discourse is correct, then we have some degree of confirmation as well as refinement of our position on Marx's departure from and inversion of the rationale and order built into the productive-economic efformation; in other words,

if we are correct a diagonal discursive contravention exists that cuts across the productive-economic efformation and its format of property relations and factors, in this case labor-power, capital and landed property, engendering a corresponding class division of labor resulting in wages, profits and ground-rent, respectively. This diagonal discourse invokes class as organizing and arranging production ownership, or lack thereof, that in turn defines (and confines) the social division of labor.

This contravention contributes to a measure of refinement in the superstructural revolutionary efformation, for it summons and assigns property as the mediating link between class and the social division of labor.

To recapitulate, the superstructural revolutionary efformation of political class struggle offers the possibility of a contradistinction and a contravention to what has gone before; e.g., property, in the form of labor-power, capital and landed property, and its corresponding social division of labor, that creates wages, profits and ground-rent, respectively, follow from class. Thus, built into the superstructural efformation is an inner logic that has class organize and shape property and labor. Property and labor are categories which categorical prerequisite is class: the categories of property and labor are consequences of and

posterior to the category of class.

In short, class is not a superstructural veil upon the productive-economic base; it is given its own integrity and substance and transposed within the relational framework that ties it to property and the social division of labor such that it is the component that organizes, places and entails property and the social division of labor.

Unfolding is a revolutionary efformation in which the category of class--as yet its constituent components, its sub-categories, are not known to us--is superior, circumscriptive and directional with reference to property and the division of labor. It is in keeping with this unfoldment that Marx has class relations fix individual "participation in production," the social division of labor, that in turn determines product distribution, individual access to the "result of production."

The relations and modes of distribution are thus merely the reverse aspect of the factors of production. An individual whose participation in production takes the form of wage-labour will receive a share in the product, the result of production, in the form of wages. The structure of distribution is entirely determined by the structure of production. Distribution itself is a product of production,

not only with regard to content,
for only the results of production
can be distributed, but also with
regard to the form, since the
particular mode of men's
participation in production
determines the specific form of
distribution, the form in which
they share in distribution.⁸⁶

If the "structure of distribution is entirely determined by the structure of production," and if, as we are arguing, the mode of production participation is subordinate to, circumscribed by and follows from--i.e., production labor is determined by--class relations, especially class antagonism, then it would be logically continuous to expect that the superstructural efformation manifest product consumption, the "use of products," as based upon antagonistic class relations: "The use of products is determined by the social conditions in which the consumers find themselves placed, and these conditions themselves are based on class antagonism."⁸⁷

An objection may be raised to the effect that it is possible to view these Marxian materials as envincing class as the intervening category between "factors of production" and the totality of distribution and consumption. How then do we deal with this objection? The materialization of the intents and purposes of the subsequent section requires that there be some clear indication that class is prior to and a precondition as

well as a determinate of property, production labor, distribution and consumption.

In the pursuit of this materialization, Marx's critique of Hegel's stand on property illustrates his encoding of the categorical nexus we are seeking to validate and advance.

Hegel, for example, correctly takes ownership, the simplest legal relation of the subject, as the point of departure of the philosophy of law. No ownership exists, however, before the family or the relations of master and servant are evolved ⁸⁸

Thus, consumption, distribution, participation in the social division of production, labor and property relations can be determined consequences of "the relations of master and servant," i.e., class relations, in the light of some preliminary materials.

The Constituent Categories
(Sub-Categories) of Class:
Formation and Struggle

In this section Marx's work will be shown so as to display its embodiment of a complicated, varied and sometimes baffling picture of class. Unlike the relatively simple and straightforward relationship between economic conditions, class and revolution found in the productive-economic efformation, the superstructural efformation has economic conditions 1) not leading to class formation, 2) leading to class formation, 3) not leading to revolutionary class struggle, 4) subsumed under class, and 5) revolutionized by class, a class for revolutionary struggle.

The small holding peasants form a vast mass, the members of which live in similar conditions but without entering into manifold relations with one another. Their mode of production isolates them from one another instead of bringing them into mutual intercourse. The isolation is increased by France's bad means of communication and by the poverty of the peasants. Their field of production, the small holding, admits no division of labour in its cultivation, no application of science and, therefore, no diversity of development, no variety of talent, no wealth of social relationships. Each individual peasant family is almost self-sufficient.... A small holding, a peasant and his family; alongside them another small holding....

In this way, the great mass of the French nation is formed by simple addition of homologous magnitudes, much as potatoes in a sack form a sack of potatoes.⁸⁹

This metaphorical imagery of a sack of potatoes expresses as well as emphasizes a Marxian view, that is lastly a bourgeois view, of humanity; a view that negatively contrasts the masses of humanity with the classes of humanity, and a view that looks most favorably towards the formation of classes out of the "vast mass" of humanity, "homologous magnitudes." This view grants us a field of vision that illuminates the multifariousness of the superstructural efformation. In all ways, manner and form the superstructural efformation requires an investigation and interrogation that must proceed through intricate details as well as convoluted and confounded depths.

To begin, forces and relations of production may or may not be sufficient, unto themselves, for the transformation of the masses into classes, and they are not sufficient, unto themselves, for the occurrence of revolutionary class struggle. Economic conditions, productive/property relations, are knitted to productive forces in a weave of structural correspondence in non-revolutionary periods and a weave of non-correspondence in revolutionary periods within the productive-economic

efformation; on the other hand, economic conditions are rendered as somewhat passive conditions within the voluntaristic efformation. More than this, economic conditions become reflexive under the circumstances of revolutionary class struggle; i.e., economic conditions --base conditions--are transformed by revolutionary class struggle.

Economic conditions may generate different and distinctive life situations,⁹⁰ but they may not generate class formation as evidenced by the "vast mass" of humanity remaining so many separate and isolated entities as potatoes in a sack.

Economic conditions may generate different and distinctive classes. Which is to say, economic conditions may simply establish "class in itself" and not establish "class for itself": a united class capable of organizing, representing, defending and enforcing its interests politically.⁹¹

What can be teased out of the capacious Marxian literature on class is a three stage model of relations between economic conditions and class. A model which has as its last stage of relationship class as not bound to economic conditions; this third stage has class bound by the dynamic of voluntary struggle.

Stage 1. Economic conditions do not produce class formation.

In so far as there is merely a local interconnection among these small-holding peasants, and the identity of their interests begets no community, no national bond and no political organization among them, they do not form a class. They are consequently incapable of enforcing their class interest in their own name, whether through a parliament or through a convention. They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented.⁹²

Stage 2. Economic conditions lead to the formation of class in itself.

In so far as millions of families live under economic conditions of existence that separate their mode of life, their interests and their culture from those of other classes, and put them in hostile opposition to the latter, they form a class.⁹³

In this manner, where economic conditions lead to 1) the transformation of the masses into a compact body of workers, 2) similar and common living conditions that generate manifold social relations, 3) the breakdown of isolating and individualized/self-sufficient modes of production, 4) modes of production that bring on "mutual intercourse," 5) improved means of communication and material conditions resulting in an abundance of social relations, 6) fields of production that utilize a division of labor, applied science, diversity of development,

a wealth of social relations and a variety of talent, 7) an identity and commonality of separate interests, 8) a community, 9) a national bond, 10) a separate mode of life, 11) a separate culture, 12) hostile opposition to other classes and 13) political organization and representation to defend and enforce identical and common interests (that are separate from the interests of other class) the formation of class itself takes place. Where economic conditions do not lead to these 13 factors, class formation does not take place.

To this enumeration of the categorical constituents of class in itself produced by economic conditions is to be added 14) class-bound "sentiments, illusions, modes of thought, and concepts of life."⁹⁴ As our investigation and interrogation progresses we find another categorical constituent of class that develops out of economic conditions, viz., 15) "class-consciousness."⁹⁵ Such a consciousness makes class "being" to which conforms a clear apprehension of its visible and irrevocable "historical action," and this visibility and irrevocability is "foreshadowed" in the life circumstance of a class as well as in the larger society.

It is not a question of what this or that proletarian, or even the whole proletariat, at the moment regards as its aim. It is a question of what the proletariat is, and what, in accordance with this being, it will historically be compelled to do. Its aim and historical action is visibly and irrevocably foreshadowed in its own life situation as well as in the whole organisation of bourgeois society today. There is no need to explain here that a large part of the English and French proletariat is already conscious of its historical task and is constantly working to develop that consciousness into complete clarity.⁹⁶

By postulating "class-consciousness" as part of what goes into the formation of class, as part of the categorical constituents of class, Marx arrives at a collective "being" of class reality: a collective consciousness of class reality. One ingredient of this collective reality is the "mutual interdependence" of class members.

...the division of labour implies the contradiction between the interests of the separate individual or the individual family and the communal interests of all individuals who have intercourse with one another. And indeed, this communal interest does not exist merely in the imagination, as the "general interest," but first of all in reality, as the mutual interdependence of the individuals among whom the labour is divided.⁹⁷

This statement evidences Marx's concern that class consciousness be shown to be more than "phrases," "fancies" and "conception," that it be shown "first" to exist in reality, for if revolutionary class struggle is the instrument of historical change, then it has to take place in the material reality not "merely in the imagination" and minds of class members.

...as in private one differentiates between what a man thinks and says of himself and what he really is and does, so in historical struggles one must distinguish still more the phrases and fancies of parties from their real organism and

their real interests, their
conception of themselves,
from their reality.⁹⁸

Class "being," what the class is, entails a consciousness of the circumstances and conditions of its historical aim and action as well as a consciousness of its everyday life circumstances and conditions.

...the proletariat as proletariat,
poverty which is conscious of
its spiritual and physical
poverty, dehumanisation which is
conscious of its dehumanisation,
and therefore self-abolishing.⁹⁹

Class-consciousness, as so described, is a collective self-consciousness built around class interests.

The proletarian movement is
the self-conscious,* independent
movement,...in the interest of
immense majority.

* The word "self-conscious,"
is not in the original.¹⁰⁰

Taken together these fifteen sub-categories, ranging from the transformation of the masses into a close association of workers to class consciousness, are the categorical constituents of class in itself. Class for itself is, however, constituted by an additional sub-category

that makes for a differentiation and distinction between it and class in itself. Where class in itself takes on this additional sixteenth sub-category it is constituted as class for itself; moreover, this categorical constituent which establishes class for itself lies outside the limits of economic determination that circumscribe the initial fifteen categorical constituents, and it is not enjoined by the structural design and demands that highlight and accentuate the productive-economic efformation. Which is to say, class for itself is class engaging in tasks, activities and objectives that neither arise out of nor are delimited by economic conditions lodged within the base structure; these tasks, activities and objectives are situated at the superstructure, the "reflex"/the "mirror" of the base structure, yet they are not a "reflex" of, i.e., they are not determined or conditioned by, base economic conditions. Class for itself is class engaged in the constituent category of political struggle, revolutionary class struggle.

Economic conditions had first transformed the mass of the country into workers. The domination 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 pointed out only a few phases, this mass becomes united, and constitutes itself as a class for itself. The interests it defend become class interests. But the struggle of class against class is a political struggle.¹⁰¹

Thus, class in itself precedes and provides the groundwork for the appearance of class for itself, and mere conflict between or amongst classes is not sufficient to establish class for itself. Class hostility and conflict are among the many categorical constituents of class in itself. When and if class hostility and conflict is translated into class struggle, then class for itself comes into existence; class struggle is specifically defined as, or is synonymous with, struggle within the political sphere.

The German bourgeoisie therefore already finds itself in conflict with the proletariat even before being politically constituted as a class. ¹⁰²

We will return, in detail, to the issue of the nature of class struggle as politically defined. At this instance it must be borne in mind that the political struggle of class for itself is revolutionary struggle because it encompasses a great deal more than mere political organization to represent, defend or enforce class interests; it encompasses the radical transformation of both the

superstructure and base as well as the radical transformation of the entirety of social relations.

In stage 3 of class formation economic conditions do not determine or generate class for itself. In this stage of class formation the relationship between economic conditions and class breaks down and the structural relationship between base and superstructure depicted in the productive-economic efformation collapses. In the third stage it is political struggle that constitutes class for itself. Political struggle, in and of itself, determines, dictates and dominates the existence of class for itself.

At this juncture it is the voluntary efformation of revolutionary class struggle that makes its way into the material. It is not economics, property relations or the structural dislocation of non-corresponding forces and relations of production which launch revolutionary class struggle; it is the voluntarism of a class that launches revolutionary struggle, and where a class hurls itself into political struggle revolutionary class struggle takes place. A class moves from being a class in itself to class for itself through political struggle by means of voluntarism. Class for itself comes into being and is constituted in non-economic and non-structural terms, concepts and theory; it is self-generating and

self-constituting because it operates voluntarily in its political struggle.

When this voluntary efformation of class revolution is superimposed upon the productive-economic efformation of structural requirements, revolutionary struggle, class struggle defined (refined) politically, appears to come into existence from nowhere and lands somehow upon the superstructural level. There is no economic or structural principle, rationale or argument within the productive-economic efformation that can explain how 1) class for itself can emerge out of the conditions of existence or the constituent categories of class in itself and 2) revolutionary class struggles arrive at the political superstructure inasmuch as it is not the consequence, result of or concomitant to economic or structural conditions within the base. Put differently, there is no economic or structural factors or pressures that give life to political struggle. Hence, what is it that brings political struggle into existence?

As can be seen, the efformation of political class struggle and its dynamic not only impairs the logic and order of the productive-economic efformation, it also contradicts it.

Whereas the model of formation of class in itself brings together individuals as a class only insofar as they joined in and are subsumed under common economic conditions, the model of formation of class for itself brings together individuals as a class only insofar as they engage in and are subsumed under a common struggle.

The separate individuals form a class only insofar as they have to carry on a common battle against another class; otherwise they are on hostile terms with each other as competitors. On the other hand, the class in its turn achieves an independent existence over against the individuals, so that the latter find their conditions of existence predestined, and hence have their positions in life and their personal development assigned to them by their class, become subsumed under it.¹⁰³

In other words, this voluntaristic revolution brings together individuals to form a class along an axis of human activity; on the other hand, the structurally required revolution built around productive and economic relations brings together individuals to form a class along an axis of decisive ownership of the means of production, or lack thereof. This leaves us with two revolutionary efformations both of which produce class in itself; i.e., in both the productive-economic and voluntaristic efformations there occurs the formation of class in itself: in both efformations economic conditions produce the fifteen categorical

conditions of existence of class in itself. But only in the voluntaristic efformation 1) does class in itself become class for itself when its members carry on a common political struggle, 2) is class political struggle the heart of revolution, 3) does revolutionary struggle give class for itself the quality of self-generation and self-constitution, 5) does class for itself obtain the quality of self-generation and self-constitution because it voluntarily "finds the content and material for its revolutionary activity directly in its own situation" (emphasis added) and 6) is the self-generation and self-constitution of class for itself the consequence of its own voluntary deeds that drive it on.

As soon as it has risen up, a class in which the revolutionary interest of society are concentrated finds the content and material for its revolutionary activity directly in its own situation: foes to be laid low, measures dictated by the needs of the struggle to be taken; the consequence of its own deeds drive it on. It makes no theoretical inquiries into its own task.¹⁰⁴

This review has deliberately omitted a detailed discussion of the dynamism that drives this variant of revolution: voluntarism. To this point, voluntarism has been used to account for the process of transition in which class in itself becomes class for itself, the process of transition in which revolutionary political

struggle arises out of none of the determinates, generators, conditioners or inputs found in the productive-economic revolutionary efformation. Put more aggressively, voluntarism has been used to explain how class in itself bursts forth from the constraints and parameters we saw in the productive-economic efformation into the revolutionary political struggles of class for itself, yet revolutionary class voluntarism remains unclear. How does it operate as a categorical condition of existence of class for itself.

In the immediate above citation revolutionary class voluntarism is specified in broad terms; e.g., 1) what class for itself will do as "soon as it has risen up," i.e., "its revolutionary activity," is discovered "in its own situation." and 2) the self-generation and self-constitution of class for itself is "dictated by the needs of the struggle...;the consequences of its own deeds drive it on." In these comments there is only a vague sense of how class in itself gets to the point of rising up; we are only told that as "soon as it has risen up " the what of revolutionary struggle will unfold. The how of revolutionary struggle still remains elusive even when the initial sentence is brought under scrutiny. There we find that "a class in which the revolutionary interests of society are concentrated" will be the class

that will rise up, so we know which class has the capacity to attain revolutionary struggle. Still how class for itself comes to carry on revolutionary struggle remains obscure. This obscurity clouds the voluntary movement of the historically specific emancipation of the proletariat for itself:

...the emancipation of the working class must be conquered by the working classes themselves...¹⁰⁵

In spite of these remarks the question stands, how does the working class conquer its own emancipation?

The how of voluntary class for itself emancipation continues in its opaqueness. The solution to the dense mystery of class voluntarism may lie in the unity of revolutionary theory and practical human needs:

For revolution requires a passive element, a material basis. Theory can be realised in a people only insofar as it is the realisation of the needs of that people. But will the enormous discrepancy between the demands of German thought and the answers of German reality be matched by a corresponding discrepancy between civil society and the state and between civil society and itself? Will the theoretical needs be immediate practical needs? It is not enough for thought to strive for realisation. reality must itself strive towards thought.¹⁰⁶

The notion of a voluntaristic class revolution having a theoretical and "material basis" in the practical needs of humanity is implied in Marx's depiction of the relationship between philosophy and the proletariat.

As philosophy finds its material weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its spiritual weapons in philosophy.¹⁰⁷

The how of revolutionary class struggle looks as if it is becoming less mysterious: revolutionary struggle seems to be explained in the terms and concepts of a concurrence between theory and practical needs, between theory and practical activity.

Hence, in the Essence of Christianity, he [Feuerbach's] regards the theoretical attitude as the only genuine human attitude, while practice is conceived and fixed only in its dirty-judaical form of appearance. Hence he does not grasp the significance of "revolutionary," of "practical-critical," activity.¹⁰⁸

In other words, the mysteries of class voluntarism find their solution in social life when human practice is comprehended by human theory.

Social life is essentially practical. All mysteries which mislead theory to mysticism find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice.¹⁰⁹

Within the efformation of class voluntarism the comprehension of human practice by human theory does not take the

form of interpreting the world; rather, it takes the form of changing the world.

The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it.¹¹⁰

This prepares us for the propositions that are to follow:

- 1) Human practice becomes revolutionary where it is the "coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity."
- 2) Human theory becomes revolutionary where it is the rational and conceptual correspondent to revolutionary practice.

The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionising practice.¹¹¹

Thus, the meeting of the conceptualization and rational understanding of the "coincidence" of the changing of circumstances and human activity is the essence of voluntaristic class revolution, so that the coming together of revolutionary theory and practice is the necessary condition for the voluntarism that generates revolutionary struggle and human emancipation.

And once the lightning of thought
has squarely struck this ingenuous
soil of the people the emancipation
of the Germans into human beings
will take place.¹¹²

Nevertheless, the joining of revolutionary theory and practice is not sufficient for voluntaristic struggle. More than comprehending revolutionary practice, revolutionary theory has to also demonstrate "that man is the highest being for man," and by so demonstrating it establishes the "categorical imperative" to overthrow all (class) relations that dehumanize and diminish the ultimate status of humanity.

Theory is capable of griping the masses as soon as it demonstrates ad hominem and it demonstrates ad hominem as soon as it becomes radical. To be radical is to grasp the root of the matter. But for man the root is man himself. The evident proof of the radicalism of German theory, and hence of its practical energy, is that it proceeds from a resolute positive abolition of religion. The criticism of religion ends with the teaching that man is the highest being for man, hence with the categorical imperative to overthrow all relations in which man is a debased, enslaved, forshaken, despicable being....¹¹³

Given what has been said, revolution requires, within the efformation of political class struggle, the grasping of the root of voluntarism. Revolutionary theory is the 1) rational correspondent to the revolutionary practice that is the "coincidence" of social change and

human activity--the necessary condition of revolutionary theory--as well as 2) rational demonstration of humanity as the pinnacle for humanity, and, hence, 3) the embodiment of the "categorical imperative" (emphasis added) for revolutionizing dehumanizing (class) relations--the sufficient condition of revolutionary theory. Since revolutionary theory is the rational correspondent to, demonstration and embodiment of revolutionary practice, revolutionary practice must realize, so as to remain within a relationship of correspondence, demonstration and embodiment with revolutionary theory, a "coincidence" of social change and human action--the necessary condition of revolutionary practice--that also corresponds to, demonstrates and embodies the supreme elevation of humanity as well as seeks the overthrow of all dehumanizing (class) relations.

Where the theory and practice of humanity in class in itself is juxtaposed such that theory comprehends practice and this theory and practice concur., evidence and incorporate that humanity is the highest being, revolution becomes a spontaneously derived imperative within the emergent class for itself.

To grasp the root of revolution in this efformation is to grasp the root of voluntarism, and to grasp the root of voluntarism is to grasp the root of humanity itself:

a voluntaristic revolution is a human revolution--a revolution ground in humanity, not economy and social structure. Thereby, the enigma of voluntarism is really the enigma of humanity.

It appears that the human enigma will be resolved by a "resolute positive abolition of religion," the specified relationship between the theory and practice that emancipates the human being by means of a (victorious) revolutionary class struggle, the annulment of class relations and the realization of revolutionary theory: philosophy. In a few words, a voluntaristic liberation is a practical possibility to the extent that humanity is a practical possibility.

The only practically possible liberation of Germany is liberation that proceeds from the standpoint of the theory which proclaims man to be the highest being for man... The emancipation of the German is the emancipation of the human being. The head of this emancipation is philosophy, its heart is the proletariat. Philosophy cannot be made a reality without the abolition of the proletariat, the proletariat cannot be abolished without philosophy being made a reality.¹¹⁴

Everything appears transparent. Class in itself moves to become class for itself; class in itself progresses to class for itself voluntarily, and that means that it has dovetailed in a comprehensive manner the

theory and practice that emancipates humanity in all relations; such dovetailing, it has and will be further argued, leads to and embraces political class struggle-- class in itself moves voluntarily to become class for itself in and through political struggle.

This transparency, however, masks a more profound dimension of opacity: it hides and obscures the "root of the matter....man himself." How transparent is "the root of the matter," the voluntarism of humanity itself, in what Marx has said? Still cloaked and eschewed is the reality of a revolution that requires and is predicated upon a voluntaristic "material basis," a voluntaristic creature/subject. These remarks broach one of the most controversial subjects in the annals of work on Marx: does Marx approach, either explicitly or implicitly, human beings as having the capacity, faculty or resource to voluntarily unite, take hold of and carry emancipatory theory and practice into revolutionary struggle? If so, does such an approach bespeak of a human nature?

Before these serious questions are addressed, it might be said that a problem exists with reference to some of Marx's statements on theory--in particular, such seemingly inconsistent statements as, "as soon as it has risen up, a class in which the revolutionary interest of

society are concentrated...It makes no theoretical inquiries into its own task" (emphasis added) and, "The head of this emancipation is philosophy, its heart is the proletariat." (emphasis added). Perhaps this imputed inconsistency can be explained away by the substitution of the terms "ready-made utopias" or "ideals to realize" within a reworking of the first statement: "as soon as it has...concentrated....It makes no ready-made utopias or ideals to realize for its own task." In other words, the revolutionary class can "work out their own emancipation" with a philosophy that is the "full consciousness of...and...heroic resolve" towards the fulfillment of "their historic mission." The revolutionary class cannot "work out their own emancipation" with a philosophy that is a theoretical inquiry/ attitude typified by Feuerbach: utopian, idealized, abstract and interpretative; the revolutionary class cannot "work out their own emancipation" with a limited or non-existent practice, with a limited or non-practical/non-existent human need.

The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce par decret du peuple. They know that in order to work out their own emancipation....

They have no ideals to realise, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant. In the full consciousness of their historic mission, and with the heroic resolve to act up to it....115

What is at stake here is the difference and distinction between "theoretical inquiries"/"ready-made utopias"/"ideals" of philosophers and the "revolutionary," "practical-critical," activities of class for itself, so that although the revolutionary class does not make "theoretical inquiries into its own task," it does, nevertheless, engage in the practical-critical activities of revolution.

...proletarian revolutions...criticize themselves constantly, interrupt themselves continually in their own course, come back to the apparently accomplished in order to begin afresh, deride with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weakness and paltrinesses of their first attempts, seem to throw down their adversary only in order that he may draw new strength from the earth and rise again, more gigantic, before them, recoil ever and anon..., until a situation has been created which makes all turning back impossible.... 116

The topic of human nature is pivotal to the discourse of the efformation of voluntaristic revolution. It is the unspecified and unspoken undercurrent within the efformation, a voluntary revolution can only be the expression,

articulation and elaboration of a voluntary humanity
who compose class in itself and make possible the
transition from class in itself to class for itself.

Again, what is not being argued here is the nature of voluntarism, that will be dealt with later. What is being argued here is that there must be some human disposition, resource, capacity or faculty that allows for a voluntaristic revolution, i.e., a voluntaristic "human nature in general."

To know what is useful for a dog,
 one must study dog-nature....

Applying this to man, he [Jeremy Bentham] that would criticise all human acts, movements, relations, etc., by the principle of utility, must first deal with human nature in general, and then with human nature as modified in each historical epoch.¹¹⁷

This citation will be part of an amalgam of evidence used to demonstrate a clear cut, substantive, comprehensive and dispersed underlying dimension of human nature that exists throughout Marxian texts. At certain places this dimension is referred to implicitly, and at certain other places it is referred to explicitly, as is the case in the immediate above. To begin with, a voluntaristic class revolution implies and presupposes a basic dimension of species nature (analogous to a "dog-nature"). If the "history of all hitherto existing society is the

history of class struggles," then, certainly, there must be a human nature that is deep within humanity that is not "modified in each historical epoch" in order for humanity to have and/or be the power and need to make the total history of different historical epochs one kind of history: the history of class struggles. In other words, there is a substratum of nature in humanity which is generalized within and unconditioned by history, and it is different than and distinct from the more surface and historically specific and conditioned nature in humanity. What a voluntaristic revolution does by its attempt to change the world, is awaken, develop and harness the dormant but ever present powers in humanity.

By thus acting on the external world and changing it, he [i.e., humanity] at the same time changes his own nature. He develops his slumbering powers and compels them to act in obedience to his sway.¹¹⁸

No revolution without human need and power! Revolution provides humanity with the opportunity to change its own powers and needs by nurturing, cultivating and controlling them. In short, the generalized and trans-historical human nature which makes revolution possible, engenders the changes that take place "with human nature as modified in each historical epoch."

It will be argued that a lucid and articulate corpus on human nature involving needs, power, capacities, faculties and dispositions is posited in the efformation of voluntaristic class revolution, and that the presupposition of human nature asserts itself and becomes more and more explicit as the voluntary efformation is amassed; it surfaces as the intervening variable impelling class in itself towards class for itself. If our argumentation proves successful, then human nature will be seen as the intervening factor that launches political class struggle and is the categorical condition/constituent of existence of class for itself. Human nature serves both as 1) an integral suppositional building block of voluntarism and 2) an explicitly recognized and validated mediator of class revolution, a propelling mediator lodged between class in itself and class for itself.

To be able to demonstrate that generalized human nature is an explicitly recognized and validated mediator of revolution and historical transformation, that in turn contributes to the transmutation of historically specific human nature, an outline of "human nature in general" is requisite. This outline will, of necessity, mark the boundaries between "human nature in general" and "human nature as modified in each historical epoch";

it will not, however, detail or draw out "human nature as modified in each historical epoch," for such a detailing or drawing out is actually tangential to the main thesis of this writing. Suffice it to say, generalized human nature directs attention to properties that are independent of particular historical epochs; for example, the human need for oxygen, food, water, shelter, etc. On the other hand, specific human nature directs attention to the same properties but adapted to the demands of particular historical epochs; for example, the human adaption to the production, distribution and consumption of food in the feudal epoch. Generalized human nature is universal, constant and enduring to the species; whereas specific human nature is particular, changing and modifiable. It will be argued that voluntarism is universal, constantly present and lasting to the human species; the factor that makes possible revolutionary class struggle and historical transformation, and, thus, the modification of specific human nature.

Generalized Human Nature

Marx's position on generalized human nature can be inferred from the distinction he draws between humans and animals.

Men can be distinguished from animals by consciousness, by religion or anything else you like. They themselves begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence,....119

Thereby, humanity begins to become distinguishable from animals/insects with the production of human subsistence, but it is not the form of labor that subsistence production takes that creates the distinction; rather, it is in the purposive imagination that guides all production.

We pre-suppose labour in a form that stamps it as exclusively human. A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee that puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement. He not only effects a change of form in the material on which he works, but he also realises a purpose of his own that gives the law to his modus

operandi, and to which he must subordinate his will. And this subordination is no mere momentary act. Besides the exertion of the bodily organs, the process demands that, during the whole operation, the workman's will be steadily in consonance with his purpose.¹²⁰

In the process of changing the material world, humanity realizes formative and structural expression, and by so doing it also realizes the expression of a purpose formed and structured in its imagination. Hence, humanity is distinguishable from animals/insects by way of

1) consciousness, religion or "anything else you like" that comes about "as soon as" humanity begins to produce its "means of subsistence" and 2) an inherent purposive imagination that is the prior condition and basis ("raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality") for "every labour-process" including the production of the "means of subsistence."

It is this purposive imagination that is immanent in humanity and the special property which enables humanity, it is being argued, to carry out "every labour-process" as well as carry out a voluntaristic class revolution. It is important to refine this property and address it in the more familiar Marxian language: free, willed, purposive and conscious life activity--"species character."

The whole character of a species--its species character--is contained in the character of its life activity; and free, conscious activity is man's species character....

The animal is immediately one with its life activity. It does not distinguish itself from it. It is its life activity. Man makes his life activity itself the object of his will and his consciousness. He has conscious life activity. It is not a determination with which he directly merges. Conscious life activity distinguishes man immediately from animal life activity. It is just because of this that he is a species being. Or rather, it is only because he is a species being that he is a conscious being, i.e., that his own life is an object for him. Only because of that is his activity free activity.¹²¹

Elsewhere we find that Marx's alignment with and praise of Epicurean philosophy was based upon its theoretical concurrence with his own position on human freedom: human freedom understood as "the absoluteness and freedom of self-consciousness";¹²² this is a shorthand description of "species character." Seen in its shortened variant, "species character" becomes visible as the linchpin that holds together and brings uniformity to the total Marxian assemblage on human labor. The all pervasive descriptions and discussions of exploitation, brutalization, alienation, dehumanization, and mortification of human labor create plausible, powerful and persuasive effects solely, but not exclusively, because there is a "loss"

of what is indispensable, absolute and indwelling in humanity. Which is to day, there is a "loss" of "self," a loss of "species character," a "loss" of freedom of self-consciousness and "spontaneous activity" which leads to 1) a blurring of the distinction between humanity and animals and 2) a cross-over between humanity and animals.

...so is the worker's activity
not his spontaneous activity.
It belongs to another;
it is the loss of
his self.

As a result, therefore, man (the worker) only feels himself freely active in his animal functions--eating, drinking, procreating, or at most in his dwelling and in dressing-up, etc.; and in his human functions he no longer feels himself to be anything but an animal. What is animal becomes human and what is human becomes animal.¹²³

It is Marx's advocacy of "species character" which highlights his critique of bourgeois economist Adam Smith's treatment of labor as "sacrifice" and a "curse," for such labor is "always...external forced labour" which precludes free, willed, purposive and conscious life activity: species/"self realization." Sacrificial and cursed labor is emptied of human freedom and filled with "natural urgencies," basic survival.

A. Smith. Work as a sacrifice....

In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou labour! was Jehonah's curse on Adam [Genesis 3, 19]. And this is labour for Smith, a curse. "Tranquility" appears as the adequate state, as identical with "freedom" and "happiness."...Certainly, labour obtains its measure from the outside, through the aim to be obtained and the obstacles to be overcome in obtaining it. But Smith has no inkling whatever that this overcoming of obstacles is in itself a liberating activity--and that, further, the external aims become stripped of the semblance of merely external natural urgencies, and become posited as aims which the individual himself posits--hence as self-realization, objectification of the subject, hence real freedom, whose action is, precisely, labour. He is right...that, in its historic forms as slave-labour, serf-labour, and wage-labour, labour always appears as repulsive, always as external forced labour; and not-labour {sic} by contrast, as "freedom, and happiness."¹²⁴

Therefore labor and revolution are similar; to wit, the human essence of freedom of self-consciousness and spontaneous activity is present in "every labour-process" and in class revolution. Marx has, unlike Smith, an "inkling" 1) that the "overcoming" of class "obstacles is in itself a liberating activity" and 2) that, "further, the external" revolutionary class "aims become stripped of the semblance of merely external natural urgencies, and become posited as aims which the individual"

class members themselves posit--"hence as self-realization, objectification of the" subject's freedom of self-consciousness and spontaneous life activity, "hence real freedom, whose action is, precisely," revolution. Marx "is right," given this argument, in that under the slave-labor, serf-labor and wage-labor modes of production, revolution, as well as labor, "always appear as repulsive, always as external forced" revolution, and not revolution, "by contrast, as 'freedom, and happiness.'" Revolutionary class struggle has for its aim the liberation, the self-realization/objectification, of "species character" through the action of overcoming class obstacles, class relations. Hence, class struggle is 1) in itself liberating, 2) the positing of aims of species realization/objectification, 3) real freedom whose action is, precisely, revolution, 4) present in species destructive modes of production always appearing as repulsive, as externally forced revolution and 5) in its genuine appearance the pathway to freedom and happiness.

In other words, voluntarism is built into revolutionary class struggle by making it part of human essence, and human essence is actualized in the objectification of voluntarism by means of human labor and revolution. Generalized human nature is a trans-

historical description of and prescription for human liberation. and fulfillment within each historical epoch. It is trans-historically descriptive and prescriptive because

- 1) it is not modified within each historical epoch,
- 2) it is perpetual and 3) its realization leads to liberation and fulfillment.

Voluntarism is the hidden, now visible, revolutionary agency of human nature, and human nature is the hidden, now visible, trans-historical agency of revolutionary class struggle. Human liberation and fulfillment, by way of humanity objectifying its voluntaristic essence, takes its descriptive form in the (in)famous first paragraph of the Manifesto quoted above, and it takes its prescriptive form as the "realm of freedom": the realm of free, purposive and self-conscious life activity under communism "as the real appropriation of the human essence by man and for man."

Communism as the positive transcendence of private property, as human self-estrangement, and therefore as the real appropriation of the human essence by man and for man; communism therefore as the complete return of man to himself as a social (i.e., human) being--a return becomes conscious, and accomplished within the entire wealth of previous development. This communism, as fully developed naturalism, equals humanism, and as fully developed humanism equals naturalism; it is the genuine resolution of the conflict between man and nature and between man

and man--the true resolution of the strife between existence and essence, between objectification and self-confirmation, between freedom and necessity, between the individual and the species. Communism is the riddle of history solved, and it knows itself to be this solution.¹²⁵

Human liberation in its prescriptive form is based upon and follows from human liberation in its descriptive form; i.e., the "realm of freedom" under communism is based upon and follows from revolutionary class struggle, and revolutionary class struggle is based upon and follows from human nature in general--generalized human nature is the description of and prescription for human freedom and realization. Which is to say, communism, as fully developed "species character"/"naturalism," equals humanism, and as fully developed humanism equals "species character"/"naturalism." Communism, in light of these statements, takes into account, in the first analysis, "man's nature" as one of its "vital principles."

But one of the most vital principles of communism, a principle which distinguishes it from all reactionary socialism, is its empirical view, based on a knowledge of man's nature...; therefore the false tenet, based upon existing circumstances, "to each according to his abilities," must be changed, insofar as it relates to enjoyment in its narrower sense, into the tenet,

"to each according to his need";...
a different form of activity, of
labour, does not justify inequality,
confers no privileges in respect of
possession and enjoyment.¹²⁶

This vital principle of communism peels away the "narrow bourgeois form" and equates wealth and material pleasures with the empirical view of the universality of individual needs, capacities and abilities.

..., when the narrow bourgeois form
has been peeled away, what is
wealth, if not the universality of
needs, capacities, enjoyments,
productive powers, etc., of
individuals, produced in universal
exchange? What, if not the full
development of human control over
the forces of nature--those of his
own nature as well as those of
so-called "nature"?¹²⁷

The argument Marx develops is one in which communism is historically prescriptive because it is "worthy of,... human nature"¹²⁸; communism corresponds to the "realm of freedom" inasmuch as it begins with the "development of human energy which is an end in itself,"¹²⁹ and it entails

1) the elaboration of "creative dispositions...i.e.,

the evolution of all human powers as such," and

2) "the elaboration of what lies within man."

...the absolute elaboration of
his creative dispositions, without
any preconditions other than
antecedent historical evolution
which makes the totality of his
evolution--i.e. the evolution of
all human powers as such, unmeasured

by any previously established yardstick--an end in itself? What is this, if not a situation where a man does not reproduce himself in any determined form, but produces his totality?...In bourgeois political economy--and in the epoch of production to which it corresponds--this complete elaboration of what lies within man, appears as the total alienation, and the destruction of all fixed, one-sided purposes as the sacrifice of the end in itself to a wholly external compulsion.¹³⁰

In sum, humanity is a free, conscious, purposive, spontaneous and active being, and humanity cannot give up or set aside its freedom, self-consciousness, will, spontaneity and activism without ceasing to be human. Generalized human nature is a dynamic coherent whole that links human beings to the objective world, and, thereby, it bridges the gap between what is and what can be, and it does so in the most explosive of social relations, revolution: it bridges the gap between the what is of economic determination of class and the what can be of class as determined by political struggle. This construction of generalized human nature as the nexus of voluntarism is substantive and proof positive that human agency is not a passive reflex of/reflection of or wholly and utterly determined by economic conditions where revolution, or human labor for that matter, is

on the agenda. Generalized human nature is the creative capacity underlying revolutionary struggle, i.e., human nature is the unseen force promoting human advancement beyond the economic givens towards the economic circumstances "worthy of,...human nature."

Finally, for those who want to reduce humanity to a "natural object, a thing," they must remember that

(Man himself, viewed as the impersonation of labour-power, is a natural object, a thing, although a living conscious thing, and labour is the manifestation of this power residing in him.)¹³¹

*

*

*

Marx's critique of bourgeois economy and economists, as cited above, concerns itself, in large part, with the problem of abstraction, i.e., with the mystery, mystification and fetishism of commodity production and private property, and Marx found the rational solution to this problem, so he claimed and we have recorded, "in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice." This critique and rational solution leads us to the oft quoted sixth thesis on Feuerbach. This thesis has become the common reference, used by Marxists and non-

Marxists alike, to support the contention that Marx relegated human essence--as an inherent property--to the category of "religious self-estrangement" or "religious sentiment."

Feuerbach resolves the essence of religion into the essence of man. But the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations. Feuerbach who does not enter upon a criticism of this real essence, is hence obliged:

1. To abstract from the historical process and to define the religious sentiment [Gemut] by itself, and to presuppose an abstract--isolated--human individual.
2. Essence, therefore, can be regarded only as "species," as an inner, mute, general character which unites the many individuals in a natural way.¹³²

Here again, Marx is being critical of conceptions and theorizing that are abstract; he is focusing in on and ridiculing the abstract quality of Feuerbach's treatment of human nature, as he did with the abstract quality of bourgeois economists' treatment of commodity production and property. Marx is not, contrary to overwhelming opinion, ridiculing the conceptualization and theory of human nature per se. His critique is of Feuerbach's mysticism in which the "essence of man" loses its concrete, practical and social quality. Marx's

critique of Feuerbach is aimed at his rendering of human essence as 1) an "abstraction inherent in each single individual" that in turn leads to conceptualizations and theories of an a-historical/trans-historical "abstract--isolated--human individual" and, therefore, 2) "'species,'" as an inner, mute, general character which unites the many individuals in a natural way (emphasis added)--an empathetic consciousness of kind in which human beings recognize each other as members of the same species: "species being." Marx's rendering of human essence, i.e., generalized human nature, avoids the abstractness/mysteries that "mislead theory into mysticism," for the reason that it inscribes "human practice," freedom of self-consciousness and spontaneous and purposive life activity, and "the comprehension of this practice."

Marx is saying that in "its reality" human essence is social, practical, laboring and revolutionary rather than an atomistic abstraction, so that Marx treats human essence, unlike Feuerbach, as a property of practice and comprehension; a property "inherent in each individual" which leads to a historical, social, practical, laboring and revolutionary human individual, and, therefore, 2) a "species character," an inner, deafening, "general character which unites the many individuals in a"

historical, social, practical, laboring and revolutionary way of freedom of self-consciousness in which humans recognize their own willed, purposive and spontaneous life activity.

Human essence is, then, in "its reality...the ensemble of social relations": human essence is the trans-historical ensemble which leads to historical, social, practical, laboring and revolutionary relations. Human essence is not, then, an ensemble of serialized atomistic abstractions "inherent in each single individual."

When examined more closely Marxian human essence contains its own partial mysticism, partial abstraction, within its own intellectual formation; to wit, generalized human nature is, as documented by Marx's statements, a trans-historical factor operating within history. In this intellectual formation human essence, is, it turns out, similar to Feuerbach's mystical religious ("religious sentiment") rendering of human essence. Marx too abstracts human essence via "human nature in general" and "species character" from the historical process, for his "human nature in general" and "species character" are placed outside the status of "social product." Human essence via "human nature in general" and "species character" are identified, developed and analyzed as

neither belonging to nor embedded in a "particular society."

We can conclude from this that Marx exempted his intellectual formation on human nature and character from the same analytical scrutiny that he so vigilantly applied to Feuerbach's intellectual formation on human nature and character. The difference between Feuerbach and Marx is that Feuerbach is intellectually consistent in that he kept his abstractions abstract: he kept his abstractions outside of history. On the other hand, Marx is intellectually inconsistent in that he did not keep his abstractions abstract: "human nature in general" and "species character" penetrate history. Furthermore, Marx disingenuously submerges his abstractions in history by having "human nature in general" and "species character" underwrite historical development, periodicity and change. Thus, if Marxian analytical scrutiny shows Feuerbach to be guilty of religious mysticism and if the same analytical scrutiny is applied to Marx, the conclusion is warranted that Marx be found guilty of mystical humanism, humanistic sentiment. Marx involves the essence of humanity into the essence of history, and has it undergo alienation: humanistic self-estrangement.

Marxian mystical humanism resembles Hegelian spiritual mysticism in that Marx has his transcendental human Geist find and realize itself in history in the epoch of communistic freedom. As with Hegel, Marx gives no

satisfactory explicit account of why the human Geist seeks out and calls upon, of necessity, history as the singular source of self-discovery and self-realization.

The inability of and failure by Marx to treat generalized human nature and "species character" as social products adhering to or embedded in a particular social formation lies at the heart of Marxian mystical humanism. By turning the very analysis Marx constructed to ferret out Feuerbach's religious mysticism upon his own work, Marx would have had to face the possibility that his intellectual formation on human nature and "species character" was a "social product" of bourgeois society; his voluntarily inspired revolution of class for itself, that draws upon human essence, would have to be looked at as a "social product" endemic to bourgeois society. The major alternatives impacting upon Marx were either 1) a theoretical inconsistency that misleads theory into mysticism--a cardinal crime within the Marxian moral-intellectual domain--or 2) a locating of his intellectual formation on human nature and character as a property of bourgeois practice and comprehension inherent in each single bourgeois individual who forms and cements the ensemble of bourgeois social relations.

Given everything that has been said about the contextual impact of bourgeois society upon the productive-

economic revolutionary efformation, and given that the same line of argumentation is being developed with reference to the voluntaristic revolutionary efformation, Marxian human nature and character is, then, a depository of bourgeois motivational ideals and action complexes. The qualities, features and characteristics of generalized human nature, in contrast to modifiable human nature, are those that give bourgeois life its trans-historical aura; i.e., Marxian "human nature in general" eternalizes bourgeois virtues and values. By equating bourgeois virtues and values with "human nature in general," the universalization of bourgeois life and the internal disposition that corresponds to this life is accomplished. In other words, "human nature in general" and "species character" are bourgeois models of life enshrouded in an intellectual formation on human essence. Such models can be understood as bourgeois mystification because Marx did not situate his intellectual formation within the bourgeois mode of life, as his method would require. Rather, he analyzed and articulated bourgeois life and its motivational make up, and then proceeded to project it backwards, forward, above and below human history. Stated in Marxian terms, his "...reflections on the forms of social life,...his scientific analysis of those forms, take a course directly opposite to that of their

actual historical development. He begins, post festum, with the results of the process of development ready to hand before him....[he] seeks to decipher, not their historical character, for in his eyes they are immutable, but their meaning."¹³³

After having shown that the efformation of class struggle leans heavily on a voluntaristic human nature, the exploration of class revolutionary politics is needed. This section will attempt to argue 1) that political class struggle can radically alter the superstructure, 2) that radical transformation of the superstructure can revolutionize the base structure and, therefore, 3) that political class struggle circumscribes economic relations, i.e., political relations enclose economic relations. The efformation of voluntaristic political class struggle will be shown to be an inversion of the relationships, logic and order of the productive-economic efformation, if our argumentation reaches its mark.

Notwithstanding the tentative and spotted outline of the efformation of voluntaristic class struggle given so far, our presentation has suggested if not partially

exhibited the complete and full Marxian base-superstructure revolutionary complex as an inconsistent and incompatible conjuncture of terms, categories, concepts and theorizing. What we have in one formation is a structural discordance brought on by a conflict between forces and relations of production that, in turn, generates superstructural class struggle, and in the other formation is voluntaristic class struggle that lays claim to the superstructure and from there proceeds to shatter the base. This base-superstructure revolutionary complex with its inconsistent and incompatible intellectual efformations offer us a cognitive map of bourgeois society and its inconsistent and incompatible formations. The Marxian base-superstructure revolutionary complex is an intellectual formation which charts the bourgeois social formation and its productive-economic and voluntaristic contradiction. The qualities, characteristics and features which animate the bourgeois world are the very same qualities, characteristics and features that animate the Marxian world of revolution: a productive-economic efformation in opposition to a voluntaristic efformation. To cite the Marxian revolutionary complex is to site bourgeois society.

Illuminated in this fashion the Marxian revolutionary complex can be seen as a juxtaposition of revolutionary assemblages and movements. One assemblage and movement

within capitalist development, which is charted by Marx, took place within the productive-economic base and advanced upwards to superstructural class relations; another assemblage and movement within capitalist development, which is also charted by Marx, took place at the superstructure where class for itself was gathered voluntarily and advanced downward to demolish the existing productive-economic base. In one capitalist revolutionary assemblage and movement base parameters structurally erupt and radicalize superstructural class formation and relations; this assemblage and movement is mapped in the "Preface." In another assemblage and movement a class in itself formed out of productive-economic conditions, structurally set, erupts voluntarily upon the superstructure and within antagonistic class relations; with its voluntary eruption it becomes a class for itself in political superstructural struggle, and with its triumph class for itself will proceed to use the political superstructure to shatter the existing productive-economic base. This assemblage and movement is in its nascent and inchoate form in the (in)famous lines of the Manifesto employed to introduce this section.

It is this latter capitalist assemblage and movement that awaits an exhaustive and comprehensive exposition.

In advance of our exposition, it should be made clear that these comments ought not to be taken to mean, suggest or adumbrate that there are only two distinct and different revolutionary efformations to be found in Marxian literature, and, therefore, only two revolutionary assemblages and movements in bourgeois society--irrespective of their consistency or incompatibility, or lack thereof; in addition, these comments ought not to be taken to mean, suggest or adumbrate that there are only two distinct and different base-superstructure intellectual formations to be found in Marxian literature --irrespective of their consistency or compability, or lack thereof.

Rather these comments should be taken to mean, suggest and adumbrate that the revolutionary efformations that house the base-superstructure formations are a terminological, categorical, conceptual, theoretical and structural map of the context of capitalist revolutions. One capitalist revolutionary assemblage and movement is bottom heavy; thus Marx has his map of this assemblage and movement indicate the sinking of capitalism in the tide of communism freedom. Another capitalist revolutionary assemblage and movement is top heavy; thus Marx has his map of this assemblage and movement indicate the toppling

of capitalism under the push of the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

We have observed how the productive-economic efformation establishes the base structure as the real "anatomy," "form," "essence" and "hidden basis of the entire social structure." The "anatomy" is the determining structure while the superstructure is the "reflex." To illustrate this, Marx discusses superstructural ideological formation as follows: "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 (emphasis added).¹³⁴

Marx's use of "determines" with reference to the base confirms it as the limit-setting, boundary setting, content generating or content informing structure. How then, it may be asked, is it possible to frame an argument in which reflexive superstructural class struggle can revolutionize the determining base? Does not such an argument imply that the superstructure would operate as the "anatomy," "form," "essence" and "hidden basis"--the superstructure would operate as commodities in that they are the anatomy, form, essence and hidden basis, the visible concealment, of capitalism--of the base superstructure. To continue this line of interrogation, does this

imply further that the superstructure would set base limits and boundaries as well as generate or inform base content? To go right to the heart of the matter, how can class revolutionary voluntarism overcome the determinations of production-economy and the structural requirements of the base?

This series of questions throws new light upon the revolutionary political class struggle. Illuminated in the productive-economic efformation, revolutionary political class struggle is reflexive, a phenomenal reaction to a basic upheaval. Illuminated in the voluntaristic efformation, revolutionary class struggle appears as somewhat sui generis, an independent and unique phenomenon acting upon the basic structure that becomes reflexive, a phenomenal reaction to a super-structural penetration.

This new light spreads itself across and illuminates the most fundamental topic in the entirety of the voluntaristic efformation; viz., why is "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of" political superstructural "class struggle"? The "why" of social history and the "why" of voluntarism dovetail. This dovetailing creates the social historical possibility that revolutionary political class for itself struggle is the key that unlocks the base-superstructure housed

in the voluntaristic efformation. It is possible that revolutionary class for itself politics can open up the "legal and political superstructure...forms of social consciousness" and "ideological forms" as well as open up productive relations and forces. The dovetailing of class voluntarism and social history makes real the possibility that revolutionary class for itself political struggle is the perfect key to unlock the "legal and political superstructure"--"in short, the...specific form of the state,"¹³⁵ and with that unlock the base structure. We know that this possibility is real because the proletarian class for itself under capitalism can actually become or take the place of the state: "a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."¹³⁶

Attending "a political transition period" away from the state and towards the erection of a proletarian government, the Paris Commune serves well as an example of this kind of transitional period, is a perception of class voluntarism as capable of overcoming and overturning the state. It follows from this that there is a definite need to focus in on the state to fathom if 1) it cements the entire superstructure, 2) it is the

place, or perhaps the fulcrum, from where the entire superstructure can be overturned and 3) its destruction or replacement by the oppressed class for itself can result in the revolutionizing of the base structure.

Standing above the economic base is "a legal and political superstructure"/"the juridical and political superstructure"; standing above the economic base is the government/bureaucracy, the army, the courts, and the police ";¹³⁷ stated more definitely, standing above the base is

The centralised state power, with its ubiquitous organs of standing army, police, bureaucracy, clergy, and judicature--organs wrought after the plan of a systematic and hierarchic division of labour--originates from the days of absolute monarchy ¹³⁸

The state is the "bureaucratic-military machine";¹³⁹ the "State machinery"¹⁴⁰ is part of the "whole super-incumbent strata";¹⁴¹ it stands above the economic base of private property relations as a mode of estrangement in human existence.

Religion, family, state, law, morality, science, art, etc., are only particular modes of production, and fall under its general law. The positive transcendence of private property, as the appropriation of human life, is therefore the positive transcendence of all estrangement--that is to say,

the return of man from religion,
family, state, etc. to his human,
i.e., social existence.¹⁴²

We learn two essential things from this, both of which lead to a critical distinction and difference between the base and superstructure. First, we learn that positive transcendence of the private property base is also the positive transcendence of the superstructure; the contention within the voluntaristic efformation is that this "transcendence" begins and progresses from the superstructure and moves downward to the base. Second, we learn that in addition to the state there are other modes of superstructural estrangement. In general, Marx arranges these estrangements under two broad superstructural classifications: "definite forms of social consciousness" and "legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic--in short, ideological forms."¹⁴³ Estranged superstructural forms, as "modes of the existence and being of man--...have no validity in isolation, but dissolve and engender one another, etc."¹⁴⁴ Consequently, superstructural forms/modes are inter-related and interconnected in Marxian thought. In our discussion this unification of these modes of human existence will be designated by the sign "superstructure"; which is to say, "superstructure" will designate the state, forms of social consciousness and ideology.

The most important difference and distinction between the state superstructure and the economic base structure, given the intent and purpose of this section, is one that is often ignored or eschewed, for the reason that inconsistent and incompatible intellectual formations within Marxian literature are generally married in a dialectical wedding, or this difference and distinction is made so abstruse that its impact on revolution is blunted. Perhaps, this difference and distinction has remained recondite because the revolutionary efformations of production-economy and voluntarism have not received critical review in a single writing. What comprehensively differentiates and distinguishes the economic base from the superstructure is individual will;¹⁴⁵ whereas the economic base structure operates independently of individual will, the superstructure maintains the illusion that individual free and private will is its basis, i.e., it is free and entirely independent of economic structures and relations.¹⁴⁶

The material life of individuals, which by no means depends merely on their "will," their mode of production and form of intercourse, which mutually determine each other-- this is the real basis of the state and remains so at all the

stages at which the division
of labour and private property
are still necessary, quite
independently of the will of
individuals.¹⁴⁷

Two questions can be drawn from this. 1) If the superstructure as the superincumbent segment of the social structure operates with individual free will only to the degree that there is phantasmagoria, then does not the voluntaristic emergence of class for itself in superstructural political struggle belong also to the world of the chimerical? 2) The productive mode, the articulate combination of productive forces and relations, and "form of intercourse," e.g., class relations, "mutually determine each other"; then does the base (productive forces, "the division of labor and private property") determine the superstructural class "form of intercourse" and the superstructural class "form of intercourse," that encompasses the state, determines the base?

The first question is blatantly false, and the second is to be answered forthright; in showing the first question to be false the groundwork will be laid from which we can draw our second answer.

The voluntarism of class for itself in superstructural political struggle does not operate independently of free, self-conscious, purposive, spontaneous and willed collective struggle; class for itself is willed collective

action in superstructural political struggle. Marx is asserting that economic relations carry on independently of individual will, and that "material life," not individual will, "is the real basis of the state." He nowhere asserts that economic relations are independent of collective, i.e., class, struggle; moreover, nowhere does Marx make individual free will an illusion or reject its existence, and he states clearly that the superstructural state is the "universal expression" of the will of individuals and the "form" their power assumes; the content of this "universal expression" is determined by the relations of the ruling class.

These actual relations are in no way created by the state power; on the contrary they are the power creating it. The individuals who rule in these conditions--leaving aside the fact that their power must assume the form of the state--have to give their will, which is determined by these definite conditions ["mode of production and form of intercourse"], a universal expression as the will of the state, as law, an expression whose content is always determined¹⁴⁸ by the relations of this class....

This leaves us with individual will as a reality having superstructural impact, but not a reality that penetrates the reality of the economic base. We have shown already, in a more direct expression, that for Marx individual will

and struggle is determined, in the final analysis, by "material life," i.e., "individuals are...the personifications of economic categories, embodiments of particular class-relations and class-interests," so that, for example, Aristotle's striving to solve the riddle of commodities would fall short due to the constraints of his economic context, no matter how much he, as with all individuals in Marx's eyes, "may subjectively raise himself above them."

We can assert forcefully, then, that individual phenomena, be it will or deed, is given little if any determination in material human relations within Marxian studies. One of Marx's most powerful images reminds us that individuals and their wills and actions remain as potatoes in a "sack of potatoes"; solely with the transformation of individuals into class participants can they obtain determination in "the process of natural history" and social relations. Class formation makes possible political representation, and political representation brings the ruled class to the "dangerous turn" of engaging the state: the trigger of revolutionary change. Marx's work is peppered with examples of the limits of individual endeavor, limits imposed or dissipated by means of the material conditions of life. In Capital, Vol. 1, the division of labor and its crippling and

constrictive effects on the body and mind of workers is stressed (pp. 359-368); the factory system restrains and converts "the workman into a living appendage of the machine" (p. 484); unemployment in modern industry defines a habitat for the "recruits of crime" (p. 485); "natural obstacles" confine some populations to the practice of cannibalism (pp. 511-512) and soil quality, "natural products" and "changes in the natural surroundings, spur man on to the multiplication of his wants, his capabilities [this is a Marxian instance of historically modified human nature], his means and mode of labour." (pp. 513-514)

Class will, as with human volition, rises and falls with the "economic conditions of existence." To see class will as not ground in economic conditions is to earn Marx's scorn: "if Herr Heinzen believes that whole classes which are based on economic conditions independent of their own will and are forced into the virulent contradiction by these conditions, can by means of the quality of 'humanity,' ... shed their relationships, how easy must it be for one particular prince to rise by the power of 'humanity' above his 'princely condition'.... Why then does he resent it when Engels discerns a 'good Emperor Joseph' behind his revolutionary phases?"¹⁴⁹

The "character and direction" of class will are "determined" by the economic conditions of class existence, so we find that Marx says of the ruling bourgeois class

...the will of your class..., a will, whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical [sic] conditions of existence of your class. 150

We also find, given the unity of the capitalist content and the unity of the base-superstructure in the voluntaristic efformation, that the same relationship between class will and economic conditions holds true for the classes

which are ruled, whose will plays just as small a part in determining the existence of law and the state. For example, so long as the productive forces are still insufficiently developed to make competition superfluous, and therefore would give rise to competition over and over again, for so long the classes which are ruled would be wanting the impossible if they had the "will" to abolish competition and with it the state and the law....

...the state does not exist owing to the dominant will, but the state, which arises from the material mode of life of individuals, has also the form of a dominant will. If the latter loses its domination, it means that not only the will has changed but also the material existence and life of the individuals, and only for that reason has their will changed. 151

Individual will and action/struggle and class will are saddled to the mount of material and economic circumstance. These individual and group phenomena cannot acquire the movement of an independent and autonomous superstructural reality; they cannot accomplish a superstructural revolution on their own accord, they are the revolutionary accompaniments of an already disjointed base. In short, the base directs and determines these individual phenomena as well as directs and determines class will.

With the completion of the answer to the first question, we have prepared the way for the answer to the second question. The case of class political action/struggle, on the other hand, develops into a new, uniquely formed synthesis, a synthesis that acquires the movement of an independent and autonomous superstructural reality. Put simply, class political action/struggle is a movement that can realize a superstructural revolution on its own accord. Expressed in Marxian lexicon, class in itself is determined and conditioned by the economic "anatomy," the economic base, and class for itself is a composition of a non-modifiable individual characteristic--"human nature in general"--that comprehends will, self-consciousness, spontaneity, freedom and action.

This composition of an inherent individual structure and an economically derived aggregate is, therefore, one of a concurrence of a willed, self-conscious, spontaneous and free active class-for-superstructural-revolution: class-for-itself against the superstructure. This synthesized convergence of individualized human nature and an economic aggregate is a unity that takes place, by Marxian definition, at the super-strata. Thus, it is a higher order concurrence of the historically general revolutionary dynamic of individuals and the historically specific economic conditions of groups that unfold in neither individual nor economic struggles. More specifically, class-for-itself is a class for superstructural political revolution; class-for-itself is the highest order of concurrence since it fuses individual endowment and economic processing at the point of "official society," at the point that releases the entire superstructure.

Consequently, Marx addresses the proletariat in the Manifesto--his most enthusiastic, optimistic and apocalyptic affirmation of the proletariat--as a class-for-itself perched at the precipice of the highest order of concurrence.

The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole super-incumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.¹⁵²

Class-for-itself, an emergent combination resulting from the historically general and the economically specific, carries itself upon the superstructure as the dialectical resolution of "official society"; class-for-itself is the Marxian group that catapults the superstructure "into the air" by means of revolutionary struggle at the state. It is capable of such profound and far-reaching consequences for reasons that the state superstructure is 1) the "form" through which the ruling class asserts its interests, 2) the epitome of a civil society within a historical epoch, 3) the mediator of superstructural institutional formation and, thereby, 4) able to infuse superstructural institutions with a political contour.

Since the state is the form in which the individuals of a ruling class assert their common interests, and in which the whole civil society of an epoch is epitomised, it follows that the State mediates in the formation of all common institutions and that the institutions receive a political form.¹⁵³

Class-for-itself is capable of such profound and far-reaching consequences because revolutionary struggle is a

"political movement" that pits the ruled class-for-itself against the ruling classes-for-themselves: "every movement in which the working class as a class confronts the ruling classes and tries to constrain them by pressure from without is a political movement."¹⁵⁴ In other words, the state is the site of revolutionary, i.e., "real struggles,"¹⁵⁵ between classes-for-themselves.

Real struggles encompass a "political movement" in which the ruled class-for-itself attempts to conquer political power¹⁵⁶; real struggles transport class-in-itself beyond the less profound, less consequential and greater safety associated with a "purely economic movement"¹⁵⁷; real struggles transport class beyond the "dangerous turn" that transforms class antagonism into class "struggle against state power": against the state form of "socially coercive" power.

...a political movement, that is to say, a class movement, with the object of enforcing its interests in a general form, in a form possessing general, socially coercive force.¹⁵⁸

The "dangerous turn" transforms class antagonism into a struggle between ruled and ruling classes-for-themselves. Accordingly, the

...political state is a register of the practical struggles of mankind. Thus, the political

state expresses, within the limits of its form sub specie rei publicae [As a particular kind of state], all social struggles, needs and truths.¹⁵⁹

Class-for-itself is capable of such profound, far-reaching and "dangerous" consequences because its objective brings into play such profound, far-reaching and "dangerous" consequences. As a conduit, summary and mediator, the state superstructure serves the ruling class-for-itself in the organization and management of the whole super-structure, so it is easy to understand why the conquest of political power by the proletarian class-for-itself is equated with the catapulting of "civil society--that is to say,..." official society"¹⁶⁰--into the air. Marx carries to its conclusion the logic of the role the state superstructure in revolution. He has political emancipation culminating in the "dissolution" of an old social form, feudalism.

Political emancipation is at the same time the dissolution of the old society on which the state alienated from the people, the sovereign power, is based. Political revolution is a revolution of civil society. What was the character of the old society? It can be described in one word--feudalism.¹⁶¹

An objection may be raised; namely, these citations apply to two different concrete societies and productive modes, yet our argument attempts to interconnect proletarian political revolution with political revolution under feudalism. It is true that these references speak to two different assemblages and modes, but they identify the common inner reasoning and sequential order of social structural change that can be generalized across different societies' modes. This common inner reasoning and sequential order of change fits "Revolution in general," including the transition from feudalism to capitalism and the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Every revolution dissolves the old society and to that extent it is social. Every revolution overthrows the old power and to that extent it is political....

...whereas a social revolution with a political soul is a paraphrase or nonsense, a political revolution with a social soul has a rational meaning.

Revolution in general--the overthrow of the existing power and dissolution of the old relationships--is a political act. But socialism cannot be realized without revolution. It needs this political act insofar as it needs destruction and dissolution.¹⁶²

Political revolution has "rational meaning" for Marx by way of its being a struggle against the state which can

materialize the destruction of existing political power and the dissolution of "the old society." Put otherwise, legal-political superstructural change, with its "social soul," affects the whole social structure. Because political superstructural change provokes the whole social structure, political emancipation from the state can, therefore, emancipate the base from the internment of private property relations, and this two-step process of emancipation in which state transformation evokes base transformation is a historical/revolutionary change.

Do not say that social movement excludes political movement. There is never a political movement which is not at the same time social.

It is only in an order of things in which there are no more classes and class antagonism that social evolutions will cease to be political revolutions. Till then,...the last word of social science will always be:

"le combat ou la mort; la lutte sanguinaire ou le neant. C'est ainsi que la question est invinciblement posee."

George Sand⁵³

⁵³"Combat or death, bloody struggle or extinction. Thus the question is inexorably put."163

Revolution destroys and dissolves the constituted social structure, and therewith historical change and social evolution unfold. Said otherwise, historical change and social evolution has class struggle as its agency.

...the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is a struggle of class against class, a struggle which carried to its highest expression is a total revolution.¹⁶⁴

The highest expression of class struggle, ruling class-for-itself against the ruled class-for-itself, is located at the state superstructural level: "the struggle of class against class is a political struggle." Where classes-for-themselves struggle is carried to the state superstructure there is the "general reshuffling of society."¹⁶⁵

Although the economic base operates outside the direct control of individual will and action and class will; it does not operate, however, outside the control of the legal-political superstructure, and the legal-political superstructure operates inside the controls of class relations.

Political power, properly so-called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another.¹⁶⁶

Put in other words, the state is the organized power of and for class tyranny, and therefore it is "an abstract whole, which exists only through separation from real life." It is the "abstract whole" against which those classes excluded from political power are to organize so they can end their exclusion from real power and social life.

The political soul of revolution,
...consists in the tendency of
classes having no political
influence to abolish their
isolation from statehood and rule.
Its point of view is that of the
state, of an abstract whole,
which exists only through separation
from real life, and which is
inconceivable without the
organized contradiction between
the universal idea of man and
the individual existence of
man.¹⁶⁷

Revolutionary struggle against the state is "a political act" against that which is indispensable to the protection and reproduction of ruling class economic relations.

Revolutionary struggle emanates from a class-for-itself; a material group, in contradistinction to an idealized group (such as humanists) or spiritualized groups (such as confessional affiliations), having a shared and common form and content united in a conscious and committed "political movement"--no longer united in a "purely economic movement"--directed at the state

"possessing general, socially coercive force" necessary to hold together, stabilize and maintain the economy of private property/class oppression. This specification of class-for-itself applies equally well to the ruling class-for-itself; however, in this case, the "political movement" is directed from the state. This differentiating distinction is the culmination of all the previous materials.

The proletariat in the Manifesto as well as Marx's letter to Bolte (November 23, 1871) give his most concise formulation of class-for-itself. In the Manifesto Marx says,

The proletarian movement is the self-conscious,* independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority (p. 47).

* The word "self-conscious," is not in the German original.

The proletariat as the ruled class-for-itself is a collectivity of a "self-conscious," (i.e., aware of its existence as born in struggle), "independent" (i.e., free of the constraints of class in itself and co-opted groups) "movement" (i.e., a "political movement") "of the immense majority," (i.e., the material majority) "in the interest of" all members of this majority. In the productive-economic efformation "a political movement" grows out of "separate economic

movements of the workers"; in the voluntaristic efformation even though "the working class is not yet far enough advanced in its organisation to undertake a decisive campaign against the collective power, i.e., the political power, of the ruling classes, it must at any rate be trained for this by continual agitation against this power and by a hostile attitude toward the policies of the ruling classes" (emphasis added).¹⁶⁸ In the productive-economic efformation political organization "arises from...economic struggles";¹⁶⁹ in the voluntaristic efformation Marx introduces the novel position that training in the form of "agitation against...power" and a "hostile attitude toward the policies of the ruling classes," is the means for developing the "organisation to undertake a decisive" struggle against the state.

Contained in this correspondence to Bolte is the configuration and movement of political class struggle in which class-for-itself voluntarily erupts out of economically conditioned class in itself. Class-for-itself as an organizational framework--the Marxian collective expression of voluntaristic struggle--must at any rate undergo training; that is, a training of its voluntarism at the state superstructure. The state is the pedagogical locus for agitational and attitudinal training of class-

for-itself. Class-for-itself, as a voluntaristic emergent "must" be prepared organizationally through "agitation" and "attitude" for "complete political liberty" at the training ground of the state. Marx has class-for-itself with its voluntaristic content of free, spontaneous, self-conscious and willed struggle needing an appropriate organizational form that is achieved through agitational and attitudinal training at the site of one of its pre-conditions of existence, the political superstructure.

If there is any doubt as to why Marx grants the state its status in the organizational pedagogy of class-for-itself, we need only to comprehend that as a representation of the "public" and the "general interest," the state claims to serve the "rights of man" and "civil society." In actuality, Marx contends that the state is the "basis" of "the general principle of social maladies."

The mightier the state, and the more political therefore a country is, the less is it inclined to grasp the general principle of social maladies and to seek their basis in the principle of the state, hence in the present structure of society, the active, conscious and official expression of which is the state.¹⁷⁰

Class-for-itself is the voluntaristic content given organizational form through agitational and attitudinal training at the level of the organization of society, at the level of "official expression" of the "maladies" of class society. The ruled class-for-itself is a content and an organizational form designated and prepared, within the voluntaristic efformation, to overcome the content and organizational form of the state superstructure. Similarly, the ruling class-for-itself is designated and prepared, within the voluntaristic efformation, to perpetuate the content and organizational form of the state superstructure.

In this conjuncture of affairs, class-for-itself involves necessarily another class-for-itself in that the existence of class-for-itself presupposes the existence of 1) another class with which to engage in struggle and 2) the legal-political superstructure as a "register of the practical struggles of mankind" and the expression of "all social struggles, needs and truths." This establishes the ruled class-for-itself as the voluntaristic group, by way of "human nature in general," with the appropriate training in "agitation against... power and...a hostile attitude toward the policies of the ruling classes" to wage a "decisive campaign" against the political power of the state. It can

in and of itself, singularly, can usurp effectively the state superstructure because it alone is a "self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority" lodged in an organizational form built around agitation and a hostile attitude toward the state. Furthermore, the ruling class-for-itself can singly and effectively protect the state superstructure because it can enforce "its interests in a general form, in a form possessing general, socially coercive force."

The constituent factors and arrangement of class-for-itself makes it a collectivity of a common, shared and majority struggle born of economic conditioning but baptized in the womb of its voluntaristic givens. Class-for-itself skirts the weaknesses and problems of lack of sustained cohesion generally associated with idealistic or spiritual groups--weaknesses and problems which are the consequence of lack of the necessary training at the academy of the state.

Attending the political transition corresponding to the change from capitalism to communism is the vanishing of class-for-itself from history. Class-for-itself passes out of history with the "dissolution"/"abolition" of the state, but before this "transcendence" occurs the state is rendered as "nothing but the

"revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

However, the proletarian class-for-itself, unlike "All the preceding classes"¹⁷¹-for-themselves is a "movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority" which abolishes the state by abolishing the "contradiction between public and private life,...the contradiction between general interest and private interest."

The contradiction between the purpose and goodwill of the administration, on the one hand, and its means and possibilities, on the other, cannot be abolished by the state without the later abolishing itself, for it is based on this contradiction. The state is based on the contradiction between public and private life, on the contradiction between general interests and private interests.¹⁷²

The state is, then, nothing but the site of revolutionary politics that abolishes itself, i.e., the site of revolutionary politics that abolishes the legal-political superstructure, and with this abolition the protective shield over the "anatomy" has been removed. The removal of the superstructural shield means that the "anatomy" is exposed and can be transformed from private property relations to communist property relations by means of the proletarians becoming "masters of the productive forces of society." This

constitutes a class-for-itself transformation of a productive mode by removing its state superstructural defense layer. Revolution is class-for-itself struggle aimed at dissolving the state defense.

Class-for-itself strips away the state strata of estrangement, so that it can alter the economic tier and therewith seize control of the production tier. Stated more comprehensively, class-for-itself is the resolute collective revolutionary agency to abolish the state, the "fraud," that shields economic exploitation; in turn economic exploitation would be abolished by communistic control and ownership of the production tier that would be emplaced by class-for-itself.

The state is a fraudulent representation because it feigns expression of the "public" and "general interest" while it is compelled to function as a mechanism for separating and dividing civil society into rulers and ruled. It operates as a mechanism for private and particular interests. This partition of society is materialized, in large part, by the judicial institutions and the edifice of law that pretend to be devoid of class roots and interests. Consequently, the bourgeois legal superstructure is not a setting for pursuing "the welfare of the world and universal human

aims";¹⁷³ rather, this system of "jurisprudence is but the will of" the bourgeois "class made into a law for all."¹⁷⁴ In this way, the state and legal superstructure operate hand in glove with each other to erect a social hierarchy of domination and subordination.

The elaboration of the voluntaristic efformation features the state as "the active, conscious and official expression" of ruling class power, the state as the organizing principle of the antagonism inherent in the "present structure of society." Marxian argumentation on the state as "precisely the official expression of antagonism in civil society"¹⁷⁵ includes, as we have already suggested, detailed formulations concerning the capitalist state as the active, conscious and official expression of the bourgeoisie's "own exclusive power and the political recognition of its own special interest."¹⁷⁶

The executive of the modern
State is but a committee for
managing the common affairs of
the whole bourgeoisie.¹⁷⁷

Marx reiterates his description of the bourgeois state where he says, "In countries where the bourgeoisie has already conquered political power and political rule is none other than the rule, not of the individual bourgeois

over his workers, but of the bourgeois class over the whole of society."¹⁷⁸ All in all, in those contexts that engulf modern social relations

...all struggles within the State, the struggle between democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy, the struggle for the franchise, etc., etc. are merely the illusory forms in which the real struggles of the different classes are fought out among one another.¹⁷⁹

Now let us provide the detail and specifics to confirm our thesis. To this juncture we have imparted that class-for-itself strips away "the old civil society" and its "political power properly so-called" and emplaces social relations that "exclude classes and their antagonism."¹⁸⁰ Political class struggle singularly can end class rule and the private property economic base. Class-for-itself in struggle against another class-for-itself composes the "history of all hitherto existing society" because the struggle over the state generates "social evolution."

Standing before us is a dialectical process of class-for-itself (thesis) against class-for-itself (antithesis) mediated by the protective mechanism of the state with history as the emergent resultant (synthesis). This dialectical process dictates that irrespective of the form the state takes it is armoring to shield the

ownership patterns established by the ruling class-for-itself. Therefore it is an error on the part of the ruled class-for-itself to perceive the cause of "all evils" and the "remedy in violence and in the overthrow of a particular form of state."¹⁸¹ The evil is in the state itself

The state--contrary to what the Prussian demands of his King--will never see in "the state and the system of society" the source of social maladies. Where political parties exist, each party sees the root of every evil in the fact that instead of itself an opposing party stands at the helm of the state. Even radical and revolutionary politicians seek the root of the evil not in the essential nature of the state, but in a definite state form, which they wish to replace by a different state form.¹⁸²

The ruling class(es) guard and preserve their state and their state guards and preserves the property relations of the ruling class(es): "The present bourgeois property relations are 'maintained' by the state power which the bourgeoisie has organised for the protection of its property relations."¹⁸³ To reproduce (bourgeois) ruling class property relations the state has to stay, of necessity, in the grasp of the existing (bourgeois) ruling class. "The proletariat must therefore

overthrow the political power where it is already in the hands of the bourgeoisie. It must itself become a power, in the first place a revolutionary power."¹⁸⁴

The degree to which the state becomes vulnerable to the ruled class(es) is the degree to which the ruling class(es) property relations become vulnerable to the ruled class(es). This relationship between the vulnerability of the state and the vulnerability of the economic base is found, inter alia, in the analysis of revolutionary political class struggle contained in The Manifesto, The 18th Brumaire, The Civil War in France and Class Struggles in France. These works materialize this relationship in its most articulate and explicit form. On the other hand, the degree to which the ruling class(es) has not "conquered political power" is the degree to which its property is vulnerable to harassment and "disruptive interference."

We are therefore faced with two kinds of power, on the one hand the power of property, in other words, of the property-owners, on the other hand political power, the power of the state. "Power also controls property" means: property does not control the political power but rather it is harassed by it, for example by arbitrary taxes, by confiscations, by privileges, by the disruptive interference of the bureaucracy in industry and trade and the like.

In other words the bourgeoisie has not yet taken political shape as a class. The power of the state is not yet its own power.¹⁸⁵

By abolishing, dissolving, transcending, siezing, transforming and/or smashing the state,¹⁸⁶ the ruled class(es) could gain effective control over the means of production because the legal-political superstructure shield has been so acted upon that it cannot shelter the means of production, and consequently a full and complete revolutionary alteration can be accomplished. This circumstance of radical modification of the ruling class(es) property relations relies heavily upon the ruled class-for-itself being "the immense majority" having a "universal interest", to wit, with the majority class having the interest of the largest segment of society; any revolution by a minority will be too particularistic to act efficaciously upon the superstructure and the base. To maintain control over the state or to abolish, transcend, smash the state, large scale groups with concerns that are perceived as generalized is requisite in the voluntaristic efformation.

The logic and order of this efformation stands opposed to the disputation that the base structure can and should be transformed by a direct attack upon it launched by the working class: an attack to take over

production directly. Marx argued vehemently against the thesis and practice of circuiting with reference to the legal-political superstructure--the legal-political superstructure is not to be skirted and the economic structure confronted head-on.

The stratagem of a direct attack upon the productive means is associated with anarchists and has been given its most celebrated exposition by Bakunin.

Bakunin confronted the voluntaristic efformation with a countermovement that endorsed 1) a legal decree that would declare the existing state superstructure as null and void and 2) a forceful capture and control of productive means. Marx disavowed outright this revolutionary countermovement. In a correspondence concerning the Paris Commune--the situation discussed in Marx's work that most dramatically and completely expresses the factors and details of the superstructural revolution--Bakunin (and anarchism) is harshly ridiculed as disrupting "revolutionary Government....--La Commune."

As to Lyons....At first everything went well. Under the pressure of the "International" section the Republic was proclaimed before Paris had taken that step. A revolutionary Government was at once established--La Commune--composed partly of workmen belonging to the "International," partly of Radical middle-class Republicans. The octrois were at

once abolished,...measures were taken to arm the whole people.... The action of Lyons was at once felt at Marseilles and Toulouse.... But the asses, Bakunin and Cluseret, arrived at Lyons and spoiled everything. Belonging both to the "International," they had, unfortunately, influence enough to mislead our friends. The Hotel de Ville was seized--for a short time--and most foolish decrees on the abolition de l'etat [abolition of the state] and similar nonsense were issued....These two men left Lyons after their failure.¹⁸⁷

For Marx class political struggle at the state superstructure is the culmination of a process of economic conditioning and historical development; it is a struggle that has to take place in order to 1) bring the ruled class-for-itself into existence, 2) bring the classes-for-themselves to the "dangerous turn" of decisive class struggle, 3) take or keep hold of the general socially coercive form for implementing the interests of class-for-itself, i.e., to have "...the state, the law, the constitution... , with a material permeation of "the content of the remaining, non-political spheres"¹⁸⁸ and 4) develop within class-for-itself the training and steadfastness to endure as a collective entity having the shared experience of overcoming the state and building a stateless society.

Whereas Bakunin prescribes the overcoming of the state because it is an authoritarian construction, and he prescribes that this overcoming be achieved by declaration, force and violence, Marx prescribes the overcoming of the state because it lacks a universal content in that it is a screen for particular and private economic interests in civil society; it manufactures the illusion of community and public and general interests, and he prescribes that this overcoming be achieved by class political struggle. In a few words, Bakunin attacks the superstructure as the coalescence of authoritarianism and Marx attacks the superstructure as the coalescence of alienation, their premises differ and, so, their conclusions differ.

The focal point of contention between Marx and Bakunin is Bakunin's stratagem of bypassing the state superstructure in favor of an assault upon production property. For Marx this stratagem is tantamount to a withdrawal from political struggle, a withdrawal from revolution in general: "a political act"; consequently, Marx perceives Bakunin's stratagem as tantamount to a small select group engaged in a non-political act and divorced from the "immense majority" and "the interest of immense majority." In the eyes of Marx what Bakunin was proposing took the appearance of some type of elite

movement having private and particularistic concerns and engaged in conspiratorial coups, for Bakunin's program stood in direct opposition to Marx's program for "class making a revolution."

For each new class which puts itself in the place of one ruling before it, is compelled, merely in order to carry through its aim, to represent its interest as the common interest of all the members of society,...it has to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones. The class making a revolution appears from the very start, if only because it is opposed to a class, not as a class but as the representative of the whole of society; it appears as the whole mass of society confronting the one ruling class.¹⁸⁹

In short, Marx saw Bakunin's rationale and practice as devoid of the universal form and content necessary to take the state through its own dissolution and onto a democratic society where there is "the self-determination of the people."¹⁹⁰

By rejecting the revolutionary schematic Marx has forged in and for the bourgeois context, Bakunin rejects the locating of class "struggles within the State," and thereby rejects the locating of class, as the "general representative" of society itself, within the "emancipatory position" of politically utilizing

"all spheres of society in the interest of its own sphere...."

No class of civil society can play this role [the general emancipation of society] without arousing a moment of enthusiasm in itself and in the masses, a moment in which it fraternises and merges with society in general, becomes confused with it and is perceived and acknowledged as its general representative; a moment in which its demands and rights are truly the rights and demands of society itself. ...Only in the name of the general rights of society can a particular class lay claim to general domination. ...the storming of this emancipatory position, and hence for the political exploitation of all spheres of society in the interest of its own sphere, ...¹⁹¹

Marx discerns Bakunin's anarchism as failing to address the critical issue of generalizing the "private interest" that dominates the state structure; it does not resolve the "conflict between the general interest and private interest, the schism between the political state and civil society,"¹⁹² and it cannot mend this schism since it is not a "striving of civil society," the locus of the actual "general interest," to puncture the "private interest" and "fictitious civil society of the legislative power," and insert itself in political being and power. Bakunin's approach fails to repair the schism between "the political state and civil society"

because it fails to turn the "private interest" impressed in the "fictitious civil society of the legislative power" into the "general interest" of the actual civil society.

...the civil society should penetrate the legislative power in the mass, if possible in its entirety, that actual civil society wishes to substitute itself for the fictitious civil society of the legislative power, this is merely the striving of civil society to give itself political being or to make political being its actual being. The striving of civil society to turn itself into political society, or to turn political society into actual society, appears as the striving for as general as possible a participation in the legislative power.¹⁹³

In other words, Bakunin's revolutionary anarchism is not civil society "in the mass....striving for as general as possible a participation in the legislative power." Bakunin married himself to particularism and clandestineness; his bride is a legislative act which pursues the abolition of the state. According to Marx this marriage is a failure, for a legislative act of this sort merely transfers political power to a new political superstructural apparatus; such an act merely continues human estrangement under a new complex

of political institutions. Neither the state nor private property can be abolished through political annulment.

Nevertheless the political annulment of private property not only fails to abolish private property but even presupposes it....the state... feels itself to be a political state and asserts its universality only in opposition to these elements of its being {e.g., private property, social rank, occupation, etc.}.194

With neglect or avoidance of class struggle within the state superstructure no classes-for-themselves come into being, and by not having classes-for-themselves struggles there is no social history: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."

Bakunin's political posture impinged upon the stance Marx had assumed for almost four years; viz., that open and broad-based political "class struggle is the immediate driving power of history, and in particular that the class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat is the great lever of modern social revolution." Not having classes-for-themselves means not having any agency for historical development as well as not having any agency for religious, philosophical

and ideational development.

...revolution is the driving force
of history, also of religion,
of philosophy and all other types
of theory¹⁹⁵

Classes-for-themselves are the root of human emancipation in pre-communist social settings, for they presuppose a confrontation at the state superstructure, the "great lever" of revolution.

Political emancipation....is not the final form of human emancipation in general, but it is the final form of human emancipation within the hitherto existing world order. It goes without saying that we are speaking here of real, practical emancipation.¹⁹⁶

Political emancipation is human emancipation in the "existing world order" in that political struggle is the only course on which class-for-itself can be constituted. Therefore, political emancipation signals the triumph over superstructural alienation and the abolition of classes: the "ultimate goal" of revolution.

In its struggle against the collective power of the possessing classes the proletariat can act as a class only by constituting itself as a distinct political party, opposed to all the old parties formed by the possessing classes.

This constitution of the proletariat into a political party is indispensable to ensure

the triumph of the social
revolution and of its ultimate goal:
the abolition of classes.¹⁹⁷

Bakunin promulgates the state out of existence;
Marx requires class "struggle against the political
power" for the state's demise. Marx insists upon this
struggle because it is the only real, practical, method
to conquer the defense and perpetuation structure of
"economic monopolies" and enslaved labour.

As the lords of the land and
of capital always make use of
their political privileges to
defend and perpetuate their
economic monopolies and to
enslave labour, the conquest
of political power becomes the
great duty of the proletariat.¹⁹⁸

Put simply, "'The social emancipation of the workmen is
inseparable from their political emancipation.'"¹⁹⁹

In the final analysis, Bakunin's variant of
anarchism does not engender either political or economic
emancipation, for it abstains "from the political
movement"²⁰⁰ that is part and parcel of "the great duty"
to conquer the state--the site of coercive force--via
class struggle. By abstaining "from the political
movement," Bakunin is abstaining from the economic movement
of removing or transforming the class-based economy.
Thus, in reply to Bakunin's question, "Once the prole-
tariat is the ruling class, over whom does it rule?",

Marx answers

...as long as the other classes, and in particular the capitalist class, still exist, as long as the proletariat is still struggling with it (because, with the proletariat's conquest of governmental power its enemies and the old organisation of society have not yet disappeared), it must use coercive means, hence governmental means; it is still a class and the economic conditions on which the class struggle and the existence of classes depend, have not yet disappeared and must be removed by force, or transformed and their process of transformation speeded up by force.²⁰¹

Bakunin's methodology, to sum up, does not generalize the private interest that adheres to the state superstructure. Therefore, it does not generalize the private, particularistic, property relations of the capitalist economic base. The universalization of the protective and defensive "mask," "weapon,"--the state superstructure--is a requisite for the universalization of the private, particularistic, property of the economic society of class exploitation; the state superstructure has to be unmasked and disarmed, has to be exposed and made weaponless, so that the private property base of capitalist society can be exposed and dismantled.²⁰² Bakunin's sectarianism is a blatant repudiation of the "immediate aim of the Communists" and "all the other proletarian parties: formation of

the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat."²⁰³ Marx characterizes Bakunin's anarchism as not only sectarian but also as a "makeshift programme," and he places it in the "first phase" of the proletariat's struggle, i.e., as a sectarian movement of "political abstention."

The first phase of the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie is marked by a sectarian movement. This is logical at a time when the proletariat has not yet developed sufficiently to act as a class. Certain thinkers criticise social antagonism and suggest fantastic solution thereof, which the mass of workers is left to accept, preach or put into practice. The sects formed by the initiators are abstentionist by their very nature, i.e., alien to all real action, politics, strikes, coalitions, or, in a word, to any united movement. The mass of the proletariat always remains indifferent or even hostile to their propaganda....

Contrary to the sectarian organisation with their vagaries and rivalries, the International is a genuine and militant organisation of the proletarian class of all countries united in their common struggle against the capitalists and the landowners, against their class power organised in the state.²⁰⁴

Finally, what Marx had to say about the Communist League could serve well as a final remark on "Bakunin's makeshift programme" that "aims at forming not the government party of the future but the opposition party of the future could have but few attractions for individuals who on the one hand conceal their personal insignificance by strutting around in the theatrical cloak of the conspirator, and on the other wished to satisfy their narrow-minded ambition on the day of the next revolution, and who wished above all to seem important at the moment, to snatch their share of the proceeds of demagoguery and to find a welcome among the quacks and charlatans of democracy."²⁰⁵

The first section was dedicated to evincing the base structure as determining and altering the superstructure. This section comes together as a collection of materials that establish superstructural primacy in revolutionary transformation. This collection presents the state superstructure as the birthplace, in the first analysis, of class-for-itself as well as the arena, in the middle analysis, of struggle for classes-for-themselves. The struggle of the proletarian class-for-

itself has as its objective the abolition/transcendence/ smashing of the state as the location from which to terminate human alienation, bring an end to class relations, dissolve particularized private property and instigate generalized social property.

This presentation of the state superstructure in revolutionary transformation was set out in an efformation of voluntaristic class struggle. What makes and identifies this efformation is a rationale and course that has 1) the state superstructure as the dominant and indispensable feature for the protection and reproduction of the base structure and 2) class political struggle as the sole mode of class strife which can effect the practical removal or change of the society of class economics, the tyranny of class rule.

An important conclusion to this voluntaristic efformation is that control of the state superstructure by the "possessing class" is vital to the control of the class-based economy; therefore, the wresting away of control of the state superstructure from the "possessing class" is vital to the class(es) attempting to control, and thereby overturn, the class-based economy. Correspondingly, the state is the burial ground of the vanquished class(es)-for-itself(themselves), and, in the final analysis, the state is the burial ground of all classes.

Marx acknowledges the utmost importance and centrality of the state superstructure within the voluntaristic efformation. What is readily discernible in this efformation is that Marx recognizes the state superstructure as conditioning, directing and determining the economic base; such conditioning, directing and determining is preceptible where Marx emphasizes that the very existence of the economic base is dependent upon or is governed by the state superstructure: e.g., "economic conditions" are "removed" or their transformation speeded up by the force of the state.

In what is to follow we will witness Marx enlarge and enhance the range and scope of the state superstructure. We will behold the establishment of fundamental superstructural equations: 1) superstructural change is equivalent to epochal change and 2) successful political revolution is tantamount to the dissolution of an entire social structure.

Superstructural conditioning, direction and determination of the base is most vivid where Marx demonstrates that the superstructure is both indispensable and adequate for basic transformation. Marx lays out plainly and openly the role of "the State" in the growth, development and cultivation, or perhaps more accurately the formation and construction, of a mode of production--

both its economic and production tier. The state, we will discover in clear and direct Marxian discourse, conditions, directs and determines--the state is indispensable and adequate for the transformation of--both the relations and forces of production.

We will begin with "the State" and observe its relationships with and consequences upon the economic foundation of society.

Notes

¹Marx, Karl, "Marx to Joseph Weydemeyer In New York," London, March 5, 1852, Marx Engels: Selected Correspondence, trans., I. Lasker, ed., S.W. Ryazanskaya, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1975, p. 64; see also Marx and Engels, German Ideology; Marx, Karl, The Poverty of Philosophy: Answer to the "Philosophy of Poverty" by M. Proudhon, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1975; Marx, Karl, The Class Struggles in France 1848-1850, New York: International Publishers, 1980; Marx, 18th Brumaire and Marx, Karl, Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy, trans., Martin Nicolaus, New York: Vintage Books, 1973.

²Marx, Capital, I, p. 19.

³Ibid., p. 20.

⁴Marx, Critique Of Political Economy, pp. 20-21; emphasis added.

- 5
Marx, Capital, I, p. 372 fn.
- 6
Ibid., pp. 372-373 fn.
- 7
Marx, Karl, The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts Of 1844, ed., Dirk J. Struik, trans., Martin Milligan, New York: International Publishers, 1976, pp. 141-143.
- 8
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 61.
- 9
Ibid., p. 57.
- 10
Marx, Karl, "Marx To Engels In Manchester," (London,) January 28, 1863, Selected Correspondence, p. 129.
- 11
Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 160.
- 12
Ibid.; emphasis added.
- 13
Ibid.; emphasis added.
- 14
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 58.
- 15
Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, Manifesto Of The Communist Party, trans., Samuel Moore, Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975, p. 46.
- 16
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 86.
- 17
Ibid., p. 87.
- 18
Ibid., pp. 88-89; emphasis added.
- 19
Ibid., p. 89; emphasis added.

20 Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 142.

21 Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 46.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.

24 Marx, 18th Brumaire, p. 75; emphasis added.

25 Given that the material conditions of production generate, ultimately, revolutionary change, given that the class of direct-laborers are the thesis of value and given that the class of direct-laborers is the only class tied directly--perhaps chained directly would be better--as appurtenant contributors to the production of the material conditions of revolution, is it not reasonable to claim that the conjoining of the "materialist conception of history" and the labor theory of value by means of productive labor veils a proposition calling for the direct-laboring class to act more like a technocratic, managerial and organizational elite in the supervision of revolution? This claim rests upon a perception of Marx as set upon elevating and generalizing the urban workplace as the womb of revolution; this elevation and generalization requires and entails that the home, the place of worship, the school, the village, the market and the community be diminished and compressed into auxilliary locations to the birth of revolution. In addition, this elevation and generalization suggests a gender bias insofar as it focuses on working men, the lords of labor in the capitalist context, in the urban wage-place to the exclusion of women and youth outside the urban wage-place. This wage-place becomes then, in essence and effect, the birthplace of an urban adult male revolution, a revolution which human component is urban adult male direct-laborers.

Is it not reasonable to assert that Marx's revolutionary writings were to, for and about a class of direct-labor urban revolutionaries who in the revolutionary process would operate more like an urban

adult male productive elite? The assertion being advanced is that implicit in Marxian literature is an attempt to 1) power and drive revolution such that it not only annexes class struggle to productive forces and relations, but that it also annexes all sites to the urban work site and 2) treat women, the young and males outside of the urban work-site/wage-site as engaged in activities made worthwhile and given meaning solely in terms of their connection and subordination to direct-labor revolutionaries--e.g., "Sixteen million peasants (including women and children)....find their natural ally and leader in the urban proletariat,..." (Marx, 18th Brumaire, pp. 127-128, emphasis added).

As a last thought on this matter, the direct-labor revolutionaries who were the central characters in Marxian literature were white urban adult males. Consequently, the complete assertion that is being advanced is that implicit in Marxian literature is a class of direct-labor revolutionaries peopled by and operating as an urban white adult male productive elite.

26

It is interesting to note that the logic of this material standard leads to the following: "The actual wealth of society, and the possibility of constantly expanding its production process, therefore, do not depend upon the duration of surplus-labour, but upon its productivity and the more or less copious conditions of production under which it is performed." (Marx, Capital, III, p. 820). Thus, to the list of humanity, history and revolution, we can add social wealth; i.e., the standard against which social wealth is measured is the societal capacity and conditions to produce value.

27

See especially Marx, Capital, Vol. I; Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p.44 and Marx, Gotha Programme.

28

Marx, Capital, I, p. 763.

29

Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 44.

30
Marx, Karl, "Moralising Criticism And Critical Morality," Karl Marx Frederick Engels: Collected Works 1845-1848, New York: International Publishers, 1976, VI, p. 319.

31
Ibid., pp. 322-323.

32
Marx, Manifesto, pp. 48-49.

33
Marx, Manuscripts Of 1844, p. 132.

34
Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, pp. 141-142.

35
Marx, "Moralising Criticism....," p. 330.

36
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 54.

37
Marx, "Moralising Criticism....," p. 319.

38
Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 35.

39
Marx, "Moralising Criticism....," p. 319.

40
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 80.

41
Marx, Capital, III, p. 791.

42
Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 166.

43
Ibid., pp. 171-172.

44
Marx, 18th Brumaire, p. 47.

45
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 54.

- 46
Marx, Critique Of Political Economy, p. 212.
- 47
Marx and Engels, Manifesto, pp. 43-44.
- 48
Marx, 18th Brumaire, p. 66.
- 49
Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 160.
- 50
Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 45; other translations read: "This organization of the proletarians as a class, and that means as a political party" (emphasis added); see, for example, Dahrendorf, Ralf, Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1973, p. 17.
- 51
Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, pp. 116-117.
- 52
Marx, Karl, "Marx to Friedrich Bolte In New York," [London,] November 23, 1871, Selected Correspondence, pp. 254-255.
- 53
Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 72.
- 54
Marx, "Moralising Criticism...", pp. 319-320; emphasis added.
- 55
Marx and Engels, Manifesto, pp. 39-40; emphasis added.
- 56
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, pp. 86-87; emphasis added.
- 57
Marx, Capital, I, p. 762; emphasis added.

58 Marx, Capital, III, p. 820.

59 Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, pp. 160-161.

60 Marx and Engels, Manifesto, pp. 50-51.

61 Marx, Gotha Programme, p. 10.

62 Marx, Capital, I, p. 645.

63 Marx, Karl, "Economic Manuscripts Of 1857-1859: Introduction," Marx Engels: Pre-Capitalist Socio-Economic Formations, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1979, pp. 100-101. It would appear from these statements that Marx is equating wealth with the universality of human faculties and essence, and thereby he has shown our argument on labor, explicit and implicit, and its relationship to human value/wealth to be defective and deficient. But upon closer examination we can observe that human value/worth/wealth does not stand on its own terms: human faculties and essence do not have their own intrinsic value/worth/wealth independent of other factors. Above we tried to demonstrate that human endowment did not have its own intrinsic value/worth/wealth independent of the factor of production labor. Now we come upon another factor to support our content that human endowment does not have independent intrinsic value/worth/wealth; in this case we discover, as we read on, that wealth as "the universality of the individual's..." is "produced in the course of universal exchange." Thus, human endowment, whatever it is and is about, is a product of an exchange relationship, albeit an "universal" exchange relationship. We are left then with the conclusion that for Marx human endowment does not have its own inherent value/worth/wealth independent of production labor or exchange relations. Do these two factors mean that human value/worth/wealth is dependent upon market relations: productive labor for exchange?

Moreover, the second equation of wealth and "the full development of human control over the forces of nature--both those of what is known as nature and those

of his own nature" bespeaks of Marxian "objectification of total estrangement" from nature and the surges and urges of human existence. Why equate human wealth with the control of nature? Is not the control of nature a pursuit of an impoverished humanity forlorn and threatened in what it perceives as an alien and hostile world? Is not part of human wealth the mere existence of nature with or without human control?

Why equate human wealth with the control of human nature? Is not the control of human nature a pursuit of an impoverished humanity forlorn and threatened in what it perceives as an alien and hostile inner world? Is not part of human wealth the mere existence of human nature with or without human controls?

In short, rather than question, undermine or offset our argument that the productive-economic revolutionary efformation having structural requirements can be cited for its absence of inherent human wealth/value/worth independent of those factors that arise from the productive-economic efformation, namely production labor and exchange, these Marxian statements substantially perfect and complete our argument.

By substantially perfecting and completing this particular argument, our thesis takes another step towards the realization of one of its major aims: wedding Marx to the bourgeois context. Is not the bourgeois formation and its corresponding productive mode a situation and category of analysis in which human value/worth/wealth is not inherent and independent in and of itself, but is attached to and dependent upon production for exchange: is adscititious to and dependent upon market relations? Then, does not Marxian productive-economic efformation literature exhibit its marriage to and union with bourgeois equations and perceptions?

64

Marx, "Marx To... Weydemeyer," p. 64.

65

Marx, Manifesto, p. 47.

66

Ibid., p. 51.

67

Ibid.

- 68
Ibid., p. 53; emphasis added.
- 69
Ibid.
- 70
Ibid., p. 59.
- 71
Marx, Critique Of Political Economy, p. 212;
emphasis added.
- 72
Marx, "Moralising Criticism...", p. 337.
- 73
Marx and Engels, Manifesto, pp. 32-33.
- 74
See Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, Marx Engels:
On Colonialism, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976,
inter alia; Marx and Engels, Marx Engels: Formations,
inter alia and Marx, Karl Marx Formations, inter alia.
- 75
Marx, Critique of Political Economy, p. 205.
- 76
Marx, Capital, I, pp. 9-10.
- 77
Marx Karl and Frederick Engels, "Marx And Engels
To August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Wilhelm Bracke And
Others ('Circular Letter') {Draft}," [London, September
17-18, 1879], Selected Correspondence, p. 307; emphasis
added.
- 78
Marx, Moralising Criticism...", p. 337.
- 79
Ibid., emphasis added.
- 80
Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, pp. 154-155.
- 81
Ibid., p. 158.

82 Marx, Critique Of Political Economy, pp. 210-211; emphasis added; in the same work also see pp. 188-217 as well as see Marx, Capital, III, chap. 52 (that will be dealt with, in detail, in the main text).

83 Marx, Capital, III, p. 885; emphasis added.

84 Ibid., p. 886.

85 Ibid.

86 Marx, Critique Of Political Economy, p. 200; emphasis added.

87 Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 60.

88 Marx, Critique Of Political Economy, p. 207; emphasis added.

89 Marx, 18th Brumaire, pp. 123-124.

90 Marx, Capital, I, see especially pp. 167-774.

91 Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 54

92 Marx, 18th Brumaire, p. 124.

93 Ibid.

94 Ibid., p. 47.

95 Marx, Capital, I, p. 15.

- 96
Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism, trans., Richard Dixon and Clemens Dutt, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1980, p. 47.
- 97
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 53.
- 98
Marx, 18th Brumaire, p. 47.
- 99
Marx and Engels, Holy Family, p. 46.
- 100
Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 47.
- 101
Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, pp. 159-160; emphasis added.
- 102
Marx, "Moralising Criticism...", p. 332; emphasis added.
- 103
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 82.
- 104
Marx, Karl, "The Class Struggles In France 1848 To 1850," Selected Works, 1973, I, p. 213; emphasis added.
- 105
Marx, Karl, "General Rules Of The International Working Man's Association," Selected Works, 1973, II, p. 19; see also Marx, Karl, "First Address Of The General Council Of The International Working Men's Association On The Franco-Prussian War," Selected Works, II, pp. 190-194 and Marx and Engels, "Marx and Engels To...Bebel...", pp. 302-307.
- 106
Marx, Karl, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law," Marx Engels: On Religion, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976, p. 47.
- 107
Ibid., p. 52.

¹⁰⁸Marx, Karl, "Theses on Feuerbach," On Religion, p. 62.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 64.

¹¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 63.

¹¹²Marx, "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law," On Religion, p. 52.

¹¹³Ibid., p. 46.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 52.

¹¹⁵Marx, Karl and V.I. Lenin, Civil War In France: The Paris Commune, New York: International Publishers, 1976, pp. 61-62.

¹¹⁶Marx, 18th Brumaire, p. 19.

¹¹⁷Marx, Capital, I, p. 609 fn.; emphasis added.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 177.

¹¹⁹Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 42.

¹²⁰Marx, Capital, I, p. 178.

¹²¹Marx, Manuscripts Of 1844, p. 113.

¹²²Marx, Karl, "Difference Between The Democritean And Epicurean Philosophy Of Nature In General: Doctoral Dissertation," Collected Works 1835-1843, 1975, I, p. 72.

¹²³Marx, Manuscripts Of 1844, p. 111.

¹²⁴Marx, Grundrisse, pp. 610-611.

¹²⁵Marx, Manufscripts Of 1844, p. 135.

¹²⁶Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, "The German Ideology," Collected Works 1845-1847, 1976, V, p. 537.

¹²⁷Marx, Karl Marx Formations, p. 84.

¹²⁸Marx, Capital, III, p. 820.

¹²⁹Ibid.

¹³⁰Marx, Karl Marx Formations, pp. 84-85.

¹³¹Marx, Capital, I, p. 202; emphasis added.

¹³²Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach," p. 4; emphasis added. This citation is the original statement of Marx; the version edited by Engels is on pp.7-8 of the same volume and reads as follows:

Feuerbach resolves the essence of religion into the essence of man. But the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations.

Feuerbach, who does not enter upon a criticism of this real essence, is hence obliged:

1. To abstract from the historical process and to define the religious sentiment [Gemut] regarded by itself, and to presuppose an abstract--isolated--human individual.

2. The essence of man, therefore, can with him be regarded only as "species," as an inner, mute, general character which unites the many individuals only in a natural way (emphasis added).

¹³³See chapter 3 in the main text for the entire citation.

¹³⁴Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 47.

¹³⁵Marx, Capital, III, p. 791.

¹³⁶Marx, Gotha Programme, p. 18.

¹³⁷See Marx's numerous comments in Marx and Engels, Collected Works, I, pp. 109-375; Marx says, for example,

...one should proceed from the actual differences created and conditioned by the internal structure of the state....The true spheres...in which its entire movement takes place, are the districts, rural communities, governments, provincial administrations, and military departments,... (p. 296).

¹³⁸Marx and Lenin, Civil War In France, p. 54.

¹³⁹Marx, Karl, "Letters to Dr. Kugelmann On The Paris Commune," April 12, 1871, Civil War In France, p. 86.

¹⁴⁰Marx and Engels, "Preface to The German Edition Of 1872," Manifesto, p. 2.

¹⁴¹Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 47.

¹⁴²Marx, Karl, "Economic And Philosophic Manuscripts Of 1844," Collected Works 1843-1844, 1975, III, p. 297.

¹⁴³Although Marx speaks of "definite social forms of thought" in Capital, I, (p. 82 fn.), as if he makes no distinction between "forms of social consciousness" and "ideological forms," he does distinguish between these two "social forms of thought." In German Ideology Marx and Engels write, "Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness" (p. 47; emphasis added), and in his Surplus-Value, (1971) Part 3, is the following:

In exactly the same way in religious reasoning [i.e., a form "of social consciousness"], ... (p. 276).

With the disappearance of the religious form of consciousness [i.e., the corresponding form "of social consciousness" to religious ideology] and these relationships, the labour of the priests will likewise cease to enter into the social process of production.... in the same way the labour which the capitalist performs qua capitalist, or causes to be performed by someone else, will end together with the existence of the capitalists (p. 496).

An interruption of the discussion on the topic of this note is necessary, for we can observe that Marx has an alteration, in this case a "disappearance," of a super-structurally generated phenomena, in this case "the religious form of consciousness," being attended by an alteration, in this case a cessation, in the basic process of production; to wit, a superstructural alteration is accompanied by a basic alteration. This adds further material to support the argumentation being developed in the main text. To return now to the topic at hand.

The distinction between "forms of social consciousness" and "ideological forms" is not one in which there is no difference. It is a distinction which contrasts the individual with the collective; it is Marx's recognition of individual subjectivity as divergent from class membership: "I paint the capitalist and landlord in no sense couleur de rose. But here individuals are dealt with only in so far as they are the personification of economic categories, embodiments of particular class-relations and class-interests. My standpoint, from which the evolution of the economic formation of society is viewed as a process of natural history, can less than any other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he socially remains, however much he may subjectively raise himself above them " (Marx, Capital, I, p. 10).

Given the strictures of this writing, it will suffice to say that given that "forms of" social "consciousness" correspond to "ideological forms" and given that the Marxian standpoint is one in which individuals, e.g., priests, capitalists and landlords, do not assume a role of responsibility for their social relations within the "process of natural history," a tentative formulation is presented

for heuristic purposes; namely, "forms of social consciousness" are subjectively held codes, images and symbols of collectively held ideological forms: the subjective impression and map on individuals of the impact and topography of the ideological forms of class-relations and class-interests. This formation suggests a Marxian psychology or social psychology which relates 1) the individual to class, 2) subjectivity to economic formation and relations, and, most importantly, 3) subjectivity to political class struggle: class-for-itself and its voluntaristic origins. This proposed psychology or social psychology could offset mainstream sociological, psychological and philosophical criticisms heaped upon Marxian thought for its imputed failure to deal effectually and cogently with the interrelationships amongst and between class, individuals and subjectivity.

Moreover, the distinction with a difference between "forms of social consciousness" and "ideological forms" and its possible extension into a Marxian psychology or social psychology repudiates and rejects the out of hand contention that Marx negated, denigrated or ignored the individual and/or subjectivity. What Marx was striving to achieve was to situate his investigation of the individual and subjectivity within the "process of natural history"; i.e., "the process of natural history" and not the individual or subjectivity as "responsible" for social relations. By so situating, Marx could then locate the responsibility for social relations within "the precision of natural science."

In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined, with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic--in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out (Marx, Critique Of Political Economy, p. 21).

Thus, Marx was not a personification, embodiment, of the loss or alienation of the individual and/or subjectivity. Rather he was a personification, an embodiment, of the quest to nail down the elusive form worlds of social consciousness and ideology within the structure of science--

he was a personification, an embodiment, of the scientism that is suffuse within the bourgeois context.

¹⁴⁴Marx, "Manuscripts Of 1844," p. 340.

¹⁴⁵Marx and Engels, German Ideology, pp. 46-47 and Marx, Critique Of Political Economy, p. 20.

¹⁴⁶Marx and Engels, German Ideology, pp. 46-47. Here Marx speaks of "mystification and speculation" as being built into the "political structure"/"the State"; p. 54 where Marx speaks of "illusory communal interests" and "illusory 'general' interest in the form of the State," and pp. 80-81 where Marx speaks again of the illusion of the legal-political superstructure.

¹⁴⁷Marx and Engels, "German Ideology," p. 329; emphasis added.

¹⁴⁸*Ibid.*; emphasis added.

¹⁴⁹Marx, "Moralising Criticism...", p. 330.

¹⁵⁰Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 54; see also Marx and Engels, Holy Family, p. 47; Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 53; Marx, 18th Brumaire, p. 47 and Marx, Poverty Of Philosophy, p. 159-160.

¹⁵¹Marx and Engels, "German Ideology," pp. 329-330.

¹⁵²Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 47.

¹⁵³Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 80.

¹⁵⁴Marx, "Marx To...Bolte," p. 254.

¹⁵⁵Marx, Karl, "Letters From Deutsch-Französische Jahrbucher," Collected Works 1843-1844, III, p. 144.

¹⁵⁶Marx, "Marx To...Bolte," p. 254.

¹⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 255.

¹⁵⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹Marx, "Letters From Deutsch...", p. 143.

¹⁶⁰Marx, Karl, "Marx To Pavel Vasilyevich Annenkov In Paris," Brussels, December 28 [1846], Selected Correspondence, p. 30.

¹⁶¹Marx, Karl, "On The Jewish Question," Collected Works, III, p. 165.

¹⁶²Marx, Karl, "Critical Marginal Notes On The Article By A Prussian," Collected Works, III, pp. 205-206; emphasis added.

¹⁶³Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 161.

¹⁶⁴Ibid.

¹⁶⁵Ibid.

¹⁶⁶Marx and Engels, Manifesto, pp. 60-61.

¹⁶⁷Marx, "Critical Marginal Notes," p. 205.

¹⁶⁸Marx, "Marx to Friedrich...Bolte," p. 255.

¹⁶⁹Ibid., p. 254.

¹⁷⁰Marx, "Critical Marginal Notes," p. 199.

¹⁷¹Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 47.

¹⁷²Marx, "Critical Marginal Notes," p. 198.

¹⁷³Marx and Engels, Holy Family, p. 154.

¹⁷⁴Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 54.

¹⁷⁵Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 161.

¹⁷⁶Marx and Engels, Holy Family, p. 154.

¹⁷⁷Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 135.

¹⁷⁸Marx, "Moralising Criticism...", p. 318.

¹⁷⁹Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 54.

¹⁸⁰Marx, Poverty Of Philosophy, p. 161.

¹⁸¹Marx, "Critical Marginal Notes," p. 204. It is generally assumed that political class struggle must, of necessity, be violent. To the contrary, Marx, for example, makes room for universal suffrage, i.e., a non-violent method, in political transformation. In "Critique of Hegel's Doctrine of the State," Marx says:

To consider the vote in its relation to the power of the crown or the executive is to fail to look at it philosophically, i.e., to grasp its particular nature. The vote expresses the real relation of real civil society to the civil society of the legislature, to the representative body....the vote is the immediate, direct, not merely representative but actually existing relation of civil society to the political state. It is therefore self-evident that the vote must constitute the chief political interest of real civil society. Only when civil society has achieved unrestricted active and passive suffrage has it really raised itself to the point of abstraction from itself, to the political existence which constitutes its true, universal, essential existence. But the perfection of this abstraction is also its transcendence [Aufhebung]. By really establishing its political existence as its authentic existence, civil society ensures that its civil existence, in so far as it is distinct from its political existence, is inessential. And

with the demise of the one,
the other, its opposite,
collapses also. Therefore,
electoral reform in the abstract
political state is the equivalent
to a demand for its dissolution
[Auflosung] and this in turn
implies the dissolution of civil
society (Marx, Karl, Karl Marx:
Early Writings, ed., Quintin
Hoare, trans., Rodney Livingstone
and Gregor Benton, New York:
Vintage Books, 1975, p. 191).

This is not an isolated example of Marx's profession
of universal suffrage. As a non-violent method for the
"destruction of the State power," Marx acknowledges
"universal suffrage" in "The Civil War in France"
(Selected Works, II, p. 221); universal suffrage can lead
to the dissolution of the legal-political superstructure
and subsequently the dissolution of civil society, so that
the "first step in the revolution by the working class,
is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling
class, to win the battle of democracy" (Marx, Karl
and Frederick Engels, "Manifesto Of The Communist Party,"
Selected Works, I, p. 126).

Furthermore, Marx never required, as a matter of fact
or axiom, a violent assumption of political supremacy
by the ruled class.

The worker will some day have to
win political supremacy in order to
organise labour along new lines....

We know of the allowances we must
make for the institutions,
customs and traditions of the
various countries; and we do not
deny that there are countries such
as America, England, and I would add
Holland if I knew your institutions
better, where the working people
may achieve their goal by peaceful
means (Marx, Karl, "The Hague Congress,"
Selected Works, II, pp. 292-293.

England comes up again in a correspondence Marx has concerning peaceful "evolution"; "...an English revolution not necessary, but--according to historical precedents--possible. If the unavoidable evolution turn into a revolution, it would not only be the fault of the ruling classes, but also of the working class. Every pacific concession of the former has been wrung from them by 'pressure from without.' Their action kept pace with that pressure and if the latter has more and more weakened, it is only because the English working class know how to wield their power and use their liberties, both of which they possess legally" (Marx, Karl, "Marx To Henry Mayer Hyndman In London," [London,] December 8, 1880, Selected Correspondence, pp. 313-314).

Marx appears to be saying that if revolution occurs in England it would be the outcome of the misuse and/or abuse of class power and liberties--by the ruling and working classes. Apparently, the English legal-political superstructure was evolving, in Marx's eyes, peacefully and legally towards its own dissolution, and if this evolutionary process turns revolutionary it is because the legal power and liberties of the working class were blocked by the ruling classes and used ineffectually by the working class.

Revolution in England was not necessary because the legal-political superstructure had already become subject to the ruled class-for-itself; revolution--i.e., forceful change--was not necessary because the "unavoidable" evolutionary progress would deliver the legal-political superstructure to the working class. On the other hand, in countries other than England, America and Holland, "it is force that will have to be the lever of our revolutions; it is force that we shall some day have to resort to in order to establish a reign of labour" (Marx, "Hague Congress," p. 293).

¹⁸²Marx, "Critical Marginal Notes," p. 197.

¹⁸³Marx, "Moralising Criticism...", p. 319.

¹⁸⁴Ibid.

¹⁸⁵Ibid., p. 318.

¹⁸⁶Marx speaks of the "abolition," "dissolution"-- "abolition" or "dissolution" are the two terms used alternatively in the major and authoritative translations of Marx's work--and "transcendence" of the state (see especially Marx and Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 3, en passant, and fn. 181 above), or he says "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery" (Marx, Karl, "The Civil War In France," Selected Works, II, p. 217); in addition to "abolition," "dissolution," "transcendence" and "lay hold" of the state, Marx speaks of "transfer" and "smash" with reference to the state.

...If you look at the last chapter of my Eighteenth Brumaire you will find that I say that the next attempt of the French revolution will be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic-military machine from one hand to another, but to smash it, and this is essential for every real people's revolution on the Continent (Marx, "Letters To Dr. Kugelmann," p. 86).

Engels, on the other hand, displays an even greater willingness than Marx to encase social process and relations within the temple of natural science; thus, Engels addresses the state in more naturalistic, i.e., organic, biological, terms: "The state is not 'abolished,' it withers away" (Engels, Frederick, Anti-Duhring: Herr Eugen Duhring's Revolution In Science, trans., Emile Burns, ed., C.P. Dutt, New York: International Publishers, 1976, p. 307). He approaches the state, in our opinion, from within a natural science perspective, whereas Marx approaches the state from within a philosophical perspective, e.g., a Hegelian perspective, with its emphasis on overcoming social process and relations. For Engels the state is one more phenomena subject to natural scientific law and principles, and for Marx that state is a, or the, major obstacle in human overcoming.

Engels contradicts Marx with reference to the state because natural scientific law and principles may not necessarily be compatible with philosophical law and principles--and for Engels this is one instance where natural science and philosophy clash.

¹⁸⁷Marx, Karl, "Marx To Edward Spencer Beesly In London," [London,] October, 19, 1870, Selected Correspondence, p. 235.

¹⁸⁸Marx, Karl, "Contribution To The Critique Of Hegel's Philosophy Of Law," Collected Works, III, pp. 30-31.

¹⁸⁹Marx and Engels, German Ideology, pp. 65-66; see also Marx, Karl, "Critique Of Hegel's Philosophy of Law. Introduction," Collected Works, III, p. 185.

¹⁹⁰Marx, "Critique Of Hegel's Philosophy of Law," Collected Works, III, p. 31.

¹⁹¹Marx, "Critique Of Hegel's Philosophy Of Law. Introduction," Collected Works, III, pp. 184-185.

¹⁹²Marx, "Jewish Question," p. 155.

¹⁹³Marx, "Critique Of Hegel's Philosophy Of Law," Collected Works, III, p. 118.

¹⁹⁴Marx, "Jewish Question," p. 153.

¹⁹⁵Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 59.

¹⁹⁶Marx, "Jewish Question," p. 155.

¹⁹⁷Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, "From The Resolutions Of The General Congress Held In The Hague," Selected Works, II, p. 291.

¹⁹⁸Ibid.; emphasis added.

¹⁹⁹Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, "Fictitious Splits In The International--IV," Selected Works, II, p. 270 fn.

²⁰⁰Marx, "Marx To...Bolte," p. 423; here Marx says that Bakunin's "main dogma" of "abstention" is "Proudhonist."

²⁰¹Marx, Karl, "Marx on Bakunin (1875)," Karl Marx Frederick Engels: Werke, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1956-1968, XVIII, p. 630, cited by McLellan, Thought of Marx, pp. 210-211.

²⁰²Marx, "Moralising Criticism...", p. 318.

²⁰³Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 50.

²⁰⁴Marx and Engels, "Fictitious Splits," p. 271.

²⁰⁵Marx, Karl, "Revelations Concerning The Communist Trial In Cologne," Collected Works 1851-1853, 1978, XI, 1978, p. 449.

REVOLUTION, BARBARISM AND MARTYRDOM

by

WAA'IZ MUHAMMAD ABDUL-WAHHAB

VOLUME II

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Sociology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Sociology,
The City University of New York.

1986

CHAPTER FIVE
PRIMITIVE ACCUMULATION OF BARBARISM

"The So-Called Primitive Accumulation" section of Capital, Vol. 1, has one essential, dominant and unifying theme: "legal means" and "bloody legislation" as the modus operandi for conditioning, directing and determining "the pre-historic stage of capital and of the mode of production corresponding to it." This the masterpiece of Marxian production--with its stated "ultimate aim... to lay bare the economic law of motion of modern society"--concludes with "the economic law of motion of modern society" being qualified, regulated, conducted, delimited, informed and engendered by the legal-political superstructure. The culmination of Marx's "discovery of the natural laws of" movement of bourgeois society is that the bourgeois state laid the foundation of bourgeois economy and production.

It is apparent and obvious that in "Primitive Accumulation" Marx is referring, primarily, to the transformation of feudalism into capitalism. Below we will examine other relevant materials to decide if "the economic law of motion of modern society" holds true for the post-modern society, i.e., does "the economic law of motion of modern society" hold true for the transformation

of capitalism into communism? Does the state lay the foundation for communist economy and production?

If we find this to be the case, then feudalism, capitalism and communism and the social formations to which they correspond are linked by an identical process of transformation, an identical process of transformation and construction of a new society in the "womb" of "the old society." Marx presents us with the legal-political superstructure bringing about the formation and construction of capitalism out of the "womb" of feudalism, and that the legal-political superstructure, in the hands of the proletarian class-for-itself, will bring about, in Marx's vision, the formation and construction of communism out of the "womb" of capitalism. In this way a comprehensive and generalized role can be attributed to the state in the transformation of those modes of production and the social formations to which they correspond that received the most attention and focused concentration by Marx.

"The So-Called Primitive Accumulation"

"The Secret Of Primitive Accumulation": The State

We have seen how money is changed into capital; how through capital surplus-value is made, and from surplus-value more capital. But the accumulation of capital pre-supposes surplus-value; surplus-value pre-supposes capitalistic production; capitalistic production pre-supposes the pre-existence of considerable masses of capital and of labour-power in the hands of producers of commodities. The whole movement, therefore, seems to turn in a vicious cycle, out of which we can only get by supposing a primitive accumulation (previous accumulation of Adam Smith) preceding capitalistic accumulation; an accumulation not the result of the capitalist mode of production but its starting-point.¹

How did the "starting-point," the "primitive accumulation," of the capitalist mode of production come into existence? In order to answer this question Marx draws an analogy between primitive accumulation and original sin of Judaic-Christian theology, i.e., he draws out the mystification inherent to the anecdotal notion that in "times long gone by there were two sorts of people; one the diligent, intelligent, and, above all, frugal elite; the other, lazy rascals, spending their substance, and more, in riotous living."² The "legend" of theological original sin runs counter to the history of

economic sin in which "the great majority, ... despite all its labour, has up to now nothing to sell but itself, and the wealth of the few that increases constantly although they have long ceased to work."³ In the actual economic history of primitive accumulation

it is notorious that conquest,
enslavement, robbery, murder,⁴
birefly force, play the great part.

Marx debunks the idyllic status of primitive accumulation in the "tender annals of Political Economy" by asserting that "the methods of primitive accumulation are anything but idyllic."⁵ In the place of "legend" and "insipid childishness" as an intellectual defense of primitive accumulation and property in Political Economy, Marx inserts the historical actuality of force and its great importance in primitive accumulation and property, and what is the most comprehensive, systematic socially coercive general form of force? Here is where we will bring in the state as a (secondary) secret of the "starting-point" of primitive accumulation.

The "starting-point" of primitive accumulation occurs where money, commodities, the means of production and the means of subsistence are transformed into capital; "this transformation itself can only take place under certain circumstances that centre in this, viz., that two very different kinds of commodity-possessors must come

face to face and into contact; on the one hand, the owners of money, means of production, means of subsistence, who are eager to increase the sum of values they possess, by buying other people's labour-power; on the other hand, free labourers, the sellers of their own labour-power, and therefore the sellers of labour....they are,...free from, unencumbered by, any means of production of their own."⁶ Consequently, there is a polarization within the market, and therein "the fundamental conditions of capitalist production are given."

The capitalist system pre-supposes the complete separation of the labourers from all property in the means by which they can realise their labour....The process, therefore, that clears the way for the capitalist system, can be none other than the process which takes away from the labourer the possession of his means of production; a process that transforms, on the one hand, the social means of subsistence and of production into capital, on the other, immediate producers into wage-labourers.⁷

The so-called primitive accumulation is, therefore, "the historical process of divorcing the producers from the means of production."⁸ It is primitive, i.e., original, accumulation "because it forms the pre-historic stage of capital and of the mode of production corresponding with it";⁹ furthermore, this historical process of separating

the direct producers from the productive means that formed the "economic structure of capitalistic society grew out of "the economic structure of feudal society"; the "dissolution of the latter set free the elements of the former."¹⁰

We have been apprised of the origins of primitive accumulation and that the dissolution of feudal society and the setting free of capitalistic elements took place in the fold of "conquest, enslavement, robbery...", so Marx says

...the historical movement which changes the producers into wage-workers, appears, on the one hand, as their emancipation from serfdom and from the fetters of the guilds, and this side alone exists for our bourgeois historians. But, on the other hand, these new freedmen became sellers of themselves only after they had been robbed of all their own means of production, and of all of the guarantees of existence afforded by the old feudal arrangements. And the history of this, their expropriation, is written in the annals of mankind in letters of blood and fire.¹¹

Marx continues in this vein by discussing the "conquest of social power" by the industrial capitalist; this conquest entailed the displacement of guild masters, feudal lords and a struggle against the constrictions on the development of production and exploitation. This conquest, Marx goes on to say, uses "means as vile as those by which the Roman freedman...made himself the master of his patronus."¹²

To sum up, 1) the "starting-point" of primitive capitalist accumulation "was the servitude of the labourer," 2) the transformation of feudalism into capitalism was the "transformation of feudal exploitation¹³ into capitalist exploitation" and 3) the means by which feudalism gave rise to the economic structure of capitalistic society were bloody, fiery and vile.

Marx dates the "capitalist era... from the 16th¹⁴ century" (Christian Era); noting, however, that the dawn of capitalist production appeared as early as the fourteenth and fifteenth century "in certain towns of the Mediterranean." This dating of the capitalist era is of great importance, for, as we shall observe, it is only in the later chapters of "Primitive Accumulation" that Marx stresses the legal-political actions of the sixteenth century as changing the separation of the laborer from productive means into the "servitude of the labourer" under capitalism. It is the legal-political sphere that set in place and in motion capitalism: the state "set free" the conditions of existence of capitalism, yet Marx does not mention the state directly or explicitly in "The Secret of Primitive Accumulation." Why is this? Is there a secret within "The Secret" that involves the state? Our answer is a resounding yes!

In "The Secret Of Primitive Accumulation" Marx is preoccupied with emphasizing the divorce of "the producer" from the 1) means of production and 2) statuses, regimes, rules and impediments of feudalism, but this divorce does not, of necessity, result in a marriage with the "economic structure of capitalistic society--the feudal divorce does not make "the first beginnings of capitalist production;¹⁵ this divorce could just have simply resulted in the barbarism of a "great mass of men...suddenly and forcibly torn from their means of subsistence"¹⁶ spreading rape and pillage over the lands. Instead of bringing out this most definite, direct and immediate possible result of the feudal divorce, Marx marries this "torn" "great mass" to capitalism by having them "hurled" onto the labor-market "as free and 'unattached' proletarians."¹⁷

Well this is a quantum leap from the divorce of a "great mass" to the marriage of a proletarian class situated on the already constituted altar of the capitalist labor-market. This raises a series of questions that point to a secret within "The Secret":

- 1) How is this dislocated mass "hurled" into a coherent class?
- 2) What agency has the capacity to hurl masses of humanity from one state of being to another?

3) Whence do the controls, regulations and governance appear that are required for the organization and stabilization of a wage-labor market--an orderly and coherent complex of relations?

4) Is there an unexplained necessity--"a shotgun wedding" being played out in the terms of a historical, economic and logical compulsion--operating upon feudalism such that it is immediately and directly transformed into/united with capitalism?

5) What propels this quantum leap, i.e., this historical, economic and logical projection, of a displaced anomic "mass" into the placement of a class located and lodged in capitalism?

Questions 1) to 3) can be and are answered by Marx in the remaining chapters of "Primitive Accumulation"; on the other hand, questions 4) and 5) cannot be and are not answered by Marx in the remaining chapters of "Primitive Accumulation." Questions 4) and 5) witness an obscured reality in "The Secret Of Primitive Accumulation"; a reality which requisities the state, because of its "essential nature," for its own abolition; a reality that

can be nothing other than barbarism. Barbarism is the secret within "The Secret." Once it is injected into this chapter the unexplained necessity is rendered accessible, the quantum leap reduced to a step and the absence of the state is accounted for.

Feudalism was not followed directly and promptly by capitalism. Capitalism did not grow directly and promptly out of the "economic structure of feudal society." The "starting-point" of the "wage-labourer as well as...the...capitalist" was not a change in the nature of servitude-- "the transformation of feudal exploitation into capitalist exploitation."

More correctly, the "starting-point" of primitive accumulation was barbarism: "conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder, briefly force, play the great part....the methods of primitive accumulation are anything but idyllic."

Barbarism is the secreted intervening social link in the Marxian chain of transition from feudalism to capitalism. In disentangling the secret of "so-called primitive accumulation," Marx comes upon and introduces barbarism, but it is given no name or title other than "force." To say "briefly force," is to conceal that fact that force is a social relation, and, therefore, it is an existent within a social mode. If the mode is one in

which "conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder...play the great part," then what else is Marx discussing but a barbaric social mode, i.e., barbarism. Barbarism is the shadowy reality of "so-called primitive accumulation"; it is the origin and source of "so-called primitive accumulation; therefore, [it] is nothing else than" the stage of "the historical process of divorcing the producer from the means of production...it forms the pre-historic stage of capital and the mode of production corresponding" to it. Barbarism, in short, ended feudalism and was the mode of origin of capitalism, and capitalism conquered barbarism!

Given barbarism as the unstated social mode linking feudalism to capitalism, it becomes apparent why Marx skirted the state, for the state, in Marxian terms, is the ultimate, general coercive form of force. This would have dictated an analysis in "The Secret Of Primitive Accumulation" of the ultimate social force subduing a social mode of force; which is to say, the state is what built and managed the "process...that clears the way for the capitalist system" out of the "blood and fire" and vilification of barbarism. Thus Marx had to usher in the state at a subsequent juncture in "Primitive Accumulation" or risk the full-blown exposure of barbarism vanquishing feudalism. By holding off the introduction

of the state, Marx could hold off and screen barbarism, and by cloaking barbarism Marx could hold onto the transition of feudalism to capitalism. Finally, by holding onto his chain of transition of feudalism → primitive accumulation → capitalism, Marx could hold onto his sequence of stages that compose history and the progress of revolution.

The birth of the offspring capitalism did not take place in the "womb" of feudalism; feudalism gave birth to barbarism, and it was the intervention (Caesarian section) of the state that gave birth to "the economic structure of capitalistic society." "In actual history" barbarism and the conquest of barbarism by the state are what circumscribed "an accumulation not the result of the capitalist mode of production but its starting-point."

By appropriately interpolating 1) barbarism as the issue of the demise of feudalism and 2) bourgeois legal-political power, i.e., their state, as the means of ending barbarism into the (cryptic) last paragraph of "The Secret" cited below, our case is strengthened further; to wit, barbarism, not capitalism, felled feudalism, and the capitalist state felled barbarism.

In the history of primitive accumulation, all [state] revolutions are epoch-making that act as levers for the capitalist class in course of formation [of the "economic structure of capitalistic society"]; but, above all, those moments [of barbarism] when great masses of men are suddenly and forcibly torn from their mean of subsistence, and hurled [from barbarity by the capitalist state that maintained this separation from the means of production as well as "reproduces it on a continually extending scale"¹⁸] as free and "unattached" proletarians on the labour-market. The expropriation of the agricultural producer, of the peasant, from the soil, is the basis of the whole process [within the social mode of barbarism].¹⁹

Put simply, the capitalist state performed epoch-making revolutions that served as levers for the capitalist class in the formation of capitalism out of barbarism; the creation of free sellers of labor power, who carry their "commodity wherever" they find a market, could have happened "only after they had been robbed of all their own means of production, and of all the guarantees of existence afforded by the old feudal arrangements" (emphasis added). The revolutions of the capitalist state encompass the founding of the 1) proletariat out of the immediate producers/the laborers; the "great mass," who could only dispose of their own persons after they had been "torn" from the "soil and ceased to be the slave, serf, or bondsman of another,"²⁰ and 2) the wage-labor

market out of the usurpation, blood, disconnection, displacement and disjunction of great masses of former feudal slaves, serfs and bondsmen. Thus the capitalist state laid the economic foundation of capitalism by forming and constructing the "circumstances," "market for commodities," i.e., "the polarisation of the market for commodities," so that the "two very different kinds of commodity-possessors" who "must come face to face and into contact" did so--the state engaged the proletarians with the owners of the means of production in a complex of orderly and coherent relations. The capitalist state laid this foundation on the ground of barbarism beneath which was buried feudalism.

It could be counter-argued that this paragraph is an abstract, general and summary statement used by Marx to conclude "The Secret Of Primitive Accumulation," and that it can be framed by a number of divergent treatises. Where, however, Marx sets out a concrete analysis, his demonstration of the relationship between capitalism and feudalism is well documented and rigorous. To indicate that this is not an isolated case, let us take another prominent example, albeit a not too detailed example, that embodies every and all of the theoretical characteristics intellectual operations and historical raison d'etre present in the paragraph that underwent our interpolation.

Marx gives his analysis of the development of capitalism in Italy. Again he has a feudal category, e.g. the serf, advancing, instantly and straight, as he has the "torn" "great mass," into the proletariat and coming "face to face and into contact" with "his master" waiting for him in the capitalist labor market of the towns.

In Italy, where capitalist production developed earliest, the dissolution of serfdom also took place earlier than elsewhere. The serf was emancipated in that country before he had acquired any prescriptive rights to the soil. His emancipation at once transformed him into a free proletarian, who, moreover, found his master ready²¹ waiting for him in the towns....

The latent necessity operating upon feudalism such that is immediately and directly formed into capitalism as well as the quantum leap from serf to free proletarian both underscore Marxian analysis; this Marxian compulsion and vault from the feudal relations of the serf class to the capitalist relations of this proletarian class lacks a manifest rationale. We are neither told how Italian serfs were "at once transformed" into free proletarians nor how a "free proletarian,...found his master waiting for him." Marx cannot have an "at once" transformation of serfs into proletarian without some inexorable, urgent, unseen and mute push and pull factor speeding feudalism

towards capitalism. Thus there are at least two possible conclusions: 1) this "at once" transformation is predicated upon and presupposes a non-material, ineluctable and exigent historical agency, or 2) this "at once" transformation secrets the barbarism that took place between feudalism and capitalism and from which capitalism arose. It is our argument that the second conclusion is most warranted.

To continue, Marx cannot be discussing a free proletarian's feudal master, for the dissolution of the serf-master relationship had occurred already in Italy; therefore, it had to be a free proletarian's capitalist master who was "waiting for him." How, it has to be asked, did a "free proletarian" find "his" capitalist master? What methods and means were accessible for a "free proletarian" to interface and contact as a "free proletarian" the members of an antagonistic class. Unless and until capitalist labor-market relations were established there could be no methods and means of access for the "two very different kinds of commodity-possessors" to exchange their commodities. Thus, the establishment of the capitalist labor market is realized by a quantum leap from a "free proletarian" to a "found" and "waiting" relationship with his capitalist master in a specified

and definitive location, "the towns." Why the quantum leap?

Although Marx acknowledges the essential role of the state in the structuring of the capitalist economic sphere. He situates that role in the transformation of feudalism to capitalism; by so situating the capitalist state, Marx can bring forth the capitalist economy out of the feudal economy. Which is to say, the quantum leap, this historical, economic and logical projection, shifts the capitalist state and its role from that of bringing forth the capitalist economy out of the barbarous economy to that of bringing forth the capitalist economy out of the feudal economy. This shift, in effect, secrets the transformation of the capitalist economy out of the barbarous economy. While Marx gives bright light to the capitalist state and its indispensable role in the structuring of the capitalist economic sphere, he casts a dark shadow over the social mode in which this structuring happened. He makes visible the state and hides barbarism: a visible concealment.

To sum up briefly, it is not enough for Marx to say that 1) the owners of the means of production must meet with the sellers of their labor, free laborers who themselves do not form "part and parcel of the means

of production" and the means of production do not belong to them, and 2) "this polarisation of the market for commodities" accomplishes the "fundamental conditions of capitalist production."²² It is not enough because in their totality statements 1) and 2) beg the very question that they were intended to resolve: namely, what induced and introduced the "polarisation" of humanity into two different, distinct and divergent economically defined groups in the first place?

Before going on to "the basis of the whole process" of primitive accumulation, namely, the "expropriation of the agricultural producer, of the peasant, from the soil," one final comment can be made about Marxian history, given our argument. Marxian history is bourgeois history to the extent that Marx presents, in the fashion of "bourgeois historians," capitalism as the emancipation from feudalism. Where he distinguishes himself from "bourgeois historians" is where he says, "these new freedmen became sellers of themselves only after they had been robbed of all their means of production, and of all the guarantees of existence afforded by the old feudal arrangements" (emphasis added), but this is a distinction with very little difference; it amounts to,

in the final analysis, a less sanitized variant of standard bourgeois history. Whereas "bourgeois historians" delete the "blood and fire" of the "historical movement" from feudalism to capitalism, Marx puts back the "blood and fire" into this "movement" by having capitalism rob feudalism. What he and the "bourgeois historians" have in common is that they both expunge barbarism from the "historical movement" of the change from feudalism to capitalism. The quintessential secret of "The Secret Of Primitive Accumulation" is that it is a tried and tested bourgeois historiography of the development of capitalism; a historiography that renders inscrutable the possibility --and, perhaps, the necessity--that capitalism can develop solely on the "basis" of barbarism.

"Expropriation Of The Agricultural Population
From The Land": Barbarism

Marx prefaces this chapter in "The So-Called Primitive Accumulation" by letting the reader know that the "history²³ of this expropriation" finds its classic form in England. "In England," where "serfdom had practically disappeared²⁴ in the last part of the 14th century," is where barbarism, in its "classic form," took place in the fifteenth century, our argument will contend. Our case is that the fifteenth century in England is one of barbarism, and that the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England and elsewhere (especially "Western Europe") is one of "bloody legislation," "statutes," licenses and "laws" by which the capitalist state brought about "the discipline necessary for the wage system," i.e., the discipline of the capitalist economic base; the capitalist state constituted the capitalist era in the sixteenth century, and secured it in place in the seventeenth century.

The prelude of the revolution that laid the foundation of the capitalist mode of production, was played in the last third of the 15th, and the first decade of the 16th century. A mass of free proletarians was hurled on the labour-market by the breaking-up of the bands of feudal retainers,...²⁵

Enough has been said about the quantum leap from "mass" to

"free proletarians on the labour-market," which Marx has presented here in a modified version, but we see here the "prelude of the revolution that laid the foundation of the capitalist mode of production." Given the case we have argued above, the "prelude" is barbarism and the "revolution" is the revolution brought on and about by the capitalist state. Using Marxian descriptive terms we will evince barbarism as the "prelude" to the state revolution.

Although the royal power, itself
a product of bourgeois development,
in its strife after absolute
sovereignty forcibly hastened on
the dissolution of these bands of
retainers, it was by no means the
sole cause of it. In insolent conflict
with King and parliament, the great
feudal lords created an incomparably
larger proletariat by the forcible
driving of the peasantry from the
land, to which the latter had the same
feudal right as the lord himself, 26
and by the usurpation of common lands.*

Here Marx is laying the groundwork for his thesis that the dissolution of feudalism can be explained and discerned in

* In this and the next citation the terms used by Marx to underscore his thesis received a single underline, the terms used to underscore our thesis received a double underline.

terms of the advancing forces of capitalism. This groundwork is raised to the level of infrastructure in the entire statement that comes upon the heels of what has just been cited.

The rapid rise in the Flemish wool manufacturers, and the corresponding rise in the price of wool in England, gave the direct impulse to these evictions ["...the forcible driving of the peasantry from the land, ...and by the usurpation of the common lands."]. The old nobility had been devoured by the great feudal wars. The new nobility was the child of its time, for which money was the power of powers. Transformation of arable land into sheep-walks was, therefore, its cry.... The dwellings of the peasants and the cottages of the labourers were razed to the ground or doomed to decay. 27

As a phenomenon, however, Marx is in actuality laying the groundwork and giving definition to our thesis that the dissolution of feudalism can be explained and discerned in terms of the advancing forces of barbarism: "strife after absolute sovereignty," forcible dissolution of "bands of retainers," "insolent conflict" between dissimilar spheres of power rooted in dissimilar social modes, forcible removal of peasants from the land, the breakdown of feudal rights and obligations, "the usurpation of common lands," rapid growth of a manufacturing sector, drastic

changes in economic relations and power, drastic changes in land usage, the destruction and decay of dwellings and the homeless, displacement and loss of means of subsistence for two feudal categories having immense membership. This barbaric groundwork can be raised to the level of a barbaric infrastructure by bringing together all of this material in the following manner: what eventuated in England in the fifteenth century was the creation of masses of disenfranchised, structurally torn, scattered, wandering and brutalized humanity within an anomic context of strife, force and might, arbitrary and contumelious conflict between dissimilar, if not contradictory, spheres of power embedded in dissimilar, if not contradictory, social modes and modes of production. Upon this groundwork and infrastructure can be raised up the totality of barbarism as a social mode: the competition, conflict and struggle played out in brute force, power and might between varying and dissimilar, if not contradictory, modes of existence (e.g., nomadism, vagabondage, banditry, gypsy) and (Marxian) modes of production (e.g., feudalism and capitalism) for supremacy. To carry our thesis to its logical completion is to say, the capitalists, viz., capitalism, won out in their competition, conflict and struggle within the social mode of barbarism because of their ability to muster up

a greater amount and a greater intensity or brute force, power and might in the form of their state because they (eventually) conquered the legal-political structure in England. England in the fifteenth century was in the mortar of barbarism from which capitalism emerged victorious in the sixteenth century.

Before returning to our elicitation of barbarism it is apropos at this juncture to interject a fitting comment of Marx on "bourgeois prejudices" and feudalism.

Japan, with its purely feudal organization...gives a much truer picture of the European middle ages than all our history books, dictated as they are, for the most part, by bourgeois prejudices. It is very convenient to the "liberal" at the expense of the middle ages.²⁸

We find Marx to be subject to his own criticism; he is, for the most part, in conformance with "bourgeois prejudices," as previously suggested, within his "truer picture of the European middle ages." "It is very convenient" for him "to be 'liberal'"--viz., to be and do as the bourgeois ideologues who show feudalism unfolding into capitalism, notwithstanding his evidencing the part played by force--"at the expense of the middle ages."

Marx's thesis is that the transition of feudalism to capitalism in England took place in the "gulf between the 15th and 16th century"; a "gulf" in which the "English

working-class was precipitated without any transition from its golden into its iron age."²⁹

Well let us examine closely and meticulously this "gulf" and its precipitation of the English working-class. We learn that

Legislation was terrified at this revolution ["...the revolution in the conditions of production."]. It did not yet stand on that height of civilisation where the "wealth of the nation" (i.e., the formation of capital, and the reckless exploitation and impoverishing of the mass of people) figure as the ultima Thule of all state-craft.³⁰

If legislation was not on that "height of civilisation" where economic power and control could be used as the ultimate tool of state-craft, then where was it? If legislation, as part of the state structure, could not hold back the revolutionary tide of the conditions of capitalist production, as we shall see, then how do we characterize a social formation in which the state is impotent and/or lacks legitimacy? How do we characterize a social formation in which social controls and policy are confined to the use of sheer force and power? Before answering these questions we need to look at what else Marx has to say about this "gulf" and its precipitation of the English working class.

He notes a number of acts that were dedicated to the prevention of the "destruction of all 'houses of husbandy,'" ³¹ yet the "cry of the people and the legislation directed ,...against the expropriation of the small farmers and peasants, were alike fruitless." ³² Marx tells us why legislation and the "cry of the people" were ineffective.

What the capitalist system demanded was,...a degraded and almost servile condition of the mass of the people, the transformation of them into mercenaries, and of their means of labour into capital.³³

Let us quickly dispose of the reification that permeates the totality of the section on primitive accumulation; to wit, the capitalist system makes no demands: human beings make demands, not systems, and, therefore, it was the capitalists--who were not yet a class in itself due to the absence of the requisite economic and political conditions of its existence or a class-for-itself due to absence of the necessary formation of class-in-itself for its existence--who demanded the degradation and servility of "the mass of people"--mass is not a class, it is "a sack of potatoes"; ³⁴ if the capitalists were a class, then their very existence as a class would have required, within the Marxian framework, the existence of another class with which to battle against, but there is

a singular specification of "the mass of people." This is further substantiation that the capitalists, whose demands were contrary to (the cry of) "the mass of people," and the "mass of people" themselves were not classes, but were simply "competitors": "The separate individuals form a class only insofar as they have to carry on a common battle against another class; otherwise they are on hostile terms with each other as competitors."

In addition, the transformation of a portion of the people into mercenaries³⁵ and their means of labor into capital does not constitute, in and of itself, the formation and establishment of class relations. What is going on here is the erection of the capitalists by means of reification, for the reason that the classes of capitalism were not yet in existence in the fifteenth century. Marx is substituting/switching and confounding an analytical category, "the capitalist system," with the contextual reality of fifteenth century England. Marx constructs the existence of "the capitalist system" in an analytical framework without having, first, proven the actual existence of the constituent material categories of "the capitalist system," without having proven the actual existence of classes--Marx has built a reified world of capitalism that existed nowhere but in his textual analysis. Which is to say, Marx invokes "the capitalist

system" as a tool for analyzing fifteenth century England without having demonstrated the contextual presence of the concrete classes of capitalism; that which is inherent in the actual material composition of fifteenth century English society is never really demonstrated to be what is necessary, i.e., the constituents of class, for Marx to claim the presence of "the capitalist system" in fifteenth century English society. This would be analogous to a meteorological determination of rain in a region that has no atmosphere, no water and no clouds.

In other words, "the capitalist system" is "an abstraction" if one disregards the classes of which it is composed. Isn't this really "an abstraction"? Or is it the case that Marx is building "the capitalist system" upon the forces and relations of production, the base structure: "classes...remain empty terms if one does not know the factors on which they depend, e.g., wage-labour, capital and so on." This Marxian counter-case is, however, without merit; it fails because it posits the structure of capitalist operation and accumulation, the base, and thereby avoids having to show how it actually came into existence. Wage-labor and capital, for example, are asserted and then made to appear as natural and inextricable progressions from feudal society.

The levels of capitalist operation and accumulation appear without rhyme or reason; they were given contextual reality within feudalism because Marx postulated them and then gave them textually to the context of fifteenth century England. What this Marxian counter-case does is deny Capital, Vol. 1, chapter XXVIII that evinces clearly that the state structuralized (integrated, coordinated and centralized) barbarism, and, thus, was able to put forth the base structure of capitalist operations and accumulative relations. It also denies that "wage-labour, capital and so on" "remain empty terms if one does not know the factors on which they depend"--the "factors" of the integration, coordination and centralization of barbarism by the state. Classes are "an abstraction" unless their dependencies upon the base structure are regarded, and, in similar manner, wage-labor, capital and the tiers of the capitalist base are "an abstraction" unless their dependencies upon the legal-political superstructure are regarded.

Marx postulated "the capitalist system" as arising out of feudal society; in the contextual reality of sixteenth century England "the capitalist system" arose out of barbarism with the state becoming the apogee of barbarism in the hands of the capitalist competitors.

With the pinnacle of barbarism in their sway the capitalist competitors could bring about their forces of operation and relations of accumulation. Thus the state formed and constructed the operative tier of the capitalist labor process as well as the accumulative tier of the capitalist economic process. The state opened up the way for the processes of private ownership of the means of production and capital against labor. The state lead the way to not only the economic strata of the capitalist base, but it also lead the way to the strata of capitalist production--the capitalist character of production--that Marx formulates so brilliantly in parts IV and V of Capital, Vol. 1. Here we learn of the unique complex of production centered around machinery, the unique arrangement of interactions between capitalists, workers, commodities, the factory, industry, social cooperation and a division of labor: the world of production which formed the peculiar and particular productive strata of the capitalist base.

To say that the state in the hands of the capitalist competitors lead the way to the operative tier of the base of capitalism, is to say that capitalist productive forces were inseparable from the superstructural events that put them in place and in motion within a specific

social context. Capitalist productive forces were given their value and meaning not by the property relations that cover them but by the superstructural realities that legitimated, secured and guaranteed the type of effective ownership and access necessary for the productive means to remain in the hands of the capitalist competitors.

In this fashion, capitalist private ownership and control of the means of production cannot stand on its own legs, it cannot stand alone as a single tier; it is a form and construction of relations of production which has force and sanctions as its architect, and, in the same vein, productive forces are valueless and meaningless, they too cannot stand on their own, under capitalism unless and until they can be formed and constructed by the force and sanctions of the superstructure into capitalist private ownership relations; i.e., forces of production become capitalistic where and when they are subsumed under capitalist relations of production by the superstructure. A machine, for example, has value and meaning under capitalism only to the extent that it can be privately owned and controlled, and such decisive ownership is the consequence of the superstructure. Stated in the terms of a general proposition, a productive force is not a means of transforming nature, as Marx states;

a means of transforming nature is a productive force solely to the extent that it can be fitted into the social structure by the superstructure. The term "productive force" is a designation of a value and meaning that can be conferred upon anything, including a means of transforming nature, by the legal-political, ideological and social forms of consciousness structure.

Using the evidence gathered by Marx, it will be demonstrated that the superstructure in general and the state structure in particular constituted the base of capitalism. By making this statement, the critical dimensions and differences between the Marxian efformation in which capitalism is built from the base up and the Marxian efformation in which capitalism is built from the superstructure down can be surmised.

- 1) We have ascertained hitherto that the productive/operative-economic/accumulative base has a corresponding superstructure upon which takes place an attending class struggle.

- 2) We have brought out materials which suggest and argue the case that the state superstructural revolution formed and constructed the base of capitalism by vanquishing barbarism through its epitomization of barbarism.

3) We have inferred that the superstructure is the structure of origin of class in itself, in the first analysis, because it is the structure of origin of the economic conditions that generate class in itself.

4) From 2) and 3) it can be concluded that within the efformation of voluntarism the superstructure has a corresponding base structure.

5) By taking over the state the conquering group can stop and then abolish classes in themselves by destroying the productive-economic basis of their existence and/or forcefully stopping and then terminating their existence if necessary.

6) By taking over the state the conquering group can stop and then abolish classes-for-themselves, competitors and modes of existence by force if necessary.

7) From 2)-6) it can be concluded that within the efformation of voluntarism, superstructural class struggle is directed at a) the take over of the superstructure and b) the formation of the base structure by the superstructure.

8) Class-for-itself is a revolutionary phenomenon because it is aimed at and geared up for taking over the state superstructure in general; it is revolutionary because its movement is towards the structure that builds a mode of production.

9) From 7) and 8) it should be apparent that classes-for-themselves is a designation of classes locked in a struggle over the architectural power to preserve, vanquish or build a new mode of production, social mode or mode of existence.

To sum up and to tighten up some of the loose ends of this section, let us say that the state paved the way for the productive-economic base of capitalism to arise in sixteenth century English society. The point where this base was established was the point where the state became a capitalist state and the point where the capitalist and labor classes were given their economic grounds for development. Prior to the establishment of the base of capitalism by the state there was merely a state in the hands of a group of capitalist competitors who were in competition with other groups, including other capitalists competitors, for supremacy. The economic conditions produced by the base of capitalism

fused the separate individual capitalists into a common battle against the masses who were fused into common battles against each other well as against the capitalists. The capitalist base produced the conditions of existence of classes. The state set the capitalist base and with this setting the capitalist state and the constituent classes of capitalism were born; the state has primacy and determination, in the first analysis, over the capitalist base and classes.

To broaden this conclusion beyond capitalism is to say that the state would have primacy and determination, in the first analysis, over the base structure and classes in the history of Marxian epochs --we have hitherto come across this in Marx's rebuttal of Bakunin, and in his pronouncements on the transition of capitalism to communism we find further substantiation for this conclusion.

*

*

*

The process of forcible expropriation of the people received in the 16th century a new and frightful impulse from the Reformation, and from the consequent colossal spoliation of the church property. The Catholic church was, at the time of the Reformation, feudal proprietor of a great part of the English land. The suppression of the monasteries, & c., [sic] hurled their inmates into the proletariat. The estates of the church were...sold...to speculating farmers and citizens, who drove out,

en masse, the hereditary sub-tenants
 and threw their holdings into one....
 the nation was obliged to recognise pauperism of-
 ficially by the introduction of a
 poor-rate.³⁶

Again the quantum leap from a feudal category to a capitalist class, but here at least the leap takes place during the 16th century in which the supremacy of capitalism was becoming a reality. When we continue on in this chapter on expropriation of the agricultural population we gain a fuller picture that indicates what it is that Marx continually leaps over in his transit from feudalism to capitalism.

Communal property---always distinct
 from the State property...--was
 an old Teutonic institution which
 lived on under cover of feudalism.
 We have seen how the forcible
 usurpation of this, generally
 accompanied by the turning of
 arable into pasture land, begins
at the end of the 15th century
and extends into the 16th century.
But, at that time, the process was
carried on by means of individual
acts of violence against which
legislation, for a hundred and
fifty years, fought in vain. 37

The dawn of capitalism is visible as coming forth out of the night of barbarism; a night of the fifteenth and early sixteenth century in which individuals not classes were engaged in the "forcible usurpation" of communal property, feudal property; a night where individual violence ruled to such an extent that the legal-political

superstructure and its violence "fought in vain" for "a hundred and fifty years"; a night which was turned into the dawn of capitalism "at the end of the 15th" century, and then turned into the day of capitalism in the sixteenth century; a night turned into the dawn and day of capitalism by means of the legal-political superstructure becoming the inclusive instrument of barbarism--the state became the structuralization of barbarism. Hence, Marx says in the sentences that follow the above quote

The advance made by the 18th century [the day of capitalism] shows itself in this, that the law itself becomes now the instrument of the theft of the people's land....The parliamentary form...robbery...a parliamentary coup d'etat....³⁸

"The advance made by the 18th century" was the advance of capitalism over barbarism; an advance in which capitalism proceeded beyond barbarism by structuralizing it into the form of the capitalist superstructure. Superstructural barbarism was the modus operandi for establishing the capitalist modus vivendi over the barbarous modus vivendi; which is to say, capitalist structural barbarism used "conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder, briefly force," and violence to abolish the forceful and violent competition,

conflict and struggle between capitalism, feudalism, modes of existence and individual competitors for hegemonic supremacy. The advance made by capitalism was one of hegemonic supremacy over the social mode/modus vivendi of barbarism.

Whereas Marx speaks of the advance of the dawn of capitalism upon feudal relations, we speak of Marx's continual leap over the night of barbarism that preceded this dawn; we speak of barbarism as "the pre-historic stage of capital and" the social mode corresponding with it. Furthermore, we find in Marx's own words how he was able to vault repeatedly from feudalism over barbarism into capitalism, and we find in his own words why he had to "lay the foundations of the capitalistic mode of production" upon feudalism and not lay them upon barbarism. His remarks about a bourgeois political economist reveal this how and why.

The stoical peace of mind with which the political economist regards the most shameless violation of the "sacred rights of property" and the grossest acts of violence to persons, as soon as they are necessary to lay the foundations of the capitalistic mode of production, is shown by.... The whole series of thefts, outrages, and popular misery, that accompanied the forcible expropriation of the people, from the last third of

the 15th to the end of the 18th
century, lead him [Sir F.M. Eden]
...to....³⁹

It is our case that Marx was able to catapult himself repeatedly over the night of barbarism because he approached his materials from "within the bounds of the bourgeois horizon"; i.e., Marx was operating from within the mind-lock, the "stoical peace of mind," of a bourgeois economist, and this perspective is one of the dissolution and breakdown of feudalism followed by the composition and buildup of capitalism. Although Marx does not defend the "most shameless violation...grossest acts of violence to persons....thefts, outrages and popular misery, that accompanied" the laying of "the foundations of the capitalistic mode of production." as bourgeois economists, e.g., Sir F.M. Eden, do defend the barbarism that accompanied the laying of the capitalist base, Marx still does not, however, journey beyond the "bounds of the bourgeois horizon." He too carries on his analysis with the "stoical peace of mind" of bourgeois political economists who could see only capitalism on the horizon of the twilight of feudalism.

The question still remains as to why Marxian analysis was lodged within the "narrow limits" of bourgeois political economy, and, therefore, why he had to place

capitalism as issuing from feudalism? The answer, we argue, is given by Marx himself--paradoxically it is given in the criticism just cited of a bourgeois political economist. Marx was, therein, affirming and securing the "shameless violation of the 'sacred rights of poverty'...the grossest acts of violence....thefts, outrage...misery,..."as the "necessary" pre-conditions of existence of the capitalist foundation of the capitalistic mode of production. What distinguishes and differentiates Marx from the tradition and consensus of bourgeois political economy is his willingness to evince that the means and methods necessary for laying the capitalist foundation were "shameless," gross, violent, etc., as well as his unwillingness to evince that these means and methods--the "necessary" pre-conditions of existence of the capitalist foundation "of the capitalistic mode of production"--became intrinsic and essential to capitalism.⁴⁰ He does not, however, distinguish and differentiate himself from the tradition and consensus of bourgeois political economy in his willingness to evince that the pre-conditions of existence for laying the capitalist foundation were, in actuality, "necessary" in order for (and due to) the capitalist competitors to conquer a social mode of violation, violence, theft, outrages, misery, forcible expropriation, etc., by

epitomizing it. Marx does not, consequently, break from bourgeois political economic tradition and consensus by way of a willingness to evince that these pre-conditions of existence are not necessarily capitalistic, but these pre-conditions are absolutely and necessarily barbarous.

Which is to say, either there are no "necessary" pre-conditions for laying the capitalist foundation and barbarism was accidental, coincidental or incidental to the development of capitalism or barbarism was the "necessary" pre-condition of existence for laying the foundation of capitalism. Shameless violations against property, the grossest acts of violence, theft, etc., do not, of necessity, lay the capitalist foundation--they could have laid the foundation of slavery, anarchy, dictatorship, "banana republics," monarchy, etc.; they do, of necessity, lay the foundation of barbarism. Our argument is, therefore, that if barbarism is rejected as the "necessary" pre-condition of existence of the capitalist foundation, then capitalism has no "necessary" pre-conditions of existence and Marx's complete analysis of "Primitive Accumulation" falls and crumbles.

We will conclude our analysis of the chapter on the expropriation of the agricultural population by quoting Marx's summary paragraph on this chapter. Once again

our entire argument on the relationship between capitalism and barbarism, particularly our position on the hegemony of capitalism as a consequence of its structural mastery of barbarism, highlights the historical, economic and logical necessity and quantum leap animating Marx's rationale; once again our either-or, if-then, proposition haunts Marx's scenario of capitalist development.

The spoliation of the church's property, the fraudulent alienation of the State domains, the robbery of the common lands, the usurpation of feudal and clan property, and its transformation into modern private property under circumstances of reckless terrorism, were just so many idyllic methods of primitive accumulation. They conquered the field for capitalist agriculture, made the soil part and parcel of capital, and created for the town industries the necessary supply of a "free" and outlawed proletariat. 41

In short, barbarism circumscribed and was a pre-condition of existence of primitive accumulation, and this barbarism entailed state barbarism.

"Bloody Legislation Against The Expropriated,
From The End Of The 15th Century. Forcing
Down Of Wages By Acts Of Parliament":
State Barbarism Overwhelms the Social Mode
of Barbarism and Builds the Capitalist Base.

The proletariat created by the breaking up of the bands of feudal retainers and by the forcible expropriation of the people from the soil, this "free" proletariat could not possibly be absorbed by the nascent manufacturers as fast as it was thrown upon the world. On the other hand, these men, suddenly dragged from their wonted mode of life, could not as suddenly adapt themselves to the discipline of their new condition. They were turned en masse into beggars, robbers, vagabonds, partly from inclination, in most cases from stress of circumstances. Hence at the end of the 15th century and during the whole of the 16th century, throughout Western Europe a bloody legislation against vagabondage. The fathers of the present working-class were chastised for their enforced transformation into vagabonds and paupers. Legislation treated them as "voluntary" criminals, and assumed that it depended on their own good will to go on working under the old conditions that no longer existed.⁴²

Again, let us examine closely and meticulously this paragraph. We encounter immediately in the first sentence the quantum from the constituent categories of feudalism --"bands of feudal retainers"--into a constituent category of capitalism--"The proletariat"; under no

"certain circumstances" does it follow, historically, economically, logically, axiomatically or necessarily, that "the forcible expropriation of the people from the soil" results in a "'free' proletariat." If anything does follow from the people, be they constituent members of feudalism or otherwise, being "suddenly dragged from wonted mode of life" is that they do "not as suddenly adapt themselves to the" trauma, uprootedness and calamity "of their new condition." We understand that Marx is speaking, at this juncture, of "the discipline" of capitalism; nevertheless, our case is that "the discipline" of capitalism was achieved in the sixteenth century out of barbarism by means of state barbarism. Back to our argument, if anything does follow from this sudden and life-threatening anomie imposed upon these people, it is that they would be "turned en masse into beggars, robbers, vagabonds...from stress of circumstances," and not because of any "idiocy of rural life"⁴³ or "inclination" that Marx finds in these people.

What is being pointed out is that the "bands of feudal retainers" adapted to the sudden stress of the breakdown of feudal society by means of the formation of modes of existence that contributed, along with those constituent members of feudalism who fought each other as well as fought for the survival of the feudal mode of

production and the capitalist competitors who fought each other as well as fought for the arrival of the capitalist mode of production, to the creation of the social mode of barbarism--the social mode of barbarism that spread over Western Europe in the fifteenth century. The appearance of this social mode that induced the breakdown of feudalism explains, in a meaningful, sensible and parsimonious manner, why "bloody legislation" and criminalization were the exclusive means and methods of choice employed against vagabondage and pauperism. "Hence at the end of the 15th and during the whole of the 16th century, throughout Western Europe a bloody legislation against vagabondage....Legislation treated them as 'voluntary' criminals...."

There are three critical issues here that argue against Marx and in favor of our case; viz., 1) the superstructural construction of the capitalist base, 2) the brutality and deadliness of the legislation and criminalization and 3) the human targets of the brutal and deadly legislation and criminalization.

1) To begin our discussion of these three critical issues, let us say that the superstructure was used as the ultimate tool to build the capitalist base; in saying this we not only agree fully with Marx, but we are using

the entire section on "The So-Called Primitive Accumulation" to take the efformation of voluntaristic revolution, with its emphasis on the superstructure, to its conclusion and completion. Having said that, we can go forward and further our case that the legal-political superstructure founded the capitalist base through the instrumentality of barbarism, and that the occurrence of this founding took place on the ground of barbarism not feudalism. Consequently, this manner of founding was not due to any indwelling barbarism infixed in the early stages of capitalist development; rather, this barbaric expedient was necessary to overcome the social mode of barbarism that formed the "pre-historic stage of capital," the "pre-historic stage" of primitive accumulation. Capitalistic barbarism was the super-structuralization of barbarism within the "new condition" and "stress of circumstances." The barbarism of capitalism was the super-structuralization of barbarism that constituted the "new condition" of stressful circumstances for the masses. Capitalistic barbarism grew out of and successfully integrated, coordinated and concentrated the generalized barbarism fostered by the sudden breakdown of a social "mode of life." Capitalism did not necessarily or intrinsically requisite barbarism for its development in sixteenth

century Western Europe, as Marx argues in "...Primitive Accumulation." To the contrary, capitalism rose to hegemonic supremacy out of fifteenth century barbarism in Western Europe through the superstructural wherewithal of barbarism.

The barbarism of capitalistic development was necessitated by an intrinsic to the "mode of life" of barbarism in fifteenth century Western Europe, and not that barbarism was necessitated by and intrinsic to the capitalistic "mode of life" at "the end of the 15th and during the whole of the 16th century, throughout Western Europe...." Thus, whereas Marx has argued that barbarism was part and parcel of capitalistic development, we are arguing that capitalistic development was part and parcel of barbarism.

Our case against the Marxian relationship between capitalism and barbarism is confirmed by the three critical issues brought out in the introductory paragraph of this chapter on "Bloody Legislation." 1) The super-structural construction of the capitalist base.

In England this legislation began under Henry VII.

Henry VIII. 1530: Beggars old and unable to work receive a beggars license. On the other hand, whipping and imprisonment for sturdy vagabonds....

Edward VI: A statute of the first year of his reign, 1547, ordains that if anyone refuses to work, he shall be condemned as a slave to the person who has denounced him as an idler....

Elizabeth, 1572: Unlicensed beggars above 14 years of age are to be severely flogged and branded on the left ear unless someone will take them into service for two years;...

James I.: Any one wandering about and begging is declared a rogue and a vagabond....

Similar laws in France, where by the middle of the 17th century a kingdom of vagabonds (truands) was established in Paris. Even at the beginning of... (July 13th, 1777) every man in good health from 16 to 60...if without means of subsistence and not practising a trade, is to be sent to the galleys.⁴⁴

Marx concludes:

...the agricultural people,... first forcibly expropriated from the soil, driven from their homes, turned into vagabonds, and then whipped, branded, tortured by laws grotesquely terrible, into the discipline necessary for the wage system.⁴⁵

In other words,

The bourgeoisie, at its rise, wants and uses the power of the state to "regulate" wages, i.e., to force them within the limits suitable for surplus-value making, to lengthen the working-day and to keep the labourer himself in the normal degree of dependence. This is an essential element of the so-called primitive accumulation.⁴⁶

The state, then, is "an essential element" of the "pre-historical stage of capital and of the mode of production corresponding with it"; the "uses" of "the power of the state" by the bourgeoisie was essential in the sixteenth century for the transformation of "masses of men" into classes of men "who have nothing to sell but their labour-power," and the ideological superstructure and its generation of "forms of social consciousness" was the sufficient element in the "advance of capitalist production."

It is not enough that the conditions of labour are concentrated in a mass, in the shape of capital, at the one pole of society, while at the other are grouped masses of men, who have nothing to sell but their labour-power. Neither is it enough that they are compelled to sell it voluntarily. The advance of capitalist production develops a working-class, which by education, tradition, habit, looks upon the conditions of that mode of production as self-evident laws of Nature....In the ordinary run of things, the labourer can be left to the "natural laws of production," i.e., to his dependence on capital, a dependence springing from, and guaranteed in perpetuity by, the 47 conditions of production themselves.

Again let us examine this paragraph line by line. We see that the "conditions of labour" that were created by the bourgeoisie's "wants and uses" of state power are not sufficient for the "advance of capitalist production"; which is to say, the state superstructure is not sufficient

for advancing beyond the establishment of capitalistic forces and relations of production. It is necessary and sufficient for the formation and construction of the base of capitalism, but it is not sufficient for its "advance" to a self-evident natural phenomenon. What Marx means by this is that for the "advance of capitalist production" to occur there has to be the full development of the "organisation of capitalist process of production" such that "ideology" and their "corresponding forms of social consciousness" break "down all resistance" to the capitalist mode of production. The ideological superstructure and its "corresponding forms of social consciousness" is the sufficient element that moves capitalist production beyond the fundamental process of formation and construction, its basic operative and accumulative processes, to a self-perpetuating base-superstructure capitalist system.

The organisation of the capitalist process of production, once fully developed, breaks down all resistance. The constant generation of a relative surplus-population keeps the law of supply and demand of labour, and therefore keeps wages, in a rut that corresponds with the wants of capital. The dull compulsion of economic relations completes the subjection of the labourer to the capitalist.⁴⁸

In other words, the ideological superstructure and its "corresponding forms of social consciousness" cements the subjugation and dependency of the laborer to the conditions of the capitalist mode of production such that, "Direct force, outside of economic conditions, is of course still used, but only exceptionally."⁴⁹ The state superstructure creates the necessary and sufficient conditions for the early foundational and fundamental formation and construction of capitalism. The ideological superstructure is essential for building upon this early foundational and fundamental formation and construction. It fashions a "working-class, which by education [part of the ideological superstructure], tradition [a well developed and continuous cultural pattern requiring a stable and enduring ideological structure and "forms of social consciousness" for its perpetuation], habit [an expression of mind and deed characteristic of a form of social consciousness], looks [a perceptual orientation framed by a social consciousness corresponding to an ideological structure] upon the conditions of that mode of production [capitalism] as self-evident laws of Nature [capitalism is embedded in an ideological universe removed from inquiry]...In the ordinary run of things [the conjuncture of education-tradition-habit-perception-ideological universe],

the labourer can be left to the 'natural laws of production,' i.e., "[bourgeois ideology]....

After the successful "advance" and completion of ideological and social consciousness conquest, the state no longer served as the super-structuralization of barbarism. Hence, "bloody legislation," brutal criminalization as well as State statutes and laws for fixing maximum wages, keeping wages down and prohibiting "coalitions of labourers to manufacturers"⁵⁰ had outlived their practicality and necessity by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.

Finally, in 1813, the laws for the regulation of wages were repealed. They were an absurd anomaly, since the capitalist regulated his factory by his private legislation....
The barbarous laws against Trades' Unions fell in 1825.... only against its will and under pressures of the masses did the English Parliament give up laws against Strikes and Trades' Unions.... This law [of June 14, 1791 against the "workers... right of association"] which, by means of State compulsion, confined the struggle between capital and a labour within limits comfortable for capital, has outlived revolutions and changes of dynasties.⁵¹

"The organization of the capitalist process of production" entailed, in its full development in Western Europe, the emergence of the ideological superstructure. This emergence signaled the submergence, and eventual

disappearance, of the "uses" of the legal-political superstructure as the superstructuralization of barbarism. What legal-political superstructural barbarism built out of the barbarous mode of life ideological capitalism advanced to the point where the barbarous mode of life became a non-existent social mode in both the present and the past, and in "...Primitive Accumulation" Marx contributes greatly to the advancement of ideological capitalism.

Now that we have displayed the materials which substantiate, without any ambiguity or doubt, our contention that Marxian texts have a revolutionary efformation in which the superstructure can transform as well as form/ found and construct the capitalistic base, we can advance toward the substantiation of Marxian dedication to the ideological superstructure of capitalism and his manifestation of the corresponding social forms of bourgeois consciousness; to wit, Marx's thesis on primitive accumulation, capitalistic accumulation and the capitalist productive mode which breaks and conceals the link between the barbarous mode of life in Western Europe during the pre-historical and historical stages of capital and capitalism.

Let us return to the paragraph where Marx declares the limits of the legal-political superstructure for the advancement and development of the capitalist process of production and declares the essentiality of the ideological superstructure and social forms of consciousness for the advancement and development of the organization of capitalistic production. Let us also ask why does these "grouped masses of men" have to sell anything? Why can't they engage in barter, exchange or sharing in order to meet their needs? Why can't they engage in mass rebellion or mass upheaval to meet their needs, and thereby counteract the embryonic transformation initiated by their capitalist competitors via the state? Why can't they form guerilla bands, terrorist groups, gangs or secret societies to create their own modes of existence by way of warfare, terror, murder, plunder, liberation of wealth from the rich, swindle, etc.? Why can't they end the "dull compulsion of economic relations" by destroying or taking control of the means of production? Why can't they abduct their capitalist competitors and, at least, halt or slow down the "dull compulsion of economic relations"?

We know from Marx's overall position on this matter that he would have been extremely critical of any
 52
 destruction of the means of production or mass seizure

of the means of production--remember his denouncements of Bakunin--especially by a grouped mass of "beggars, robbers, vagabonds" who lived such lives, in part, because of their "inclination."

In other words, we know from Marx's overall social forms of compliance to, conformance with and reproduction of bourgeois consciousness that he reduces this great mass of humanity torn and "suddenly dragged from their wonted mode of life" to mere labor-power. It is Marx who is "compelled" by bourgeois ideology to speak of this great human mass as nothing but labor-power in capitalist production. There are no reasons why this mass of humanity could not do every and all of what is stated in the above series of questions; there are no reasons why this mass of humanity could not have delivery itself from capitalist production. There are many reasons why this mass of humanity torn and "suddenly dragged from their wonted mode of life" would be more likely to enter into barbarism than the capitalists who were not as directly and immediately devastated by the anomie and dislocation, yet Marx has this great mass of paupers, vagabonds, beggars, robbers, etc., as a mass of one dimensional creatures surrendering on the treadmill of historical and economic transformation of feudalism into capitalism.

What we have here is the bourgeois composite of ruptured masses of destitute, estranged and compelled humanity subjugated to the sole option of complying and conforming, and therewith reproducing the conditions of capitalistic labor.

All of this is to be understood as Marx saying, in essence and effect, that the legal-political superstructure formed and constructed capitalist productive forces and relations, the production base having a "specific capitalistic character."⁵³ This formation and construction was necessary and sufficient to overcome a mode of social relations that we have designated as barbarism: the competition, conflict and deadly struggle between and amongst feudal members, capitalists and great numbers of robbers, vagabonds, beggars and paupers for survival and supremacy.

At this point comes forth the crux of why the legal-political superstructure was the necessary and sufficient factor in building the base--in contrast to the base being the necessary and sufficient element in building the superstructure as is the case in the productive-economic efformation. Barbarism is a mode of mass law and politics enforced violently; it is a mode without super-structural law and politics: it is without law or politics in the sense of a centralized, coordinated and integrated legal-political structure. Barbarism is, in the terms,

categories, concepts, theories and structures of the legal-political superstructure, lawless and apolitical or dis-political because it is without a state derived law, politic, sanction and force. Barbarism is a stateless social mode of life--not a legal-political mode of life--where mass law, politics, sanction and force compose and comprise its relations. Whereas barbarism is a social mode of 1) undifferentiate force and coercion, 2) no articulated combination of forces and relations of production, i.e., it is not a Marxian mode of production, and 3) no ideological structure, feudalism and capitalism, as constructed by Marx, are legal-political-ideological superstructural modes of production.⁵⁴ Barbarism has neither superstructure nor base; feudalism and capitalism on the other hand, have superstructures that correspond to their productive forces and relations that constitute their base. Barbarism is undifferentiate and localized mass sanctions, force and power, and feudalism as well as capitalism are differentiated and centralized⁵⁵ in their methods and means of sanctions, force and power.

The reason why the legal-political superstructure was necessary and sufficient for building the capitalist base is that the legal-political superstructure was the apparatus perfectly fixed to and capable of conquering the undifferentiated, mass and localized law, politics

sanctions and force of barbarism. The state was necessary and sufficient to bring an end to a stateless--i.e., superstructural lawlessness and apoliticalization/dis-politicalization--social mode of life; the state was necessary to put in place and motion differentiated and centralized power to form, construct and regulate a coherent and articulate combination of capitalist productive forces and relations out of which develops a capitalist and working class. The state was necessary and sufficient for the capitalist competitors to realize the subordination not of labor to capital, but the "great masses of men" to capitalistic atomization and serialization; and with this the atomization and serialization which leads to class formation. The hegemonic supremacy of capitalism was the result of the hegemony supremacy of class formation and organization over the mass formation and organization of humanity.

Where and when the state repressed the law, politic, sanctions and force of the masses, additional steps were required to advance, develop and complete the organization of the capitalistic production process in Western Europe. Such advancement, development and completion called into play the ideological superstructure to dissolve forms of mass social consciousness and generate corresponding form of class social consciousness that lead to perceptions

of the conditions of the capitalist productive mode as "self-evident laws of Nature." The advancement, development and completion of the ideological superstructure of capitalism itself can be seen by examining the forms of class social consciousness, the forms of human organization that mark the hegemony of capitalism, that discover the self-evident laws of history, revolution and political economy; "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" marks the summit of capitalism and bourgeois hegemony; "Population is an abstraction if, for instance, one disregards the classes of which it is composed," is another hallmark of the conversion/inversion of mass social consciousness into class social consciousness.

Marx's "...Primitive Accumulation" is an expression of the advancement, development and completion of capitalist ideology, and Marx represents the apogee of forms of bourgeois social consciousness. In order for Marx to have acknowledged barbarism, the social mode of mass life, as the ground that was suited to the legal-political superstructure as the necessary and sufficient condition for establishing capitalism in Western Europe, and in order for Marx to have acknowledged barbarism as the condition of existence and historical stage of primitive accumulation, Marx would have had to acknowledge

that 1) capitalism did not have to emerge supreme in Western Europe, 2) his stages of historical epochs, particularly the transition of capitalism out of feudalism, is bourgeois ideology in that it has new classes taking over the state power from decomposing feudal classes and 3) real antagonism, real contradiction, "real struggles" under capitalism are not class against class, but the real antagonism, real contradiction and "real struggles" are class against the great masses of humanity.

2) The brutality and deadliness of the legislation and criminalization.

Given all that has been said in 1), it will suffice to say that the brutality and deadliness of legal-political decrees was directed against those who were unable or refused to work within the capitalist labor process, according to Marx; brutality and capital punishment, no pun intended, were imperative to accomplish the necessary "discipline" of the "wage-system." Marx was unable or refused to explain the severity and draconian nature of the legislation and criminalization from the perspective of the "great masses of men" who resisted, refused or were unable to give up their mode of life. Marx looked at this brutality and deadliness from within the discipline

and conditions of the capitalist labor process, and, therefore, his perceptions were of the brutality and deadliness as directed against those who were unfit for or contrary to the confines and subordination of labor to capital. Marx did not view this brutality and deadliness from without the discipline and conditions of the capitalist labor process. He did not perceive the brutality and deadliness as directed against those who were unfit for, contrary to and fought against giving up or abandoning their mass way of life. Brutality and deadliness was not the consequence of trying to fit beggars, robbers, paupers and vagabonds into the confines and subordination of labor to capital, nor was it the consequence of disciplining the masses of humanity to the wage-labor system. To the contrary, such torture and torment was the consequence of trying to extirpate the "great masses of men" from their adherence and embeddness in the mode of barbarism.

Marx perceived these "bloody" and deadly events through the lens of capitalistic social consciousness, and, as a result, he looked at them solely for their relation to the capitalist labor process and their effect on the wage-labor system. What he did not perceive, because of his bourgeois blinders, was that these "great masses of men" had no

knowledge of or experience with the conditions and discipline of capitalism, they had no forms of capitalist social consciousness. They did have knowledge and experience with their own "wonted mode of" barbarous life, and it was their effort to preserve, protect and reproduce "their wonted mode of life" that lead to their inability, refusal, resistance and opposition to march to the drum of capitalism. In turn, their inability, refusal, resistance and opposition made sensible and rational to their capitalist competitors the brutal and deadly use of the legal-political superstructure. Marx, not this great mass of humanity, lived with and by forms of capitalistic social consciousness that incorporated prior knowledge of and prior experience with the conditions and discipline of capitalist production; consequently, when he documented the pain, suffering and extinction of this great mass of humanity he did so as a radical and humane capitalist--he did so in light of his capitalistic reality. His forms of social consciousness prevented him from documenting the plight of this mass in light of their barbarous reality; moreover, he could not, as could not the capitalist competitors at the helm of the legal-political superstructure and in pursuit of the hegemony of capitalist production, broach this mass of humanity as having their own reality--a reality distinct

and different from capitalistic reality--and dedicated to its distinction and differences.

In short, blood and death was mandated by the capitalist to quell the attachment and tradition of their rivals, i.e., to quell an oppositional social mode of life. Blood and death were not mandate by any inhesion or unavoidable feature of capitalistic production and the wage-labor system. This point of view lies outside of Marxian reference because Marx was lodged within the forms of bourgeois consciousness; hence the blood and death is explained by Marx from within capitalistic codes--Marixan writings represent an expression of such codes. By way of his critique of alienation and exploitation, Marx criticizes bourgeois forms and capitalistic codes, but nowhere does he transcend these form and codes.

In sum, the Marxian frame of reference is no more or less than the radicalization of bourgeois forms and capitalistic codes which convergence and completion is class and class revolution as human salvation.

3) The human targets of the brutal and deadly legislation and criminalization.

Marx makes mention of beggars, robbers, vagabonds, and paupers. Vagabonds receive most of Marx's attention. He uses the vagabond to demonstrate that the 1) "bloody

legislation" was aimed at those who refused to work, and 2) severity of punishment or the penalty of capital punishment was related directly to the refusal to work or wandering about in contradistinction to those who were "old and unable to work." By so demonstrating Marx seeks to substantiate his position that we have been discussing up to the present. Let us take the example of the vagabond to represent all members of the mode of barbarism that Marx mentions, and let us continue our case from 1) and 2) by way of substantiating capitalistic development from within the pith of barbarism.

Vagabonds were perceived by Marx solely in relation to the legislation, laws and statutes of the capitalist legal-political superstructure, i.e., Marx perceived vagabonds solely in relation to production and labor. He could not perceive them in any way that was outside his forms of social consciousness that correspond to the capitalist ideological superstructure. He could not perceive vagabondage--as a mode of existence within a mass social mode of life--as inimical and an anathema to the class mode within the capitalist mode of production: vagabondage could not be accommodated or incorporated into the capitalistic ideological codes and their corresponding forms of social consciousness that so dominated Marx. Vagabondage disrupts, challenges and shatters the

convergence and completion of these codes and forms:
class formation, development and struggle.

Vagabonds form a mass: an anti-atomized, anti-serialized and anti-linear arrangement and organization of human population. They along with peasants, robbers, feudal barons, beggars, paupers, gypsies, capitalists, artisans, etc., formed a mass social mode of life in which each "grouped mass" of humanity was vying between and amongst each other with whatever violent and forceful means were necessary for power and control. This social mode characterized fifteenth and sixteenth century Western Europe, and we have designated it barbarism.

From within the bowels of barbarism, the "grouped mass" of capitalists emerged, and by the late sixteenth they had fashioned and shaped the powerless and ineffectual superstructural ruins of feudal society into their legal-political-ideological bulwark. To insure their control, power, authority and sanctions the mass social mode of life had to be destroyed and made to vanish by the capitalists. This they did through their innovation of class; they introduced a revolutionary new mode of human association: class, and it served as the final solution to mass formation and society.

The mass of capitalists established legal-political and ideological dominance, this in turn served to establish their mode of production; this in turn served to atomize, serialize and linearize humanity into classes--this series of events is what really composes chapters 4 and 5 of Capital, Vol. 1, and is discernible where 1) Marx's capitalistic ideological codes and their corresponding bourgeois forms are stripped from capitalist production and 2) the mystique Marx's builds around it in laying it bare is exposed. The bourgeois arose at capitalism's peak and the disbanded, fragmented and partitioned masses settled to the bottom of capitalism as ruled classes.

From this we can glean that the mass modes of existence were the targets of "bloody legislation" and criminalization. "Bloody Legislation" and criminalization were not aimed directly at those who refused to work, nor was the harshness of punishment or the penalty of capital punishment related directly to the refusal to work or idleness. Work in the capitalist production process was the mechanism for the atomization, serialization and linearization of the masses. The production of classes takes place in the capitalist production process where humanity is situated on the assembly line by the capitalists; from this process the ruling capitalist class and ruled classes emerged. "Bloody Legislation" and

criminalization were aimed directly at the "grouped masses of men" whose modes of existence were a clear and present danger to the capitalists take-over; a take-over to be accomplished by means of their revolutionary program of transformation: change the barbarous masses into the novel human configuration of class through violent and forced atomization, serialization and linearization in the capitalist production process. The masses of barbarism were transformed coercively in order to lock them into the despotism of class--a despotism Marx would offset, revolutionarily, with the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

* * *

We will go through, in brief, the remaining chapters of "...Primitive Accumulation" in order to supplement and improve upon the logic and order of what has been said so far in the presentation of our case.

" Genesis Of The Capitalist Farmer "

Now that we have considered the forcible creation of a class of outlawed proletarians, the bloody discipline that turned them into wage-labourers, the disgraceful action of the State which employed the police to accelerate the accumulation of capital by increasing the degree of exploitation of labour, the question remains: whence came the capitalists originally?⁵⁶

The forced and violent formation of classes is one of our principle propositions. We have argued that "the forcible creation of a class of outlawed proletarians" by means of "the bloody discipline" (1) took place in a context of barbarism and not in the context of feudalism and (2) was a "forcible creation" of an outlawed class out of an "outlawed" mass. The masses became outlaws only after the capitalists seized control of a devastated superstructure weakened and made impotent by the ravages of barbarism. The capitalists firmed up the legal-political superstructure and initiated "the disgraceful action of the State which employed the police to accelerate the accumulation of capital by increasing the degree of exploitation of labour." In other words, the capitalist employed the organizational tier, the superstructure, to establish and accelerate the development of the accumulative tier, the economic base.

The organizational tier set out the economic base which in turn set out classes.

Now to the question Marx employs to frame this chapter: "whence came the capitalist originally?"

What is the genesis of the capitalist farmer?

...as concerns the genesis of the farmer, we can,...put our hand on it, because it is a slow process evolving through many centuries. The serfs, as well as the free small proprietors, held land under very different tenures, and were therefore emancipated under very different economic conditions. In England the first form of the farmer is the baliff, himself a serf. His position is similar to that of the old Roman villicus....During the second half of the 14th century he is replaced by a farmer, whom the landlord provides with seed, cattle and implements....So long, during the fifteenth century, as the independent peasant and the farm-labourer working for himself as well as for wages, enriched themselves by their own labour, the circumstances of the farmer, and his field of production, were equally mediocre. The agricultural revolution which commenced in the last third of the 15th century, and continued during almost the whole of the 16th (excepting, ...its last decade), enriched him just as speedily as it impoverished the mass of the agricultural people.⁵⁷

Everything is laid out clearly; now we know "whence came the capitalists" originally as well as know the genesis of the capitalist farmer. We know from the prior

chapters of "The So-Called Primitive Accumulation" that "the expropriation of the agricultural population creates, directly, none but great landed proprietors"⁵⁸ and "the servitude of the labourer." was the "starting-point of the development that gave rise to the wage-labourer as well as to the capitalists." That is, "the expropriation of the agricultural population" is the basis of the whole process of class formation under Western European capitalism. The agricultural revolution which began in the "last third of the 15th century" and continued until the last decade of the sixteenth century enriched the farmer to the point where "England, at the end of the 16th century, had a class of capitalist farmers" who were rich.⁵⁹

Notwithstanding this Marxian layout, the question of the origin of the capitalist class in general and the "genesis" of the "class of capitalist farmers" in particular remains obscured.

The obscurity which covers the question of the origin of the capitalist class is the same obscurity which covers the question of the genesis of the capitalist farmer. It is an obscurity uncovered by "the mass of agricultural people." What we have here are farmers who are imputedly swept along through the

fifteenth and most of the sixteenth century by the wave of the agricultural revolution and they are cast upon the shores of "a class of capitalist farmers." For Marx a class, in itself or for-itself, exists always in relation to at least one other class. But there is no other class. What we have is the agricultural mass; a mass who were not brutalized into class-ification by the State until "the end of the 16th century." We know this because of our ongoing investigation and interrogation. Moreover, we know this because Marx informs us that the class formation of capitalist farmers occurred "at the end of the 16th century," and, thus, with the formation of the capitalist class of farmers came the required counter-class: the proletarians who were formed out of "the mass of agricultural people."

Whence came the capitalist class? What is the genesis of the class of the capitalist farmers? It is not Marx's dual-obscurants of industrial and agricultural revolution; the capitalists in general and the capitalist farmers in particular do not have their origin in the onrush of revolutionary waves. They have their origin in the "bloody discipline...of the State." It was "the disgraceful action of the State" in the hands of the capitalist competitors, the capitalists who were in a hegemonic war with their rivals, which laid the economic foundation of

capitalism, the primitive accumulation of capital, upon the mass burial ground of "the agricultural people." It is this economic foundation laid by the State from which the descent of the capitalist class, the capitalist farmer and the proletariat proceeds, and it is a descent which ensues from "the end of the 16th century," as is revealed by Marx once his obscurantism is uncovered.

To conclude our comments on this chapter let us say that Marx is engaged in a well constructed and insidious reversal of the sequence of stages in the development of capitalism in Western Europe during the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries. Great masses of men were not "hurled as free and 'unattached' proletarians on the labour-market." They were "hurled" as a "free and 'unattached'" "mass of agricultural people" (emphasis added). The servitude of the wage-laborer, the "'unattached' proletarians," was the consequence of State actions not the consequence of sudden and forcible wrenching of the agricultural mass "from their means of subsistence."

The State forced the "torn" agricultural mass into the class-ification process of capitalistic production; the organizational tier was employed by the capitalist competitors to violently push the masses onto the production tier. In addition, the State founded capitalistic

economic conditions; the organizational tier was employed by the capitalist competitors to materialize the accumulation of capital, to materialize the accumulative tier. Thus, the State accomplished the capitalistic base: the capitalist mode of production, and the capitalist mode of production generated the formation of the proletariat and capitalist classes.

We are jumping ahead of ourselves. Suffice it to say, the insidiousness in Marxian "...Primitive Accumulation" is centered around the reversal of the following sequence of stages: (1) the capitalist competitors seized a state ravaged by barbarism, (2) the state was propped up and repaired by the capitalist competitors, (3) the state forged in force and violence the capitalist mode of production and (4) the capitalist mode of production established classes. The State, the organizational tier was the antecedent of capitalism, the operative and accumulative tiers, and its classes in Western Europe.

"Reaction Of The Agricultural
 Revolution On Industry.
 Creation Of The Home-Market
 For Industrial Capital."

The expropriation and expulsion of the
 agricultural population, intermittent
 but renewed again and again, supplied,
 ...the town industries with a mass of
proletarians entirely unconnected with
 the corporate guilds and unfettered by
 them....60

Again we encounter the insidious construction of
 an instantaneous and automatic creation of "a mass of
 proletarians." Here Marx shifts into the subterfuge
 of a mass of the proletarian class; to wit, Marx
 tries to cloud the difference between class and mass so
 as to obscure the realization that an expropriated
 expelled "mass of the agricultural people" was not
 instantaneously and automatically transformed into a class.

This dispossessed and displaced agricultural mass
 was not a "mass of proletarians"; proletarians had to be
 formed/made/established; and this production of proletarians
 is not a necessary, inexorable or invariable outcome of
 the arrival of an expropriated and expelled "agricultural
 population" into the context of "town industries"--
 unless, of course, there is a hidden agenda dictating
 Marxian discourse.

Accordingly, the dispossessed and displaced "agricultural population" is just that, a dispossessed and displaced "agricultural population," so that the "town industries" were "supplied," or better still were invaded and threatened by an agricultural mass who had to be fitted, as we observed, with a heightened barbarity into these industries, i.e., they had to be fitted with a heightened state of barbarity into capitalist production and economic conditions (conditoning).

What is this hidden agenda that has been alluded to? Does its disclosure offer us anything above and beyond what has been revealed thus far?

With the setting free of a part of the agricultural population, therefore, their former means of nourishment were also set free. They were now transformed into material elements of variable capital. The peasant, expropriated and cast adrift, must buy their value in the form of wages, from his new master, the industrial capitalist. 61

It offers us a panoramic view of the bourgeois world and Marx's place in that world. It gives us the perception of Marx "setting free of a part of the agricultural population" and then consigning them to the fetters of economic determinism in the prison of bourgeois historiography. The hidden agenda we speak of is the

immutable, and reductional laws, principles and axioms Marx wields to deliver, relegate and commit human agents to be "transformed into material elements of variable capital." The hidden agenda we speak of details the most rigid and rigorous definition of economic determinism--the supersedure of all human choice and responsibility by the sufficiency of economic circumstances and phenomena--infixing in the official bourgeois narrative that scripts the "peasant, expropriated and cast adrift," as compelled to surrender to capital: they "must buy their value in the form of wages" (emphasis added). How are we to understand the transformation of a mass collectivity "into material elements of variable capital" in light of the free-willed, spontaneous and conscious activity of "human nature in general"? Perhaps the peasants are not quite human even in Marx's radicalized variant of the bourgeois narrative on the primitive accumulation of capital? Maybe "human nature in general" only applies to classified humanity?

Put plainly and simply, Marx has fettered the peasant with the imperative of buying into the value system that takes "the form of wages" and capital. Marx has fettered the peasant with the laws, principles

and axioms of motion of modern bourgeois economics and history. It is because of this fetter that the great "revolutonist" cannot discover, suggest or even allude to mass revolt, resistance or sabotage in "...Primitive Accumulation." It is because of this fetter that an agricultural population who were ripped "from their wonted mode of life" and turned "into beggars, robbers and vagabonds" was presented as an idle, shiftless, lazy and aimless mass and not presented as a volatile mass locked in a combative struggle to beat back and destroy the very conditions of existence of the capitalist. In a word, Marx has the "agricultural population" fettered by capital, variable or constant, and bowed at the feet of its "new master, the industrial capitalist."

Our argument stands against economic determinism exercised in the elaboration of a radicalized yet thoroughly bourgeois chronicle: "The So-Called Primitive Accumulation." Our argument holds that Marx, not the peasantry, was fettered by capital and bowed at the feet of "his new master, the...capitalist." It is our argument that Marx was fettered by the laws, principles and axioms of motion of modern bourgeois economics and history. Consequently he was bound to economic determinism

infix in a bourgeois historical construction which operates to quash the discovery of (1) an agricultural mass set in opposition to the capitalists in the context of barbarism; (2) a barbarous context where human agents were first "transformed" into warring factions and (3) a barbarous context where a greater and more systematic state barbarism then turned a faction of the "agricultural population" into a conquered and subjected proletarian class buying "their value in the form of wages."

The state was the imperative, the compelling force, of primitive accumulation. The state not capital, economics or history compelled some of the peasantry to surrender to the hierarchy of capitalist domination and mastery. The state not industrial revolution, agricultural revolution or capital was the linchpin in the primitive accumulation of capital. The state laid the foundation of capitalism by making radical developments and changes in industry and agriculture possible as well as making capital possible. "The Secret Of Primitive Accumulation," the hidden agenda in the Marxian manufacture of "The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," is that Western European barbarism not feudalism was resolved by the capitalists through a greater and more profound state barbarism which fashioned a conquered

and defeated proletarian class out of an agricultural mass.

To continue, Marx has thrown down feudalism and erected capitalism upon it by means of "setting" an "expropriated and cast adrift" feudal "agricultural population" into capitalist operative and accumulative processes as well as into the contextual space where the operative, accumulative and organizational--the legal-political superstructure--processes conjoin: the market; "The expropriation and eviction of a part of the agricultural population not only set free for industrial capital, the labourers, their means of subsistence, and material for labour; it also created the home-market."⁶² In other words, Marx has the feudal mode of production and its constituent members being released into capitalist processes and places. In this way Marx has "set free" the downfall of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode of production, and with that established feudalism as the antecedent to capitalism as well as established the constituent classes of capitalism as fashioned out of the constituent classes of feudalism. In this way Marx vaults over the barbarous intertexture that associated feudalism and capitalism; moreover, by vaulting the barbarous mode of

existence Marx is able to evade a classless context, and by evading a classless context Marx's attribution of classes to feudalism gains the weight of historical, social and economic continuity.

In total, then, Marx's "...Primitive Accumulation" is embedded in capitalism. From his embedment in capitalism Marx organized the downfall of feudalism into capitalism; from his embedment in capitalism Marx projected backward its terms, categories, concepts, theories and structures across place and time, and therewith universalize bourgeois accomplishments: classes, productive modes, base-superstructures and historical epochs were made synonymous with human relations.

These are our claims against Marx. Again we must recall what Marx claimed for himself.

And now to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society or the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the existence of class is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production, 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes

the transitoin to the abolition of
all classes and to a classless
society.⁶³

A great deal is learned from these comments. Marx acknowledges the discovery and detailing of classes and "the struggle between them" in "modern society" as well as "the historical development of this class struggle" as occurring in the bourgeois context. It is our argument that classes and their historical and economic details were not discovered in the bourgeois context, they were manufactured in the bourgeois context. This acknowledgement demonstrates that all Marxian analysis presupposes the existence of classes; more specifically, it presupposes the existence of the bourgeoisie and their historians and economists who first discovered and detailed classes and their struggles. This acknowledgement proves that Marx was deeply embedded in capitalism.

In addition, what is "new" and unique about Marx is that he proves "that the existence of class is only bound up with [a] particular historical" phase "in the development of production," and that phase is capitalism. What is "new" and unique about Marx is his demonstrated ability to project backward the entire bourgeois frame of reference. History is constituted as historical epochs and their corresponding modes of production;

economics is constituted as the "anatomy of the classes"; history and economics become a regressive bourgeois configuration. Marx carried into his work on concrete social formations the panoply of the bourgeoisie, so that his production is a conformation rooted in capitalism.

Hence, the "materialist conception of history" is really a bourgeois conception of history: a history replete with epochs, productive modes, class struggle, base-superstructure, etc. It is really a retrogressive projection and superimposition of bourgeois terms, categories, concepts, theories and structures upon human contexts. It is also a progressive projection and superimposition of bourgeois terms, categories... where Marx radicalizes his forward vision and arrives first at "the dictatorship of the proletariat" and then at "the abolition of all classes and to a classless society."

The Marxian "materialist conception of history" is, then, a retrogressive and progressive projection and superimposition of the bourgeoisie upon humanity-- it is a teleology which has the bourgeoisie as its hidden and final cause and in its manifest purpose and design.

What Marxian radical bourgeois history accomplishes is the elusion of the arbitrariness,

capriciousness, contingency and absurdity inherent to the context in which the primitive accumulation of capital took place. Instead of the storm and thunder of barbarism as the contextual frame for primitive accumulation, we get the necessity, purposiveness, consistency, order and rationality of the construction of "the internal market": "Thus, hand in hand with the expropriation of the self-supporting peasants, with their separation from their means of production, goes the destruction of rural domestic industry, the process of separation between manufacture and agriculture. And only the destruction of rural domestic industry can give the internal market of a country that extension and consistence which the capitalist mode of production requires."⁶⁴ Of course, the capitalist hand in the iron glove of the state which forced the necessity, purposiveness, consistency, order and rationality of the construction of "the internal market" upon the masses is skillfully and cleverly kept out of sight.

Thus, a mass population whose mode of existence was inimical to capitalism are cast by Marx, in his radical bourgeois narrative, as expropriated and evicted victims suffering in the harsh but vital progression of capitalism in general and the conquest of "Modern

Industry" in particular.

Modern Industry, alone, and finally, supplies, in machinery, the lasting basis of capitalistic agriculture, expropriates radically the enormous majority of the agricultural population, and completes the separation between agriculture and rural domestic industry, whose roots--spinning and weaving--it tears up. It therefore also, for the first time, conquers for industrial capital the entire home-market.⁶⁵

This mass "agricultural population" is torn up; they are the victims. Their roots are rent by the confluence of history, technology and economics surging through the conduit of capitalism, and those with a bent similar to Marx's have been known to say, "so be it...this is the price of progress."

They are the victims only in the Marxian bourgeois narrative, the real victims are the conquered and subdued aftermath: the proletarians! The mass "agricultural population" whose mode of existence was inimical to capitalism were not victims, they did not join in association around their capitulation; they were not the class formation of submission; they were not proletarians. They became barbarians; they fought and struggled for control against the capitalists. They became warriors whose weapons included robbery, banditry, vagabondage and, as we shall observe, riots

and revolts. Many of them were never really conquered by the capitalists: migration not class formation was their destiny--a destiny which awaits our attention.

Mass victims conforms to and confirms the Marxian narrative. The victimization of "the mass of agricultural people" eludes the groundwork of original accumulation; it eludes the discovery of fifteenth and sixteenth century Western Europe in the throes of the arbitrariness, capriciousness, contingency and absurdity of barbarism; it eludes the ground from which capitalism entered the human condition. By so confounding the barbarous beginnings of the capitalists, Marx could establish, along with other diligent sycophantic historians, philosophers, economists, etc., their beginnings as the bedrock, however bloody, of modern civilization as well as establish Asia, Africa, the Americans, etc., as barbarous conformations. With this global demarcation of civilization and barbarism in place, the capitalists and their sycophants could ensconce their colonial and imperial campaigns under the banner of civilization advancing across Asia, Africa, the Americas, etc., to conquer "barbarism";⁶⁶ with this global demarcation of civilization and barbarism in place, the capitalists could disengage and use their (remaining)

undefeated enemies, the barbarous mass, by forcing or preparing them to migrate under the banner of civilization, so that the undefeated barbarous mass of Western Europe became the capitalists' campaigners and agents of civilization in the global advance against barbarism and for capitalism.

Our investigation and interrogation of "...Primitive Accumulation" has become a terminological, categorical, conceptual, theoretical and structural assault on this Marxian narrative. Our unpremediated attack has or will lead us to the following conclusions.

- 1) There was a thoroughly barbarous mode of existence in Western Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.
- 2) The conquest of this mode of existence by the capitalists took hold in the late sixteenth century.
- 3) That it is a fundamental falsehood and fiction to present capitalism as the revolutionary, historical, economic, political, cultural and civilized zenith and completion of freedom, consciousness, order and rationality in its own context and epoch, to say nothing of the extent of the falsehood and fiction

of presenting capitalism as the revolutionary, historical, economic, political, cultural and civilized zenith and completion of freedom, consciousness, order and rationality in any other context and/or epoch.

4) The barbarism of capitalistic colonialism and imperialism was the result of the exportation and dispersion of a perilous barbarous mass by the capitalists in order to realize power, control and wealth in Western Europe.

5) This colonialism and imperialism reproduced the Western European context in Asia, Africa, the Americas, etc.

6) This reproduction materialized one ingenious anomaly; viz., the superordinate and systematic State barbarism--"conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder....blood and fire"--was not forced upon the exogenous, i.e., the migrating, barbarous mass--the original and initial recipients of capitalist directed State barbarism--who introduced the barbarism, rather it was forced upon the indigenous "barbarism": the capitalist directed State barbarism in Asia, Africa, the Americas, etc., was

(and continues to be) genocidal.

7) The majority of these indigenous "barbarians" who were kept alive were subdued and bowed to the State, i.e., to the capitalists, indirectly via their forced or willing entrance into the class-ification processes of capitalist production and accumulation.

8) Those of humanity--be they in Western Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas or wherever--who capitulated and bowed indirectly to the capitalists became proletarians (and their sympathizers and hacks).

9) It appears that Marx generalized his non-application of "human nature in general" beyond the agricultural mass of Western Europe; he appears also to have fashioned "human nature in general" as irrelevant and unsuited to the global masses of pre-class-ified, non-class-ified and anti-class-ified.

10) The global network of capitalistic colonialism and imperialism was truly inspired by, in the words of Marx, the

"conquest of barbarism": that is, Western
European barbarism.

This takes us straight to the next chapter in "...Primitive Accumulation"; a chapter which buttresses and fortifies our investigative and interrogative assault on the Marxian narrative.

"Genesis Of The Industrial Capitalist"

The genesis of the industrial capitalist did not proceed in such a gradual way as that of the farmer....The snail's pace of this method corresponded in no wise with the commercial requirements of the new world-market that the great discoveries of the 15th century created. 67

These "great discoveries of the 15th century" were in reality the great conduit for the exodus of barbarism from Western Europe and its entrance into the Americas, Asia, and Africa; "the commercial requirements of the new world-market" were in fact the first worldwide commercialization of barbarism.

The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the original population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation. 68

The "chief momenta of primitive accumulation" nevertheless reproduced a similar sequence of events leading up to colonialization and imperialism, i.e., a sequence that details the interjection of barbarism to be followed by primitive accumulation and superstructuralization.

The colonial system ripened like a hot-house, trade and navigation....The colonies secured a market for the budding manufactures, and, through the monopoly of the market, an increased accumulation. The treasures captured outside Europe by undisguised looting, enslavement, and murder, floated back to the mother-country and were there turned into capital.⁶⁹

From this Marx draws an incomplete conclusion that "commercial supremacy" implies industrial supremacy and that the "colonial system" plays a "preponderant role" in "commercial supremacy": "In the period of manufacture properly so called, it is,...the commercial supremacy that gives industrial predominance. Hence the preponderant role that the colonial system plays...."⁷⁰ Here we have a deliberate incompleteness of reasoning and logic. It was not the "colonial system" per se that gave way to "commercial supremacy" that in turn gave way to "industrial predominance." It was barbarism itself that gave way to the "colonial system" that secured markets, monopolies and "increased accumulation." It was the "looting, enslavement and murder" that were the "chief momenta" of commercial success and primitive accumulation. It was the undisguised supremacy and commercialization of barbarism that "captured" the treasures "floated back to the mother-country and were

there turned into capital."

This Marxian inconclusiveness was called deliberate since his prior pages are taken up by a concerted effort to point out the "treachery, bribery, massacre, and meanness" within the enfoldment of colonialization that lead to the market monopoly that, in turn, lead to "an increased accumulation." He even cites an author who views as unparalleled the "barbarities" and "outrages" of European Christian colonialization: "'The barbarities and desperate outrages of the so-called Christian race, throughout every region of the world, and upon every people they have been able to subdue, are not to be paralleled by those of any other race, however fierce, however untaught, and however reckless of mercy and of shame, in any age of the earth.'" ⁷¹ In other words, unparalleled barbarism lead to the colonial system that, in turn, lead to commercial supremacy that, in turn, lead to the predominance of industrial capital.

We will end our review of this chapter by examining its last paragraph (to which reference has been made previously).

Tantae molis erat, to establish
the "eternal laws of Nature" of
the capitalist mode of production,
to complete the process of
separation between labourers and
conditions of labour, to transform,

at one pole, the social means of production and subsistence into capital at the opposite pole, the mass of the population into wage-labourers, into "free labouring poor," the artificial product of modern society.

We can shed new light on this extensive labor, "to establish the 'eternal laws of Nature.'" To begin, Marx is one of the laborers in this extensive task. His work displays the incorporation of the "natural laws" of capitalist production into "the 'eternal laws of Nature'" as the self-evident "Secret Of Primitive Accumulation." Consequently, the "separation between labourers and conditions of labour" is equivalent/analogous/corresponds to the transformation of "at one pole, the social means of production and subsistence into capital" and "at the opposite pole, the mass of the population into wage-labourers," and thereby the end point of feudalism is the point of origin of capitalist primitive accumulation; the expropriated and expelled feudal masses were altered into a class of wage-laborers in the "process" to "complete" the capitalist mode of production (the capitalist marriage).

What we have discovered and conceptualized in the chapters subsequent to "The Secret Of Primitive Accumulation" brings many doubts and questions to bear

on the eternality and self-evidence of Marx's laying "bare the economic law of motion of modern society." Marx's "discovery of the natural laws of its movement" is seriously undermined by our case for barbarism as the end point of feudalism, the point of origin of primitive accumulation and the point of departure for capitalist colonialism and imperialism. Chapter XXVIII, "Bloody Legislation....," has been most important for our case. It provides the materials which give credence as well as give support to the whole of our counter-argument; namely, that many within the "mass of population" were not converted into wage-laborers because they clung to their barbarous mode, and, therefore, they could/would not fit or accept capitalist management and control.

In order "to complete the process" of establishing the capitalist mode of production, this barbarous mass of the population was moved/removed (and/or hustled) by the capitalists to other contexts, and, thereby, they served as the vanguard and conveyance of capitalist colonialism and imperialism.

*

*

*

.. What does the primitive accumulation of capital, i.e., its historical genesis, resolve itself into? In so far as it is not immediate transformation of slaves and serfs into wage-labourers, and therefore a mere change of form, it only means the expropriation of the immediate producers, i.e., the dissolution of private property based on the labour of its owner.⁷²

Once more back to scrutinizing. This paragraph is significant because it offers a strong and obvious confirmation of our case. First we are informed that primitive accumulation is "not an immediate transformation of slaves and serfs into wage-labourers" (emphasis added); i.e., it is not an immediate change of feudal class organization into capitalistic class organization. This point we have argued throughout, but with our addition of barbarism as the reason for this protracted transformation. Marx acknowledges, as late as the 1860's when he was writing "...Primitive Accumulation," that primitive accumulation was less than an "accomplished" reality in certain parts of Western Europe and that "those strata of society...belonging to the antiquated mode of production, continue to exist." This acknowledgment is to be found in his (next) chapter on colonialization.

In Western Europe,...the process of primitive accumulation is more or less accomplished. Here the capitalist regime has either directly conquered the whole domain of national production, or, where economic conditions are less developed, it, at least, indirectly controls those strata of society which, though belonging to the antiquated mode of production, continue to exist side by side with it in gradual decay.⁷³

From these remarks we can conclude that this transformation of slaves and serfs--"those strata of society [Marx appears to be implying that slaves and serfs have undergone "gradual decay" and no longer constitute a class, but that they constitute a layer of society]... belonging to the antiquated mode of production"--into wage-laborers had not as yet been fully accomplished in those Western European regions where "economic conditions are less developed." In light of our entire thesis these remarks can be understood as follows:

1) in those parts of Western Europe where the capitalists have directly "conquered the whole domain of national production" barbarism has undergone forced or facilitated emigration, i.e., capitalist conquest in Western Europe was dependent upon the forced or facilitated migration of barbarians; 2) in those parts of Western Europe where "the capitalist regime" merely "indirectly controls

those strata of society...belonging to the antiquated mode of production," these indirect controls are not the outcome of less developed economic conditions; rather, the actuality of indirect controls and less economic development are both direct indications and consequences of the less than accomplished reality of forced or facilitated emigration of barbarism; 3) the "historical genesis" of primitive accumulation resolves "itself into" the forced or facilitated emigration of "those strata of society which" belong "to the antiquated" social mode of barbarism, so that they no longer exist side by side with the "capitalist regime": i.e., they do not gradually "decay," they are pushed or gotten out, and, in this way, 4) unless and until "the process of" emigrational transformation has sufficiently "decomposed the old society from top to bottom [here is a metaphorical expression that corroborates our thesis on the direction and format of revolutionary change in the voluntary efformation: from the top downwards towards the bottom],...labourers are " not "turned into proletarians, their means of labour" is not turned "into capital,...the capitalist mode of production" does not stand "on its own feet."⁷⁴

*

*

*

This set of conclusions takes us past our present concerns; we will return to the entire issue of forced or facilitated emigration in our final section, "The Modern Theory Of Colonisation."

To continue with the question of the historical resolution of primitive accumulation is to consider that we have argued that there was a protracted transformation "of slaves and serfs into wage-labourers," that this transformation was not fully accomplished even in the 1860's in certain regions of Western Europe, and that where this transformation was "more"/ "sufficiently" accomplished it was because of forced or facilitated emigration of manifold prior slaves and serfs who were emerged in an ongoing mass mode of barbarism. In other words, there was never a complete, comprehensive, or universal transformation of slaves and serfs into wage-laborers at the time of the writing of Capital. This confirms one of our cardinal propositions: "primitive accumulation of capital....only only means the expropriation of the immediate producers, i.e., the dissolution of private property based on the labour of its owner "(emphasis added).

In accordance with this, "primitive accumulation of capital" does not mean the formation of capitalism

with its constituent classes and private property relations. Expropriation of slaves and serfs, "the immediate producers," i.e., the dissolution/separation of the "private property of the labourer in his means of production"⁷⁵ from "the immediate producers," does not mean, imply or require that slaves and serfs, or any other expropriated group, became wage-labourers. In this sense, expropriation and dissolution/separation only mean, imply or require that certain existing economic conditions, i.e., property relations, are breaking down, ceasing to be or disappearing; expropriation and dissolution/separation do not mean, imply or require the build up, beginning, or appearance of any other mode of production: primitive accumulation of capital does not mean, imply or require that it was the "prelude to the history of capital."⁷⁶

Expropriation and dissolution/separation within feudal context "was accomplished with merciless Vandalism," was created by a multitude thrown into an anomic disjunction "under...passions the most infamous, the most sordid, the pettiest, the most meanly odious,"⁷⁷ so that expropriation and dissolution/separation within the feudal context was created by the social conjuncture of barbarism.

Primitive accumulation did not take place in the epoch-making juncture of barbarous capitalists/capitalism, as Marx would have it. To the contrary, the social conjuncture of barbarism generated the expropriation and dissolution/separation within feudalism. Primitive accumulation of capital was an original affirmation of barbarism; it was not an affirmation of capital/capitalism. This original affirmation of barbarism was subsequently elaborated upon and progressed into the superstructuralization of barbarism. Primitive accumulation of capital was a historical contingency, better still it was a contextual contingency: it was an original accumulation within its own barbarous context. Therefore, it represented an affirmation of its own present context--barbarism--and not an affirmation of a future context that may have never come into existence--i.e., capitalist production or the capitalist system.

When primitive accumulation of capital is seen in the light of its representing an original affirmation of barbarism, then the self-evidence of Marx's forms of bourgeois social consciousness that correspond to their inexorable ideological structures is most visible.

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 labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation.⁷⁸

Here we have the Marxian radicalization of the terms that characterize the "Hegelian dialectic";⁷⁹ to wit, Marx has capitalist private property negating individual private property and "socialised property"⁸⁰ negating capitalist private property: "the negation of the negation." Marx is applying the dialectic of an established bourgeois philosopher in the pursuit of his radical ends. The radicalization of any variant of bourgeois consciousness remains, nevertheless, a form of bourgeois consciousness, for it continues the terms, concepts, reasoning and logic, as well as strengthens the historiography, fostered by the capitalist ideological structure. Marx's "negation of negation" corresponds to, articulates and ideally represents bourgeois ideology because it shields and guards against the discovery of 1) primitive accumulation of capital as an original (previous) affirmation of the conjuncture of barbarism, 2) capitalist private property as the first affirmation of truly individualized, particularized and

privatized property, 4) class as the novel and new affirmation of the capitalist seizure of power and control of the superstructure, 5) class as the linearization, atomization and serialization of human population into a society of truly individualized, particularized and privatized constituents, 6) capitalist production begetting "with the inexorability of a law of Nature" the forced and/or facilitated emigration of barbarism packaged in colonialism and imperialism and 8) "the primitive accumulation of capital" as the consummation of Capital.

Notes

¹Marx, Karl, "Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," Capital, I, p. 713.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 714.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., pp. 714-715.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 715.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Again, unless specified otherwise, the centuries will be dated according to Christian chronology and its Gregorian calendar.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 716.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Marx, Karl, "Capital, Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," Selected Works, II, p. 101.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 102.

²⁰Ibid., p. 101.

²¹Ibid., p. 103 fn.; emphasis added.

²²Ibid., p. 101.

²³Ibid., p. 103.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., p. 104.

²⁶Ibid., p. 104; emphasis added.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 104-105; emphasis added according to the specifications indicated in text.

²⁸Ibid., p. 104 fn.

²⁹Ibid., p. 105.

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid., p. 106.

³³Ibid.; emphasis added.

³⁴Marx's use of the terms "masses"/"mass" in "The Secret Of Primitive Accumulation" and this present chapter is not to be taken as incidental, accidental, superfluous or trivial. These terms are used throughout Part VIII of Capital, Vol. 1. Their use serves to differentiate and distinguish, in our opinion, class formation and organization as the resultant of economic conditions from the formation and non-organization of the masses that is due to the absence of the conditioning effects of economic order, logic and principles. Consequently we find Marx saying in his chapter on the "Genesis Of The Industrial Capitalist" in "So-Called Primitive Accumulation,"

Tantae molis erat [cost so much labor],
to establish the "eternal laws of
Nature" of the capitalist mode of
production, to complete the process
of separation between labourers and
conditions of labour, to transform,
at one pole, the social means of
production and subsistence into
capital at the opposite pole, the
mass of the population into wage-
labourers,... (P.141; emphasis added).

In the main text a more comprehensive discussion of the relationship between class formation and economic conditions is given: the materials on class-in-itself. Suffice it to say, the cardinal distinction and difference between mass and class is that "the mass of the population"

.

is "as potatoes in a sack" and they "form a sack of potatoes," and the class of the population is as potatoes in an economic cauldron and they form mashed potatoes.

³⁵Marx calls attention to a connection between the peasantry and the infantry and husbandmen, ploughmen and beggars and the cavalry as part of the development of the capitalist system via a mercenary military formed from those thrown off the land due to expropriation.

³⁶Ibid., p. 107.

³⁷Ibid., p. 110.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Ibid., p. 113; emphasis added.

⁴⁰Marxian reasoning throughout his work on this subject suggests that the "necessary" pre-conditions of existence of capitalism are intrinsic and essential to capitalism, beginning with its stages of inception in the Western European context.

This line of reasoning is especially true of "So-Called Primitive Accumulation," and it is accomplished, in our opinion, by 1) a teleological version of historical epochs that overrides and suppresses the barbarism that preceded capitalism in the Western European context and/or 2) the superimposition of models of productive modes and formulations of their internal dynamics upon the actual barbaric relations in which was founded the concrete capitalist context of Western Europe.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 118; emphasis added.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 118-119; emphasis added.

⁴³Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 38.

⁴⁴Marx, "Capital, Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," pp. 119-121.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 121; emphasis added.

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 121-122; emphasis added.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 121; emphasis added.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 123.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 124-125; emphasis added.

⁵²See Marx, Karl, "The Strife Between Workman and Machine," Capital, I, pp. 427-437.

⁵³Marx, "Capital, Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," p. 122; see also Marx, Capital, I, Part IV.

⁵⁴Marx, Capital, I, p. 82 fn.

⁵⁵Class formation, more precisely class in itself formation, has as one of its categorical constituents political organization and representation to enforce class interests: "...no political organization among them, they do not form a class. They are consequently incapable of enforcing their class interest in their own name....They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented." Most especially during the early and middle periods of the fifteenth century, Marx informs us of the presence of a weak, ineffectual and crumbling shell of a superstructure. Such a decaying scaffolding precluded any real possibility of political organization and representation to enforce class interest. This resulted in the designation of a mass social mode of life to characterize and portray this set of circumstances, for it lacked any conditions of effectual and demanding political authority and power. Therefore, it was lacking a constituent category of class formation.

Class formation, class-for-itself, had to wait through the fifteenth century until the late sixteenth century for its realization in Western Europe. In that place and time the revitalization and resurrection of a powerful and compelling legal-political superstructure was realized with the impetus of the capitalists--the place and time in which state force and violence could establish classes.

⁵⁶Marx, "Capital, Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," p. 126; emphasis added.

⁵⁷Ibid., emphasis added.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 127; emphasis added.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 128; emphasis added.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 128; emphasis added.

⁶²Ibid., p. 130.

⁶³Marx, Karl, "Marx To J. Weydemeyer," March 5, 1852, 18th Brumaire, p. 139; emphasis added.

⁶⁴Marx, "Capital, Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," p. 131.

⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 131-132.

⁶⁶See, for example, the entirety of Marx's work on the AMP; in particular see Marx, Grundrisse; Marx, Karl Marx Formations; Marx and Engels, Marx Engels: Formations; Marx and Engels, On Colonialism and Marx, Karl, Karl Marx: Surveys From Exile (Political Writings), ed., David Fernbach, New York: Vintage Books, 1974, Vol. II.

⁶⁷Marx, "Capital, Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," p. 132; emphasis added.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 133; emphasis added.

⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 135-136.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 136; emphasis added.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 134.

⁷²Ibid., p. 142.

⁷³Marx, "Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," p. 765; emphasis added.

⁷⁴Marx, "Capital, Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," p. 144.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 142.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 143.

⁷⁷Ibid.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 144; emphasis added.

⁷⁹Marx, Capital, I, p. 19.

⁸⁰Marx, "Capital, Part VIII, The So-Called Primitive Accumulation," p. 145.

CHAPTER SIX

SUPERSTRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE BASE

Before initiating our final chapter, in this section let us introduce additional materials that confirm our presentation on the superstructural transformation of the old base as well as the superstructural formation and construction of a new base. This is indicate in order to surmount any possible criticism that superstructural transformation, formation and construction of the base is exclusive to Capital, Vol. 1.

The Civil War In France has Marx's detailed discussion of the Paris Commune of 1871; therein can be said to be the unfolding of the revolutionary efformation of voluntarism. The Commune is shown to have captured and transformed the established Parisian superstructure, and then employed it to uproot the base structure and put in its place a newly formed and constructed base structure. The Civil War In France leaves no doubt as to the existence in Marxian work of the fullness of voluntarism and spontaneity. This writing has a revolutionary class-for-itself employing the superstructure to act upon, delimit, direct, define and determine the base structure.

"The proletarians of Paris," said
the Central Committee in its
manifesto of the 18th March,

"amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs....They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies, by seizing upon the governmental power."¹

The Parisian proletarians-for-themselves took "into their own hands", i.e., they spontaneously called upon their own resources in order to secure the mastery of "their own destinies." How is this mastery to be achieved? It is achieved by directing "public affairs" by means of seizing upon "governmental power." Which is to say, the "centralised state" became "a government of the people by the people."

The great social measure of the Commune was its own working existence. Its special measures could but betoken the tendency of a government of the people by the people.²

A "government of the people by the people" is a government that ends "class rule itself."

The great antithesis to the empire was the Commune. The cry of "social republic" with which the Revolution of February was ushered in by the Paris proletariat, did but express a vague aspiration after a republic that was not only to supersede the monarchical form of class rule, but class rule itself. The Commune was the positive form of that republic.³

In this manner, a proletariat-for-itself can place the already constituted legal-political superstructure under "special measures" such that the superstructure serves to supersede class rule; to wit, a proletariat-for-itself in control of the legal-political superstructure can affect a revolutionary change that supersedes class domination itself as well as generates shock waves throughout the established order.

When the Paris Commune took the management of the revolution in its own hands; when plain working men for the first time dared to infringe upon the governmental privilege of their "natural superiors", and, under circumstances of unexampled difficulty, — the old world writhed in convulsions of rage at the sight of the Red Flag, the symbol of the Republic of Labour, floating over the Hotel de Ville.⁴

Here is a revolution, arising from the spontaneous and self-managed actions of a class-for-itself, which employs legal-political power to convulse the "old world." It is this efformation of revolution, and only this efformation of revolution, which can give way to the self-generating, self-constituting and self-governing society of responsible productive agents: "the self-government of the producers."

The communal regime once established in Paris and the secondary centres, the old centralised government would in the provinces, too, have to give way to the self-government of the producers.... While the merely repressive organs of the old governmental power were to be amputated, its legitimate functions were to be wrested from an authority usurping pre-eminence over society itself, and restored to the responsible agents of society.⁵

From this it can be surmised that the communal government of responsible producers was not to be completely decentralized, nor was it to break up national unity, a national entity.

The few but important functions which still would remain for a central government were not to be suppressed, ...but were to be discharged by Communal and therefore strictly responsible agents. The unity of the nation was not to be broken, but, on the contrary, to be organised by the Communal Constitution ⁶

A unified nation would only "become a reality by the destruction of the state power which claimed to be the embodiment of that unity independent of, and superior to, the nation itself, from which it was but a parasitic excrescence."⁷

In other words, this voluntaristic revolution operating upon the estranged and parasitic "old centralised

government would...have to give way to" certain realities: the proletariat-for-itself would alter the centralized legal-political superstructure into self-generating, self-constituting, self-governing and predominately localized legal-political structures of government.

...the Commune was to be the political form of even the smallest country hamlet, and that in the rural districts the standing army was to be replaced by a national militia, with an extremely short term of service. The rural communes of every district were to administer their common affairs by an assembly of delegates in the central town, and these district assemblies were again to send deputies to the National Delegation in Paris, each delegate to be at any time revocable and bound by the mandat impératif (formal instructions) of his constituents.⁸

Marx warns us not to view this superstructural revolution that "breaks the modern state power" as "an exaggerated form of the ancient struggle against over-centralisation."

Thus, this new Commune, which breaks the modern state power, has been mistaken for a reproduction of the mediaeval Communes, which first preceded, and afterwards became the substratum of, that very state of power....The antagonism of the Commune against the state power has been mistaken for an exaggerated form of the ancient struggle against over-centralisation.⁹

What is under discussion is a revolutionary reworking of the superstructure and its institutional network in and for the service of the proletariat-for-itself; a proletariat-for-itself carrying forward the creation of the new society.

The Commune was formed of the municipal councillors, chosen by universal suffrage in the various wards of town... The majority of its members were naturally working men, or acknowledged representatives of the working class. The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary body, executive and legislative at the same time. Instead of continuing to be the agent of the Central Government, the police was at once stripped of its political attributes, and turned into the responsible and at all times revocable agent of the Commune.... Not only municipal administration, but the whole initiative hitherto exercised by the state was laid into the hands of the Commune.¹⁰

This new society not only incorporated new political initiatives, but it also incorporated new juridical initiatives.

The judicial functionaries were to be divested of that sham independence which had but served to mask their abject subserviency to all succeeding governments to which, in turn, they had taken, and broken, the oaths of allegiance.¹¹

This revolution, as we have stated, cuts across the network of spiritual and educational institutions, and therewith the ideological fetters forged by the church and state were broken:

...the Commune was anxious to break the spiritual force of repression, the "parson-power," by the disestablishment and disendowment of all churches and proprietary bodies. The priests were sent back to the recesses of private life, there to feed upon the alms of the faithful in imitation of their predecessors, the apostles. The whole of the educational institutions were opened to the people gratuitously, and at the same time cleared of all interference of church and state. Thus, not only was education made accessible to all, but science itself freed from the fetters which class prejudice and governmental force had imposed upon it.¹²

We have given a detailed and lengthy description of the superstructural transformation that was launched by the Paris Commune. This was done in such a fashion to lend support to the proposition of superstructural revolution initiated and managed by a class-for-itself. Now to the task at hand: the use of a revolutionarily transformed superstructure to emancipate labor by means of revolutionizing base economic/property relations.

This proposition was concretely embodied in the Commune, and was its "true secret" (emphasis added).

The multiplicity of interpretations to which the Commune has been subjected, and the multiplicity of interests which constructed it in their favor, show that it was a thoroughly expansive political form, while all previous forms of government had been emphatically repressive. Its true secret was this. It was essentially a working class government, the produce of the struggle of the producing against appropriating class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical [sic] emancipation of labor.¹³

In an exact and succinct manner Marx has given us the essence of the voluntaristic and spontaneous revolution: a class-for-itself arises spontaneously to struggle against the hegemonic class-for-itself at the legal-political superstructure; from this struggle a new hegemonic class-for-itself emerges and establishes a "political form... under which to work out" spontaneously the destruction of the old complex of property relations in favor of a new complex of property relations that support the new governmental structures or superstructure. The "true secret" of the Commune was that it was a governmental lever in the hands of a revolutionary class-for-itself used to dig up the economic/accumulative tier

of the capitalist foundation, so that a new emancipated economic/accumulative tier could be planted in its stead, and thereby remove the economic seeds of class.

The political rule of the producer cannot co-exist with the perpetuation of his social slavery. The Commune was therefore to serve as a lever for uprooting the economical [sic] foundations upon which rests the existence of classes, and therefore of class rule. With labour emancipated, every man becomes a working man, and productive labour ceases to be a class attribute.¹⁴

The metaphor of the legal-political structure as the cutting edge of a superstructural device used by the producer class-for-itself "for uprooting" the property tier within the capitalist foundation, serves Marx well as a powerful descriptive technique, and it serves as well as a descriptive metaphor for condensing and framing Marx's efformation of superstructural revolution acting to extirpate the old property relations from the base.

From superstructural extirpation of the base, from revolutionary penetration and overturning of property, Marx goes forward to the superstructural formation and construction of a new revolutionary property assemblage.

The Commune, they exclaim, intends to abolish property, the basis of all civilisation! Yes, gentlemen, the Commune intended to abolish that class property which makes the labour

of the many the wealth of the few.
 It aimed at the expropriation of
 the expropriators....But this,
 is communism, "impossible" communism!¹⁵

Upon closer examination we can be certain that Marx not only referenced a spontaneously inspired revolution of class-for-itself, but, as we have shown, he also referenced a spontaneously guided and processed revolution of a class-for-itself. The Marxian efformation of a spontaneously inspired as well as a spontaneously guided and processed revolution of class-for-itself at the superstructural level is given in its full shape, form and dimensions when Marx speaks of the Paris Commune: 1) "...emancipation of labour,...the working men anywhere take the subject into their own hands with a will,..."¹⁶; i.e., the emancipation of labor begins with the working class willing to make their own emancipation a subject of their own determination, and 2) the working-class-for-itself is emancipated by being guided and processed "through long struggles, through a series of historic processes"¹⁷ with "no ready-made utopias" or "no ideals to realise"; rather, the working-class-for-itself is emancipated by being guided and processed spontaneously --"They know that in order to work out their own emancipation,...they will have to pass through...transforming circumstances and men....set free the

elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant. In the full consciousness of their historic mission and with the historic resolve to act up to it,...."¹⁸

Throughout, the Marxian efformation of superstructural revolution has been referenced as a voluntarily inspired revolution of a class-for-itself. We have developed The Class Struggles In France into a discussion of a revolutionary class-for-itself pregnant with voluntarism: "As soon as it has risen up, a class in which the revolutionary interests of society are concentrated finds [spontaneous discovery] the content and material for its revolutionary activity directly in its own situation [a "situation" which contains its "own" subjective "content" and objective "material" for the revolutionary activity of a class-for-itself]: foes to be laid low, measures dictated by the needs of the struggle to be taken [i.e., measures dictated by the conscious exigencies of class-for-political struggle]; the consequences of its own deeds drive it on [i.e., revolutionary momentum: a revolutionary activity spontaneously generates another revolutionary activity]. It makes no theoretical inquiries into its own task [because it finds its way into and through this "task" with the human compass of spontaneous free "conscious activity"]."

One final dynamic within the efformation of a spontaneously inspired, guided and processed revolution of a class-for-itself deserves our attention. In the formation and construction of the new economic base; again, the superstructure is the device in the hands of a revolutionary class-for-itself for not only "uprooting" the old economic groundwork, but also the device for planting a new economic groundwork. The question arises, does the revolutionary class-for-itself have in its hands the means by which to "uproot" the old production groundwork as well as for planting a new production groundwork? Does, to put the question differently, the spontaneous class revolution at the superstructure transform the bottom, operative, tier of the base? If it does not then the Marxian efformation of spontaneous revolution would be a partial and ineffectual revolution in regards to its consequences on the entire base. What then is the relationship between a spontaneous revolutionary class-for-itself, the superstructure and the foundational/productive level of the base?

In order to deal with this question, it must be remembered that the superstructure rests directly upon the economic/property tier of the base, and that the economic/property tier rests directly upon the production/operation tier of the base. Which is to say, the

economic/property tier mediates, is in an intermediate position, between the superstructural/organizational tier and the production/operation tier. Moreover, we have provided a documented demonstration which shows that revolutionary political class struggle can result in the transformation of the economic/property strata of the old base as well as result in the conformation of a new economic/property tier. Thus, Marx had aligned himself with the following superstructure-base structure dictums: "The social emancipation of the workmen is inseparable from their political emancipation...to support,...every political movement tending towards the accomplishment of our ultimate end--the economical [sic] emancipation of the working class.'"19

Our argument is that the superstructural alteration and conformation of the economic tier results in the economic tier altering and conforming the production tier; superstructural determination, delimiting, defining and directing of the economic tier leads to an economic determination, delimiting, defining and directing of the production tier. The superstructural "uprooting" and building of a new economic structure proceeds downward; the new economic structure, in turn, uproots and builds a new production structure.

What we are propounding is the Marxian efformation of voluntaristicrevolution in its completed form, i.e., as

a revolutionary totality. We have previously observed that economic conditions produce class in itself, class in itself can become a class-for-itself through voluntarism at the state superstructure and class-for-itself is aimed at transcending/abolishing/smashing the existing state superstructure, but what we have not as yet observed is the initial events and factors that produced the economic conditions; to wit, we have not as yet observed the events and factors that composed the first analysis-- we have previously composed just the middle and last analysis. Attending the substantiation of the state as forming and constructing the economic tier of the new base is the realization that the state produces the economic conditions that produce class in itself and all that can possibly follow. In other words, the state generates the economic conditions that, in turn, generate the conditions for class that, in turn, generate the revolutionary class struggles against the state: the state generates the conditions of its own transcendence/abolition/destruction. By elucidating this analysis in such a fashion it is apparent that the existing state generates classes and their struggles, and classes and their struggles generate the new state. What is not so apparent in this state-class interrelationship is that class struggles are superstructural struggles, and it is

class superstructural struggles which overturn the old production tier and fashion a new production tier.

Class superstructural struggles uproot old economic conditions and build new economic conditions, and new economic conditions, in turn, uproot old production conditions and build new production conditions.

Given this set of propositions, what is now called for is the evidence of the "transformation...from top to bottom": the change of operative forces by superstructural class struggles mediated via economic/property relations.

...the Commune intended to abolish...
class property...It wanted to make
individual property a truth by
transforming the means of production,
land and capital, now chiefly the
means of enslaving and exploiting
labour, into mere instruments of
free and associated labour.²⁰

This outlines the "transformation...from top to bottom": the revolutionary "working class government" sets out to alter property relations and therewith the productive process is altered. Alteration of the productive process as a consequence of the alteration of property relations is not indicated in this citation, but it is indicated in the following citation where the effects of class superstructural struggles on existing property relations and their effect on production is emphasized.

So soon as the gradually surging revolt of the working-class compelled Parliament to shorten compulsorily the hours of labour, and to begin by imposing a normal working-day on factories proper, so soon consequently as an increased production of surplus-value by the prolongation of the working-day was once for all put a stop to, from that moment capital threw itself with all its might into the production of relative surplus-value, by hastening on the further improvement of machinery.²¹

In one broad stroke Marx has painted the downward revolutionary change of the social structure from the super-tier through the upper most tier of the base on to the bottom tier of the base. Class struggles at the legal-political superstructure, i.e., Parliament, had an enormous impact on the economic/accumulative process of the ruling class(es); this impact resulted in an expansion of productive capacity. Marx continues to fill in details of the overturning of existing productive means to make way for the introduction of new productive means. This overturning is in reaction to the dangers and threats to the accumulative process that follows from the struggles of classes-for-themselves.

But machinery not only acts as a competitor who gets the better of the workman, and is constantly on the point of making him superfluous. It is also a power inimical to him, and as such capital proclaims it from the roof tops and as such makes use of it. It is the most powerful weapon

for repressing strikes, those periodical revolts of the working-class against the autocracy of capital.²²

Marx moves his way towards locating 1) revolutionary productive developments and 2) (the history of) certain inventions as "weapons" in the arsenal "against the revolts of the working-class," weapons brought on by attacks against existing property relations:

According to Gaskell, the steam-engine was from the very first an antagonist of human power, an antagonist that enabled the capitalist to trend under foot the growing claims of the workmen, who threatened the newly borne factory system with a crisis. It would be possible to write quite a history of the inventions made since 1830, for the sole purpose of supplying capital with weapons against the revolts of the working-class. At the head of these in importance, stands the self-acting mule, because it opened up a new epoch in the automatic system.²³

These materials, all very specific and concrete in their nature and terms, demonstrate that class superstructural struggles have as their consequence the alteration of economic/property relations, and this alteration has as its consequence the alteration of production/operation relations as well as the formation and construction of a new productive epoch. Classes-for-themselves have as their consequences struggles at the economic tier of the base that provoke struggles at the production tier of the base: political struggles produce economic struggles that produce

productive struggles, or, stated in the language of Marx, political/parliamentary struggles "of the working-class against the autocracy of capital" generate struggles against the "increased production of surplus-value" that generate struggles against the "introduction of machinery ...against the instruments of labour...the material embodiment of capital....the material basis of the capitalist mode of production."²⁴

To this point, our argument authenticating the "transformation...from top to bottom," the transformation as well as reformation of the productive "bottom" from above, has been coalesced, in large part, from Capital, Vol. 1. We will advance to The Poverty Of Philosophy where our argument gains further vindication and produces some startling conclusions--conclusions not at all anticipated.

In raising such a question one would naturally be supposing that the English could have produced this wealth without the historical conditions in which it was produced, such as: private accumulation of capital, modern division of labour, automatic workshops, anarchical competition, the wage system--in short, everything that is based upon class antagonism. Now, these were precisely the necessary conditions of existence for the development of productive forces and of the surplus left by labour. Therefore, to obtain this development of productive forces and this

surplus left by labour, there had to be classes which profited and classes which decayed.²⁵

Here class antagonisms, a dimension of class in itself, are classified as "the necessary conditions of existence for the development of productive forces and of the surplus left by labour"; in other words, class antagonism was necessary for the development of the capitalist accumulative process as well as the capitalist operational process. Class antagonism in England, "which we take as our example" of the "classic form" of the development of capitalism, brought about the development of both tiers of the base.

Classes in themselves represent classes involved in economic and productive antagonism, and economic and productive class antagonism lead only to the development of new economic and productive processes; they do not lead to the "uprooting" of the old economic and productive structures and the laying down of a new accumulative and operational base. Economic and production class antagonism, antagonism within the two-tiers of the base, lead only to development in the base. Political class struggle of classes-for-themselves is the necessary and sufficient condition for overturning the entire base by exploding economic and production antagonism into economic and production struggles: superstructural struggles penetrate the economic structure and convert the economic class

antagonism into economic class struggles, and the economic struggles penetrate the production structure and convert the production antagonism into production struggles. Such a revolutionary "transformation...from top to bottom" sets the ground upon which the economic class antagonism becomes the necessary condition "of existence for the development of productive forces [the bottom tier] and...the surplus left by labour [the upper tier]"; such a transformation sets up the production and economic class antagonism upon which political superstructural class struggles become the sufficient condition for the development of the new economic process (of accumulating surplus value) and new production process.

This unexpected turn in our thesis, which has 1) the voluntarily inspired, guided and processed revolution of class-for-itself at the superstructure as the necessary and sufficient condition for overturning the existing base structure and the sufficient condition for the development of the new base structure, and 2) the productively and economically conditioned antagonism of class-in-itself as the necessary condition for the development of the new base, brings together all the materials we have gathered in the efformation of voluntarism.

Therefore, we have to add an additional clause to one of our fundamental propositions; namely, the superstructural transformation of the established base by class-for-itself is a full and complete argument; the superstructural construction of a new base by class-for-itself is made a full and complete argument with the following: in order for the superstructural construction of a new base by class-for-itself to progress, expand and become an effective and efficient operation--in short, for construction of the base to advance to the stage of reproduction of the base--struggles at the economic and production levels are necessary.

With this articulation of this unexpected complementary proviso and with its incorporation into our argument, we are now equipped with the proper tools for illuminating the full meaning and significance of what Marx had to say in the immediate above quotations from The Civil War In France and Capital, Vol. 1 (section on capitalist production). Now we have the propositional tools which make not only visible but transparent the full meaning and significance of the commencement and conclusion of capitalism prepared for us by Marx.

Our claim that where economic and production class antagonism is exploded into economic and production class struggle by superstructural class struggles there is

revolutionary transformation and destruction of the old base, and that this explosion does not account for the development of the newly founded base, is born out below.

Feudalism also had its proletariat--serfage, which contained all the germs of the bourgeoisie. Feudal production also had two antagonistic elements which are likewise designated by the name of the good side and the bad side of feudalism, irrespective of the fact that it is always the bad side that in the end triumphs over the good side. It is the bad side that produces the movement which makes history, by providing a struggle.²⁶

Marx states, in this criticism of bourgeois economists, what we have just formulated, namely, that economic and production class antagonism within the existence of the established feudal mode of production merely "produces the movement" from which (voluntarily) erupts "a struggle" of classes--for-themselves, feudal lords, guilds and corporations against the bourgeoisie, "which makes history," which makes for the revolutionary transformation of feudalism into capitalism. In accordance with this, Marx's censure of bourgeois economists and their attempt to naturalize and eternalize bourgeois relations of production makes it obvious that they "destroyed" the antagonism "which called forth...struggle...."

All the ["antagonistic"] elements which called forth the struggle would have been destroyed, and the development of the bourgeoisie

nipped in the bud. One would have set oneself the absurd problem of eliminating history.²⁷

We see Marx bolstering his thesis that class antagonism at the economic and production tiers are the necessary preconditions "which called forth the" superstructural class "struggle" and the putative historical transition of feudalism to capitalism. We also see, for the first time, the essential properties of the opaque hindrances that Marx erected around the barbarism subsequent to feudalism and preceding capitalism; to wit, he blocked out/destroyed all the antagonistic "elements which call forth the struggle" for fifteenth-sixteenth century Western Europe, and thereby, the development of the barbarians was "nipped in the bud." He set out for others a radical bourgeois labyrinth that traps them in the absurdity of bourgeois history; he sets forth the radical bourgeois project of "eliminating history" within the detours of this labyrinth. A labyrinth in which the pathways from feudalism lead directly to capitalism and the pathways from capitalism lead directly to communism (via the proletarian dictatorship); a labyrinth in which all pathways are transversed by class antagonism as 1) the necessary condition for development and growth within a mode of production and 2) not the necessary and sufficient condition for the destruction of a mode of production and the founding

of a new mode of production. A labyrinth in which all pathways are transversed by class superstructural struggles as the necessary and sufficient condition for the destruction of a mode of production and the founding of a new mode of production. A labyrinth, that is, made in the quintessential bourgeois form, linear progression of modes of production, and traveled by the quintessential bourgeois product: classes; a labyrinth, that is, constructed, developed and transformed by the bourgeois product, with its antagonisms and struggles, acting upon it.

It is this very radical bourgeois maze of modes and classes which blocks out barbarism in the period between feudalism and capitalism. There is no barbarous period in the bourgeois periodization of later Western Europe and its Marxian extension of linear transition of feudalism to capitalism to communism--thus Marx blocks out the possibility of barbarism in between the periods of capitalism and communism, but this is jumping ahead of ourselves. It is this Marxian bourgeois mode-class maze that mislead the author into postulating and arguing for the existence of two incompatible and contradictory Marxian efformations of revolution. In point of fact, there is one complete and total revolution in Marx's work, or, more

correctly, there is one complete and total Marxian
bourgeois labyrinth in which the efformations of
productive-economic structural requirements and voluntaristic
superstructural class struggle are circumscribed and
subsumed. Let us, for the moment, say that this
 comprehensive and totalizing productive-economic-struc-
 tural-voluntaristic-superstructural-class-struggle,
 bottom-top, revolution fuses and synthesizes the two
 efformations as follows: not only does the bourgeois
 product, class antagonism and struggle, shape (construct,
 develop and transform) the bourgeois labyrinth of linear
 progression of modes of articulated combinations of
 forces and relations of production, the bourgeois form,
 but the bourgeois labyrinth of linear progression of
 modes of articulated combinations of forces and relations
 of production also shapes (constructs, develops and
 transforms) class antagonism and struggle. This fused
 and synthesized complex, shall we say higher order
 dialectically germinated complex, travels the pathways
 in and out of capitalism. Thus, Marx says that

...feudal production,...must be
 considered as a mode of production
 founded on antagonism. It must be
 shown how wealth was produced within
 this antagonism, how the productive
 forces were developed at the same
 time as class antagonism, how one
 of the classes,...went on growing
 until the material conditions for

its emancipation had attained full maturity....the mode of production, the relations in which the productive forces are developed,...they correspond to a definite development of men and of their productive forces, and that a change in men's productive forces necessarily brings about a change in their relations of production...28

He continues on in this passage to discuss capitalism, the next linearly placed pathway/period/mode on the road to a "complete revolution," and here we encounter the necessary conditions for advancement within a mode: class antagonism.

The bourgeoisie begins with a proletariat which is itself a relic of the proletariat of feudal times. In the course of its historical development, the bourgeois necessarily develops its antagonistic character....As the bourgeoisie develops, there develops in its bosom a new proletariat, a modern proletariat; there develops a struggle between the proletarian class and the bourgeois class....the production relations in which the bourgeois moves...wealth is produced, poverty is produced also;...in the self-same relations in which there is a development of productive forces, there is also a force producing repression; ...an ever-growing proletariat.29

We then come across the interaction of necessary and sufficient conditions for passing beyond the capitalist mode of production, i.e., for passing beyond the capitalist

pathway/period and arriving at the communist pathway/
period of production. The communist pathway/period which
is paved by the proletariat is surveyed by Marx as a
non-utopian theoretician of the proletariat.

Just as the economists are the
scientific representatives of
the bourgeois class, so the socialists
and the Communists are the
theoreticians of the proletarian
class. So long as the proletariat
is not yet sufficiently developed
to constitute itself as a class,
and consequently so long as the
very struggle of the proletariat
with the bourgeoisie has not yet
assumed a political character,
and the productive forces are not
yet sufficiently developed in the
bosom of the bourgeoisie itself
to enable us to catch a glimpse
of the material conditions
necessary for the emancipation
of the proletariat and for the
formation of a new society, these
theoreticians are merely utopians
who, ...improvise systems and go
in search of a regenerating science.³⁰

This journey from feudalism through capitalism to
communism had its necessary and sufficient conditions
mapped, in their detailed relationships, by our fundamental
(and amended) propositions. These propositions led us
to abandon our extensive and well-developed case for the
existence of two, if not more, incompatible and contradictory
revolutionary Marxian efformations.

We were obliged by our own propositional demands,
built upon Marxian materials, to accept a confluence and

union of these two revolutionary efformations; viz., a radicalized composite of the ultimate bourgeois form and product: a productive-economic-structural-voluntaristic-superstructural-class-struggle complex. This complete and inclusive, as well as exclusive, revolutionary complex, Marx formulates in The German Ideology. There he unfolds "a complete revolution."

With the community of revolutionary proletarians ,...who take their conditions of existence and those of all members of society under their control....It is just this combination of individuals (assuming the advanced stage of modern productive forces, of course)....³¹

This paragraph suggests the revolutionary combination and synthesis of the two efformations: the combination and synthesis of class antagonism and voluntaristic struggle and the structural dislocation produced by the "advanced stage of modern productive forces." The revolutionary unity which subsumes productively induced structural upheaval and the voluntarily inspired, guided and processed superstructural class struggles that break down a mode, and is alluded to in the above paragraph, is for Marx "a complete revolution": a merging of the "material elements" of the efformations into a complete and whole revolutionary complex.

And if these material elements of a complete revolution are not present (namely, on the one hand the existing productive forces, on the other the formation of a revolutionary mass, which revolts not only against separate conditions of society up till then, but against the very "production of life" till then, the "total activity" on which it was based), then, as far as practical development is concerned, it is absolutely immaterial whether the idea of this revolution has been expressed a hundred times already, as the history of communism proves.³²

Where does this leave our dissertation? It is obvious that within the last several pages an intent and purpose of this thesis has been seriously undermined. Marx's work has been shown to contain "a complete revolution," a revolutionary amalgam which consolidates in an integrated and unified whole the supposedly incompatible and contradictory Marxian revolutionary efformations. In response to this reasonable and appropriate question, our reply is one of recognition and acceptance of the weight of our own conclusion and the materials that lead to its formulation. Notwithstanding the lack of success in accomplishing our main intent and purpose, we sense that Marx's "complete revolution" is not a revolution at all and is not anti-bourgeois. Rather, it appears to be a schematic for circuitry and impedienc which serves to establish, maintain and reproduce bourgeois forms,

products and experiences; stated more aggressively, the Marxian "complete revolution" is a complete and complex mode-class labyrinth that radicalizes a bourgeois enterprise of periodization of production into modes and legitimizes and universalizes class development.

Our research into the possible existence of duality and conflict within Marxian revolutionary texts and writings opened up a greater and more profound possibility concerning revolution in Marx's work; to wit, "a complete revolution" is not, in essence or effect, a higher order concurrence, complex, of revolutionary efformations. To the contrary, it is the highest order concurrence of the fusion and synthesis of bourgeois form --linearly arranged productive modes--and product--classes. It is, in essence and effect, the highest bourgeois property. As it relates to our concerns, "a complete revolution" exists against and for barbarism: it exists as a puzzlement against the discovery of barbarism in the Western European context and the discovery of what happened to the barbarians of Western Europe, and it exists as a tanglement for the exportation and forced emigration of barbarism and barbarians from bourgeois society. Our argument is that "a complete revolution" is the ultimate maze for imprisoning humanity in bourgeois history, civilization, progress, and revolution--in short, the ultimate maze for entrapping

humanity in bourgeoisie property.

We have already observed that Marxian history parallels standard and common bourgeois history in that the stresses, strains and conflicts that surrounded the birth of capitalism are summarily located in the womb of feudalism; we will begin to observe that Marxian civilization, i.e, socialism-communism, conjoins with bourgeois civilization in its justification, vindication and defense of barbarous colonialism and imperialism to "dissolve" supposed "barbarism" and "semi-civilization." We will begin to observe that Marxian progress is identical to bourgeois progress: i.e., progress is "constantly revolutionising the instruments of production,"³³ and we will begin to observe a complete Marxian revolution as a means of bourgeois production and subsistence.

Consequently, although we were unsuccessful in realizing two contradictory and incompatible revolutionary Marxian efformations, it must be remembered that Marxian revolutionary production was addressed always as bourgeois production: revolution produced/generated by the bourgeois context and reflected by Marx. These hypothesized revolutions were never addressed as revolutions generated within Marxian texts and reflected in the bourgeois context. Therefore, if we can demonstrate and corroborate

the above assertions, our overarching and integrative principle will remain not just sound and intact but will be greatly expanded and amplified.

Notes

- ¹ Marx and Lenin, Civil War in France, p. 54.
- ² Ibid., p. 65.
- ³ Ibid., pp. 56-57.
- ⁴ Ibid., p. 62.
- ⁵ Ibid., p. 58.
- ⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹ Ibid., p. 59.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., p. 57.
- ¹¹ Ibid., p. 58.
- ¹² Ibid., pp. 57-58.
- ¹³ Ibid., p. 60; emphasis added.

- 14
Ibid., pp. 60-61; emphasis added.
- 15
Ibid., p. 61.
- 16
Ibid., p. 61; emphasis added.
- 17
Ibid., p. 62.
- 18
Marx and Lenin, Civil War In France, pp. 61-62;
emphasis added.
- 19
Marx and Engels, "Fictitious Splits," p. 270 fn.
- 20
Marx and Lenin, Civil War In France, p. 61.
- 21
Marx, Capital, I, p. 409; emphasis added.
- 22
Ibid., pp. 435-436.
- 23
Ibid., p. 436; emphasis added; see also Marx,
Poverty of Philosophy, pp. 154-155.
- 24
Marx, Capital, I, p. 427; see also p. 432.
- 25
Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 93; emphasis added.
- 26
Ibid., p. 113; emphasis added.
- 27
Ibid.
- 28
Ibid., pp. 113-114.
- 29
Ibid., pp. 114-115.

30

Ibid., pp. 116-117.

31

Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 85.

32

Ibid., p. 59; emphasis added. Marx here speaks of "a revolutionary mass," and we assume, in light of the paragraph suggesting "a complete revolution," that this is another way of saying "all members of society" bent on revolution who come under the "control" of the "revolutionary proletarians," i.e., "a revolutionary mass" under the "control" of a revolutionary class.

33

Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 36.

PART II

BARBARISM:
FROM POST-FEUDAL ACCUMULATION TO CAPITALIST-
SOCIALIST IMPERIALISM

.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ALL THAT IS SOLID DOES NOT MELT
 INTO AIR; RATHER MARX MAKES IT
 ABSURD OR ELIMINATES IT FROM THE
 BOURGEOIS CONTEXT: A MODERN
 THEORY OF COLONIALIZATION DISSOLVES
 INTO A MODERN THEORY OF BARBARISM

Constant revolutionising of production,
 uninterrupted disturbance of all
 social conditions, everlasting
 uncertainty and agitation distinguish
 the bourgeois epoch from all earlier
 ones.* All fixed, fast-frozen
 relations, with their train of ancient
 and venerable prejudices and opinions,
 are swept away, all new-formed ones
 become antiquated before they can
 ossify. All that is solid* melts
 into air, all that is holy is
 profaned, and man is at last compelled
 to face with sober sense his real
 conditions of life and his relations
 with his kind.

* In the German edition of 1890,
 the word "earlier" reads "other."

* In the German original, the word
 "solid" reads "privileged and established."¹

Marx chose to close his masterwork, Capital, Vol. 1,
 with "The Modern Theory Of Colonisation."² Although Marx
 correctly characterizes the "bourgeois epoch" as disting-
 uished by "Constant revolutionising of production,
 uninterrupted disturbance..., everlasting uncertainty and
 agitation....fixed, fast-frozen relations,...swept away

all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify," and although he correctly identifies these characteristics as the distinguishing features that separate the bourgeois epoch "from all earlier" epochs, he wrongly attributes these characteristics to the internal logic and actions of the bourgeoisie. He cannot bring forth the possibility that the bourgeoisie are part of this set of distinguishing characteristics. Which is to say, the bourgeoisie are an attribute, an end-product of the successful class-ification of the capitalistic competitors and their rivals, of the inner logic and dynamic of a circumstantial formation in fifteenth and sixteenth century Western Europe. A formation of dramatic changes in production, social havoc, unrest, violence and pillage; a formation in which all that was "solid" and stable did not melt "into air"; all that was solid and stable thawed into strife, murder and brutality: a formation in which "man is at last compelled to face with sober sense his real conditions of life and his relations with his kind." All that was "solid" melted into barbarism. Only in the Marxian bourgeois configuration does barbarism melt into air.

Capitalism is a contingent end-product of a circumstance. Capitalism rose from a position of sub-circumstance, a product of a sub-circumstance, within the

larger circumstantial formation of barbarism; it rose to the position of dominance and control over barbarism; thus feudalism happened to melt into barbarism and capitalism happened to obtain and secure a hegemonic position during the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Western Europe.

Capitalism has no epochal or modal origin; capitalism did not rise as a successor to a long series of successive epochs-modes--the "epochs in the progress of the economic formation of society": the primitive community, the Asiatic mode, the ancient mode, the slave mode, the Germanic mode and the feudal mode.³ Capitalism rose from its primitive accumulation during barbarism, and there was no necessity or requirement for it to have gone beyond primitive accumulation. It was not born in the womb of any epoch-mode or its antecedent epoch-mode, feudalism; it was born in a womb that was composed and comprised of dramatic productive changes, havoc, unrest, anomie, violence and warfare .

In other words, capitalism did not emanate out of an epochal-modal history, out of a historical scheme or productive paradigm. Just the opposite, Marxian epochs-modes emanated out of capitalism. Marx took the bourgeois project of epochs-modes and set out a complete revolutionary complex that arranged the integration of a

productive-economic structural efformation and a super-structural class voluntaristic efformation within a configuration of necessary and sufficient conditions having a downward and upward design flow. This complete revolutionary complex demonstrates that just "as the economists are the scientific representatives of the bourgeois class, so" Marx is revolutionary representative of the bourgeois class. The Marxian complete revolutionary complex is, then, a complete and comprehensive bourgeois complex, but more than this, although this conclusion is in itself significant, we will show that it is in reality an opaque bourgeois labyrinth that hides away all that was "solid" in fifteenth and early sixteenth century Western Europe--barbarism--by rendering its discovery absurd and its acceptance bewildering. Such a discovery and acceptance becomes absurd and bewildering because the Marxian variant of the bourgeois project of epochs-modes excludes barbarism in later Western Europe, and because the bourgeoisie set itself, its epoch and its mode as more than just the expression of the self-evident and eternal "laws of Nature": the bourgeoisie established and stationed itself, its epochal period and capitalism, at the end-point and zenith of civilization, history and progress.

In accordance with this, we will look into Marxian production for proof that the Marxian complete revolutionary complex met the "wants" of the bourgeois class; the Marxian complete revolution is an exhaustive and thorough maze in which to select 1) Western European barbarism, 2) the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries of emigration and deportation of Western European barbarians in the passage of bourgeois civilization, history and progress over the globe, and, thereby, 3) the exodus of the true antagonists/protagonists to the bourgeois and capitalism.

Consequently, we will search to determine whether all "that is solid" and comes into contact with the bourgeoisie and capitalism melts into air or whether everything was made to disappear first from Western Europe by means of forced and/or facilitated emigration and deportation of barbarians and then made to form bourgeois civilization, history and progress by the likes of "a complete revolution."

The very moment civilisation begins, production begins to be founded on the antagonism of orders, estates, classes, and finally on the antagonism of accumulated labour and immediate labour. No antagonism, no progress. This is the law that civilisation has followed up to our days. Till now the productive forces have been developed by virtue of this system of class antagonism. 4

The Marxian "complete revolution" takes us beyond the concrete and specific overturning of pre-capitalist economic-productive levels; it takes us beyond their reformation into "the material basis" of capitalism and communism, respectively. Marx has generalized bourgeois-specific materials, references and conditions across all history, civilization and progress. He continues this generalization by saying, in a refutation of Proudhon, that "to leave class antagonism out of account" is commensurate with turning "all historical development upside down."⁵ This is to say, that when "all historical development," e.g., "civilisation" and "progress," is "turned right side up again" by Marx, as he "turned right side up" the "Hegelian dialectic," the productive bottom is "founded" and "developed" by class antagonism. In other words, the universalization of the Marxian corrective/complete revolution gives us history, civilization and progress as it really is: "turned right side up." The corrective/complete revolution Marx discovered in laying bare the "law of motion of modern society" fosters the only veridical--"right side up"--history, civilization and progress within human society.

At this point, we must ask is Marx engaged in universalizing the format of the supposed origin and termination of capitalist society via a corrective/

complete revolution? Isn't Marx sewing a universal cloth from the novel bourgeois weave of change and development patterned on productive-economic conditions, a bottom to top weave, and class dynamic at the superstructure, a top to bottom weave? Isn't the universalization of the Marxian corrective/complete revolution really the universalization of bourgeois history, civilization and progress--in particular, the universalization of bourgeois property: modes and classes.

Any hesitancy or reservation attending our discussion on Marxian revolutionary production can be relinquished forthright. These questions are easy and simple to answer, for Marx was excurberant and deliberate in his posture as a mouthpiece for bourgeois "wants." When we have finished this section it will be evident that Marx is standing right side up with his head "within the mystical shell" of bourgeois social forms of change and development. Marx stands tall in his corrective/complete revolution because he stands at the peak of the capitalist superstructure.

Marx's position as a mouthpiece of and crusader for the putative history, civilization and progress that has come to be known as bourgeois, will be developed by exploring Marx's implantation of "a complete revolution" into Arabia, Northern Africa, India, Turkey, China, Persia,

(Middle and Southern Europe) and Russia. Which is to say, we will explore Marx's response to bourgeois colonialism and imperialism and their penetration and impact upon those contextual formations to which correspond the AMP.

In general the AMP is drawn out so as to provide a contrast between the rational, systematic and higher form of the realization of freedom and consciousness that is portrayed as characterizing Western European capitalist society, on the one hand, and, on the other, the primitive and stagnant AMP, a lower and limited form of the realization of freedom and consciousness.⁶

In so drawing out the AMP and its corresponding societies in this fashion, Marx manifests his absorption of the typical and predominant thought that can be discovered in the classical bourgeois works on economics, political economy and philosophy: Adam Smith's The Wealth Of Nations, James Mill's The History Of British India, John Stuart Mill's Principles Of Political Economy and George Hegel's The Philosophy Of History.

Marx, then, reproduced and elaborated upon bourgeois ideology in his orientation towards "Asiatic societies"; societies which he, therefore, observed to be primitive and stagnant economically and unstable politically, the political form does not change, only the rulers change.

The simplicity of the organisation for production in these self-sufficing communities that constantly reproduce themselves in the same form, and when accidentally destroyed, spring up again on the spot and with the same name--this simplicity supplies the key to the secret of the unchangeableness of Asiatic societies, an unchangeableness in such striking contrast with the constant dissolution and refounding of Asiatic States, and the never-ceasing changes of dynasty. The structure of the economic elements of society remains untouched by the storm-clouds of the political sky.⁷

In this characterization Marx calls attention to the relationship between the political superstructure and the "structure of the economic elements." A relationship in which political change does not proceed downward and touch upon as well as penetrate the base structure of economic conditions. What this signifies for Marx is that any social formation lacking the bourgeois modus operandi is economically and politically defective. Hence, societies which correspond to the (analytic category) of the AMP are the site of "inevitable slavery"⁸ and the political structure of "Asiatic despotism"/"Oriental despotism"--"Asiatic despotism"/"Oriental despotism" represent a hallmark of classical bourgeois works on the economy and politics of Asia/the Orient.

The stationary character of this part of Asia--despite all the aimless movements on the political surface--

is fully explained by two circumstances which supplement each other:
 1) the public works were the business of the central government; 2) besides this the whole empire, not counting the few larger towns, was divided into villages, each of which possessed a completely separate organisation and formed a little world in itself... These idyllic republics, which only jealously guard the boundaries of their village against the neighbouring village, still exists in a fairly perfect form in the North-Western parts of India.... I do not think anyone could imagine a more solid foundation for stagnant Asiatic despotism.⁹

Marx manifested continually his immersion in the bourgeois characterization of the Asiatic political apparatus:

"...the political state was nothing but the private caprice of a single individual so that, as in Asiatic despotism, the political state was as much a slave as the material state."¹⁰ This characterization is rooted in the 1) absence of change in the productive-economic base in the face of "restless" personnel change at the political superstructure: "...the Oriental empires show us a picture of steadfast immobility in the social substructure and restless changes in the persons and peoples that get control of the political superstructure,"¹¹ and 2) circumstances in which the entire social structure is responsible for restraining higher and expansive forms of consciousness and freedom as well as responsible for

depriving the Orient, in general, and India, in particular, of historical movement and change.

these idyllic village-communities, inoffensive though they may appear have always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies.¹²

To sum up, Marx says,

complete isolation of the various villages from each other, which produces in the whole country identical, but the very opposite of truly common interests, is the natural basis of oriental despotism, and from India to Russia this type of social structure has always produced despotism wherever it was paramount, and has always found its completion in this form of government. ...The whole is held together laboriously and externally by an Oriental despotism, whose arbitrariness and caprice we cannot imagine in the West.¹³

We have provided this introduction in order to consider the significance of Asiatic societies within the throes of "a complete revolution"; i.e., the meaning and importance of the dialectics of forces and relations of production and superstructural class struggle upon Asia, the East, the Orient. We have provided this introduction to set the stage for Marx's heralded imposition of bourgeois history, civilization and progress to overcome the "semi-

barbarian," "semi-civilized communities," "rubbish" and "stagnation" of Asia, the East, the Orient. We have provided this introduction to illustrate Marx's reproduction of classical bourgeois terms, categories, and concepts, and now we will illustrate Marx's juxtaposition and annexation of "a complete revolution" to classical bourgeois thought to form a whole representation of colonialism and imperialism, to wit, a whole representation of barbarous conquest within the maze of "a complete revolution": bourgeois conquest disguised within the maze of history, civilization and progress.

In articles published in the New York Daily Tribune, Marx began his development of the **AMP**. His initial discussions were based upon his study of the consequences of British penetration and administration in India and China. He viewed the East as providing the possibility of additional impetus and momentum to the rapid changes occurring in the capitalist West,¹⁴ so it would appear. Capitalism, as a transformative force, was sweeping away the "rubbish" of past historical periods, destroying the religious fetishes of Asia and breaking apart the Asiatic productive-economic foundation. The radical transformation embodied in the capitalist mode of production must not be understood as merely or simply a Western or European phenomenon; this revolution is not a

Western or Europocentric revolution; it is not the means of universalizing Western or European history, civilization or progress. It is a bourgeois phenomenon: the capitalist mode of production is the embodiment of the bourgeoisie, it specifically embodies the bourgeoisie not the West or Europe. Capitalism universalizes bourgeois history, civilization and progress. In accordance with this Marx says,

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on the pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In a word, it creates a world after its own image. 15

In a word, capitalism is "a complete revolution," a complete bourgeois change, which had already demonstrated its capacity to change the West. Now it was demonstrating its capacity to change the East.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities,

has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.¹⁶

Let us examine carefully what Marx is saying: 1) the bourgeoisie class-for-itself altered the productive forces in Western Europe as well as improved the means of transportation and communication; this led to the barbarian nations being conquered and dragged into the orbit of bourgeois civilization;¹⁷ 2) it was not the "cheap prices" of bourgeois commodities that battered "down all Chinese walls"; it was the reverse, the "heavy artillery" battered "down all Chinese walls" which opened up "trade with China";¹⁸ 3) we do not accept that "the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners" that generated resistance to the bourgeois foreigners existed independently of the intensely obstinate barbarity of the conquest by the bourgeois foreigners; we do accept that "the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners" was generated by the intensely obstinate barbarity of the conquest by the bourgeois foreigners and 4) the Eastern "barbarian and semi-barbarian countries" were not "made" dependent upon the civilized Western nations--this is pure and simple bourgeois

ideology, for these countries and peoples had survived thousands of years and will continue to survive without the bourgeoisie's complete revolution of capitalism; rather, it was (and is) the bourgeoisie's complete revolution of capitalism, the bourgeoisie's exportation of barbarous conquest, which was (and is) dependent upon Eastern countries, for it could not survive without them: "The need of a constantly expanding market for its products [in line with our argument, "its products" are classes conjoined with its form of productive forces and relations to establish its property, and its property is used as a labyrinth in which to re-nestle, re-settle, and re-establish its barbarians everywhere as a vanguard in the conquest of markets for "its products" and form; thus Marx continues, this quest] "chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connexions everywhere."¹⁹

Our overriding critique in all of the above Marxian statements, as well as our overriding critique in all of the below Marxian statements, is that the bourgeois would bring, via "a complete revolution," history, civilization and progress to the "barbarian" hinterlands; they would realize in the East/Orient/Asia what they had realized in Western Europe: the conquest of "barbarism" by a greater barbarism. Colonialism and imperialism were the external

passages of a bourgeois complete revolution. These passages formed a network for the employment and relocation of the remaining and threatening barbarians in bourgeois society. These barbarians would serve to open up the way for bourgeois colonies and rule. Marx would have us accept, as we shall observe in greater detail, that the bourgeois class-for-itself and the capitalist productive mode brought revolutionary transformation to the East/Orient/Asia. But we shall observe, from within Marx's work, that what actually occurred in the "barbarian and semi-barbarian countries" was "conquest....violence, war, pillage, murder and robberty, etc." What actually occurred was the destruction of "an old civilisation." Conquest in Western Europe and in the East/Orient/Asia, this is ²⁰ "the driving force of history" --this is the actual driving force of bourgeois history, civilization and progress. Dispossessed of the labyrinthine configuration of "a complete revolution," the "materialist conception of history" is discovered to be antithetical to the actuality of the bourgeoisie's rise to power and control in Western Europe and the East/Orient/Asia. The "materialist conception of history" is, it is being argued, a mode of production-class struggle maze in which to hide the reality of violence and conquest in the hegemonic rise of the bourgeoisie "over the whole surface of the globe."

In essence and effect, then, "the materialist conception of history" is a conception of history, civilization and progress in the service of the bourgeoisie. Colonialism and imperialism are, then, the repetition of the bourgeoisie's experience in Western Europe, but, and this is critical, outside of Western Europe the bourgeoisie manufacture "a complete revolution" to conceal the invasion of a "conquering barbarian people" upon "an old civilisation." This was done in order to give ideological legitimacy and propulsion to their conquest and expansionistic ambitions and needs. The "materialist conception of history" operates in the vanguard of this ideological legitimacy and propulsion.

Whereas in Western Europe "a complete revolution" along with forced and facilitated emigration and deportation served to conquer barbarism, outside of Western Europe forced and facilitated emigration and deportation of barbarians--those who clung to violence and force and did not succumb to 1) the atomization, linearization and serialization of capitalist production, 2) bourgeois history, civilization and progress and 3) class-ification around the bourgeois productive mode and superstructural relations--around the globe was accomplished by way of lodging them in the configuration of "a complete revolution" that served to universalize bourgeois conquest.

Consequently, within Western Europe "a complete revolution" coupled with "the materialist conception of history" served to secrete (the possibility of) forced and facilitated emigration and deportation of barbarism as the means by which the bourgeoisie finally materialized their conquest; and in all those regions exterior to Western Europe, "a complete revolution" coupled with "the materialist conception of history" served as a universal labyrinth for barbarous bourgeois conquest.

Marx stands out as a major vanguard figure in the construction of this universal labyrinth in which to enclose bourgeois conquest. (Other bourgeois builders complemented this Marxian construction by adding on religious, social and cultural scaffolding.)

Marx took a picture of Eastern/Oriental/Asiatic societies through the categorical lens of the AMP. His picture exhibits these societies as lacking any indigenous mechanism of change via the base-superstructure or class struggle. The AMP was built around the absence of private ownership of land in these societies.²¹ This absence created a condition within these societies and their individual members such that there was a lacking in the explosive dynamic of base-superstructure and/or class struggle seen above in the revolutionary complex. As a consequence of the absence of private ownership of

land, the societies corresponding to the AMP contained a²² generalized absence of ownership of private property.

Therefore, the productive-economic and/or voluntaristic efformation(s) could not develop. No structural dislocation due to a misfit between forces and relations of production was possible because there was no private ownership of productive means, there was no accumulated labor; in addition, because the economic conditions, the property relations, were devoid of private ownership of property, there were not the conditions/relations that entail classes.

The essential feature of all the structural, functional, and voluntaristic relationships--or lack thereof, i.e., the "inevitable" general slavery--of the AMP is the appropriation of the surplus product, there is no surplus value, by the state, the core of Oriental despotism, the owner of the land: "The surplus product--which is, incidentally, determined by law in consequence of the real appropriation through labour--thereby automatically²³ belongs to this highest unity."

Devoid of any indigenous mechanism or dynamic of change, change, therefore, in Eastern/Oriental/Asiatic societies would have to arrive from the insertion of dynamic capitalism. AMP societies contained no developed or burgeoning production tier, nor did they contain

independent classes (in themselves or for-themselves). Therefore, these societies possessed no capitalist character of production or class(es) that could engender structural upheaval or classes-for-themselves struggling to transform the base via seizure and control of the political superstructure. These societies were, in a word, stagnant and primitive.

In AMP societies the means of production and subsistence were in the effective control of the state--the overall unity--and as a result 1) the efformation of non-correspondence between productive forces and relations would not unfold and 2) the efformation of superstructural class struggle for power was not to be found. Consequently, the capitalist mode-class formation was portrayed, by almost all bourgeois thinkers including Marx, as the fundamental dynamic force of history, civilization, progress and revolutionary change. This would result in a "destructive" and "regenerating" "mission" in Asia/the East/the Orient.

England has to fulfill a double mission in India: one destructive, the other regenerating--the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of the material foundation of Western society in Asia.²⁴

What is the "material foundation of Western society"?

It is nothing but the bourgeois mode-class formation, and it is laid in Asia. Which is to say, it is nothing but the capitalist release of barbarous violence in order to conquer "old Asiatic society." But this "is not the question"; the "question is" can the bourgeoisie "fulfill its destiny without a fundamental" barbarism being structured as "a complete revolution"?

Now, sickening as it must be to human feeling to witness those myriads of industrious patriarchal and inoffensive social organizations disorganized and dissolved into their units, thrown into a sea of woes, and their individual members losing at the same time their ancient form of civilization and their hereditary means of subsistence....

England, it is true, in causing a social revolution in Hindustan, was actuated only by the vilest interests, and was stupid in her manner of enforcing them. But this is not the question. The question is, can mankind fulfill its destiny without a fundamental revolution in the social state of Asia? If not, whatever may have been the crimes of England she was the unconscious tool of history in bringing about that revolution.

Then, whatever bitterness the spectacle of the crumbling of an ancient world may have for our personal feelings, we have the right, in point of history, to exclaim with Goethe:

"Sollte diese Qual uns qualen
 Da sie unsre Lust vermehrt,
 Hat nicht Myriaden Seelen
 Timur's Herrschaft aufgezehrt"*

* "Should this torture then
 torment us
 Since it brings us greater pleasure?
 Were not through the rule of Timur
 Souls devoured without measure?" 25

How conveniently Marx unwraps and condones violent conquest by the bourgeoisie under the mystical cloak of "unconscious" historical agency of revolutionary change. He covers with poetical niceties the horrible atrocities heaped upon non-bourgeois and anti-bourgeois humanity.

But this still does not answer our question. Let us restate the question to get at the heart of the matter. Can Marx remove bourgeois colonial and imperial barbarism from the labyrinth of revolution? Can Marx find barbarism at the point of origin and throughout the passage of "the only social revolution ever heard of in Asia?"

English interference having placed the spinner in Lancashire and the weaver in Bengal, or sweeping away both Hindu spinner and weaver, dissolved these small semi-barbarian, semi-civilized communities, by blowing up their economical [sic] basis [here Marx is reiterating the dynamic of a class destroying the old

society and economic base; later we will encounter the productive-economic dynamic dissolving "old Asiatic society" and its economic relations], and thus produced the greatest, and, to speak the truth, the only social revolution ever heard of in Asia.²⁶

The answer to our question is apparently no. Not only can Marx not expose the bourgeois revolution as pure and simple conquest, but he goes beyond the limits of bourgeois history, civilization and progress by making the bourgeoisie the conveyors of the greatest and most unique transformation to have ever occurred in Asia. The degree to which Marx expanded the "narrow horizon" of the bourgeoisie can be measured by the materials Marx used to apply "a complete revolution" to Eastern/Oriental/Asian societies. These materials contain 1) a placement of these societies within the legitimate and necessary interests of the bourgeoisie, 2) a developmental schema which casts these societies as backward and stagnant and, therefore, 3) advancement and progress as arriving in these societies on the tracks of "a complete revolution." Accordingly capitalist production structures and the emergence of a "fresh class,"²⁷ within new conditions of political unity,²⁸ these are the material elements of Eastern/Oriental/Asiatic liberation.

What will this liberation bring to India, for example? What will "a complete revolution" do for India?

Nothing more or less than India being "actually annexed
 29
 to the Western world."

We have just witnessed the expansion of the narrow "bourgeois horizon" to the point where its history, civilization and process of transformation becomes the "destiny....unconscious...history" of "mankind." The bourgeoisie epitomize humanity; they do so because of their complete revolution, or, more accurately, "a complete revolution" epitomizes humanity because it is bourgeois. What this presents is a view of the completion and culmination of "human progress" as predicated upon "a great social revolution," and "a great social revolution" as predicated upon bourgeois history, civilization and progress. This series of predications demonstrates Marx's mastery of bourgeois history, civilization and progress, and, thereby, it stations him amongst "the most advanced peoples" worthy of controlling human progress--worthy of building upon the "skulls... slain" in bourgeois conquest.

When a great social revolution shall have mastered the results of the bourgeois epoch, the market of the world and the modern powers of production, and subject them to the common control of the most advanced peoples, then only will human progress cease to resemble the hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.³⁰

According to this, we can say that no matter what Marx says, in point of fact his presentation of "a great social revolution" and "human progress" is raised upon "the vilest interests" and force: Marx's analysis and advocacy belie his attempts to avoid or downplay conquest as the foundation and point of origin of "a great social revolution" and "human progress." Indeed, his mastery of bourgeois life and his station amongst "the most advanced peoples" leads him to the arrogant, condescending and truthful conclusion that Indian society was a waiting and helpless "prey," not of "a great social revolution" but of conquest.

I propose...to conclude my observations on India. How came it that English supremacy was established in India?...A country not only divided between Mohammedan and Hindu, but between tribe and tribe, between caste and caste; a society whose framework was based on a sort of equilibrium, resulting from a general repulsion and constitutional exclusiveness between all its members. Such a country and such a society, were they not the predestined prey of conquest? If we knew nothing of the past history of Hindustan, would there not be one great incontestable fact, that even at this moment India is held in English thralldom by an Indian army maintained at the cost of India? India, then, could not escape the fate of being conquered,....³¹

In fact Marx's mastery and his advanced status are the consequence of his immersion in a process of history, civilization and change in which all bourgeois conquests are epoch-making, civilizing and revolutionary, and only bourgeois-like mode-class conquests are epochal, civilizing and revolutionary levers.

India,...the whole of her past history, if it be anything, is the history of the successive conquests she has undergone. Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history. What we call its history, is but the history of the successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society. The question, therefore, is not whether the English had the right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to India conquered by Briton. 32

If this isn't a glaring polemic and rationalization for bourgeois conquest, then nothing is. Marx is polemicizing and rationalizing bourgeois conquest as a bourgeois revolution.

From all of what Marx has said about Asia/the East/ the Orient we can conclude that successive non-bourgeois conquests (of India, for example) did not produce history; however, bourgeois barbarous conquest (of India, for example) brought about the dissolution of "small semi-barbarian,

semi-civilized communities," the only great "social revolution ever heard of in Asia" and the fulfillment of human destiny and progress. Why is this the case? Why is bourgeois conquest the prelude to human transformation and progress and non-bourgeois conquests the prelude to the human mind being restrained in "the smallest possible compass" and stagnation? Marx's answer is, of course, that bourgeois conquest brought productive development and classes: "a complete revolution" creating the "material conditions of a new world."³³

However, this is a tautology: human transformation and progress is just another way for Marx to say "a complete revolution." Marx has created a linguistic substitution in which human transformation and progress means bourgeois transformation and progress, so that the elimination of this tautology leaves nothing but unveiled and naked barbarism.

The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked.³⁴

Human transformation and progress carried on by the bourgeoisie, unveiled and stripped naked, is barbarism, violent conquest. Bourgeois transformation and progress unveiled and stripped of its labyrinthine complete revolution

is not inherently barbarous; it does not encompass an "inherent barbarism," nor is bourgeois civilization barbarous per se; rather, bourgeois transformation, progress and civilization were all inherent to the barbarism that existed in later Western Europe. Bourgeois transformation, civilization and progress took on the modus operandi of its contextual womb.

Marx cannot dwell too long on the "inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization," for this would make too transparent and obvious the existence of bourgeois civilization and its complete revolution as built upon naked and violent conquest, i.e., barbarism preceded and was a precondition for the productive-economic and voluntaristic efformations.

This whole world of bourgeois history, civilization and progress as based on "the fact of conquest....violence, war, pillage, murder and robberty, etc.,"--barbarism "as the driving force of" bourgeois history, civilization and progress--must be explained away quickly, or else Marx's "profound hypocrisy" would be unveiled and go naked. To avoid his unveiling and naked endorsement of bourgeois barbarism, Marx hurriedly returns to the cover of a revolutionary maze to prevent the naked exposure of the greatest anti-bourgeois revolutionary as one of the greatest

bourgeois barbarians. He clothes the "inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization" in the "vilest interests" and "stupid" colonial management and enforcement³⁵ as well as in "futile and really absurd (in practice infamous) economic experiments."³⁶ This is to say, in order for Marx to maintain the selective (royal) garb of the revolutionary stationed amidst "the most advanced peoples," he must exhibit bourgeois barbarism as a complete "great social revolution" gone astray as a consequence of corruption, mismanagement and faulty administration. For Marx to leave bourgeois conquest unveiled and naked as pure and simple barbarism is to leave himself unveiled and naked as a bourgeois barbarian inasmuch as he is one of its fervent advocates. Stripped and taken from the maze of revolution with which Marx surrounds himself, he is seen as a leading bourgeois barbarian in the midst of the most advanced conquering people and context where "war itself is still, as indicated above, a regular form of intercourse...."³⁷

Notes

1

Marx and Engels, Manifesto, pp. 36-37; emphasis added.

2

Throughout his work Marx continually qualifies political economists as being representatives of the bourgeoisie, e.g., "The same interest which compels the sycophant of capital, the political economist,..." (Marx, Capital, I, p. 765), or he locates "Political Economy" as a Western European accomplishment, e.g., "Western Europe, the home of Political Economy,..." (Marx, Capital, I, p. 765). In these two specifications he leaves himself open to criticism; see for example the accomplishment and location of the political economy produced in the seminal work of Ibn Khaldun; Mahdi, Mushin, Ibn Khaldun's Philosophy Of History: A Study in the Philosophic Foundation of the Science of Culture, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971; Ibn Khaldun, The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History, trans., Franz Rosenthal, ed., N.J. Dawood, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974 and Faghizradeh, Saleh, Sociology Of Sociology: In Search of...Ibn Khaldun's Sociology Then and Now, Tehran: Soroush Press, 1982.

3

Marx, Karl, "Forms Which Precede Capitalist Production," Grundrisse, pp. 471-514 and see pp. 467-468; Marx, Capital, III, p. 791; Marx, Critique Of Political Economy, p. 21; Marx and Engels, Marx Engels: Formations, inter alia; Marx, Karl Marx Formations, inter alia; Marx and Engels, On Colonialism, inter alia and Marx and Engels, On Religion, inter alia.

We are not concerned here with the endless, irrelevant, i.e., academic, and tedious debates with reference to 1) the linear or non-linear quality of the succession of these epochs-modes, 2) the question of whether or not the appearance of a particular epoch-mode is dependent upon the appearance of a necessary preceding epoch-mode, i.e., the required appearance of a particular antecedent epoch-mode. All such debates are part of the problem under discussion: these debates entail the uncritical acceptance of the entire bourgeois configuration of rendering peoples and contexts into historical periods and "economic formations"/modes of production. The Marxian ordering and organization of humanity and context into

epochal and modal formation is the methodization and universalization of bourgeois hegemony, civilization and progress, and this hegemony, civilization and progress is not overturned by "a complete revolution." To the contrary, the Marxian "complete revolution" articulates and elaborates this hegemony, civilization and progress under the guise of overcoming it.

4

Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 59; emphasis added.

5

Ibid.

6

In this respect, Marxian sociology, in its development of the AMP is, in general, terminologically and conceptually similar to Max Weber's position on Asiatic and "Middle Eastern" societies. Weber characterized these societies as social forms and relations of patrimonial domination and prebendal feudalism; see Weber, Max, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans., A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, ed., Talcott Parsons, New York: Free Press, 1964; Weber, Max, Max Weber on Law in Economy and Society, ed., Max Rheinstein, trans., Max Rheinstein and Edwards Shils, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954 and Bendix, Rheinhard, Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

We have placed the regional designation "Middle Eastern" in quotation marks because it is in the middle of the eastern hemisphere only from points of origin in the western hemisphere. The geographical nomenclature of the "Middle East," "Far East," the "East" and the "Orient" are instances of the ability of Western powers to establish and organize geographical units according to their references.

Geographical destinations and nomenclature do not necessarily correspond to the natural features of the earth's surface; they do often correspond to and exist as and for marking hegemonic rule and control.

7

Marx, Capital, I, p. 358.

8

Marx, Surplus-Value, (1963) Part 1, p. 346; see Marx, Grundrisse, pp. 491-497.

Marx develops an important distinction, in his works, between slaveholding as a private property-holding mode of production and the "inevitable" general slavery of the AMP.

Slavery and serfdom are thus only further developments of the form of property resting on the clan system. ...since in this [Asiatic] form the individual never becomes a proprietor [of land] but only a possessor, he is at bottom himself the property, the slave of him in whom the unity of the commune exists, and slavery here neither suspends the conditions of labour nor modifies the essential relation (Marx, Grundrisse, p. 493).

For Marx the AMP corresponds to an "inevitable" slavery that is generalized, i.e., it applies to the community itself, and with this the individual is precluded from entering into a free relationship. The individual is exploited by the despotic "Supreme Unity": the state government.

This presentation by Marx constitutes an evolvment of bourgeois colonial and imperial ideology: the "West" is the generalization of higher forms of freedom and consciousness and the "East" is the generalization of servitude and ignorance. As suggested in this quote from the Grundrisse, Marx rests this "inevitable" general slavery and "all phenomena in the East" on "the absence of private property in land" (Marx, Karl, "Marx to Engels," London, June 2, 1853, On Colonialism, p. 311; see also Marx, Grundrisse, pp. 472-473 and Marx, Capital, III, p. 791).

Moreover, "the principle of 'no property in land'" is considered by Marx to have been established "throughout the whole of Asia" first by the "Mohammedans" (Marx, Karl, "Marx To Engels," June 14, 1853, On Colonialism, p. 315). (Later we shall look at the "Mohammedans"; here it will suffice to say that "Mohammedans" is used linguistically to demonstrate an arrogance and condescension towards and a misrepresentation of Muslims--there are innumerable linguistic constructions in the Western world that serve the same purposes: e.g., "niggers," "Negroes," "boy" and "girl" for Black Africans and "Indians" for Native/Original Americans.)

This nexus of the "East," "the absence of private property in land," and "inevitable" general slavery is revealed to be intellectual gamesmanship; in bourgeois Western Europe, or for that matter in Western Europe in general, the abolition of "private property in the soil" is one of the bases of the "realm of freedom" and consciousness and the ultimate mode of production, communism (see Marx, Manuscripts Of 1844, pp. 92-105) In other words, what is negative in the restrictive eastern goose is positive in the free communist gander, or I will cook the restrictive eastern goose in colonial ideology and then launch it as the western gander of liberation and completion.

9

Marx, "Marx To Engels," London, June 14, 1853, On Colonialism, pp. 313-314.

10

Marx, "Critique of Hegel's Doctrine of the State," p. 91.

11

Marx, Karl, "Chinese Affairs," Marx Engels: Werke, XV, p. 514, cited by Draper, Marx's Theory, II, Book 2, p. 524; see also Marx and Engels, Marx Engels: Formations, inter alia and Marx and Engels, On Colonialism, inter alia.

12

Marx, Karl, "The British Rule In India," London, June 10, 1853, Marx Engels: Formations, p. 75.

13

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, The Russian Menace In Europe, eds., Paul W. Blackstock and Bert F. Hoselitz, London, 1953, pp. 211-212 and p. 215, cited by Turner, Bryan S., Weber And Islam: A critical study, London: Routledge & Kegan, Paul, 1974, p. 15.

14

Marx, Karl, "Revolution In China And In Europe," On Colonialism, pp. 19-26; Marx, Karl, Capital: The Process of Circulation of Capital, ed., F. Engels, trans., I. Lasker, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1974, II, p. 36 and Marx, Capital, III, pp. 332-333.

15

Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 38; emphasis added.

16
Ibid., emphasis added.

17
Marx and Engels, On Colonialism, inter alia.

18
See Marx, Karl, "The British Quarrel With China," On Colonialism, pp. 91-96; see also all the other articles that pertain to China in this same work.

19
Marx and Engels, Manifesto, p. 37.

20
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 89.

21
Notes 7, 8 and 9 immediately above and Marx, Capital, III, p. 791 reference this "'no property in land.'"

22
Marx, Grundrisse, pp. 471-474.

We are in complete agreement with Marx in this regard; there were no base-superstructure or class dynamics in the East/Orient/Asia because there was no private ownership of land, and this absence of private land acts as the foundation for the generalization for the absence of private property ownership.

Furthermore, we also agree with Marx's (tentative) conclusion that the Muslims were the first to establish "'no property in land'." Therefore, our coincidence with Marx on these matters leads us to the proposition that the Muslims set in effect the absence of base-superstructure and class dynamics, the lack of the bourgeois revolutionary complex, in the East/Orient/Asia.

23
Ibid., p. 473.

24
Marx, Karl, "The Future Results Of The British Rule In India," London, Friday, July 22, 1853, On Colonialism, p. 82.

25
Marx, Karl, "The British Rule In India," London, Friday, June 10, 1853, On Colonialism, pp. 40-41.

26
Ibid., p. 40.

27
Marx, "Future Results Of The British Rule," pp. 82-85.

28
Ibid., pp. 82-83.

29
Ibid., p. 83.

30
Ibid., p. 87.

31
Ibid., p. 81; emphasis added.

32
Ibid.; emphasis added.

33
Ibid., p. 87.

34
Ibid., p. 86.

35
Marx, "British Rule In India," On Colonialism, p. 41.

36
Marx, Capital, III, p. 333 fn.; see also Marx, Grundrisse, inter alia.

37
Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 89 .

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE ROLE OF FORCE EMIGRATION AND
VIOLENCE (CONQUEST) IN BOURGEOIS
TRANSFORMATION, CIVILIZATION AND PROGRESS

This whole interpretation of history [i.e., "the materialist conception of history"] appears to be contradicted by the fact of conquest. Up till now violence, war, pillage, murder and robbery, etc. have been accepted as the driving force of history. Here we must limit ourselves to the chief points and take, therefore, only the most striking example--the destruction of an old civilisation by a barbarous people and the resulting formation of an entirely new organisation of society. (Rome and the barbarians; feudalism and Gaul; the Byzantine Empire and the Turks.)¹

With this introduction we can move beyond the argument and conclusion of our prior chapter. Marx is setting up a contradistinction between "the materialist conception of history" (emphasis added) and the fact of violent conquest; i.e., Marx is setting up a contradistinction between the bourgeois representation of history, history as a productive modes-class struggle configuration, and the actual history of violence and conquest.

Let us examine this framework of contrast to determine if we can further demonstrate our case, viz.,

that "the materialist conception of history" is used as a bourgeois representational maze to hide violent conquest as the driving force of the bourgeoisie, as its historical agency of change. We want to advance our conclusion that the contradiction between the materialist matrix of transformation, civilization and progress and "a barbarous...formation of an entirely new organisation of society"--the contradiction between bourgeois forms of intercourse and "the destruction of an old civilisation by a barbarous people"--is an inveiglement. In fact there is no contradiction, there is only a complete confirmation and concurrence between bourgeois and barbarous forms of intercourse--even though, as we shall observe, Marx attempts to build a case for a difference between bourgeois and barbarous forms of violence, conquest and "taking." This imputed difference is, we will counter-argue, false.

Bourgeois barbarism entails, as do the other and older forms of barbarism, a "compulsory emigration," a giving globally of barbarians, so that the bourgeoisie would not be threatened internally by barbarism; thus the bourgeoisie 1) would "not be deprived of the results attained and forfeit the fruits of civilisation" and 2) would continue "the shape of the periodical

establishment" of colonies which "formed a regular link in the structure of" their "society."

* * *

Capitalists in Western Europe were faced with a clear, present and imminent danger during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (which subsided in significant measure during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries). Masses of humanity had still retained their barbarous forms of intercourse; a mass form of intercourse that was antagonistic to the security and stability of the capitalist base-superstructure and class social formation. To realize an advancement beyond the primitive accumulation of capital, the capitalist competitors had to come together, unite and eliminate the danger of barbarism. A conquest of barbarism was attempted by unleashing a greater and more systematic state of violence, force, pillage and murder. Although this greater and more systematic barbarism was extremely successful, large numbers of barbarians remained in the rural areas. As late as the 1800's (the era of the Corn Laws, in England, the most highly developed capitalist country,² the "transition from barbarism to

civilisation" was still not complete.

The most important division of material and mental labour is the separation of town and country. The contradiction between town and country begins with the transition from barbarism to civilisation, from tribe to state, from locality to nation, and runs through the whole history of civilisation to the present day (the Anti-Corn Law League).³

From the barbarous countryside "radiated" the "great risings" and from the towns emerged the "rabble...revolts" that were (curiously) not mentioned or dealt with in "The So-Called Primitive Accumulation."

While, therefore, the rabble ["they were the day-labourers, never managed to organise, but remained an unorganised rabble. The need for day-labourers in the towns created the rabble."⁴] at least carried out revolts against the whole municipal order, revolts which remain completely ineffective because of its powerlessness, the journeymen never got further than small acts of insubordination within separate guilds, such as belong to the very nature of the guild-system. The great risings of the Middle Ages⁵ all radiated from the country, but equally remained totally ineffective because of the isolation and consequent crudity of the peasants.⁶

Great risings from the barbarous countryside and "rabble" revolts of those who had migrated recently from the

countryside to the towns were perilous actions in the face of a newly assembled and fragile design for conquest being constructed by the bourgeoisie. Barbarism is in contradiction to the civilization of class-ification of humanity required by capitalism, and it is a destructive force against capitalistic productive forces and conditions: "The last centuries of the declining Roman Empire and its conquest by the barbarians destroyed a considerable part of the productive forces."⁷ At stake was the ultimate survival of the bourgeoisie.

Although the newly acquired and developed productive forces and the bourgeoisie class itself had originated from within the barbarous form of intercourse, barbarism had to be eradicated, so that the bourgeoisie would not be "deprived of the results attained and forfeit the fruits of civilisation."⁸ Thus, the ultimate danger to the "fruits of civilisation" was barbarism. Barbarism, not "a complete revolution" would ultimately uproot the "fruits of civilisation": productive forces and classes.⁹ A "complete revolution," rather than bringing on an uprooting of bourgeois civilization, is in actuality the preservation and cultivation of bourgeois produce. In other words, Marx was, by means of "a complete revolution," engaged

in perserving and cultivating the bourgeoisie against the pestilence of barbarism; "a complete revolution" was counter to the barbarian forfeiture of the fruits of bourgeois civilization.

A complete revolution of production explosion and ciass struggle is the produce of the seeds, plants, trees and fruits of the bourgeoisie. It grew out of the history, civilization and progress of the bourgeoisie; a history, civilization and progress endangered by "great risings" and "rabble ...revolts."

For these reasons barbarism had to be removed from the context of the bourgeois "fruits of civilisation," history and progress, and this includes the exorcism of barbarism from the texts on bourgeois history, civilization and progress--the evils of barbarism were dispossessed from the bourgeois ideology. Although we can observe a sparing glimpse of barbarism in Marxian production, he has it always portrayed as destroyed by the onslaught of capitalism or inherent to capitalism. Our argument is that barbarism preceded capitalism and was neither crushed under the weight of capitlism nor inherent to capitalism. We argue that barbarism was expelled from the bourgeois context and textually tangled within bourgeois produce by bourgeois produce. The development of productive forces in the

areas of transportation and communication enable the bourgeois to forcibly emigrate the recalcitrant barbarians, and, thereby, use this emigration, wherever possible, as a landing force in the conquest of colonies.

This pattern of forced emigration of barbarians and bourgeois conquest resembles the pattern of conquest of Greek and Roman civilization: "In the ancient states, in Greece and Rome, compulsory emigration, assuming the shape of the periodical establishment of colonies, formed a regular link in the structure of society. The whole system of those states was founded on certain limits to the number of the population, which could not be surpassed without endangering the condition of antique civilization itself. But why was it so? Because the application of science to material production was utterly unknown to them. To remain civilized they were forced to remain few."¹⁰

It is our argument that the bourgeoisie, in their quest for survival, society and civilization, "drove the barbarians" from their midst in a periodic manner so as to relieve the pressure of barbarism and, therewith, establish colonies. Consequently, "compulsory emigration"--particularly in the embryonic

and formative stages--and colonization formed a regular and essential "link in the structure" of bourgeois survival, society and civilization. The linkage of survival and forced emigration found in the bourgeois context is the "same" linkage found in barbarian formations.

It was the same pressure of population on the powers of production that drove the barbarians from the high plains of Asia to invade the Old World. The same cause acted there, although under a different form. To remain barbarians they were forced to remain few. They were pastoral, hunting, war-waging tribes, whose manner of production required a large space for every individual, as is now the case with Indian tribes in North America. By augmenting in numbers they curtailed each other's field of production. Thus the surplus population was forced to undertake those great adventurous migratory movements which laid the foundation of the peoples of ancient and modern Europe. 11

The "pressure of population on the powers of production that drove" the "civilized" Greeks and Romans and Asian barbarians to conquest stands in opposition to the pressure that acted upon capitalist society. At least this is what Marx would have us conclude; a conclusion reached by way of a Marxian tangle.

But with modern compulsory emigration the case stands quite opposite. Here it is not the want of productive power which creates a surplus population; it is the increase of productive power which demands a diminution of population, and drives away the surplus by famine or emigration. It is not the population that presses on productive power; it is productive power that presses on population.¹²

This distinction between pre-capitalist or non-capitalist and capitalist directed "modern compulsory emigration" is central to Marx's tangle, and it is the basis for his rejection of "the notion that history up till now...has only been a question of taking," i.e., violent conquest.¹³ This distinction calls attention to surplus population, on the one hand, and increased productive power on the other. Whereas in "antique civilization" and barbarian formations the surplus population was pressed for "want of productive power" and was forced to emigrate and conquest, in capitalist formations increase productive power drives away the surplus population by means of emigration or famine.

Now let us examine close up what has been said and determine if we can demonstrate the tangle we have asserted.

Who or what constitutes the surplus population within capitalist/modern society? Our question implies that by "surplus population" Marx is speaking about more and other than a numerical excess in capitalist society: a quantity or amount of people over and above the "productive power" of society such that their subsistence needs cannot be satisfied. It is our argument that Marx is making reference to a particular population where he discusses the effects of capitalist "productive power" on compulsory emigration.

I am not speaking now of the emigration caused by the gold mania, but only of the compulsory emigration produced by landlordism, concentration of farms, application of machinery to the soil, and introduction of the modern system of agriculture on a great scale.¹⁴

Again, in this vein, Marx says: "In Great Britain the.... application of modern science to production clears the land of its inhabitants, but it concentrates people in manufacturing towns....The rural population, the most stationary and conservative element of modern society, disappears...."¹⁵ Marx gives very specific accounts of the countryside being emptied of its inhabitants by means of systematic expulsion and extermination.¹⁶ He continues to comment on this topic: "The process of clearing

estates which, in Scotland, we have just now described, was carried out in England in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries."¹⁷

Our discovery reveals to us, by way of untangling the Marxian tangle, that the rural population, the country barbarians, is the surplus population in capitalist/modern society and, therefore, in Marxian analysis. We have also discovered that this population was cleared out in England, the "most highly and classically developed" capitalist society, throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Thus as late as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries capitalism still had not secured a final or complete victory over barbarism even in the context of the most advanced and prototypic capitalist country.

Now we will expose the total process in which the capitalist/modern "productive power" drove away the barbarians/surplus population. The questions where and how the barbarian/surplus population emigrants settled are the very questions that unravel the Marxian tangle, for "compulsory emigration" screens out the issues of the areas in which the emigrants settled and whether or not their re-settlement was peaceful or not. Marx organizes perceptions around the source and origin of

the locus of the capitalist compulsion to emigrate and blocks out the locus (or loci) and the social relations into which the emigrants re-settled. Marx set out clearly the progression of alternatives within pre-capitalist "civilization": 1) remain few to remain civilized, otherwise 2) the citizens would "have had to submit to the bodily drudgery which transformed the free citizen into a slave. The want of productive power made citizenship dependent on a certain proportion in numbers not to be disturbed. [and 3] Forced emigration was the only remedy,"¹⁸ and it assumed "the shape of the periodical establishment of colonies, [which] formed a regular link in the structure of society."

Marx sets out the progression of alternatives within pre-capitalist and non-capitalist barbarian formations: 1) remain few to remain barbarians, otherwise 2) the augmentation in numbers would curtail the space of every individual's field of production and, thus, 3) the surplus population was forced to emigrate and invade other territories.

But where Marx deals with the progression of alternatives within capitalist society, he blocks out the final sequence of the third alternative: 1) increased "productive power which demands a diminution of population, and drives away the surplus by [2)] famine

or [3]] emigration." Emigration yes, but how was it realized? Our answer is that it was realized by invasive conquest that assumed "the shape of the periodical establishment of colonies, [which] formed a regular link in the structure of society." We can complete, with confidence, the final sequence of the third alternative because we know, for example, from our investigation and interrogation of "Primitive Accumulation" and the Amp that it was by means of invasion, violence, brutal conquest and genocide that the emigration from the capitalist context in Western Europe to Africa, Asia, the Pacific and the Americas--and this barbarism includes the holocaust against the "savage" tribes in North America--was realized.

The Marxian tangle attempts to construct a distinction between pre-capitalist and non-capitalist and capitalist "compulsory emigration." This construction is being shown for what it really is: another false path, a blind alley, within a complete labyrinth of bourgeois revolution. In pre-capitalist "civilization" and in pre-capitalist and non-capitalist barbarian formations a surplus population is created by the lack of "productive power," and this surplus pressed on the inadequacy of "productive power"; this pressure was remedied or lead to

forced emigration and conquest. An opposite set of conditions is imputed by Marx to capitalist society: "productive power" creates a surplus population, and it presses on the surplus by way of famine or emigration.

In actuality there is no difference between the third alternative for capitalist society, pre-capitalist and non-capitalist civilizations and barbarian formations: forced emigration and conquest is their common denominator; moreover, we have seen that where Marx discusses surplus population within capitalist society his references are directed specifically at the rural population, the barbarians. It is our argument that Marx has fixed surplus population in a tangle. Where he uses the term "surplus population" in the textual discourse on pre-capitalist civilizations and barbarian formations he uses it to mean a numerical surplus: a certain limit "to the numbers of the population," above which the productive powers are inadequate. Where Marx uses the term "surplus population" in the textual discourse on capitalist society he uses it to mean a sociological surplus: those of the population who cannot be fitted, adjusted or integrated into capitalist society and are a danger to its civilization, history and progress.

To complement this tangle Marx adds on an incomplete progression of the third alternative within capitalist society. In actuality this progression cannot and does not end with emigration, it leaves unexplored the issue of emigration itself--i.e., what was the shape, form and manner of the (re)settlement. The alternatives of famine, i.e., extermination, or emigration, did not result in the rural barbarian/surplus population migrating solely and exclusively into the towns, as it is made to appear in most Marxian discourse including "Primitive Accumulation" and German Ideology.¹⁹ In point of fact, "a large number" of this barbarian surplus population "was forced to undertake those great adventurous migratory movements"; they came upon the "New World" and laid 1) "the foundation of the peoples of...modern" North America and, as it turned out, 2) the most important and massive link in the colonial empire of bourgeois society.

As for a large number of the human beings expelled to make room for the game of the Duke of Atholl, and the sheep of the Countess of Sutherland, where did they fly to, where did they find a home?

In the United States of North America. 20

From all that has been observed, we can conclude, with confidence and justification, that with the

untangling of the Marxian tangle comes the final sequence of the third alternative within capitalist society. It reads as follows:

Now I share neither in the opinions, of Ricardo, who regards "Net Revenue" as the Moloch to whom entire populations must be sacrifice [this is the second alternative within the capitalist progression of alternatives],... nor in the opinions of Sismondi, who,...would forcibly retain the superannuated methods of agriculture [and therefore inhibit the extermination or expulsion of the rural barbarians] and proscribe science from industry....Society is undergoing a silent revolution, which must be submitted to [a silent and complete revolution to which Marx wants all to submit-- is this or is this not the absolute in bourgeois indoctrination?--especially the rural barbarians], and which takes no more notice of the human existences it breaks down [and so Marx "takes no more notice of the human existences it breaks down..."; here Marx the bourgeois barbarian plants his feet and now prepares to stand tall, and so he concludes]....The classes and races, too weak to master their new conditions of life, must give way [to extermination or emigration, and emigration must give way to colonial conquest].

Consequently, the surplus population within capitalist society are those "too weak" to be filled, adjusted and integrated into the new capitalist conditions,

and, thereby, they give way to extermination or emigration. (This proposition is tantamount to a formulation of productive-economic Darwinism, or, more correctively, bourgeois Darwinism. We must recall that Marx compares, in Capital, Vol. 1, his work to that of Charles Darwin, and we must remember Marx's request of Darwin for a written introduction to Capital.) Stated from a non-bourgeois and/or anti-bourgeois perspective, the surplus/rural population are those too strongly attached to their barbarous mode of intercourse--they are "the most stationary and conservative element of modern society."

We can end by saying that in order for the bourgeoisie to "remain civilized they were forced" to drive "away the surplus"/barbarians "by famine or emigration"; this was the case because 1) the bourgeoisie was dependent upon an increase in their numbers and a corresponding decrease in the number of barbarians and 2) the barbarians pressed on and curtailed the bourgeoisie's "field of production."

What remains, then, is the absence of any real distinction, let alone opposition, between pre-capitalist "civilization", pre-capitalist and non-capitalist barbarian formations and capitalist society. The "same pressure" and effects as well as the same progression of alternatives

acted upon all three social models. Capitalist society is not discontinuous with the contextual events and configurations that characterize the non-capitalist past and present. Capitalist society, "antique civilization" and barbarian formations all have a modus operandi in which conquest arises out of forced emigration, and forced emigration arises out of a surplus population defined, numerically or sociologically, as threatening the organization and arrangement of its members--as citizens, as tribes, individuals or classes--and as threatening the citizens', tribes', individuals' or (bourgeois) class' productive field. Modern "compulsory emigration" stands in line with and resembles the invasions of barbarians and the periodically developed colonial structure of ancient civilization. All three social models entail surplus population pressures and all three models pressed on to develop their histories and progressions by means of invasion, violence and conquest.

All three models have the "same pressure," effects and progression of alternatives, notwithstanding Marx's clever tangle in which the capitalist model appears as distinct, different and contrary, i.e., operating "under a different form," to "antique civilization" and barbarian

formations. Marx attempts to tangle conquest generated by classes in conjunction with productive power in the maze of "a complete revolution"; which is to say, conquest by class and productive power is not conquest; it is "a complete revolution." Within a complete revolutionary labyrinth, and only within a complete revolutionary labyrinth, the bourgeoisie's expulsion of a barbarian/surplus population coupled with the expansion of productive power in the realization and formation of a colonial empire is not conquest. Within this labyrinth of revolutionary transformation conquest is not the benefaction of the bourgeoisie.

The untangling of the Marxian tangle does confirm, in a paradoxical manner, that the "pressure," effects and progression of alternatives within capitalist society do operate "under a different form": within the models of "antique civilization" and barbarian formations conquest is conquest, but within the capitalist model conquest operates under a form shaped to fit the contours of a complete revolutionary labyrinth. It is therefore apparent and obvious that the Marxian coupling of the modern bourgeois class and productive power in the context and text of invasion, conquest, colonization, "violence, war, pillage, murder and robbery, etc." is a revolutionary coupling. There is no exaggeration or

hyperbole percolating through this conclusion; we arrived at a similar conclusion when we encounter the textual presence of "Primitive Accumulation" in the Western European context. Taken together those conclusions produce a transcendent universal conclusion: the global establishment of bourgeois history, civilization and progress by Marx is a consequence of the total intellectual maze built out of "a complete revolution" and "the materialist conception of history"; an intellectual maze produced by Marx which globally disestablishes "The Role Of Violence (Conquest) In [Bourgeois] History," Civilization and Progress: Marx's intellectual maze which globally de-constructs violence and conquest in the establishment of bourgeois history, civilization and progress.

By perceiving the Marxian intellectual labyrinth we can confront the global de-construction of bourgeois violence and conquest inherent to the following.

- 1) The invasions and civilization of the ancients and the war-waging relations of the barbarians constitute plain and simple conquest: plain and simple conquest in that it does not lead to radical transition because of the want of productive forces and modern economic-class relations.

2) Modern invasion and hegemony does not constitute conquest: it is not conquest in that it does lead to radical transition because of "industrial productive forces" and social relations capable of fostering historical movement.

By confronting Marx's global de-construction of bourgeois violence, conquest and "taking" we can negate the historical frames that are its consequence and conclusion:

- 1) historical change is brought on by the bourgeoisie and
- 2) historical adaption is brought on by the ancients and barbarians.

Nothing is more common than the notion that in history up till now it has only been a question of taking. The barbarians take the Roman Empire, and this fact of taking is made to explain the transition from the old world to the feudal system. In this taking of barbarians, however, the question is, whether the nation which is conquered has evolved industrial productive forces, as is the case with modern peoples, or whether their productive forces are based for the most part merely on their association and on the community. Taking is further determined by the object taken. A banker's fortune, consisting of paper, cannot be taken at all, without the taker's submitting to the conditions of production and intercourse of the country taken. Similarly the total industrial capital of a modern industrial country. And finally, everywhere there is very soon an end to taking, and when there is nothing more to take, you have to set about producing.²²

Historical change and historical adaption are the frames in which the bourgeoisie and the ancients and barbarians are being placed, respectively, in the Marxian de-construction. Marx elaborates upon these frames by arguing that where there was historical adaption, i.e., where there was conquest, the conquerors were ultimately conquered by the conquered. This happens because the ancients and barbarians adopted non-class or poorly formed class relations and a loose-knit community; "Slavery remained the basis of the whole productive system. The plebians, midway between freemen and slaves, never succeeded in becoming more than a proletarian rabble. Rome indeed never became more than a city; its connection with the provinces was almost exclusively political and could, therefore, easily be broken again by political events,"²³ and it happens because this "form of community adopted by the settling conquerors must correspond to the stage of development of the productive forces they find in existence; or, if this is not the case from the start, it must change according to the productive forces."²⁴

Thus, going full circle, where historical adaption occurs the conquerors are ultimately conquered by the conquered.

...this,...is explained [sic]
 the fact, which people profess
 to have noticed everywhere in
 the period following the
 migration of the peoples, namely,
 that the servant was master,
 and that the conquerors very soon
 took over language, culture and
 manners from the conquered.²⁵

Put in other words, the total intellectual maze of
"a complete revolution" and "the materialist conception
of history" which 1) de-constructs violence, conquest
and "taking" in the establishment of bourgeois historical
change, progress and civilization and 2) constructs
violence, conquest and "taking" in the establishment
of ancient and barbarian historical adaption and
ancient civilization is surmounted by a higher order
universal/global perception, confrontation and negation.

In all of the above on violence, conquest and
 "taking" Marx has masterfully confounded terms within
 a linguistic equation; an equation in which bourgeois
 is the sign for revolution, history, civilization and
 progress. To comprehend what is being stated it is
 necessary to ask, is conquest, violence and "taking"
 changed because those who do it are in class formation
 and are armed with productive power? Is "taking" other
 than "taking" where those doing it can "set about
 producing," or, said more concretely, is the bourgeoisie's

"taking" of resources from its colonial empire, a pivotal item in Marx's "Primitive Accumulation," any less an act of "taking" because they have "evolved industrial productive forces"? In this vein, the questions are not "whether the nation which is conquered has evolved industrial productive forces, as is the case with modern peoples, or whether their productive forces are based for the most part merely on their association and on the community." The ultimate question is, is conquest not conquest where it conforms to the bourgeois propositions and practices of revolution, history and civilization and progress?

Our response to this interrogation takes the negative form; conquest is still conquest even though it is lodged within (the maze of) class formation and productive development. Thus, we are aggressively arguing against a Marxian tautology in which 1) bourgeois conquest signs for revolution, historical change, the march of civilization and the glory of progress and 2) barbarian and ancient conquest signs for historical adaption, "no history," "semi-civilized," "antique civilization" and "taking." Within the total intellectual maze of "a complete revolution" and "the materialist concept of history" a tautology renders bourgeois

conquest as different than and contrary to ancient and barbarian conquest--a tautology which precludes the similarities and identities that exist between bourgeois and ancient and barbarian conquest; a tautology which disparages and discredits "conquest....violence, war, pillage, murder and robbery, etc." as the driving force of bourgeois revolution, history, civilization and progress--this is the essence of Marxian production.

Conquest is Conquest. This is our transcendent universal/global conclusion reduced to a few words. Conquest is Conquest. This conclusion demands a higher order perception of, confrontation with and negation of a Marxian tautology contained within the labyrinth of "a complete revolution," and "the materialist conception of history." To conclude with Conquest is Conquest is to perceive, confront, and negate at a higher order the devious and bewildering seclusion of the "driving force" of the bourgeois world. The ancients, the barbarians and the bourgeoisie, for all of them, Conquest is Conquest.

The bourgeoisie's conquest of Western Europe, the defeat and/or expulsion of the barbarian/surplus population for violent colonial conquest and "taking" all contributed to our universal/global transcendence of the Marxian maze.

In Western Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas, Australia and the Pacific, conquest was the calling card of the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois revolution, history, civilization and progress is predicated upon as well as epitomizes violent conquest and "taking." The bourgeoisie developed the means of transportation and communication, in part, to get rid of and make use of a dangerous population in the globalization of their unique and essential property: productive modes and classes, so that they could universally reproduce their world--so that they could make "taking" an unprecedented global debauch. A "complete revolution" and "the materialist conception of history" came after the fact to entangle the fact: barbarism gave rise to capitalism, capitalism gave rise to conquest as its "regular form of intercourse" and revolution--productive, class and state conquest--and conquest gave rise to Marx the labyrinth maker.

Barbarism, capitalism, revolution, history, civilization, progress and Marx have to be perceived, confronted and negated at a higher order before the bourgeoisie and their unique and essential property can be abolished/smashed. Consequently this cannot be realized by way of Greek, Roman and bourgeois barbarian relations. The transcendent abolition/smashing of barbarism, capitalism, revolution, history, civilization, progress and Marx--the bourgeois world--cannot be realized, then, by the proletariat.

Notes

¹Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 89.

²Marx, Capital, III, p. 885.

³Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, "The German Ideology," Marx Engels: Formations, p. 41; emphasis added.

⁴Ibid., p. 43; "the rabble" is an expression of Marx's denigration and devaluation of those who did not enter or could not fit into the bourgeois productive-economic machine and its resulting class order. This expression represents a more developed example of Marx's nexus of labor, labor performed within or without class formation and organization, and his evaluation of human beings. Given the materials developed on class as the innovative and hallmark bourgeois product and the bourgeois complete revolution, we can better appreciate Marx's evaluation and typology of human labor, see chap. 4, pp. 97-104, as grounded in bourgeois standards of humanity and civilization.

⁵The "Middle Ages" is a perfect illustration of bourgeois hegemony, i.e., their capacity to establish history in a periodical form as well as to organize these historical periods according to their references. As the period subsequent to the "Middle Ages," the bourgeois epoch takes on the features of being the "Later Age," the "Last Age," the "Mature Age": the "Modern Age." Furthermore, the "Middle Ages" are not the middle ages for most other social contexts and peoples. Hence, the "Middle Ages" stand as a signpost pointing in the direction of Marx's acceptance of bourgeois temporal hegemonic references.

⁶Marx and Engels, "The German Ideology," Marx Engels: Formations, p.44.

⁷Ibid., p. 39.

⁸Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, p. 167.

⁹Ibid., pp. 112-118.

¹⁰Marx, Karl, "Forced Emigration.--Kossuth And Mazzini.--The Refugee Question.--Election Bribery In England.--Mr. Cobden," Collected Works, 1978, XI, p. 530.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 530-531; emphasis added.

Marx here makes a very interesting point; viz., that the populus of ancient and modern Europe are of barbarian ancestry. This genealogical characterization helps support one of our derivative conclusions: barbarism--which is acknowledged by bourgeois thinkers as preceding feudalism--may be a subsequence and a consequence to the dissolution of capitalism. The stress of circumstances, chaos, anomie, brutality and violence which was associated with the dissolution of feudalism and the appearance of capitalism in Western Europe may have exposed and agitated "the foundation of the peoples of ancient and modern Europe": barbarism. Since these ancient and modern Europeans are now spread across the "surface of the globe" any attempt at dissolving capitalism may again expose and agitate this foundation.

In the setting of global capitalism, there would be a global exposure and agitation of barbarism. Thus those who seek the dissolution of capitalism should, at least, take this consideration into review and be prepared for what may possibly occur.

This consideration must not be understood as stating or implying any inherent racial, tribal or ethnic disposition that is the ground for a penchant for barbarism. Rather it is to state that the foundation of a barbarous social mode may have never been fully dissolved in Europe irrespective of the predominate and encompassing social relations and forms that have been employed to characterize Europe.

Moreover, the "Old World" of Europe and the "New World" of the Americas are terms which signify, as so many Marxian terms and phrases, the bourgeois organization and construction of geography and historical dating. Was the "Old World" (to be read the whole world) of Europe the "Old World"/whole world for the inhabitants of Asia and Africa, for example? Was the "New World," the new world for the "Indian tribes," the Native/Original/Old Americans, "in North America," or was it the "Old World" for the Native Americans?

¹²Ibid., p. 531.

¹³Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 90.

¹⁴Marx, "Forced Emigration," p. 530.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 531.

¹⁶Marx, Karl, "Elections.--Financial Clouds.--The Duchess Of Sutherland And Slavery," London, Friday, January 21, 1853, Collected Works, XI, p. 492.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 493.

¹⁸Marx, "Forced Emigration," p. 530.

¹⁹Marx and Engels, German Ideology, pp. 68-72.

²⁰Marx, "Elections," p. 494; emphasis added.

²¹Marx, "Forced Emigration," p. 531.

²²Marx and Engels, German Ideology, p. 90; emphasis added.

²³Ibid., pp. 89-90.

²⁴Ibid., p. 90.

²⁵Ibid.

CHAPTER NINE

THE PROLETARIAT: BOURGEOIS
BARBARISM FROM BELOW

By working their way through the Marxian labyrinth of revolution and history, the proletariat is made into a class of humanity scurrying through the blind alleys of a bourgeois network. They journey through the pathways of puzzlement and entanglement. There is a course plotted by the bourgeois and illuminated and demonstrated by Marx; a course which carries them across civilization, progress and capitalism on the bourgeois express: productive, class and state barbarism. Guided by the materialist dialectic and their universal mission, the proletariat, in the tradition of their progenitors, roll over those not defined, bound or delimited by capitalist production, namely, the pre-proletariat, non-proletariat and anti-proletariat.

This is the proletariat: the privileged class of human salvation. The class to save all classes and pre-class, non-class and anti-class humanity. The proletariat is the embodiment of eschatological revolution and history; the eschatological class defined, by Marx throughout his work, as the conformation of the

displaced, ruptured, estranged and oppressed. Nevertheless they are the manifestation of everything Marx attributes to the bourgeoisie--the great saviours--in their imputed rise out of feudal ashes.

Proletarian content differs from bourgeois content, but both classes are given the same contour and outline. Marx forged the proletariat in the likeness of the bourgeoisie, in the image of its original/primitive features. Put simply, Marx modeled the proletariat after the bourgeoisie and then inverted its content.

Furthermore, the status of the proletariat under capitalism is the same as the status of the bourgeoisie under feudalism, or, more accurately and correctly, the status of the proletariat under capitalism is the same as the status of the capitalist competitors under barbarism. The development of the proletariat within the capitalist context parallels that of the capitalist competitors within the barbarous context.

Thus we can confirm Marx's thunderous proclamations that the proletariat was the creation of the bourgeoisie. What he does not thunderously proclaim, however, is that proletarian existence is an inversion of bourgeois existence, and that socialism is a correction of this invasion, socialism rights this inversion. Under socialism, then, the proletariat will become the

bourgeoisie. The status of proletariat under socialism is the same as the status of the bourgeoisie under capitalism. Accordingly, Marx has secured the existence of the bourgeois model in the post-capitalist epoch.

We are proposing that the common and shared conditions, experiences and relations which generate the working class in itself, and hence generate the possibility of a proletariat (the working-class-for-itself), are the same conditions, experiences and relations which generate the bourgeoisie in itself, and hence generate the possibility of a bourgeoisie-for-itself. The essential point here is that the same economic, political, social and cultural configuration exists for both the working class and the bourgeoisie. They do, of course, differ: they are mirror images of each other; the bourgeoisie is on top of the proletariat economically, politically, socially, and culturally. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat participate in the same contour and outline; they differ solely in their inversely reflecting each other's position: master and servant. Master and servant bound by their common and shared context and framework.

In line with this, class struggles are hierarchal disputes over who will be above and who will be below.

Class struggles are master-servant conflicts. Hierarchical antagonism and disputes, this is the connective in the bourgeoisie-proletariat relationship. Their opposition was and is centered around who would be below--displaced, ruptured, estranged and oppressed--and who would be above--placed, whole, integrated and proprietor.

Capitalism was taken for granted and for good by both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It was never the issue of antagonism or dispute. Master or servant within capitalism, this was the overriding class fact: who would be master of capitalist production and who would be servant in capitalist production.

As a result, socialism would not constitute a new epoch. Socialism merely represents an overturn of classes and their content, a replacement in the class hierarchy. Capitalism established a generalized mode of relations based upon classes within a hierarchy of domination. Class struggle is the composite of the movement of classes up and down the master-servant hierarchy. Socialism represents the proletariat acquisition of placement, wholeness, integration and proprietorship, i.e., mastery, and the imposition of displacement, rupture, estrangement and oppression upon the bourgeoisie, i.e., servitude, by the proletariat.

Socialism maintains and perpetuates the hierarchy of class, the hierarchy of domination.

An objection may be raised that this analysis and formulation of the proletariat and socialism is faulty and in error because it reduces class differences and struggle to power and control; that is, class differences and struggle are reduced to the issue of domination. Such a reduction, this objection continues, obfuscates the revolutionary thrust of the proletariat and its will to break the chains that enshackle itself and others in capitalist society; moreover, it misses the point Marx was so poignantly trying to make: the proletariat is not seeking to become the bourgeoisie under socialism through the acquisition of power and control--the proletariat is not the class-for-becoming the capitalist masters of socialism.

To this possible objection we reply, if the "real struggles" for the proletariat are the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and human liberation, then why does Marx insist that the human agency of revolution remain in the modal straight jacket sewn by the bourgeoisie? Why is the revolutionary confined to the mold, parameters, definitions and constraints set out by his/her bourgeois masters? Why does Marx invariably arm

the revolutionary with productive forces, class formation or the state superstructure as its principle and paramount weaponry? In short, why does a Marxian complete proletarian revolution synthesize, make dialectical, the bourgeoisie bulwark, and, as a result, strengthen the control of and empower the bourgeois paradigm? Finally, why cannot Marx call for the proletariat to shatter and disintegrate the realities of the bourgeois world and not just the realities of capitalism?

If Marx truly wanted a genuine proletarian revolution to abolish/transcend/smash the realities of capitalism as well as the realities of the bourgeois world, our reply continues, he would have begun by revolting against the image in which the proletariat was formed and shaped. The dissolution of capitalism and the bourgeoisie begins by shattering and disintegrating the class model of existence that the bourgeoisie forged and forced upon humanity. A classless formation is to appear in the midst of capitalism before any transformation can take place. The class model of existence must be transcended prior to any attempt to abolish/smash capitalism and the bourgeoisie. Which is to say, a proletarian revolution is, ultimately, part and parcel of the bourgeois model of transformation, i.e., class conquest, and, therefore, is ineffectual in abolishing/

smashing the bourgeoisie although it may introduce the post-capitalist epoch. Consequently, a proletarian revolution will merely lead to an overturning of class positions within a hierarchy of domination; it will lead to class struggle in the post-capitalist epoch.

A proletarian revolution will lead to class productive power and the state being used for proletarian conquest: proletarian power and control. It will lead to war against the bourgeoisie, all other classes and non-classes who challenge proletarian hegemony. It will lead to proletarian mastery of the bourgeoisie and others: "the dictatorship of the proletariat."

In short, whereas a proletarian revolution does not abolish/smash the bourgeois mode of conquest and produce a classless society, a classless formation struggling against the bourgeois mode of barbarism can bring an end to the use, maintenance and reproduction of the hierarchy of class domination, productive forces and the state for conquest and mastery.

Put otherwise, it is our conclusion that the dissolution of capitalism and, most importantly, the bourgeoisie must proceed from the dissolution of, most especially, the proletariat because it is the purest, most clearly defined, ever present and pervasive

inverted image of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat models its existence after war and conquest to arrive at a hierarchy of class domination, productive might and superiority and state hegemony and terror; as such the proletariat constitutes barbarism from below. The proletariat is, as are all sub-classes under capitalism, the sub-reflection, sub-manifestation and sub-reflex, a sub-existence, of bourgeois barbarism.

In Western Europe barbarism was conquered by a greater and more coercive barbarism unfurled by the bourgeoisie. Those barbarians, not wiped out by this greater barbarism, were forced to emigrate. Those who remained became the particular and peculiar sub-classes of capitalism. The most notable sub-class being the proletariat, the substrata of and for bourgeois barbarism. In line with our case that the barbarians forced to emigrate were employed in colonial settlement, war and conquest, the purest, most clearly defined, ever present and pervasive capitalist sub-class was employed not only to produce commodities but domestic barbarism as well: genocide, racial and ethnic violence, mob violence, massacres, police riots, land grabs, mass theft, etc. The proletariat constitutes, in a few words, the internal substratum of barbarism in the employ of the bourgeoisie.

Understood in this fashion, the proletarian revolution is the purest, most clearly defined, ever present and pervasive Marxian illumination, demonstration and elaboration of bourgeois barbarism from below thrusting itself upward to become proletarian barbarism from above.

* * *

In summary, then, we have undertaken to expose the revolution and history in Marxian materials as a labyrinth concealing bourgeois conquest, to lay bare the proletariat as an underside of bourgeois barbarism and to exhibit the darker and horrid side of our promised collective future.

Why have we presented socialism as an extension and continuation of class, productive and state barbarism founded by the bourgeoisie under capitalism? Why animate the proletariat as engaged in a battle to displace the bourgeoisie as masters atop a hierarchy of class power and control? In brief, why invert capitalism and call it socialism?

Our answer is as follows:

1) The bourgeoisie was the paradigm for Marx; they frame the beginning, middle and end of Marxian production. At different places Marx dealt differently with this paradigm.

In some places he kept their paradigm of conquest intact, in other places he radicalized it and in still other places he inverted it, but what he never did was to discard it.

In this manner, Marxian production is a reproduction of the bourgeois paradigm, although it assumes varying postures of conquest.

2) The bourgeois paradigm of conquest is what overcame the dangers, threats and contradictions to bourgeois rule, and Marx used it, in his varying postures, to overcome the dangers, threats and contradictions to proletarian rule.

3) The bourgeoisie and the proletariat were the accomplishment and completion of capitalism; capitalism was the accomplishment and completion of the capitalist competitors' paradigm of conquest, and their paradigm of conquest became

the bourgeois paradigm of conquest with the accomplishment and completion of capitalism.

4) The accomplishment and completion of the bourgeois paradigm of conquest has as its requisite barbarism from above--the bourgeoisie--beyond--the colonial periphery--and below--the proletariat.

CHAPTER TEN
BARBARIAN SOCIOLOGY

Marx participated textually in the promotion and projection of a world made better, in the final analysis, by bourgeois domination. This exciting, new and better bourgeois world was allegedly to set the stage for an earthly paradise that would arrive with the commencement of the "realm of freedom" and its corresponding communist mode of production. His work produced a Western Europe as burdened by feudal wrecks, barbarian and conservative rural dwellers and town "rabble." In Asia, Africa, the Americas and elsewhere he produced an indigenous barbarian, primitive and stagnant populace. Humanity, in general, was juxtaposed to and overwhelmed by bourgeois enterprise and capitalism. Put in direct terms, Marx reproduced, in large measure, the standard and official bourgeois line on non-bourgeois humanity.

To experience Marxian work, then, is to experience the bourgeois magic in which "All that is solid melts into air." We attempted to demonstrate a shadow cast by this magic over pre-capitalist, non-capitalist and anti-capitalist contexts and relations;

these contexts and relations were made to vanish in the illusion of the inexorability of bourgeois progress. To experience Marx is to experience a legerdemain performed with smoke and mirrors; a legerdemain employed to establish the bourgeois world and its corresponding capitalist mode of production as the world and corresponding mode for humanity on the march to the greater good of an earthly salvation.

To investigate and interrogate Marx via his work is to perceive and confront an expert and a virtuoso in the art and practice of fabricating and proping up the bourgeois world and its reality according to code and specification. We constructed a case to counter the chimerical vaporization and disappearance of the pre-capitalist, non-capitalist and anti-capitalist social formations in the midst of capitalist expansion. We worked to evince, in as detailed a presentation as possible, Marx's engagement in the battle and crusade for the hallowed triumph of capitalism over the evil and corruptin of pre-capitalism, non-capitalism and anti-capitalism. We tried to highlight this triumph as a result of a holy war against all opposition to the virtues and propagation of capitalism. Those souls who could/would not fit or could/would not adjust

into the capitalist mission, for whatever reason, were damned to the fire and brimstone of conquest, or, said in the fabulous language of the labyrinth maker, these people were condemned by the progress of revolution to the "dung heap of history": they were unfit historical dung.

We discerned Marx as, indeed, incarnating into the proletariat the essence and effects of the nascent bourgeoisie. He better than anyone else has embodied, full well, the proletariat with the actualities of capitalism while claiming to exorcise the demon of bourgeois subjugation from them. His was an enchanting and enticing voice which held the proletariat spellbound in the incantations of bourgeois rites; as he spoke of proletarian revolution he was a primary contributor to the proletariat design as the inverted formation of the bourgeoisie; as he sermonized to the proletariat that they "have nothing to lose but their chains" and "have a world to win," he kept silent about the first link in their chains being their association as workers, i.e., their class formation and identity, and as he hailed proletarian liberation from bourgeois domination, he built proletarian enslavement in the twisting and turning course of bourgeois history,

civilization and progress: class, productive and state barbarism.

Marxian discourse, architecture and design is an envelopment in the context and relations of capitalism. As a result, it is an envelopment of humanity in the terminology, categories, concepts, definitions, criteria, theoretics, structures and practices specific and peculiar to the bourgeoisie: an envelopment in an intricate scheme of thoughts, words and action. Marxian production is a complete bourgeois maze of false starts, dead ends and traps patterned to appear as revolutionary, i.e., anti-bourgeois.

We argued that this complete bourgeois maze provide the infrastructure of "Primitive Accumulation." By having the Marxian analysis of the primitive accumulation of capital conjoin with "a complete revolution" we were able to exhibit a tangle; a tangle in which was concealed the contextual origin and operations that paved the way for capitalism. Capitalism and, then, the bourgeoisie arose, maintained and grew within an arrangement of conquest and forced emigration. Those barbarians not conquered directly and immediately constituted an explosive surplus

population, and they were forcibly expelled from Western Europe by the advancing power and control of the bourgeoisie. Capitalism was formed and shaped within and by barbarism: violence and strife was its womb, conquest gave it birth and colonialism gave it sustenance.

There was no revolution in Western Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas or anywhere else circumscribed by capitalism. Revolution occupied no place in the materiality or the materialization of capitalism; it took no space in the capitalist context; it took no part in capitalist relations. Revolution gave not conception, parturition, birth, or life to capitalism, nor will revolution bring on the demise of capitalism. There was no capitalist revolution, in actuality.

Revolution was (and is) a maze of discourse and deeds which entangle capitalist contexts and relations. Revolution consisted of a mazy complex of pathways which obscured (and continues to obscure), barbarian conquest as the driving force of capitalistic history, civilization and progress. Revolution: the labyrinth in which to ensconce bourgeois warfare. A "complete revolution" and "the materialist conception of history" are the most developed, most structured and

most heavily fortified passages in this labyrinth, according to our argument.

Revolution and material history are not the great levers and levelers of humanity. They did not uproot and then flatten all those not available, amenable or unwilling to commit or submit to capitalism.

Revolution and material history are complete micromazes within a complete bourgeois macromaze: productive modes, class struggle, the superstructure with its state, economic laws, epochs, progress, civilization, alienation, etc.

These complete micromazes within a complete bourgeois macromaze is our discovery. Our discovery warrants a new appellation for the infamous all purpose universal solvent: the dialectic. In the hands of Hegel and Marx the dialectic served the interests of bourgeois conquest. Marx did not de-mystify the dialectic, rather he sanctified it: sanctified dialectic. The sanctified dialectic revealed capitalism as the force of good overcoming the temptations of the past and present; it blessed capitalism and barbarian conquest as purified in the sacrament of revolution and history, and it consecrated its originator as the prophet of the promised people.

* * *

We have developed an argument about the nature of capitalism and socialism; an argument which evolved out of a provocative discovery. A discovery which necessitated a total reorientation towards Western European internal and external affairs during the last four or five hundred years.

Western European capitalism was the outcome of the will to conquest. Colonialism and imperialism were the unbridled and calculated expansion of this will. Capitalism is the will to conquest made into the ontological and existential principle.

Enter into this context of will Hegelian and Marxian syntheses/sympathies, and we can perceive Hegel and Marx as great barbarian synthesizers/sympathizers. Their syntheses/sympathies generated philosophical forms and content designed to shield and defend capitalism in the bulwark of dialectical arrangements.¹ Dialectical delicacies and refinements were utilized to surround and enclose barbarian lust and conquest. Within dialectical compositions and niceties, humanity, posited as "consciousness" and "species being"/"human nature in general," goes forth into the material world, and therein

creates formations and movements; history, revolution, the state, civilization, culture and technological progress, these are the momentous formations and movements --transcendences--resulting from the human advance on the material world. The dialectical process unfolds in the material world and in its unfolding human transcendence is realized through history, revolution, the state....

How natural, pristine and innocent is this the dialectic and its generation of the materiality of human transcendence. How wonderful and glorious is human achievement. How reassuring it is that the dialectic, in both its Hegelian spiritual and Marxian materialistic variants, leads inevitably to the uplift of human enterprise and the material world.

Needless to say, there is some blight on the rosy dialectical horizon. There remains still human caricatures who are enveloped in stagnant and underdeveloped, i.e., primitive, material formations and movements. However, this is nothing to worry about, for this stunted humanity encircled by a retarded circumstance will inexorably succumb to or be subdued by the power and elegance of the dialectic. That is, these hapless creatures will succumb or be subdued by the auspicious, rational and systematic transcendences that have evolved within "modern society." Whether or not these

hapless caricatures succumb or are subdued depends, of course, on the extent of their dialectical backwardness; the greater the extent of their removal from transcendences --to wit, the greater the extent of their engrossment in stagnation and primitivism--the greater the extent to which dialectical pressure will be placed upon them to submit to capitalistic or socialist transcendences.

Of course if dialectic pressure doesn't work then the troops of history, revolution...are sent in.

In the ultimate analysis, history, revolution, the state, civilization and progress are labyrinthine passages in the grand concourse of the Hegelian and Marxian context; in the ultimate analysis humanity has been forced through these passages by "conquest.... violence, war, pillage, murder and robbery, etc." Put simply, the dialectic of history, revolution, the state, civilization and progress is barbarism.

Humanity-for-itself is cast by Marx and Hegel as a composite of consciousness and freedom. A composite which has for its completion and fulfillment the material formations and movements that evolved originally, initially and uniquely within the bourgeois context, and it is these very formations and movements, and their manifold articulations, into which all of humanity is

to be confined, willy-nilly, by Hegel and Marx. In this way all of humanity will finally and truly experience itself-for-itself: humanity as consciousness and freedom. It is solely in bourgeois formations and movements that Hegel and Marx can experience and envision humanity in itself arriving at humanity-for-itself, i.e., it is only in the bourgeois world that humanity in itself can arrive at freedom and consciousness according to Hegel and Marx.

Humanity-for-itself is a composite of consciousness and freedom. This is the height of bourgeois metaphysical, philosophical and sociological factualities. It is entirely and exclusively on the bourgeois metaphysical, philosophical and sociological summit that Hegel and Marx can 1) experience and envision their own humanity-for-itself, their own consciousness and freedom, and 2) experience and envision humanity that is not a composite of consciousness and freedom as a) simply humanity in itself, humanity devoid of the completion and fulfillment of consciousness and freedom, or as b) humanity against itself, humanity against consciousness and freedom.

What all this means is that Marxian and Hegelian experience and vision locates humanity in itself

or humanity against itself as having not arrived dialectically at struggles-for-itself, as having not arrived dialectically at struggles for consciousness and freedom. Thus, humanity in itself or humanity against itself has to be administered dialectical relief and remedy: the administration of a transformative composite of consciousness and freedom; such a transformative composite can only be materialized in and through bourgeois forms and movements.

Under the guise of a dialectical verdict, the masses of humanity have been sentence to conquest, subjugation and exploitation. Their material formations and movements have been torn apart and made into a patchwork of oppression and despair.

Under the guise of dialectical processing and structuring, barbarism has been imposed and executed across the planet, and the humanity Marx and Hegel set for-itself can be clearly seen as barbarian.

Notes

¹With reference to Hegel see especially Hegel, Georg W.F., The Philosophy Of History, trans., J. Sibree, New York: Dover Publications, 1956 and Hegel, Georg W.F., Hegel's Philosophy Of Right, trans., T. M. Knox, London: Oxford University Press, 1967. Hegelian sociology is mostly couched in a philosophical and, in many places, metaphysical framework. Nevertheless, his sociological program, which cements and guides his philosophy and metaphysics, is unmistakable and undeniable. For example, Hegel's presentation of the bourgeois state--especially and particularly the Prussian state--as the highest realization of the human spirit, i.e., as the culmination of freedom and consciousness, is a self-evident sociological proposition dressed in philosophical and metaphysical finery.

CHAPTER ELEVEN
CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM?

Omnipresent terror, it haunts the hollowness of our daily pretensions and sophistications. It is in the midst of our cultivations. Star wars, nuclear holocaust, desolation, pollution, urban decay, planetary hunger, concentration camps, death squads, disappeared peoples, shattered worlds, cocaine blues, bureaucratic nightmares, teenage suicides and child abuse, yes the bourgeoisie and the proletariat have globalized their battle. We are all caught lock step in the death dance of master-servant.

Feudalism was swept away in the tide of barbarism. Between feudalism and capitalism was barbarism. Capitalism, formed and shaped in and by barbarism, was inflicted upon humanity as the prescription for humanity. The micromaze of capitalist revolution kept barbarian conquest well hidden except from those who were its recipients and knew full well its ravages. The bourgeoisie rose to the station of master.

Between capitalism and socialism is barbarism. Attending the rise of the bourgeoisie to dominance was a proletarian push upward to contest bourgeois

supremacy. Proletariat versus bourgeoisie, barbarian versus barbarian, in a conflict for mastership. Capitalism, the reign of bourgeois barbarians; socialism, the reign of proletarian barbarians. Each barbarian class is compelled to reign by means of, by mode of, conquest. Capitalist and socialist barbarians are each prepared to sweep away humanity in the production of first strikes, killer satellites, nuclear winters and W.W. III as a preface to W.W. IV.

The bourgeois-proletariat mode of conquest is upon us all. Violent conquest as the driving force of revolution, history, civilization, culture and progress has been superordinated by means of the nuclear war. Now all of humanity is driven into the capitalist-socialist war zone. The forces for proletarian dictatorship struggle for victory through the realization of a greater, more systematic and more coercive form of nuclear barbarism than that produced by bourgeois despotism.

We have all fallen prey to the progression of barbarism that has established the capitalist and socialist conquest mode. We are all prey to barbarism from above and below. We are all prey to the sanctified dialectic.

Class, productive and state barbarism conjoined to enshroud the universe in the most brutal forces. Barbarism is everywhere and strikes us as omnipotent. Barbarism spreads its doom across the horizon as the synonym for human existence. It ebulliates over the creation. Space and time become mere passive circumstances to receive its thrashing penetration. We are all fixed in the cosmology of barbarism.

Cosmological barbarism fixes the ultimate choice: Capitalism or Socialism? Barbarism or Barbarism? Barbarism from above or barbarism from below? We are to choose between the barbarity that establishes the universality of bourgeois property or the barbarity that establishes the universality of proletarian property. Choose the prototype or the inversion?

Capitalism or Socialism? Barbarism or Barbarism? Barbarism of the masters or barbarism of the servants? Capitalist or socialist death machines? Capitalist or socialist missiles? Capitalist or socialist extermination of native populations resisting the benefits of modern material relations?

Choose your form of barbarism? Choose between the barbarism of the possibly falling master or the barbarism of a possibly rising servant. Choose your

class of barbarians.

In sum, substance and essence the cosmology of choice is without choice--it offers no choice at all.

The real alternatives are, shall we even dare to speak them, Barbarism or Counter-Barbarism, Capitalism-Socialism or Counter-Barbarism? But what is counter-barbarism? Isn't any alternative to capitalism-socialism a swoon dive into hopelessness, the vanities of nihilism and the phantasmagorical mode of consciousness?

In straight talk and the real world there are no real alternatives to class, productive and state barbarism, so how can there be such a thing as counter-barbarism? Isn't it rational and sensible to accept the meaninglessness or lack of choice inherent to "Capitalism or Socialism"? Isn't "Capitalism or Socialism" more rational and sensible than suffering through a counter-barbarism, whatever it may be?

How can there be a counter to what engulfs the inevitable, necessary and universal? How can there be a counter-barbarism where all and every demand throws us up against the wall and leaves just enough room to become master or slave?

There is no escape, no space or time in which to hide, no magical disappearance of our condition, no moral awakening on the part of the bourgeoisie or proletariat, no demystification of our consciousness, no breakthroughs in communication or no new found heroes which will save us. Barbarism or Barbarism? Gog or Magog? This Is The Way It Is.

No! No! No! There is a surpassing of barbarism, a real overcoming of capitalism-socialism. There can be a world in which humanity is not conquered in the blood and fire of revolution, history, the state, civilization, culture and progress. There is a solution to mazes, tangles and puzzles that ensconce fangs and claws. There is a space and time not violated and plundered by the atomized, linearized and serialized production of capitalism-socialism. There is an exultation over barbarism.

A new and higher order of things is possible. The present order of things can fall. A new higher ordering, for example, of the "facts" and "events" of Hegel, Marx, Durkheim, Weber and Parsons has been shown to be an authentic possibility in this writing. These "facts" and "events", which serve to reify revolution, history, civilization, the state, culture

and progress with the status of causation, determination, conditionality, delimitation, directive, encompassment and/or structuralization, were discerned and addressed as comprising a labyrinthine sociology: a study of society which secretes social relations.

All of which is to say, a new higher order of sociology is possible: a counter-sociology. A counter-sociology which is in opposition to the "facts" and "events" that have set might as right, oppression as justice, tyranny as convenience, power as politics, economics as human essence and production as prophecy. This counter-sociology is the Straight Path leading directly and immediately out of the macromaze of revolution, history, the state, civilization, culture and progress. This counter-sociology is the means by which to confine barbarism, to confine Gog and Magog, until the all inclusive and unconditional transcendent eschatological horror of Hell opens before the barbarians.

They said: "O Zul-qarnian!
The Gog and Magog (people)
Do great mischief on earth:
Shall we then render thee
Tribute in order that
Thou mightest erect a barrier
Between us and them?"

He said: "(The power) in which
 My Lord has established me
 Is better (than tribute):
 Help me therefore with strength
 (And labour): I will
 Erect a strong barrier
 Between you and them;

"Bring me blocks of iron."
 At length, when he had
 Filled up the space between
 The two steep mountain-sides,
 He said, "Blow (with your bellows)"

Then, when he had made
 It (red) as fire, he said:
 "Bring me, that I may
 Pour over it, molten lead."

Thus were they made
 Powerless to scale it
 Or to dig through it.

He said: "This is
 A mercy from my Lord:
 But when the promise
 Of my Lord comes to pass,
 He will make it into dust;
 And the promise of
 My Lord is true."

On that day we shall
 Leave them to surge
 Like waves on one another:
 The trumpet will be blown,
 And we shall collect them
 All together.

And we shall present
 Hell that day for Unbelievers
 To see, all spread out,--1

This counter-sociology is the Way out of the
 barbarian macromaze as well as the Way to confine
 barbarism, in every interval and instance, prior to
 transcendent eschatology. This Way is martyrdom:

the transcendental means by which the all inclusive and unconditional Paradisiacal Life opens before the Anti-Barbarian.

Think not of those who are killed
in the way of Allah as dead.
Nay, they are alive, (they are)
with their Lord, and they have
provision.²

Notes

¹Ali, Abdullah Yusuf, trans., The Holy Qur'an, Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al Arabia, 1968, Surah 18, "Kahf, or The Cave," ayats 94-100, pp. 756-757.

It is the author's opinion that the present English translations of the Qur'an, all too often, erroneously or poorly convey both literal and figurative Qur'anic meaning. A large part of this problem is due to the usage of Middle English. In the use of this style/period of English to express the Qur'an, the author detects an effort to cast the Qur'an in the linguistic format, pattern and tone found in the Bible. As a result, these translations display the patronage, insecurity and inferiority Muslims, in general, have manifested toward Christianity and the English language. Such a response follows, in part, from the interrelationships that exist between and amongst colonialism, imperialism, Christianity, English, Muslims and Islam; which is to say, such self-denigration by Muslims has a great deal to do with their abandonment of Islam in favor of their submission to domination.

In light of these opinions, the author will use the following Qur'anic translations because they are less riddled with the problems under discussion: Al-Hilali, Muhammad Taqui-ud-Din and Muhammad Muhsin Khan, trans., Explanatory English Translation of the Meaning of the Holy Qur'an, Chicago, Illinois: Kazi Publications,

1977; Pickthall, Muhammad Marmaduke, trans., The Meaning Of The Glorious Qur'an, New York: Muslim World League, 1977; Shakir, M.H., trans., Holy Qur'an, New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an, 1982 and Ali, The Holy Qur'an.

Surahs/Surats (chapters) and ayats, verses, from these translations will be selectively referenced so that they form the least possible biblical, Christianly, Middle English, colonial and imperial rendering of the Qur'an. Furthermore, if the author deems it important and necessary, certain terms and phrases will be deleted; in their place will be put other terms and phrases that are, in the author's judgment, more representative of the Qur'an and less representative of the forced superimposition that may have been set upon the Qur'an by the translator's apologetic concerns.

²Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 3, "Al-I-Imran (Family Of Imran)," ayat 169, p. 71.

PART III

MARTYRDOM :
MASS AGAINST CLASS

CHAPTER TWELVE

MARTYRDOM: THE ULTIMATE PASSION

We have attempted, in brief, to articulate the essence of barbarian metaphysics, philosophy and sociology concocted in nineteenth century bourgeois Europe. We have stressed the sociological because it is our primary concern.

Barbarism has overrun all bourgeois and Marxist/proletarian social science. Irrespective of the liberal, humanistic and radical discourse and motif, be they dialectical, functional, structural, positivistic, phenomenological or ethnomethodological, the labyrinthine passages of barbarism luxuriate in old and new directions. Today the macromaze has been enlarged to include language systems, non-verbal codes, communication theory, group dynamics and statistical models. These disciplines offer the newest claims of having captured the forces of social relations and social change. Thus the sociological macromaze has become massive: a megalith in which to hide the omnipresent military and arsenal of capitalism and socialism establishing social relations and steering social change.

This dissertation, and other works like it, is an effort in the construction of the counter-sociology of martyrdom: the Straight Path/Way on which to exit the sociological megamaze that conceals barbarisms in bourgeois and proletarian "theories," "facts," "events," discourse and ethos. This counter-sociology faces head on and in the light of day the threats, warmongering, state terrorism, pre-emptive strikes, economic embargoes, invasions and conventional and nuclear death machines of capitalism-socialism; it is the life of facing the present reality of conquest and killing as the principal force in social relations and social change. Therefore, pain, suffering, sorrow, bereavement, tears, moans, bones, blood, corpses, funerals, graves and sacrifices, this is stuff of martyrdom counter-sociology; the giving up of life, this is its practice and method.

Barbarism or martyrdom? Barbarian or martyr? The megamaze of "theories," "facts" and "events" or the illumination of the everyday actual human existence under conquest taken to its unflinching climax. Conquest and murder or martyrdom? This is the haunting dilemma of our space and time. The question presently plaguing humankind is not "to be or not to be"; rather it is "to take or give up life on the barbarian battleground?"

This dilemma, raised and stated exclusively within martyrdom counter-sociology, advances the proposition that the martyr is the paramount and most challenging opponent to the draconian affliction heaped upon the masses. The martyr does not challenge barbarism with a budget to procure more advanced weapons or a legislative blueprint for the restriction and control of violent conquest; the martyr challenges barbarism with human life. Martyrdom pits blood against bullets, flesh against fire, weeping against weapons, virtue against violation. The strength and direction of this opposition is derived from a steadfast and protracted fidelity to the continuous, unbroken and unbent Straight Path.

And verily, this...is My Straight Path, so follow it, and follow not (other) paths, they will separate you away from His Path. This He has ordained for you that you may become pious.¹

Life and death are the armaments and fortress of the martyr. Life and death, death and life shifting in and out of a transluscent dance. In these transfixing moments between life and death, the "twilife," the human being is held motionless in awe of the actual Lord of life and death, and therewith the awe, fear and terror of the barbarian is vanquished--the Lord of life and death.

has pierced the human heart. The martyr is founded:
a life is founded against the soul of barbarism, the
barbarian.

Martyr against barbarian, a battle in which the
martyr becomes the final and supreme conquerer of
barbarism, for the martyr is victorious in the
conclusive and ultimate triumph over life and death.

And say not of those who are
killed in the Way of Allah,
"They are dead." Nay, they are
living, but you perceive (it)
not.²

Although the barbarian covets the conquest of
life and death, to hold the power of life and death in
his/her (to be abbreviated henceforth with s/he) hand,
a heart pierced in the transparency of life-death is
able to surmount this quintessential barbarian power.
Against this barbarian power the martyr rises, following
the Prophets' course, to the power of straightness,
piety and justice.

Surely (as for) those who
disbelieve in the communications
of Allah and slay the prophets
unjustly and slay those among
humanity who enjoin justice,
announce to them a painful
chastisement.³

Surpassing the barbarous power to bend and break humanity under the threat or actuality of a devastating torture or painful death, a "martyr will not feel the pangs of murder except as one of you feels pangs of a sting."⁴

Put simply and briefly, the martyr is the corporealization as well as the actualization of life and death on the Straight Path, and, as we shall see, by so being and doing the martyr is the exemplar who serves to push the masses above their awe, fear and terror of the barbarian.

Explicit in martyrdom counter-sociology is the position that barbarism can be maintained only with the complicity of all, or by vast numbers of the masses. Barbarism exists for both the conquerors and the conquered; they operate jointly and establish a concurrence that upholds and reproduces barbarism. The capitalists and socialists, for instance, engage in and accomplish conquest not because of their property relations, productive and technological pressures, successful control and expansion of markets, population growth or requirements for territorial acquisition; the "victims" of capitalism-socialism, on the other hand, participate in barbarism not because of mystification, social forms of false consciousness or

ideological subservience. Which is to say, productive relations and forces and their corresponding super-structural factors do not explain barbarism and its conquerors-conquered conspiracy.

What, then, does explain barbarism, and most especially its capitalist and socialist variants, and the compact between conquered and conquerors? Our answer, which is borne of martyrdom counter-sociology, is plain, simple and candid: desiring-in-context. This counter-sociology views barbarism as a conjuncture in which takes place the production of desires, passions, intentions and choices to conquer and surrender, and it views the barbarian and the defeated as the respective embodiments and composition of these desires, passions, intentions and choices.

Established in a context for the production of conquest and defeat, these desires forge and form, in turn, a grand intercourse of desires; this intercourse produces two fundamental human desirers: the barbarian and the defeated.

Capitalism and socialism are, consequently, conjoined conjunctures for desire production, co-contexts for the production of desirers driven to defeat and be defeated. Capitalism-socialism are not primarily or

decisively co-modes of commodity, goods and service production; rather they are first and uppermost co-contexts for the production of those desires and desirers impelled towards the reproduction and perpetuation of barbarism: barbarism in perpetuity.

It follows from this that martyrdom counter-sociology would be a counter-sociology of desire: a counter-desiring-in-the-barbarian-context. In contradistinction to the barbarian and surrenderer, the martyr is an embodiment and composition of counter-desires, a counter-desirer-in-the-barbarian-context. As a counter-sociology of desire, martyrdom emanates from a heart pierced by the Lord, and it proceeds onward to found its own basic and profound premise; namely, that martyrdom alone, as an expression of antagonistic and adversative desires to barbarism, can 1) wrench the masses from their concord of mutual coexistence with the barbarian and 2) arouse in the masses the needs and wants to triumph over barbarism by affirming belief and vouchsafing righteousness.

Systems have passed away before you.
Do but travel in the land and see
the nature of the consequence for
those who did deny (the messengers).

This is a declaration for humanity,
a guidance and an admonition unto
those who ward off (evil).

Faint not nor grieve, for ye
will overcome them if ye are
(indeed) believers.

If ye have received a blow, the
(disbelieving) people have
received a blow the like thereof.
These are (only) the vicissitudes
which We cause to follow one
another for humanity, to the end
that Allah may know those who
believe and may choose witnesses
[i.e., martyrs] from among you;
and Allah loveth not the wrong-
doers. 5

We can now begin our investigation and interrogation
to determine how and why martyrdom can move the masses
from barbarism to faith, piety and virtue. That is,
we can develop the urgency, drive and incitement of
martyrdom counter-sociology.

Whereas Hegelian-Marxian sociology constitutes
a neatly packaged, calculatable and predictable series
of linear progressions that eventually generate a
synthesized whole, to wit, a highly rational sociological
universe built upon an ordained and foretold sequence of
logical movements, martyrdom counter-sociology
constitutes a cornucopia of gushing, instigating, over-
whelming and unyielding fury of explosive desires that
are simultaneous, pulsating and all consuming, to wit, a
highly charged counter-sociological universe of
exhortation, burning zeal, raging passions,

possession and fanaticism built upon the human spirit, heart, guts, spleen, brain, etc. In contrast to the fixity and shallowness of Position-Opposition-Composition is the eruptive overflowing and depth of a life and death struggle brought on by desire.

This counter-sociology counterposes desire to dialectics, in all their sanctified variants, intense commitment to synthesis, human completion and acme to productive progress and property matrixes and the Heavenly Paradise--the ecstatic fulfillment of desire--to the realization of the Absolute-Communism in this life.

Lo! the righteous shall
 drink of a cup where of the
 mixture is of water of Kafur.

A spring wherefrom the slaves of
 Allah drink, making it gush
 forth abundantly,

(Because) they perform the vow
 and fear a day whereof the
 evil is wide-spreading,

And feed with food the needy
 poor, the orphan and the
 prisoner, for love of Him,

(Saving): We feed you, for the
 sake of Allah only. We wish for
 no reward nor thanks from you....

And hath awarded them for all
 that they endured, a Garden and
 silk attire....

Goblets of silver are brought around
for them, and beakers (as) of
glass

(Bright as) glass but (made) of
silver, which they (themselves)
have measured to the
measure (of their deeds)....

There serve them youths of
everlasting youth, whom, when thou
seest, thou wouldst take for
scattered pearls.

When thou seest, thou wilt see
there bliss and high estate.⁶

Situated in the counter-sociology under construction, capitalists-socialists are the ravenous and predatory barbarians, the masses are the defeated craving prey and the martyrs are essentially yearning desirers of Allah via the destruction of barbarian desire production. Thus, the foundation of martyrdom counter-sociology is laid by the supersedure of the desires for barbarism by the desires for martyrdom in the masses. Such newly formed transcending desires lift the masses out of barbarism through purity and virtue; martyrdom raises the mass of desirers above barbarism. Put differently, the basic propositions of martyrdom are laid down by the people themselves in their willingness to surpass the momentary pleasures and satisfaction of capitalism-socialism for the paradisiacal pleasures and satisfaction of eternity.

And verily the latter portion
will be better for thee than
the former.

And verily thy Lord will give
unto thee so that thou will
be content. ⁷

This is not a mystical or magical supersedure.
It is within the immediate and tangible reach of any
and all, vanquished and warmonger. The prayers and
invocations of any and all can lead to the opening of
their hearts and empower them against transgression and
mischievous. Divine Merce makes this supersedure possible
and feasible.

Invoke your Lord with humility
and in secret. Very, Allah
likes not the aggressors.

And do not mischief on the earth
after it has been set in
order, and invoke Him in fear
and hope. Surely; [sic] Allah's
Mercy is near unto the
good-doers. ⁸

Paradoxically, a significant factor in this process
of supersedure is the generalized cruelty and inhumanity
of barbarism. In a condition where wickedness and tumult
spreads visibly over the environ and Mercy has opened
the heart, barbarous desires subside. As the whole of
the people experience daily and systematically the
atrocities and abominations of the barbarous natus,
the invoking heart is moved to abhor barbarism. As
injustice and oppression leaves neither crevice nor
interval for "those who call on their Lord" and

exploitation and corruption become ubiquitous, constant and open, the martyr is conceived. The opened heart now begins to boil the blood, agitate the stomach, sear the brain, inflame the passions and consume the body in an ebullition against barbarism.

The blaze of the martyr can now be ignited in any place at any moment; the martyr's blaze is set to go off in the co-contexts of capitalism-socialism or any barbarian context that gorges in "desiring the pomp and glitter of the life of the world" where its people follow their "own lusts and whose affairs (deeds)" are empty and in vain.⁹ This intense anti-barbarous flame is fueled by the rule and authority of depravity and villainy. Engulfed in pervasive, continual and public displays of barbarous lusts and hollow deeds, the martyr chars barbarian rule and authority with a quick, hot, bright blaze. In a single and sudden human flash the martyr has become and introduced incandescence in barbarous darkness and frigidity.

The barbarian, on the other hand, dies relatively slowly. Those whose hearts remember their Lord and their bodies stir to challenge barbarism are, usually, few in number. The majority arrive slowly at the invocation of Mercy, seething passions and incandescent leaps; the majority reaches the solemn and determined

resolution to put an end to so violent and bloody a conjuncture only after the martyrs' cries, torments and mutilated bodies are inescapable. Which is to say, the barbarian dies relatively slowly because the masses in the yoke of barbarism, capitalistic-socialistic and otherwise, are not persuaded of its eventual and pervasive tyranny and evil until they experience it firsthand for themselves. This is especially true of the masses in capitalistic-socialistic barbarism, for they do not regard it as co-contexts of monstrous desires until one or more successive capitalist or workers classes have followed their "own lusts" and have given an undeniable and grievous demonstration of their unparalleled excesses.

Barbarism survives the scorching of the fire-storm of passions that incinerate the martyr. Where, when and if an individual or small number of individuals occupying a high standing amongst the people is martyred, the multitudes are aroused. This arousal reaches its highest pitch when the beloved of the people carry out in a deliberate fashion the sublime resolve to give of their lives. In this way, the martyrs initiate an effective and irrevocable turn of the masses against capitalism-socialism.

Whether these martyrs were alarmed by the abuses to the people or were appalled by the abuses to s/he life or to the lives of their relatives is not terribly central to the counter-sociological assault on capitalism-socialism. What is central to martyrdom counter-sociology is the mass rage, fury and retaliation that spills onto the streets and struggles against barbarism.

The convergence of iniquitous desires, excessive lusts and the martyrdom of the people's beloved erodes barbarian rule and authority. In many people hatred and intolerance replace the awe, admiration, acceptance, fear and terror of the barbarian. Public and private horrors create a growing infuriated multitude with gushing desires to tear apart the confines of barbarism. The infamous and unmentionable, as matters of everyday life, convert a people into outraged desirers, and outraged desirers turn their lives against capitalism-socialism. To turn against capitalism-socialism is to turn into a battleground strewn with martyrs.

The giving of their lives by the beloved is highly significant in the surmounting of barbarian forces and pressures; it is an attack against wrongdoing

by those whose death and departure induces the deepest affection, devotion and emotions for all martyrs as well as induces the deepest loathing, dedication and emotions against all barbarians--such is the essence of martyrdom counter-sociology. The beloved martyr gives direction and form to the maddening desires whirling in the masses: maddening because all counter-desires are repressed, narcotized, denied or avoided.

The martyr incarnates counter-desires in view of the people, and therewith initiates the counter-sociology of martyrdom. By incarnating counter-desires within observable circumstances, the martyr introduces a force that can endure the arduous, protracted and vehement struggle against capitalism-socialism. Those beloved and/or of high standing who become martyrs concretely demonstrate to the people the overpassing of the addictive provision of comfort and commodity--the stupefying provision in the world of "the pomp and glitter"--for the "Best" provision.

Those who fled their homes
For the cause of Allah
and then were slain or died,
Allah verily will provide for
them a good provision. Lo!
Allah is verily the Best of all who
make provision.

Assuredly He will cause them to
 enter by an entry that they will
 love. Lo! Allah is verily
 Knower, Indulgent.¹⁰

With the greatest certainty and efficaciousness
 the martyr realizes the supreme good of all humanity,
 but the martyr's pleasures and satisfactions are not
 and cannot be derived from the human condition:
the human situation is the occasion for martyrdom,
it is not its cause, determinate or source. The
 martyr's counter-desires arise from the Lord and
 are gratified in the Heavenly condition: the
 paradisiacal situation of bliss, rapture, security
 and plentitude.

They rejoice in the Bounty
 Provided by Allah:
 And with regard to those
 Left behind, who have not
 Yet joined them (in their bliss),
 The (Martyrs) glory in the fact
 That on them is no fear,
 Nor have they (cause to) grieve.¹¹

Given the dynamics and course of martyrdom
 counter-sociology, barbarism can be seen from an
 entirely new light. The megamaze of revolution,
history, culture, etc., serves as a fortress in which
to conceal and protect capitalism-socialism against
martyrdom counter-sociology. Counter-desires can be

contained within the rampart megamaze of barbarism to the extent that martyrdom does not solidify and unify a counter-desiring mass on the Path to an upheaval. Martyrdom can surpass the barbarous megamaze in that it materializes the counter-desires that surmount the detours, dead ends and traps of revolution, history, culture.... This materialization of transcendental desires liberates fervent repressed, narcotized, denied and avoided emotions that compel, therefore, the leveling of capitalism-socialism.

Martyrdom is singular in its capacity to solidify and unify counter-desires to transcend as well as raze capitalism-socialism, for the martyr alone is willing to face naked and grotesque desires for violence, brutality and slaughter and turn them backward and forward upon themselves. Which is to say, the martyr takes barbarism to its inverted conclusion: it is better to desire to die once than to desire to die the thousand deaths of the conquered; the martyr takes the pervasive awe, fear and terror of barbarian lusts to their emotional limits: "I've lived with this awe, fear and terror and things are as bad as they can be, so now I'm going to live with bravery and valor."

Martyrdom challenges the slow torturesome death of the conquered--the taking of a few ounces of blood everyday, the gradual perversion of every magnanimous feeling, the restraining of every gesture of self-respect, the thousands of offenses, indignities and slurs suffered as tribute for survival in defeat.... The martyr personifies in s/he death the injuries, sacrifices and pains endured, the needs and wants raped and the injustices received by the masses in order to quench barbarian thirst. The martyr brings down the fancy that life lived in perpetual dread and despair is a life to be valued.

In short, martyrdom is the substantiation of the desires to counter a life in a context that damns the life of the feeble and oppressed; it is the substantiation of the afterlife in a present life which damns the desires for Allah.

Let them (believers) fight in
the Cause of Allah, those who,
sell the life of this world for
the Hereafter, and whoso
fights in the Cause of Allah, and
is killed or gets victory, We
shall bestow on him a great reward.

And what is wrong with you
that you fight not in the
Cause of Allah, and for those,
weak, ill-treated and oppressed
among men, women and children,
whose cry is "Our Lord!

Rescue us from this town,
whose people are oppressors;
and raise for us from
You one who will protect;
and raise for us from You
one who will help!"¹²

We can conclude from this that the martyr is not a political, economic, social, revolutionary, historical, "progressive," cultural or technological desirer. We can also conclude that historical-spiritual materialism, Marxian-Hegelian materialism, the base-superstructure and sanctified dialectics have little, if any, explanatory or analytical power or worth with reference to desiring and counter-desiring in the co-contexts of capitalism-socialism. Finally, we can conclude that the martyr's heart has been penetrated by the Exalted, and with that the martyr corporifies desires that transcend the co-contexts of capitalism-socialism and are consummated exclusively and uniquely in the context of Heaven.

The Desire Establishment

Production, Management and Repair

Upon confronting martyrdom the functionaries of the barbarous megamaze, those who serve in the production, management and repair of the obscene and wanton brutality of capitalism-socialism, delineate martyrdom as pathological ritualistic suicide: a state of depression, hopelessness and uselessness which fosters an escape from reality--as defined by these functionaries --into the rites and ceremonies of the primitive, pre-civilized and pre-revolutionary world. These functionaries of history, civilization, progress, revolution...sketch the martyr as a practitioner of an irrational descent into human devolution. Thus, martyrdom is a disordered state not to be desired, for it is at base a self-murdering of normal, healthy and real desires for the capitalistic or socialistic "good life."

In this way, martyrdom is countered by social science experts, media personalities and public opinion leaders. Their task, upon confronting martyrdom, is to offset its initial manifestations of social disintegration

and unrest: their task is to produce, manage and repair barbarous desires. These functionaries operate within the network of social, domestic, educational, scientific, technological, communicative economic, religious and welfare institutions and agencies.

Enforcement, Punishment and Extinction

Annexed to this network of the megamaze is the state network of government, police, courts, prisons, military and internal and external security institutions and agencies that enforce barbarous capitalistic-socialistic desires and punish and extinguish counter-desires. It is self-evident what enforcement of barbarous desires and punishment of counter-desires encompasses, but the extinction of counter-desires may not be so self-evident. It can take two forms:

- 1) terminate the counter-desires themselves or
- 2) terminate the counter-desirers.

The task, then, of governmental bureaucrats, law-enforcement agents, armed forces, etc., is to render and treat martyrs as "thugs," "criminals," "reactionaries," "murders," "terrorists": as

"Barbarians," and therewith enforce a greater state barbarism through the punishment of all associated with the martyrs as well as through the termination of martyrdom counter-desires and counter-desirers by means of martial law, mass slaughter, a scorched earth campaign, etc. The task, then, of the functionaries of the enforcement of barbarous desires and the punishment and extinction of counter-desires is to recreate the martyr as barbarian in order to justify and vindicate a greater barbarism.

To our list of measures employed by the barbarian desire establishment to counter martyrdom we need to add force, discipline, criminalization and termination: repression, narcotization, denial and avoidance are all part of desire production, management and repair.

The desired establishment of capitalism-socialism responds absolutely and implacably to martyrdom, for the martyr's counter-desires are the most perilous. These counter-desires animate human beings to live and die for other than the state, country, political affiliation, economic class, the revolution... culture, race, tribe.... Which is to say, countering martyrdom is certain, inexorable and draconian because

the martyr is completely and unqualifiedly antagonistic to capitalism-socialism. Unlike other counter-desirers, the martyr is a life and death directed at destroying all the breastwork passages of the capitalistic-socialistic megamaze; this struggle between the martyr, the material specification of the ultimate transcendent passion, and the desire establishment, the material specification of the production, management, repair and enforcement of revolutionary, historical, state, etc., desires and the punishment and extinction of counter revolutionary, historical, state, etc., desires, unfolds amongst the Muslim masses, the material specification of the pre-, non- and anti-class collective formation based upon and built around transcendent desire and passion.

Thus it is to the conjuncture of the martyr, the masses and class, the material specification of the productive-economic-structural-voluntaristic-political-struggle-collective-formation based upon and built around conquest which first arose in bourgeois Western Europe, that we must now turn. Which is to say, we will now turn to martyrology: the life and death struggle of the martyr and the masses within the global context of capitalist-socialist barbarism--we will now enter the existing reality of the martyr and the masses against classes.

Notes

¹Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 6, "Al-Anam (The Cattle)," ayat 153, p. 148. In this ayat, as in the case of many others, the sign used to address Allah is that of the masculine pronoun He. This must be understood as a function of language and not of Allah's Essential Being. Allah is a He only within grammatical structure. Allah is not a He or a She as a Presence or Ontological Reality. The referencing of Allah with the masculine pronoun occurs because of the nature of Arabic and English; both languages organize certain phenomena by means of gender/sex, and nouns and pronouns serve, in part, as designations for identifying and locating the phenomena of persons, places and things as masculine and feminine. The grammatical classification system operating within Arabic and English identifies and locates Allah under a masculine noun, and thereby it requires a masculine pronoun when pronoun usage is indicated to identify and locate Allah.

Gender/sexual specification and classification does not hold for Allah; it serves well, perhaps, in organizing the created world, but it is insufficient in its application to Allah. Allah has neither gender nor sexual identity; Allah has neither gender nor sexual characteristics: feminine and masculine, female and male are inappropriate specifications and classifications of Allah.

Gender and sex apply to created humans, animals, situations and objects. Allah is not created, and therefore Allah transcends gender and sex. Allah is distinct and different from anything that was, is or will be created. Any and all gender and sexual designations associated with Allah are a pure fiction of language.

Say: He, Allah is One!
 Allah is He on Whom all depend.
 He begets not, nor is He begotten.
And none is like Him (Shakir,
Holy Qur'an, Surah 112, "The Unity
 (Ikhlas)," ayats 1-4, p. 633; emphasis
 added).

²Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 2, "Al-Baqara (The Cow)," ayat 154, p. 23.

³Shakir, Holy Qur'an, Surah 3, "The Family Of Imran (A'Lay Imran)," ayat 21, p. 46. The term "men" was replaced by the term "humanity." By so doing the nature and quality of the Qur'an is restored; to wit, the Qur'an is the only Divine Revelation addressed to all humankind. This all inclusive nature and quality includes an overall non-gender specific communication. By replacing the term "men" with the term "humanity" the translation is deprived of its possible male sexism.

Many Muslims adopt, unfortunately, in their acquisition of written and spoken English the discourse and idioms of male sexism. This is not to suggest that language systems native to many Muslims do not contain the signs and symbols of male sexism, but it is to state that because English evidences, as we have observed already, actual colonial, imperial, racial and historical domination, its male sexist components have far greater significance than other language systems. Where English gives voice to male power and male-centricism with the usage of "men," for example, as the sign for both men and women, it carries with it the additional weight of colonial, imperial, racial and epochal governance and authority.

⁴Karim, Al-Haj Maulana Fazlul, trans., Al-Hadis (Containing Sayings doings [sic] and Teachings of the Holy Prophet and events before and after Resurrection), Lahore, Pakistan: The Book House, n.d., II, p. 358.

⁵Pickthall, Glorious Qur'an, Surah 3, "The Family Of Imran," ayats 137-140, p. 64; emphasis added. In ayats 138 and 140 the term "mankind" was replaced with the term "humanity" so as to remove the restrictive quality that the gender-specific term "mankind" brings to the translation.

⁶Ibid., Surah 76, "'Time' Or 'Humanity'," ayats 5-20, pp. 672-673. The surah's title was changed

from "'Time' Or 'Man'" to the more appropriate Qur'anic generic 'Humanity.' In ayat 8 the term "wretch" was replaced with the term "poor." This ayat conveys a concern for those who are in poverty, powerlessness and extreme hardship. The term "wretch" conveys this concern; however, it also conveys and denotes moral depravity and base character, and depravity and baseness are not the concern of this ayat.

⁷Ibid., Surah 93, "The Morning Hours," ayats 4-5 , p. 719.

⁸Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 7, "Al-A'raf (The Heights)," ayats 55-56, p. 156. The sign "He" was replaced by the sign "Allah" in ayat 55. This emplaces a more literal translation. In addition, in ayat 56 the original reads, "...invoke Him with fear and hope." This was changed to read, "...invoke Him in fear and hope" (emphasis added) in order to better convey the general message of the ayat: in a context of "mischief...fear and hope"-- in a context of multiple experiences and feelings-- Allah's Mercy remains "near unto the good-doers."

⁹Ibid., Surat 18, "Al-Kahf (The Cave)," ayat 28, p. 296.

¹⁰Pickthall, Glorious Qur'an, Surah 22, "The Pilgrimage," ayats 58-59, p. 345. In ayat 58 the phrase "Lo! Allah, He verily is Best of..." was changed to "Lo! Allah is verily the Best of...." A similar change was made in ayat 59: "Lo Allah verily is Knower..." was changed to "Allah is verily Knower...." Both changes were performed to provide a more accurate, literal and readable translation.

¹¹Ali, The Holy Qur'an, Surah 3, "Al-i-Imran, or The Family of Imran," ayat 170, p. 167. In this ayat the sign "God" was replaced with the sign "Allah." In the original Arabic appears the sign "Allah" not the sign "God." Any English translation of the Qur'an in which the sign "God" is used where, in point of fact, the Qur'anic Arabic contains the sign

"Allah" (الله) is a translation in which is provided an opportunity to interpret the sign "God" in all manner and form. For example, the sign "God" could be used as a referent for Jesus (Peace Be Upon Him) if the reader is a Christian, Krishna (Peace Be Upon Him) if the reader is a Hindu, Buddha (Peace Be Upon Him) if the reader is a Buddhist, Ahura Mazda if the reader is a Zoroastrian or even Satan (The Despised and Cursed One) if the reader is a satanist (in any of their variant forms).

Therefore, in effect the usage of the sign "God" in the stead of the sign "Allah" sets the Qur'an in a translation suffuse with polytheistic possibilities. Moreover this usage is tantamount to an abrogation of the sign "Allah." Since "God" is the acceptable, non-offensive and a non-threatening sign--or should we say "God" is an universal commodity acceptable to most everyone and is available in all markets--in the English speaking-reading world and since "Allah" is, to the contrary, the sign that is unacceptable, offensive and threatening--or should we say "Allah" is not yet a commodity and therefore not acceptable and not marketable--in the English speaking-reading world, "Allah" has been abolished from some Qur'anic translations.

This is just one example of warfare in the myriad of campaigns against "Allah," against the sign(s) of Allah. The abortive U.S. invasion of Iran in 1980, the present Sovietization of Afghanistan, the destruction of mosques/masjids in occupied Palestine by Zionists and the U.S. support of the Maronite minority in Lebanon, to name a few, evidence plainly that the sign(s) of Allah is a global anathema in the barbarian network of power.

In line with this see Daniel, Norman, Islam And The West: The Making of an Image, Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 1960; this is a detailed and keenly documented scholarly work on the earlier Western campaigns, evolving from the Crusades, against the sign(s) of Allah.

In light of these statements, the usage of the sign "God" in the stead of "Allah" is seen as an apology, appeasement and conformance by Muslim

translators to the authority, demands and sensibilities of a non-Muslim English speaking-reading public. By using "Allah" as the referent for the All Mighty Lord and Creator, the translator would preclude polytheistic possibilities as well as liberate "Allah" from linguistic abrogation. The Qur'an has its own internal order which requires a corresponding external order that includes the signs of Allah, and by using the sign "Allah" the Muslim translator would remain faithful to this order. By using "Allah" a Muslim translator of the Qur'an would not be introducing into Qur'anic language the authority, demands and sensibilities of the barbarian power network.

¹²Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 4, "An-Nisa (The Women)," ayats 74-75, pp. 88-89. Ayat 74 contains the masculine pronoun as the grammatical substitute for those believers who die or obtain victory in Allah's Cause. Here again, this gender-characterization is a function of grammar and not a function of Allah's gender-specific bestowal or dictum concerning the exclusion of women from martyrdom or combat. Muslim women have fought in, died for and participated in the victory of Allah's Cause.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

MARTYROLOGY: THE CONJUNCTURE OF
THE MARTYR, THE MASSES AND CLASSES

To this point we have presented martyrdom in its negative form: the counter-sociology of martyrdom. We have prepared the way for its presentation in its affirmative form: martyrology, and we have prepared the way for this last section of our thesis to be a passion written in barbarism. Thus our thesis concludes with the suffering, blood and death of the martyr as the agency of mass change within barbarism.

Whereas barbarian social science functionaries, most notably sociologists, work towards producing, managing and repairing barbarous desires, the martyrs work towards obliterating barbarous desires; whereas barbarian sociology, for instance, immerses the people in the tyranny and deception of the scientific studies, facts and figures on desire, martyrology immerses the people in the actual killing power of barbarous desires; whereas barbarian sociology measures the effects of the state, class, wealth, poverty, technology, etc., on society, martyrology exposes the veritable indiscriminate violence, pain and suffering of society in the barbarous co-contexts, and whereas barbarian

sociology theorizes about everything except, of course, its raison d'etre, martyrology is the practice which theorizes about the remains of relatives, children, neighbors and friends.

Some critics may argue that we have not conclusively demonstrated, or let alone substantiated, the fundamental proposition of martyrology; namely, that the martyr is the most clear and present danger to barbarious desires--that martyrology is the supreme threat to capitalism-socialism. Our response will be forthright.

The martyr is the ultimate passion, the ultimate desirer. The martyr suffers with and struggles through all feelings, attachments and longings. All desire, upon Allah's impaling of the heart, is absorbed and consolidated into a single exquisite passion: "...how much do I like that I should be martyred in the way of Allah and then be brought back to life, and then be martyred and then be brought back to life, and then be martyred and then be brought back to life, and then be martyred." ¹

It is this single superseding passion to relinquish life which summons the masses; it is this single superseding passion to relinquish life which

uproots the very being of the masses. It collects and congeals the desires and passions of the masses into an explosive charge, and it directs and aims this charge at the rule and reign of capitalism-socialism.

In the incandescence of Mercy, some people will discharge their lives upon any new or additional barbarous impingement. These acts of martyrdom gather disdain and loathing for the condition that pushes people to the precipice of a death struggle.

As bodies pile up and the burials mount, the martyrs' shadows are cast over the barbarian's machines, gadgets and conveniences. The torn bodies and shrieking cries of the bereaved deaden whatever enrapture, enthusiasm and romance that might have blossomed with the superstars, personalities, leaders and pundits of capitalism-socialism. Grief, not production, profits or commodities becomes the bottom line. Fear and terror are succeeded by burning and illuminating impulses; hot flashes supplant the icy calculations of fear and terror.

The martyr kindles devotional bonds; obligations, friendships, loyalty and trust melt the chilling practicality and frigid indifference that operates to entrench so many in their barbarous compact.

Martyrology is literally a passion drama;
the performance of a series of detailed actions that
consecrate passion wholly and utterly to the Lord's
Victory over the barbarian. The passionate incarnation
 of Mercy and Forgiveness over the passionate worship
 of life and its gain, this is martyrology: "And if
 you are killed or die in the Way of Allah; forgiveness
 and mercy from Allah are far better than all they amass."²
 From this we can glean the guiding principle of
 martyrology: the impassioned dedication of the martyr
 for Allah.

This impassioned dedication alone makes the martyr's
 (often brutal) death a collective inspiration that
 overreaches the generalized fright and terror lodged
 in the people's spirit, heart and mind. In this way
 martyrology is not a higher order of barbarism employed
 against capitalism-socialism, a modality of pure
 animosity, frustration and aggression locked onto
 capitalism-socialism, or a moral righteous and indignation
 engaged in one-upmanship (or put in a non-sexist
 fashion, one-uppersonship) with capitalism-socialism.
 Having said this it is necessary to say that martyr's
 impassioned dedication is aided by barbarian meanness
 and villany in the conformation of the collective

inspiration necessary to incite the people, but this is a correlate of martyrology, not its guiding principle.

Passionate existence this is the human root and route of our thesis. The drama of passions--the real life struggles between states of passion--this defines our work. Martyrology offers no scientific studies, facts or measurements. There can be no scientific capture of the martyr, for science cannot capture (or deny) Allah regardless of the assertions of its functionaries. What can science do or say about this passion drama? Can it predict whose heart Allah will open? Can it measure dedication, devotion and piety? Can it determine how much zeal is required to produce furor? Can it search out the origins of cowardice and courage? In other words, martyrdom has always been and will continue to be unpredictable, a-rational, perplexing and not subject to scientific controls; in other words, the desire establishment may attempt to insure the rule and reign of barbarism but the concrete performance of a series of actions that consecrate passions to the Master has always been and will continue to be in Allah's Hands -- and therefore in the Hands of the most clear and present threat to capitalism-socialism.

A critical point must be made at this juncture. Martyrology offers an explanation of how the bridge between theory and action is crossed, i.e., the means by which theory impregnates practice. Passions take humanity across this bridge. The abyss between theory and practice which haunts Marxian production and Marxism cannot be bridged unless and until the antecedents of theory and action are recognized and acknowledged--but this is getting ahead of ourselves.

We can now ask and answer the question that guides the conclusion of our dissertation. How and why would the earth's masses reach beyond the dread and despair of their existence in order to overtake and takeover the co-contexts of barbarism?

Put simply and briefly, it is our argument that martyrology has the ability to reorganize as well as supplant desires and passions. Martyrdom can bring about an upheaval in desires and passions such that retribution and fervor ascend over apprehension and timidity. Passion and death touch everyone and every desire, but the martyrs' ultimate passion and death seizes the desires of rich and poor, powerful and

downtrodden. It accelerates their desires; it rocks and jars emotions. A desire disturbance ensues: feelings, wants and needs collide.

This (usually) leads to states of confusion in the masses. On the other hand, authority and power help to stabilize and contain the emotions of the rulers, so they (usually) return to the settled calm of arrogance. Hence, we have confusion amongst the masses--they are uncertain as to what their responses should be--and the arrogance of control amongst the rulers.

Soon all regain their desire-places, desire-conduct, desire-things and consequently the desire hierarchy and configured is secured by the desire establishment. The desire code looms over all and desire conformance is the routine of the day.

Unexpectedly, a few more martyrs have spent their passion and lives, but no matter this too will pass. Again, unexpectedly more people are martyred. But this will not pass so easily, for there were women and children amongst those martyred. These deaths make it more difficult for repression, narcotization, denial and avoidance to keep counter-desires in check. The wailing death cries raise doubts in the people as to

the effectualness of the state's enforcement and punishment of their counter-impulses.

Voluntary martyrdom begins to turn capitalism-socialism upon itself; counter-desires are escaping with greater frequency and intensity from the production, management and repair of the desire establishment. As a result desire enforcement and counter-desire punishment and extinction becomes more blatant, intrusive and routine. Great numbers are now arrested, imprisoned and tortured to counter martyrology. In fact the increased enforcement and punishment creates more martyrs because more people are brought to the brink of death, and with the welcoming of a chosen death in the stead of an imposed barbarian life, counter-desire extinction unfolds by 1) closing down, burning and dynamiting the places of assemblage where martyrdom is honored and 2) maiming and killing those counter-desirers who represent the tradition of the passion drama.

Accompanying these developments is a rearrangement of desires in the capitalists-socialists; shock now overshadows arrogance. "How dare this riff-raff challenge us and what we have established," is the refrain which echoes through the halls of power.

In this state of shock, martyrdom is finally and reluctantly perceived as the quintessential mass weapon. Upon this perceptual acknowledgement, the publicity and visibility that strengthen martyrology is stopped. The experts, personalities and public opinion leaders are silenced; martyrdom is no longer "looney tunes" in the throes of suicide. Enforcement, punishment and extinction will continue unabated, but now there will be no more martyrs. People will be disappeared, the prisons will be filled secretly and mass graves will be dug far from concerned eyes and ears. Death will spread like a plague--but there will be no bodies, scenes or images to vitalize the passion drama.

The passion struggle heats up. The capitalists-socialists, as materialists, as barbarians, fail to apprehend that the martyrs' passion escapes the grave and captures the masses. The martyrs' drama infuses renewed faith and strength in the masses. In their hearts and guts they feel the magnificence of the martyrs' passion and deed. Hopelessness and weakness are buried under the empathy and sympathy for the martyr.

Abruptly yet subtly the martyr becomes a spectre to the barbarian authorities. At first a vague but

undeniable sensation is experienced: conquest merely bends the people into a concurrence with barbarism, it does not break them into a concurrence with barbarism. There is also a fleeting twinge: these people have kept many of their attachments to piety clandestine while catering publicly to barbarism. Abruptly yet subtly the authorities recognize that for these people the martyr personifies the inescapable vision of a unified passion, a whole hearted dedication, to one Master: the surrender of creature to Creator.

Allah has not assigned unto
any human two hearts within
his [/her] body....³

Without any warning or explanation an aunt or an uncle or, perhaps, a schoolmate is martyred. As growing numbers are martyred, an appreciation of what is really going on hits everyone. Martyrdom finds its way into common discourse; the martyr's tale begins to be heard in the home, school, place of worship, the market, the executive suite and the state network.

Even though there is a blanket of desire enforcement and counter-desire punishment and extinction as well as a communication blackout, the regime is confronted with martyrs on holidays, campuses and streets

and in airports, theaters, parks and military bases. Slowly but surely the security of the desire establishment is penetrated. The barbarians are no longer safe and secure in public; their offices, parliaments/ legislatures/central committees, citadels, embassies, diplomatic refuges and resorts are imperiled. The hegemony and domination of barbarous desires is under attack. With unrelenting action the martyrs spread over barbarian space and time; they spread their passion consecrated to the Master. Beneath the weight of this passionate expanse, luxury loses its glamor, production centers for barbarous desires are abandoned and, most importantly, prophecy rather than profits suffuses the determination of life's passions and desires.

An unstoppable momentum has developed. Martyrology has struck the various appellations of capitalism-socialism and stripped them bare before the populace. The megamaze of revolution, history, the state, civilization, culture, technological progress...scientism...has been routed and its passages exposed as a code for barbarous cravings, a code for savage destruction. In all their conditions of existence the populace is shown how and why revolution, history, the state, civilization...

are used against them. How revolution is a code for destroying their own indigenous agricultural capacity and food supply. Why history is a code for dissolving their future. Why civilization is a code for what the barbarians have and what the masses don't have. How culture encodes bondage to barbarian idols. Why technological progress encodes the people's perpetual poverty. How scientism encodes the depletion of spiritual and natural resources. Lastly, but perhaps most interestingly, how and why the state cannot be dismantled/abolished/smashed/transcended but must be decoded by the ultimate passion.

In other words, the martyr is a mirror of mass death; in concentrated, heightened and accelerated form the martyr reflects collective death. There is a difference, however, in that the martyr wills s/he own death and the masses have their deaths willed by the barbarian. Martyrdom compels the masses to witness their own lingering death in a passionate glowing climax.

Impassioned convictions and energy, unthwarted by the resistance of internal contradictions or the desiring establishment, drives individuals to take on a struggle that can impel a whole people. Impassioned individuals can create a situation, even a global situation,

where they can overcome unimaginable odds.

...If there are twenty
steadfast amongst you, they
will overcome two hundred,
and if there be of you a
hundred steadfast they will
overcome a thousand of those
who disbelieve....⁴

The momentum of the struggle is such that barbarous countermeasures including mass violence fail to lessen the explosions of ultimate passion. Barbarism is escalated to an unbearable level, but the masses respond with their lives in ways that could not have been foreseen by the barbarians--they give their lives along with taking many barbarian lives.

This is a prolonged struggle that encompasses generations of martyrs. Martyrology is constituted by protracted passions, generations of passions for martyrdom. Martyrology is built upon a tradition of martyrs who have subdued barbarism with the blows of martyrdom. A hieromartyr develops which engenders an influx of fresh, durable and tenacious passions and vigor.

Barbarians ride their wave of terror, and martyrs ride their strength of purpose. Terror and purpose locked in struggle. The power of might against the power of the ultimate passion.

* * *

This martyrological thesis has constructed martyrdom as the sole materialization of barbarian counter-desires that can extricate as well as emancipate the masses from their labyrinthine conditions of existence, and it has constructed such an extrication and emancipation as following from transcendental changes in the seat of passion.

Lo! Allah changeth not the
condition of a folk until they
(first) change that which is
in their hearts....⁵

Given that martyrology emanates from Mercy and Forgiveness; and given that a folk's extrication and emancipation from their labyrinthine capitalistic-socialistic conditons of existence is a Benediction, this thesis is then, in the final analysis, a tribute to the noble, sublime and majestic in the human creature: the passion filled of tears and blood.

Nothing is dearer to Allah
than two drops...: One
drop of tears out of fear of
Allah and one drop of blood shed
in the way of Allah....⁶

Martyrology is, then, the practice of transcendental passion dedicated to Allah and directed at barbarism

by means of giving up life; its theory is the passion drama of martyrdom and its performer is the martyr. Martyrology, its practice and theory (which encompasses propositions and correlatives) is contextually set where torment, blood and death, both of individuals and the masses, is the fundamental strategic organizing principle and instrument in the achievement of revolutionary, historical, state, etc., ends.

Martyrology, therefore, contextually sets the martyr's suffering, blood and death as the propellant that ignites and unites the masses against the fundamental strategic organizing principle and instrument of capitalist-socialist achievement. In other words, whereas torment/suffering, blood and death are the fundamental strategic organizing principle and instrument of capitalism-socialism, and their planetary prison of colonialism and imperialism, the martyr's torment/suffering, blood and death are--in the same context--the fundamental strategic organizing principle and instrument in the achievement of martyrological ends: the overcoming of capitalism-socialism and its planetary prison by means of mass mobilization.

Martyrology establishes a human agency of change: the martyr and the masses locked in struggle against barbarism--be it in the class form or otherwise. Because martyrology establishes a human agency of change its draws exclusively on the truly human to organize and

mobilize people; it draws on the deepest and strongest human relations that make possible social cohesion and struggle.

There are contexts in the life of human society where martyrdom becomes an inelutable imperative. The global capitalist-socialist context is such a context (co-context). Barbarism has materialized a colonial world order with its centers of imperial power; it is a world system of death and destruction for its masses. The surface of the earth is marked by political, economic and social arrangements in which human relations have been vacated and made uninhabitable.

Buried deep within the oppressed folk is a muted lament for life: a life where passion and desire support and activate prosperity and well-being. Under the heel of butchery this plea is audible as a shrieking cry. When the crimes of the law of the mighty become unbearable, the appeals and pleas for justice grow louder. But these laments, cries, appeals and pleas fall upon the "Deaf, dumb (and) blind,"⁷ for the barbarians have "a disease in their hearts" that leads them on to deception, harm and trouble.

Allah has set a seal upon their
hearts and upon their hearing
and there is a covering over

their eyes, and there is a great punishment for them....

They desire to deceive Allah and those who believe, and they deceive only themselves and they do not perceive.

There is a disease in their hearts, so Allah added to their disease and they shall have a painful chastisement because they lied.

And when it is said to them, Do not make mischief in the land. they say: We are but peace-makers.

Now surely they themselves are the mischief makers, but they do not perceive.⁸

Contrary to their claims that they are "peace-makers," they "themselves are the "mischief makers"; to wit, they are the war-makers and violence-makers fortified in a megamaze of deceptive codes: revolution-makers, history-makers, state-makers, civilization-makers, culture-makers, technology-makers, progress-makers....

Above the context of a megamaze of deceptive codes necessary to support frenzied consumption and accumulation, state and corporate power, a minority of wealth, sprawling megalopolises and a planetary desire establishment, is Allah the martyr-Maker, the Maker of the decoder of the megamaze of deceptive codes as well as the Maker of martyrology, the decoding which breaks the megamaze of deceptive codes.

The decoding and decoder are the explosive assemblage which ignites the folk to blast their way out of the megamaze of "peace-makers," revolution-makers....Upon the ruins of this megamaze of "Tumult" and "oppression" the folk can construct the universal society of justice and faith.

And fight them on
 Until there is no mor [sic]
 Tumult or oppression,
 And there prevail
 Justice and faith in Allah
 Altogether and everywhere....⁹

If martyrology appears strange, foreign, magical, illusory or even unintelligible, it is probably due to the pervasive legitimacy of barbarian social science, again, particularly barbarian sociology. Barbarian sociology, for example, sets its analysis and explanation of human relations upon the firm and fixed ground of thought and action--from here on we will address, explicitly and implicitly, the issue of the abyss between theory and practice that troubles Marx and Marxists. Barbarian sociology skirts, what it perceives as, the abyss of passion and desire for the trite and tried platitudes that have settled on the firmness and fixedness of rationality and behavior. This is to say, barbarian sociology is an orderly, stable, studied and measured coding system of the desire establishment which

produces, manages and repairs barbarous desires and passions by identifying them as reason and activity, so that thought and action--not desire and passion--produce revolution, history, civilization, etc. In this way revolution, history, civilization, etc., operate as encoded signs for barbarous desires and passions. Barbarian sociology shuns the human reservoir--the troubling abyss in Marxian and Marxist production in particular and barbarian sociology in general--of pulsating, evocative and overpowering passions and desires.

Therefore, where barbarian sociology encounters a people who only yesterday were in the pain of the pipeline of modernization and consumerism and are today returning to their tradition of prayer, fasting and vigilance to regain independence, or where barbarian sociology encounters a people who have survived through two centuries of oppression and the next day revolt and remove their oppression with the intent of building a prophetic society, barbarian sociology indicates the failure of revolutionary process, historical regression, too rapid development, cultural conflict, state corruption, etc. The people who turn against barbarism and toward Allah and the Prophets are encoded under the signs that indicate

the effects that the capitalistic-socialistic megamaze had upon their thought and action. These people must not be encountered as passions-and-desirers-in-context for this would establish a people, and their content, as freed of the megamaze code, and therewith a people untouched by revolutionary thought and action, historical thought and action....In other words, such an encounter would establish a decoded humanity: a humanity which has remained in touch with transcendental passions and desires despite the production, management, repair and enforcement of barbarism and the punishment and (attempted) extinction of counter-passions and counter-desires; such an encounter would establish a humanity who has successfully struggled against barbarous desires and passions by revolting against and eliminating--by decoding, by martyrising--revolutionary thought and action, historical thought and action, state thought and action....

Martyrology serves as the means by which the human heart, the human reservoir, filled with transcendental passions and desires can, once again, rise up and flood the body human, and consequently sweep away barbarism. What activates humanity it continues, is passion and desire not thought--thus the abyss between theory and

practice is an artifact of barbarian sociology. Passion and desire are the antecedences of thought and action; thought and action proceed from passion and desire. Unless and until there are passions, lusts, cravings, appetites, needs, wants and affects--whatever the nature of their dedication and direction--there will be neither thought nor actualization of thought. Consequently, what elevates a people from the contextual depths of malevolence to the heights of conceiving as well as marching through tanks and bullets onward to deposing shahs, party leaders, monarchs, presidents and generals--the puppet barbarians--is the ultimate passion emanating from the heart. Passion and desire are the means by which the martyr and the masses are joined in struggle against the thoughts and actions aimed at annihilating human transcendence.

The manufactured questions on human achievement that punctuate barbarian sociology are part of its coding system used to manage and repair the disruptions and breakdowns in barbarian passions and desires engendered by counter-passions and counter-desires. As a result this sociological coding system has nothing to

say about human transcendence. Martyrology has, as we have endeavored to show, a great deal to say about human transcendence. What martyrology has to say is that human transcendence emanates from an impassioned humanity, a humanity existing in the ultimate impassioned body, and it is this ultimate impassioned body that stands against the ultimate barbarism of capitalism-socialism. This ultimate impassioned body, pregnant with the courage and dedication of self-giving, is the great human achievement and the great mover in human achievement. Bodily transcendence--not productive forces and relations, structural dislocation, class formation and consciousness, technology or cultural conflict--produces human achievement, and this bodily transcendence takes the form of martyrdom.

In the final analysis it is the martyred body that realizes human transcendence which, in turn, realizes great human achievement.

Barbarian sociology is compelled, for all the reasons cited, to repress, narcotize, deny and avoid the transcendent-human-body-in-context because it is compelled to repress, narcotize, deny and avoid the responsibility that each and every passionate and desirous body has for its own fervor, wants, needs

beliefs, ideas, infatuations, sentiments and actions:
 "Every soul is held in pledge for what it earns."¹⁰
 In the place and status of causation, determination, delimitation, conditioning, correlation and correspondence martyrology locates and positions human responsibility by way of embodied passions, desires, thoughts and actions. Embodied human responsibility, incarnate being and doing, is inescapable and inexorable in any analysis, explanation, investigation or interrogation of humanity, so that embodied human responsibility dissolves contrived quandaries about whether or not human beings are responsible, in the first, middle or last instance, for their motives and actions: "actions are judged by motives...";¹¹
 "Allah looks not to your figures, nor to your wealth, but He looks to your hearts and deeds."¹² Moreover, embodied human responsibility is inescapable and inexorable in any and all contexts because "Allah does not impose upon any soul a duty but to the extent of its ability."¹³

The transcendent body, incarnate human responsibility for being and doing, struggles against human relations and affairs lodged within the megamaze code of revolution, history, civilization, etc., and struggles for their lodgment within the transcendent society. In such a society

each and every embodied human responsibility fully realizes that: "It gets every good that it earns, And it suffers every ill that it earns."¹⁴ It--not revolution, history, civilization, etc.,--is subject to tumult or oppression" if it only assumes the obligation of good being and doing without assuming the obligation of supporting universal good being and doing.

And fear tumult or oppression,
Which affecteth not in particular
(Only) those of you who do
wrong....¹⁵

In the transcendent human society, therefore, embodied responsibility requires more than not contributing to or participating in evil, injustice and abuse; it requires also that there be prevention, prohibition and struggle against evil, injustice and abuse. Furthermore inasmuch as revolution, history, the state, culture, etc., destroy embodied human responsibility in the code of revolutionary, historical, state, cultural, etc., causation, determination, delimitation, conditioning, correlation and correspondence--i.e., revolution, history, the state, culture, etc., are made and held responsible, in essence and effect, for human relations and affairs--barbarian sociological script is written large with the mechanics, operations, forces and pressures of revolution, history, the state,

culture, etc., that illustrate, substantiate and empowers
their responsibility for human being and doing and the
universal human condition.

In the transcendent society the martyrological
script is written large, and the Lord of Creation
illustrates, substantiates and empowers an embodied humanity
with the mechanics, operations, forces and pressures for as-
suming their responsibility for being and doing and the
universal human condition.

Conclusion

Martyrology has its origin and source in an intervention of Allah into the human heart:
 "Allah intervenes between humanity and its heart."¹⁶
 Such intervent establishes the ultimate-impassioned-embodied-responsibility, the martyr, in the barbarian context; the barbarian context is, however, within the universal context of Divine order.

Allah created the heavens
 And the earth for
 Just ends, and in order
 That each soul may find
 The recompense of what
 It has earned, and none
 Of them be wronged.¹⁷

This constitutes the martyrological configuration. This configuration is set in place and in motion in the actuality and existence of the Muslim masses. How, where and when the Muslims will respond to this configuration depends upon contextual particularities. Some Muslims may respond solely and immediately with sympathetic discussion; others may come to slowly admire and identify with the martyrs, nevertheless they remain followers of the cautious, prudent, or the barbarian lackeys; others may, as events unfold, defend themselves against

the contagion of the ultimate-impassioned-responsibility by emotionally or morally discrediting the martyrs as insane, mad, fanatics, non-believing or deviant Muslims, yet others may pray and invoke Allah to open their hearts.

Consequently, a minority of Muslims have forced the majority of Muslims to take a stand for or against barbarism. Because a minority challenged the many, because a relatively small number disrupted and called into question the entirety of barbarism, because whole neighborhoods, villages and communities choose martyrdom and because the barbarians launched a global attack against this minority, the Muslim majority has no place in which to hide or escape. They must choose or reject barbarism. They must choose a descendent society and an Earthly Paradise or the transcendent society and the Heavenly Paradise. They must choose to continue their compact and commerce with barbarism or begin anew their compact and commerce with guidance, worship and piety; the Muslim masses must make the same choices as all of humanity.

These are they who have purchased error for guidance, so their commerce was profitless. And they were not guided....

O humanity! Worship you Lord,
 Who created you and those who
 were before you so that you
 may become pious.¹⁸

Individual and collective struggle has to be affirmed or negated. The barbarians prepare for what is to come from the Muslims majority.

At this conjuncture, some of the barbarians and their counterparts in the non-Muslim masses cling to barbarism, and, thereby, the transcendent society with its martyrological configuration is strongly opposed; other barbarians and their non-Muslim counterparts ready themselves for mutual concessions, and an attempt is made to adulterate and fit the transcendent society into a context of concealed, discreet and tamed barbarism; still some other barbarians and their non-Muslim counterparts find the transcendent society of human relations and affairs as their bridge over and out of the earthly fire of barbarism.

Allah citeth an example for
 those who disbelieve:
 the wife of Noah and the wife
 of Lot, who were under [the care
 of] two of Our righteous slaves
 yet betrayed them so that they
 (the husbands) availed them
 naught against Allah and it
 was said (unto them): Enter
 the Fire along with those who
 enter.

And Allah citeth as an example for
 those who believe: the wife of
 Pharaoh when she said: My Lord!
 Build for me a home with thee
 in the Garden, and deliver me
 from Pharaoh and his work, and
 deliver me from evildoing folk.¹⁹

There is no turning back, no place to hide and
 no escape. The struggles between the different factions
 is bitter, yet many who originally would have settled
 for the smallest concessions are embolden by the
 Muslim martyrs and the ineffectiveness of the barbarian
 camps in dealing with them. There is wide spread
 division amongst and between these camps. The ranks
 of the Muslim minority who continue steadfastly in
 their struggle with barbarism are swelled by Muslims
 choosing against the majority of Muslims--who remain
 wedded to barbarism--, members of the non-Muslim masses who
 become Muslim, the non-Muslim masses and barbarian defectors.

Where formerly these steadfast Muslims prayed
 and invoked in secret and in silence, this rising wave
 of Muslims now bellows the glorification of Allah in
 the streets; they give willingly now their
 lives for the perfection and completion of the
 transcendent order.

This day have I perfected
 your transcendent society for
 you and completed my favor
 onto you, and chosen for you
 as transcendent society
 AL-ISLAM.20

* * *

One question remains. Its answer completes our
 work. What or who is the origin and source of
 barbarism?

O Humanity! What has
 Seduced thee from
 Thy Lord Most Beneficient....

...ye do
 Reject Right and Judgment!21

Capitalism-Socialism are co-contexts for the
 production of barbarous lusts; thus the fulfillment and
 completion of capitalism-socialism engenders passionate
 and desirous bodies driven to capitalistic-socialistic
 political, ideological, educational, scientific,
 religious and artistic domination as well as driven to
 capitalistic-socialistic industrial, commercial,
 financial and technological conquest. These lusts are
corporified in a lustful body which passion and desire is
for blood, pain, torture and the malevolent eroticism of

of execution and extermination.

The lustful barbarian body has a sealed and diseased heart, a deadened spirit and enticed senses that are blinded by devilry. It is a body in the orgy of violence, terror and brutality. The co-contexts of the lustful body constitute the ultimate and pure seduction of humanity away from the "Lord Most Beneficent" toward the deification of lust itself: "Hast thou seen him [/her] who chooseth for his [/her] god his [/her] own lust.... They are but as cattle--nay, but they are further astray!"²²

Barbarous lust production, seduction and deification is the rock bottom foundation of capitalism-socialism, and this production, seduction and deification is ensconced in the desire establishment and the megamaze codes for fortification, protection and security.

Those who have incarnated barbarious lusts, have concurred and confederated in this production, seduction and deification, are therefore integrated and united in their battle against the transcendent society, Islam.

How exactly do the barbarians, the Muslim majority and the non-Muslim masses concur and confederate for their integrated and united opposition to the transcendent Islamic society? By "whispers"! They concur and

confederate around the "whispers" of the First Barbarian, The Originator and Source of Barbarism, The Embodiment of Ultimate and Pure Barbarous Lusts, The Infamous "Whisperer," The Great Satan (Shaitan). The "Whisperer,... whispers Into the hearts of Humanity" (emphasis added), and it is that humanity with lustful barbarian bodies who act upon these Satanic "whispers" by concurring and confederating in the production of, seduction by and deification of lust and desire to change the Divine creation and its transcendent society by way of armed forced.

And most certainly I will lead
them astray and excite in them
vain desires, and bid them so that
they...shall alter Allah's creation....

He gives them promises and excites
vain desires in them; and the
Shaitan does not promise but to
deceive.²³

It is the Grand Barbarian "Whisperer" who organizes, structures and impels barbarous lust production, seduction and deification in its most articulate, elaborate, successful and encoded form: capitalism-socialism. In other words, those who incarnate and materialize capitalism-socialism worship Satan, "an enemy" of humanity,²⁴ and therefore battle to vanquish Islam and its Creator.

Satan worship, worship of an "enemy avowed,"²⁵
 is against Divine Command: "Did I not enjoin on you,
 O Children of Adam, that you should not worship Satan.
 Verily he is a plain enemy to you. And that you
 should worship Me (Alone)."²⁶ Those who struggle for
 the Islamic order have obeyed this Command and
 therewith they

...seek refuge
 With the Lord and Cherisher of
 Humanity,

The King (Or Ruler)
 of Humanity,--

The Judge
 of Humanity,--

From the mischief
 Of the Whisperer
 (Of Evil), who withdraws
 After his whisper),--

(The Same) who whispers
 Into the hearts of Humanity,--

Among Jinns
 And among Humanity.²⁷

In sum, substance and essence the struggle between
 the barbarism of capitalism-socialism and the transcen-
 dence of the Islamic society is "but a trial" undergone,
 in the concrete materiality of human existence, by
 barbarian bodies which diseased and hardened hearts are
 open to and inspired by Satan's whispered "suggestions."

That He (Allah) may make the suggestions thrown in by Satan, but a trial for those in whose hearts is a disease...and those whose hearts are hardened. And certainly the wrong-doers are in great opposition....²⁸

Those who struggle for the transcendence of the Islamic society and against the barbarism of capitalism-socialism have undergone, in the concrete materiality of human existence, the humbling of the open heart which establishes the transcendent body Guided to the Straight Path of Islam, the transcendent society.

And that those who have been given Knowledge may know that it (the Qur'an) is the Truth from your Lord and that they may believe therein and their hearts may be made humble (open) to it. And verily Allah is the Guide, of those who believe, to the straight Path.²⁹

Final and lasting victory in this all consuming conflict occurs in the Heavenly context; the context where the transcendent body ultimately prevails irrespective of the exit through which it departs from the earthly context: "Whoever prays to Allah with sincerity for martyrdom, Allah will take him [/her] to the abodes of the martyr's, though he [/she] dies upon his [/her] bed."³⁰

WE HAVE TAKEN THE CONJUNCTURE OF BARBARISM--
 CONQUEST, VIOLENCE, WAR AND PILLAGE--THAT HAS ENGULFED
 THE PLANET IN THE PROCESS OF CLASS FORMATION AND
 ORGANIZATION OF MARX'S WORLD OF CAPITALISM, SOCIALISM,
 COLONIALISM AND IMPERIALISM AND THE MARTYR
 AND THE MASSES--TO ITS CONCLUSION AND COMPLETION:
 MARTYROLOGY, I.E., MASS STRUGGLE AGAINST CLASS.

WE ARE ALL LODGED IN THIS CONJUNCTURE.

CHOOSE HUMANITY! CAPITALISM-SOCIALISM OR
 ISLAM? BARBARISM OR ISLAM? BARBARISM OR THE
 TRANSCENDENT SOCIETY OF THE MARTYR AND THE MASSES?
 CHOOSE HUMANITY! THE LIGHT OF THE BARBAROUS
 BODY ILLUMINATING SATAN'S THRONE OR THE LIGHT
 OF THE TRANSCENDENT BODY ILLUMINATING ALLAH'S
 THRONE?

THE MARTYR HAS ALREADY (BEEN) CHOSEN.

...those that are killed in the way of Allah
have lights suspended from the Throne [of
 ALLAH]....³¹

Notes

¹Karim, Al-Hadis, II, p. 344.

²Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 3, "Al-I-Imran (Family Of Imran)," ayat 157, p. 69.

³Pickthall, Glorious Qur'an, Surah 33, "The Clans," ayat 4, p. 441. The term "man" was changed to the term "human" to arrive at, again, an all inclusive, accurate and literal Qur'anic translation; therewith a virgule and the term "her" were bracketed into the ayat.

⁴Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 8, "Al-Anfal (The Spoils Of War)," ayat 65, p. 184.

⁵Pickthall, Glorious Qur'an, Surah 13, "The Thunder," ayat 11, p. 242.

⁶Karim, Al-Hadis, II, p. 362.

⁷Shakir, Holy Qur'an, Surah 2, "The Cow (Baqarah)," ayat 18, p. 3.

⁸Ibid., ayats 7-12, pp. 2-3; emphasis added.

⁹Ali, The Holy Qur'an, Surah 8, "Anfal, or the Spoils of War," ayat 39, p. 424. The sign "Allah" replaced the sign "God" in this ayat for the reasons stated in note 11 of chap. 12 which include an accurate and literal translation.

¹⁰Shakir, Holy Qur'an, Surah 74, "The Clothed One (Muddassir)," ayat 38, p. 590.

¹¹Karim, Al-Hadis, I, p. 81; this promulgation by the Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him) has also been translated in this work as follows: "Actions are to the [sic] judged by intention" (p. 84).

¹²Ibid., p. 86.

¹³Shakir, Holy Qur'an, Surah 2, "The Cow (Baqarah)," ayat 286, p. 43; see also Surah 23, "The Believers (Moaminun)," ayat 62, p. 329.

¹⁴Ali, The Holy Qur'an, Surah 2, "Baqara, or the Heifer," ayat 286, p. 116.

¹⁵Ibid., Surah 8, "Anfal, or the Spoils of War," ayat 25, p. 421.

¹⁶Shakir, Holy Qur'an, Surah 8, "The Spoils Of War (Anfal)," ayat 24, p. 162. As has been the practice throughout, the term "man" was replaced with the term "humanity"; consequently the pronoun "his" was replaced with the pronoun "its."

¹⁷Ali, The Holy Qur'an, Surah 45, "Jathiya, or Bowing the Knee," ayat 22, p. 1360. Again for the reasons stated thus far, the sign "God" was replaced by the sign "Allah."

¹⁸Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 2, "Al-Baqara (The Cow)," ayats 16 and 21, pp. 2-3. In ayat 21 the term "mankind" was changed to the term "humanity."

¹⁹Pickthall, Glorious Qur'an, Surah 66, "Banning," ayats 10-11, p. 637.

²⁰Ibid., Surah 5, "The Table Spread," ayat 3, p. 101. The term and concept employed, in the four English Qur'anic translations cited herein, to translate the Arabic term and concept "din" is "religion." However, the term and concept "religion" is very far from any sense of equivalency with the Qur'anic term and concept "din." "Religion" occupies a very small and restrictive denotive and connotive space compared to the expansive and varied denotive and connotive space occupied by "din."

This lack of equivalency was indicated by al-Attas, Syed M.A., "Islam: The Concept of Religion And The Foundation of Ethics and Morality," Typewritten, n.p., n.d. Here we are informed that "din" has four primary significations: "(1) indebtedness; (2) submissiveness; (3) judicious power; (4) natural inclination or tendency" (p.2). It is apparent and obvious that "religion" does not occupy or cover the denotive and connotive space engendered by the four primary significations of "din." In his discussion of these four primary significations al-Attas says, "the very notion of law and order and justice and authority and social cultural refinement inherent in all these significations derived from the concept din must surely presuppose the existence of a mode or manner of acting consistent with what is reflected in the law, the order, the justice, the authority and social cultural refinement--a mode or manner of acting, or a state of being considered as normal in relation to them; so that this state of being is a state that is customary or habitual. From here, then, we can see the logic behind the derivation of the other primary signification of the concept din as custom, habit, disposition or natural tendency" (pp. 3-4).

Given the four "primary significations" of the term and concept "din," the term and concept "religion" was deleted from this ayat and the more complete and totalizing term and concept "transcendent society" was inserted in its place; "transcendent society" signifies and encompasses the "indebtedness;...submissiveness;...judicious power;...natural inclination or tendency"--"a mode or manner of acting, or a state of being considered as normal...", i.e., the transcendent human body,--of Islam.

Thus, we have said in the main text that the transcendent body, an incarnate mode of acting and being, struggles against barbarous human relations and affairs and struggles for transcendent human relations and affairs, i.e., it struggles for Islam, or, said in the language of al-Attas, the transcendent body struggles against what is inconsistent with its "natural inclination or tendency" and struggles for what is "consistent" with its "natural inclination or tendency."

²¹Ali, The Holy Qur'an, Surah 82, "Infitar, or The Cleaving Asunder," ayat 6 and 9, p. 1700. In ayat 6 the term "man" was deleted and the term "Humanity" was inserted in its place. Once again, we are endeavoring to overcome the slant and narrowness of the term "man."

²²Pickthall, Glorious Qur'an, Surah 25, "The Criterion (Of Right And Wrong)," ayats 43-44, p. 374.

²³Shakir, Holy Qur'an, Surah 4, "Women (Nisa)," ayats 119-120, p. 87.

²⁴Ali, The Holy Qur'an, Surah 35, "Fatir, or The Originator of Creation; or Malaika, or The Angels," ayat 6, p. 1154.

²⁵Ibid., Surah 36, "Ya-Sin (being Abbreviated Letters)," ayat 60, p. 1184.

²⁶Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 36, "Ya-Sin (Ya-Sin)," ayats 60-61, p. 443.

²⁷Ali, The Holy Qur'an, Surah 114, "Nas, or Humanity," ayats 1-6, p. 1810. To begin, the title of this surah was changed from "Mankind" to "Humanity"; "mankind" was deleted from ayats 1, 2, 3, and 5 and "Humanity" was inserted in its place; in ayat 6 "Men" was changed to "Humanity."

Attention must be called to ayat 4. The "Whisperer," Satan/Shaitan, is identified with the masculine pronoun "his"; this designation of "the Whisperer" may be a function of grammar and not necessarily a function of the actual gender of "the Whisperer." What is known for certain is that Iblis/The Arrogant One/Satan is created "from fire" (Surah 7, "A'raf, or The Heights," ayat 12, p. 343), and therefore even if "the Whisperer" were a he, "his" gender characteristics, if any, may not be in any way similar to human male gender characteristics.

Finally, in ayat 3--which reads in the original, "The God (or Judge) Of Mankind,"--the sign "Judge" was retained, but the signs "God" and "or" were deleted along with the parenthesis in order to accomplish a more accurate literal translation and transcend the polytheistic possibilities indwelling in "God."

²⁸ Al-Hilali and Khan, Meaning of Qur'an, Surat 22, "Ul-Hajj (The Pilgrimage), ayat 53, p. 337. Again, see note 1 of chap. 12 for the discussion on the usage of the masculine pronoun "He" as a replacement for the proper name Allah. The phrase "far opposition" was changed to "great opposition." "Far" has a standard usage which entails a specification of distance; "great" has a standard usage which entails a comparison in degree, power, number, intensity, etc. Hence, "great opposition" would seem to better convey the ayat's meaning.

²⁹ Ibid., ayat 54.

³⁰ Karim, Al-Hadis, II, p. 350. The profundity and importance of the ultimate passion in martyrology is readily discernible in this the Prophet Muhammad's (PBUH) statement. It is to be noted that a bracketed virgule and the term "her" were inserted into the Prophet's (PBUH) statement. This was done to stress the point that the use of the masculine pronoun "his" in no way restricts the ultimate passion for martyrdom solely to men. Millions upon millions of Muslim women have not only desired martyrdom, they have, indeed, been martyred. Sincere passions and desires for martyrdom flow in and through Muslim men and women. Muslim men martyrological script of the transcendent order. It is only in the strictures of grammar that martyrdom may appear as a singular male achievement.

³¹ Ibid., p. 348.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This list provides bibliographic data for titles referred to in the Notes or in the text.

WRITINGS BY MARX ON REVOLUTION

- Marx, Karl. Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production. Vol. I. Translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling and Edited by Frederick Engels. New York: International Publishers, 1967.
- _____. Capital: The Process of Circulation of Capital. Vol. II. Edited by F. Engels and I. Lasker. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1974.
- _____. Capital: The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole. Vol. III. Edited by Frederick Engels, New York: International Publishers, 1967.
- _____. The Class Struggles in France 1848-1850. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- _____. A Contribution To The Critique Of Political Economy. Edited by Maurice Dobb. New York: International Publishers, 1972.
- _____. Critique of the Gotha Programme. Edited by C.P. Dutt. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- _____. The Economic And Philosophic Manuscripts Of 1844. Edited by Dirk J. Struik and Translated by Martin Milligan. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- _____. The 18th Brumaire Of Louis Bonaparte. New York: International Publishers, 1981.
- _____. Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy. Translated by Martin Nicolaus. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.

- _____. Karl Marx: Early Writings. Edited by
Quintin Hoare and Translated by Rodney
Livingstone and Gregor Benton. New York:
Vintage Books, 1975.
- _____. Karl Marx: Pre-Capitalist Economic
Formation. Translated by Jack Cohen and Edited by
E.J. Hobsbawn. New York: International
Publishers, 1980.
- _____. Karl Marx: Surveys From Exile (Political
Writings). Edited by David Fernbach, New York:
Vintage Books, 1974.
- _____. The Poverty of Philosophy: Answer to
the "Philosophy of Poverty" by M. Proudhon. Moscow:
Progress Publishers, 1975.
- _____. Theories Of Surplus-Value. 3 Parts.
Translated by Emile Burns and Edited by S.
Ryazanskaya. Moscow: Progress Publishers,
1963-71.
- _____. Wage-Labour and Capital & Value, Price
and Profit. New York: International Publishers,
1933 and 1935.

WRITINGS BY MARX AND ENGELS ON REVOLUTION

- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. The German Ideology.
Part 1. Edited by C.J. Arthur. New York:
International Publishers, 1977.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. The Holy Family, or
Critique of Critical Criticism. Translated by
Richard Dixon and Clemens Dutt. Moscow:
Progress Publishers, 1980.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. Karl Marx Frederick
Engels: Collected Works, 40 Vols. New York:
International Publishers, 1975-.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. Karl Marx and Frederick
Engels: Selected Works. 3 Vols. Moscow:
Progress Publishers, 1973.

- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. Manifesto Of The Communist Party. Translated by Samuel Moore. Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. Marx Engels: On Colonialism. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. Marx Engels: Pre-Capitalist Socio-Economic Formations. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1979.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. Marx Engels: On Religion. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. Marx Engels: Selected Correspondence. Translated by I. Lasker and Edited by S. W. Ryazanskaya. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1975.

WRITING BY MARX AND LENIN ON REVOLUTION

- Marx, Karl and Lenin, V.I. Civil War In France: The Paris Commune. New York: International Publishers, 1976.

WRITINGS BY OTHERS ON THE MARXIAN REVOLUTION

- Acton, H.B. The Illusion Of The Epoch. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.
- Althusser, Louis. Lenin And Philosophy and other Essays. Translated by Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.
- Aron, Raymond. The Opium Of The Intellectual. Translated by Terence Kilmartin. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1957.
- Avineri, Shlomo. The Social And Political Thought of Karl Marx. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

- Clastres, Pierre. Society Against The State. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Urizen Books, 1977.
- Cohen, G. A. Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1973.
- Draper, Hal. Karl Marx's Theory Of Revolution. 2 Vols. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977.
- Gramsci, Antonio. Selections From The Prison Notebooks Of Antonio Gramsci. Edited and Translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- Hook, Sidney. Marx And The Marxists. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1955.
- Hunt, Richard N. The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels: Marxism and Totalitarian Democracy, 1818-1850. 2 Vols. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1974-84.
- Lenin, V.I. The State and Revolution: The Marxist Theory of The State and the Tasks of the Proletariat in the Revolution. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977.
- Lukacs, Georg. History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1976.
- McLellan, David. The Thought of Karl Marx: An Introduction. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Mandelbaum, Maurice. "Social Laws." Philosophical Analysis And History. Edited by William H. Dray. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Mao, Tse-Tung. Chairman Mao Talks To The People Talks and Letters: 1956-1971. Edited by Stuart Schram. New York: Pantheon Books, 1974.

- _____. Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-Tung.
 Edited by Stuart R. Shhram. New York: Bantam
 Books, 1967.
- Miliband, Ralph. Marxism And Politics. London:
 Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. London: Oxford
 University Press, 1956.
- Ollman, Bertell. Alienation: Marx's Conception Of Man
 In Capitalist Society. 2nd ed. Cambridge:
 Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Plekhanov, Georg V. Fundamental Problems of Marxism.
 New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- Popper, Karl R. The Poverty Of Historism. New York:
 Harper & Row, 1961.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. Classes in Contemporary Capitalism.
 Translated by David Fernback. London:
 Verso, 1978.
- _____. Facism And Dictatorship. Translated
 by Judith White and Edited by Jennifer and
 Timothy O'Hagan. London: Verso, 1979.
- _____. Political Power and Social Classes.
 Translated by Timothy O'Hagan. London:
 Verso, 1978.
- Schram, Stuart. Mao Tse-Tung. Baltimore, Maryland:
 Penguin Books, 1975.
- _____. The Political Thought Of Mao Tse-tung.
 New York: Prager Publishers, 1977.
- Scott, James C. "Hegemony and the Peasantry." Politics &
 Society 7 (1977): 267-296.
- _____. The Moral Economy of The Peasant:
 Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia.
 New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

- _____. "Protest and Profanation: Agrarian Revolt and the Little Tradition: Parts I and II" Theory and Society 4 (1977): 1-38 and 211-246.
- _____. "Revolution in The Revolution: Peasants And Commissars." Theory and Society 7 (1979): 97-134.
- Trotsky, Leon. The Permanent Revolution and Results And Prospects. New York: Pathfinder, 1969.
- Tucker, Robert. Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Turner, Bryan S. Weber and Islam: A critical study. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

WRITINGS ON MARTYRDOM

- Ali, Abdullah Yusuf, trans. The Holy Qur'an. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al Arabia, 1968.
- Al-Hilali, Muhammad Taqui-ud-Din and Khan, Muhammad Muhsin, trans. Explanatory English Translation of the Meaning of the Holy Qur'an. Chicago, Illinois: Kazi Publications, 1977.
- Karim, Al-Haj Maulana Fazlul, trans. Al-Hadis (Containing Sayings doings [sic] and Teachings of the Holy Prophet and events before and after Resurrection). 4 vols. Lahore, Pakistan: The Book House, n.d. Vol. II.
- Pickthall, Muhammad Marmaduke, trans. The Meaning Of The Glorious Qur'an. New York: Muslim World League, 1977.
- Shakir, M.H., trans. Holy Qur'an. New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an, 1982.

MAINSTREAM BOURGEOIS
SOCIOLOGICAL WRITINGS

- Coser , Lewis A. Masters of Sociological Thought:
Ideas in Historical and Social Context. 2nd ed.
New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Rosenberg, Morris, eds.
The Language of Social Research: A Reader in
the Methodology of Social Research. New York:
Free Press, 1955.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure.
New York: Free Press, 1968.
- Nisbet, Robert A. The Sociological Tradition. New York:
Basic Books, 1966.
- Parsons, Talcott. The System of Modern Society.
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall,
1971.

HEGELIAN SOCIOLOGICAL-
PHILOSOPHICAL WRITINGS

- Hegel, Georg W. F. Hegel's Philosophy Of Right.
Translated by T. M. Knox. London:
Oxford University Press, 1967.
- _____. The Philosophy Of History.
Translated by J. Sibree. New York:
Dover Publications, 1956.