

Correspondence with Western professors

After the publication of my article "Marxism Today", a curious correspondence arose.

Tamas Krausz writes:

"Friends, it's old and simple theory of state capitalism, it follows to nowhere, plus support of new capitalism".

Krausz simply ignorant, he did not read Russian authors, so he considers the theory of state capitalism in the USSR like unpretentious.

But "something native is heard in the long songs of coachman": "Your genetics are pouring water on the mill of imperialism!"

I write:

"Dear friends, it is very easy to say "or, it's old theory..." It's a little more difficult to try to understand what I wrote. As for other non "state capitalism" "theories" - they do not lead to anywhere, but morons don't understand it. To tell me truth I am tired of illiterate foreign dunces

Marxism is old theory too and a lot of bourgeoisie morons write that it doesn't lead to anywhere. And we see like "communist" party of Russian federation supports powers, like Trotskyist parties serve Washington, like "socialists" in France rule like capitalists, like all other left groups in the world can't do anything during tens of years. Useless lefts!"

Krausz writes:

"No, no. Illiteracy is hypothesis, everything is capitalism in the 20th century. You should read something else in this subject too. Really this theory of state capitalism is not only old, but too simply. Read Marx on state socialism and will understand stalinism. To repeat all the time the same hypothesis is very boring and ideologically also very problematic. Do not get offended. Prefer thinking on it. Thanks. I read you for a long time. Respect other's opinion too.

I answer:

"No, no. illiteracy is not hypothesis. I proved it in my article on example of US professor. And I SAW different left groups and "scientists" in UK, Argentina, France, German, Canada etc. I wrote their stupid books with the claim to scientific character.

You should read something else in this subject too. Really all other theories besides the theory of state capitalism are not only old, but too simply. Read Marx more and may be you will understand smth. To repeat all the time the same hypothesis is very boring and ideologically also very problematic. Do not get offended.

And I'll be glad to respect other's opinions too. If they are not stupid. But I don't see in your word any opinion! Only empty words about nothing.

Sorry... do you really think that I didn't read Marx on state socialism??

Our group learned scientific communism, Marx politeconomy, philosophy and historical materialism when we were students. Then we about 10 years learned it once more - to beat "soviet" professors. And we beat them easy. So please don't be bulge"

Then Krausz pulls out something, but not arguments against some fragments in my article, but old, eaten arguments against the theory of state capitalism in the USSR:

"The old state socialist regime was not profit-oriented market economy opposite to the new capitalism with semifascist face. Nobody could inherit the state ownership that is why the upper stratum of bureaucracy had to change regime (system). Or Thatcher and Kádár are the representatives of very different historical, economic, social and political systems in principle and in practice with some similar features. The core of a historical phenomenon can be found in the difference. Read Lukács on the "overwhelming moment" in Ontology without bulge.

I answer:

"The fact that there was no profit-oriented market economy in the USSR is an old propagandistic song. Any capitalist monopoly destroys the market, this was noted by Ricardo yet. You need to know the economy of the USSR, profit was the most important indicator in the economy. Well, but no one has yet proved that there was socialism in the USSR.

The right of inheritance is deeply secondary. But you do not understand the situation. Capital is not a pot that the son inherits from his father. Capital is a social attitude. It consists in the fact that the son of an elite actor becomes an elite actor, the son of a KGB general becomes a KGB general, the son of the 1st secretary of the regional committee becomes a member of the CPSU Central Committee.

Of course, there was a different situation the UK and Hungary. But the situation was different in Great Britain and Argentina. You need to understand the variety of forms of capitalism.

As for Lucasc, of course, I read him about 20 years ago. He is stalinist and made a lot of mistakes. And you have to read Ilyenkov, Batischev, Kessidy, Mamardashvily, Vazyulin if you want to understand smth.

I appeal to you as a deaf person - you have not refuted any part of my article!
I stop writing. I don't like those who is bulge, but can't think”.

Of course, Krauss could not stand it, he decided that his word must necessarily be a last resort. He writes:
“You are the big mixer. Nothing exists except for your dogma. Plan economy and the was an antithesis. Market economy without unemployment??? You do not prove anything. You do not understand even the logic of profit production. After that no sense to discuss with you, really”.

The unhappy Krauss has nothing but abuse. "Planned economy, planned economy ..." He just does not notice my words about Ricardo. Since he is unable to understand the evidence, he writes that I have not proved anything. Yes, and that was to prove. I just showed that he has no arguments! He does not even understand that I have not written a word about unemployment! So I understand, he does not know, that in 1986 there were 1.7 million unemployed in the USSR, but in market Japan with its institute of lifelong hiring unemployed was not at all.

The author of the article, professor Zarembka, whose article I criticized, also wrote to me.

“Boris, thank you for your extended reactions to my short piece which I have read fully. I understand that English is not your native language but I could understand you. Keep in mind that I was only given 1000 words, so many ideas could not be elaborated. I will focus on three reactions I have:

1. I do not disagree with your interpretation of Bernie Sanders, but the point from an American perspective is his ability to maintain that he is a "socialist", while many were not bothered with that. If you lived as long as I have here, you might understand its importance, even if he himself merely passed his support onto Clinton. Anti-socialism/anti-communism has a long ideological history here. As to the youth, if we do not respect them and their energy, we are lost.
 2. You make an interesting comment that nuclear weapons are paper-tigers, like Mao said. You cite something from Engels, but I don't know where that is. In any case, could you explain more how you think nuclear weapons are now useless? I do think Israel is quite capable of actually using it and, frankly, I don't think the rest of the nation states would do more than complain, even if forcefully, and perhaps do some sanction.
 3. I believe you misunderstand Luxemburg and thus you are in a long line of those who dismiss her. I could send you my published opinion, if interested.
- All the best, Paul”.

I answer:

«Dear Paul, thank you for your letter. You are right, I am not good hand at English and have no practice in 18 years, so I am glad that you have caught me.

1. Not so long ago I read a book in which the articles of the leaders of many Communist parties of the world are collected about what the proletariat is. This question was asked of him by the Communist Party of the Russian Federation (CPRF). I was amazed at the ignorance (illiteracy) of the leaders of the Communist Parties. Now 2018, but they do not know what the proletariat is and can not distinguish it from the workers! They correctly identify the doctor in hospital, engineer and worker with the hired character of labor. But they do not understand that workers differ from engineers and doctors in the content of labor. And CPRF too.

So they don't understand Marxism, they don't understand society dynamic: socialism is a movement towards overcoming the old social division of labor, primarily the division of labor into the mental and physical.

Lenin repeatedly stressed that the Bolsheviks are a party of the working class, not intellectuals, not peasants. He called the working class a hegemon because socialism and communism are a fundamental interest precisely for the working class. The intelligentsia will not disappear under communism, but the depersonalizing labor of the worker must disappear, and with it the working class.

Therefore Marx wrote that "all the oppressed strata of society must realize the interests of the working class as their own." We are with working class so WE ARE NOT LOST.

And what do the Western Lefts do? They have no close ties with the working class, but they add to cart, recruit a female movement, buggers, Jews, hippies, students etc. and even schoolchildren. I saw it in Argentina, in Netherlands, in UK, in France... We saw youth with it' energy in fascist maidan in Ukraine, the youth jumped, as crazy, and shouted: "Russians and Jews - on knives!", "Russian - on the gallows!" "Who does not jump - that is Russian!"
You see we in Russia are tired from Western stupid primitive.

Of course Sanders may think about himself that he is socialist. But why??? Did he organized any strike, blocked of highways, did he create any workers committee at any plant and so on, what is his PRACTICE? Only bla-bla-bla? Mitterand and Holland are socialists too. And what? Many people in Russia think about themselves that they are communists.

But the PRACTICE OBJECTIVE RESULT of Sanders' activity was help to Hillary Clinton.

May be, the word "socialism" is new for US. But... how to say... It is not great attainment, to my mind. It is word only. And I don't respect energetic youth with empty heads. The world is not France, and today is not 1968.

2. I didn't wrote that nuclear weapons are paper tigers. Of course it is dangerous, of course there is problem of using of it by terrorists etc. I didn't wrote that nuclear weapons are "useless". But, at first, nuclear weapons make the third world war impossible in view of nuclear winter. At second it gives only possibility to save itself for North Korea from US aggression.

As for Engels you may be sure, he wrote the words about war, that I repeated. Lenin repeated such words too, in his wife Nadejda Krupskaya' stories she writes he said that in the future "the war will become so destructive that it will in general become impossible". I live in military Ural so I know Russia may annihilate USA during 2 hours without any possibility of any defense as well as USA may annihilate Russia.

It is evident that Israel is the same fascist county as USA, look 2nd attached file. I mean: the idea of superiority of the US and Jews over all nations of the world, unprecedented aggression, strangling freedom of speech, if not with the help of prisons, but with the help of layoffs, the killing of children by policemen, police violence, etc.

Several Israel journalists wrote that Israel was ready to use nuclear weapon against Iran. To my opinion it is only words. Of course, every normal man wants sanctions – because of Israel aggression. But you see it is impossible, USA will stop any attempts of sanctions.

I know several Trotskyist groups that every year write resolutions against Israel. Of course, all of them are useless. I think it is such a game.

To my mind one is to choose other method: to publish truth about Israel, step by step. And not in newspapers or on TV, but in leaflets.

On the other hand there are workers in Israel. So we are to think how to support class fight in Israel, it is only way.

3. As for Luxemburg I agree with Lenin. I wrote two words about her, if you don't agree, please, write, what my words are wrong from your point of view and why.

And have you read Lenin's criticism of Rosa Luxemburg? What can you object to Lenin?

But if you may send me your article, I'll be glad.

Best wishes, your Boris Ikhlov

PS. Because you selected only 3 points, I hope you are agree with all other fragments from my article, especially main fragments.

PPS.

In the early 90's I corresponded with one of the leaders of the American Negro movement Ajamu Dillahant. I wrote to her that it would be nice if the Negro movement closed in the labor movement. After all, the problem of the blacks of the United States is a particular thing, their struggle is the fight against the consequence while preserving the cause. Ajamu stopped her correspondence".

Paul writes:

"Attached is my defense of Luxemburg. A prior work of mine that is cited includes as an appendix the first translation from Russian of Lenin's marginal notes on Luxemburg's book (by James Lawler). Lenin, to the best of my knowledge, never wrote a coherent criticism of her 'The Accumulation of Capital'. Yes, Lenin said she was 'wrong' and wrote some private letters praising criticisms of her, but without saying clearly why. In 1915 he merely cites in publication Bauer, Eckstein and Pannekoek in support of a statement that she is wrong, but without indicating which portions of what they wrote are correct, less than correct, or in error.

If you know something that I don't know about Lenin's writing on Luxemburg's book, please let me know. Otherwise, his claim that she was 'wrong' really is not worth much discussion. If she is wrong, it is not because Lenin said so.

On Sanders, you are correct but the problem is not only or mainly about Sanders' personality. What I was trying to convey about Sanders and about youth is that the U.S. is in movement, politically, and there is opposition to fascism here which would require much too much discussion to be included in that short piece.

I don't much like reference to 'Jews' as such. Because, as you point out, there are working-class Jews in Israel. If I were to accept 'Jews' as a category, then also each and every other religion as if coherent. 'Zionists' is better. But even that reference disguises the materiality of capitalist expansion. One comment I recently read actually says that Israel is a

fundamentalist Christian (!) state, disguised with its 'Jewish' reference point. Even this still makes religion the reference point in its effort to describe the main power behind this tiny state of a few million.

On nuclear weapons, I am not sure I understand you. Do you agree or disagree that nuclear weapons COULD truly be used, say, by Israel? I am not asking about 'threat'. I am asking about DROPPING the bomb from a plane or firing a nuclear missile. I am saying it is truly possible and thus must be taken account of.

Thanks, Paul"

I answer:

"Of course, the total use of nuclear weapons is impossible because of the nuclear winter. That is, the US, Russia, China, India will not be able to apply it. Britain and France, as NATO members, will not be able either.

North Korea is not going to use nuclear weapons until the US will attack.

Pakistan and Israel are the last in the list. These are small countries with a small amount of nuclear weapons. Their use of nuclear weapons in small wars means their self-destruction. But the threat of use is deterrent for the Arab countries.

Of course, we may and must cry about Israel' nuclear weapon – to compare with North Korea. But, to my mind, it is not first task. First task is Israel aggression.

As for Luxemburg. Of course, Lenin didn't criticize "The Accumulation of Capital" especially, his articles are about market, about Luxemburg position about automatic death of capitalism, about her position on national question etc. We studied it when we were students, so I will send you everything, but not quickly - you see, a lot of work, we must finish smth.

I looked through your article and should like to make several remarks.

So I ask you once more to send me, if it is possible, your text in other format, not pdf but word.

As for Sanders - you are right, modern processes in USA are radical and complete, so I shall be glad if you tell about the situation in US in details.

Sincerely, Boris"

Paul didn't send me the article in other format.

The professor cites in the article about Luxembourg such personalities, as Raya Dunaevskaya, Tugan-Baranovsky and others, gives their opinions like the truth. While, for example, Lenin thoroughly criticized Tugan-Baranovsky. Tugan-Baranovsky simply did not understand the Marxian scheme of simple reproduction.

The reader, you see - the professor ignores my questions, my requests, he does not want to answer!

A narrow specialist is like a flux - the completeness of him is one-sided. Zarembka specializes in Rosa Luxemburg, he can not understand anything else. But the American professor does not know the elementary things. He does not know how Lenin criticized Rosa Luxemburg!

Imagine how low the scientific level of professors in the West fell. Lenin laughed at the theories of Rosa Luxemburg. He completely refuted them. Of course, Luxemburg is a revolutionary, but her theory speaks of the automatic death of capitalism. Luxemburg and Sismondi rigidly link the existence of capitalism to the presence of external rank. This, of course, is nonsense.

«Capitalist production in general, writes Marx, does not exist without foreign trade. But if we assume normal annual reproduction at a given scale, we thereby represent the case in such a way that foreign trade only replaces native objects with objects of another use or natural form, and it does not affect the ratio of value, and therefore, , in which two categories are exchanged for each other: the means of production and the means of consumption, as well as the relations of constant capital, variable capital, and surplus-value, that the value of the product can be decomposed into of each of these two categories.. Therefore, attracting foreign trade to the analysis of the annually reproducible value of the product, without giving anything new either for the problem or for its resolution, can only bring about confusion. Therefore, it is necessary to completely disengage from it» ("Capital", vol. II, Ch. XX, section XII).

The Luxemburg mistake is primitive, elementary, but Western professors raised her musty theory to the banner.

This is understandable - her theory is directed against Lenin, against Marx!

I did not correspond with professor Cyrus Bina, but he also congratulated Marx on his birthday.

He particularly writes: "Marx's grasp of capitalist competition and his distinction of *capital* from *landed property* can be found early on in *The Poverty of Philosophy* (1847), where Marx chides Pierre-Joseph Proudhon on two major issues. First is on capitalist competition by which the process of concentration and centralization manifest itself and the accumulation of capital leads to class polarization. Here Marx capitalizes on a synthetic analysis in which *competition* and *integration*, just as *space* and *time* in Einstein's theory are synthetically entwined; neither competition nor integration

(i.e., concentration and centralization of capital) has separate standing. This view of competition is what Marx employed in his *Capital* (1867), some two decades later”.

Thank you. Hence, Marx agreed with Proudhon. Although the book of Marx is directed precisely at the criticism of Proudhon. It also turns out that competition and integration are like space-time. Those, in the early 20th century, banks, united, did not destroy small banks, and cohabited with them... Unless in the 80s, the consumer products of the USA did not find that the antimonopoly legislation does not work... The professor forgot what cartel collusion is? Einstein turns in a coffin as a propeller: time and space devour, cancel each other!

Zarembka is a specialist in Luxembourg, Bina is an expert on Proudhon, for which he receives money.

Further, Bina is smashing the Marxists, who buried theories of the value of Marx. I wonder where he dug up those. “These same Marxists also habitually refer to the present epoch as neoliberalism thus generating a twofold error: (1) identifying the United States (and the epoch of Pax Americana, 1945-1979) with neoliberalism – a euphemistic label for globalization – and in consequence (2) papering over the loss of American hegemony and irreversible shift in the balance of global power. In other words, these radical scholars (along their liberal counterparts in the apologist circles), perhaps inadvertently, lionize the leaders of the now defunct era and misrepresent the nature of international relations of today. On this account too, in my opinion, Marx’s legacy should be crystal clear by now”.

I.e. Bina is not limited of mixing Proudhon with Marx. He assures us that there is no neo-liberalism in Russia! He assures us that the US for Europe does not knock free trade out of Europe. At the same time, the US allegedly does not impose strict protectionist measures.

It turns out that after the collapse of the USSR, the US did not become a world hegemon, a world gendarme.

Bina still writes that there are crazy people abroad US who are afraid, as if the US hegemony, that is, fascism of the United States, may be disappeared!

Is it clear why Bina is a professor?

At the end, Bina appears before us almost Blake:

«The glimmer of hope is in the air. The heavens point to a singularity. The two hundred candles are burning intensely against gentle wind in Highgate Cemetery (North London), while birds of spring are singing in unison: “Workers of the World Unite ...” Happy Birthday Karl – Happy Birthday!»

Bina writes quite seriously. In Russia, such a phrase would cause Homeric laughter. Bina does not ask what the working people think, he asks heaven and birds. The workers themselves do not talk about solidarity, but Bina's birds sing about it.

So that by... Both correspondences confirm my "hypothesis" that the Western Lefts are little educated and can't think. Most of them are morons.

Otherwise, how could capitalism tolerate Marxists? Such "Marxists", on the contrary, benefit for capitalism, so they have the title of professors.