

MARXISM TODAY

Boris Ikhlov, Russian political union "Worker"

Professor of economics Paul Zaremka (State University of New York at Buffalo) wrote the article to the bicentenary of the birth of Marx, fragments of which we will consider in sequence.

1) «**Karl Marx's intellectual legacy** is so broad that different people are able to be attracted to the aspects most useful to them, not only for scholars but, more importantly, for working people».

To our great regret, it is the working class and other detachments of the proletariat with low incomes that are least familiar with the works of Marx. I will say more: activists of the left groups are practically unfamiliar with the books of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Plekhanov, not to mention the books of Ilyenkov or Lorenzo Vall, Lukacs or Antonio Labriola, Gramsci or Moses Hess, Cassidy or Tommaso Campanella.

The reason is clear: all this science is not required by the worker during his production. All that he read in the off-hours is eroded from his head when he, for example, is standing at the conveyor. The production period is the most important for the worker. If a worker has been working on the same detail for 3 years, then, in the process of disaggregation (in Hegel terms), the same detail, in lieu of Marxism, is formed in his head, roughly speaking.

I'm not talking about individual representatives, like Spinoza, Joseph Dietzgen, Khalturin, Shlyapnikov or Myasnikov, it's about the working class as a whole.

Today's strike is a demand for more favorable conditions for the sale of labor force. The question of taking power by the working class is not worth it. As for Russia, this is what workers say: "In order to take power, we need a higher education, which we do not have. Secondly, we do not want responsibility."

Workers understand what they say. Let me remind you, Lenin pointed out that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only violence and not so much violence. It presupposes such working class that can take ruling of the entire economy of the country in their hands.

The main principle of Soviet power is the control of workers from below at a state official of any level, including Stalin. But complex production can not be controlled without higher education. Therefore, illiterate workers entrusted both control and management to the same state officials. Therefore, not workers controlled Stalin, but Stalin controlled workers.

The second principle of Soviet power is the modest payment of state officials. But Stalin abolished the Lenin' party maximum.

The XII Congress of the RKP of Bolsheviks in 1923 (without Lenin) decided that the dictatorship of the proletariat is expressed in the form of a dictatorship of the party. Meanwhile, in his fundamental work "The State and the Revolution," Lenin wrote: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is expressed in the form of Soviet power, in the form found by the workers themselves."

Thus, there was no Soviet power in the USSR, nor did the dictatorship of the proletariat. Plekhanov also pointed out that the dictatorship of the class as the sky from the earth is different from the dictatorship of a handful of revolutionaries. Marx wrote that a socialist state can only be the dictatorship of the proletariat. If this dictatorship was not there, then there was no socialism either. There was no such absurdity as the "degenerated workers' state". Re-born as far as?? Rebirth in what??

So Lenin in 1919 said: "It is unlikely that our grandchildren will see socialism ..."

In 1999, workers of the Vyborg Pulp and Paper Mill seized the plant. They were threatened with massive layoffs. The workers chose the director. The main reason for the defeat: 1) the workers shifted the management of the plant to the director and his team, 2) the workers shifted the leadership of the protest to the chairman of the trade union committee and his team. The authorities arranged a hunt for the director, and the chairman of the trade union committee was simply bribed.

One is to understand, that contradiction can not be withdraw (снято) by destroying one of its sides - the bourgeoisie. The second side, the workers and peasants, will inevitably restore it - from itself. What we saw in the USSR. The privileged existence of a layer of Soviet managers gradually determined their bourgeois consciousness. So working class must eliminated not bourgeoisie only, but itself.

So at first capital must demand workers with higher education - at the level of a single, special and universal.

Everybody knows Marx frase: the level of development of a capitalist is determined by the extent to which science has become a productive force. But the phrase refers not only to instruments. But also to the workers!

Let us note that, consequently, oppression is not only the usurpation of the management of surplus value by a narrow social stratum, the bourgeois or the "Soviet" power, but in labor itself, as Marx wrote, a heavy, monotonous, stupefying, depersonalizing physical labor.

As one knows, both the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks understood that Russia was a backward country that was not mature for the socialist revolution.

Lenin reasoned thus: on the one hand, the productive forces determine the relations of production. But who does forbid the revolutionary transformed superstructure to grow into a backward basis?

On the other hand, Russia is a weak link in the chain of imperialism. If this link is broken, then socialist revolutions will break out in developed countries. Then the developed proletariat of these countries will come to the aid of the backward Russian proletariat.

However, the world revolution did not happen. The productive forces in the developed countries, too, were not ripe for a change of system. Therefore, in the USSR, backward productive forces led the production relations in accordance with themselves. What became apparent in 1991.

People in China are more honest. In 1956, at the 8th CPC Congress it was stated that there was state capitalism in China. Further, we assumed the Great leap from capitalism to communism, bypassing socialism. But in 1976, Deng Xiaoping began restructuring and China remained capitalistic. Although today Comrade Xi Jinping tells the world about socialism with a Chinese face.

Obviously, until the working class at the level of the general does not feel such oppression, it is not necessary to speak of a socialist revolution.

But this does not mean that the lefts must wait for this moment with folded hands.

2) «For capitalist enterprises in Brazil, Kenya, India, Spain, the US or anywhere, labor power reflects the reality that workers sell their labor hours to capitalists and they are told what to do without any democratic input from them. Workers don't care what they produce: They need the money. Capitalists don't care either: They want profit. Workers only receive as compensation the equivalent, in some currency, of the laboring time needed to produce the commodities they can get to subsist, at whatever level. The remainder in laboring hours that the capitalist keeps is "surplus value," the fundamental concept for Marx».

I would like to clarify. If you remove the extra hours (to short the working day!), capitalist will still make a profit. Because the worker produces surplus value not only in extra hours, but every minute.

Let me remind you, Marx wrote in "Capital" that mass, combined labor causes enthusiasm, thus, the workers care. However, today the enthusiasm has dried up. The worker really does not care, even if he creates a spaceship.

On the other hand, the capitalist care - he is driven by competition. Therefore, the capitalists organize the "democratic contribution" of the workers. For example, on Citroen, mailboxes are hung everywhere, where workers can omit their letters with proposals concerning production.

In this regard, it is worth noting the Russian bourgeoisie. Its specificity is that, first, it is comprador. Secondly, it achieves an average profit rate not, for example, by introducing new technologies, improving the organization of production, etc., but by freezing or retaining the wages of workers. Workers at the same time do not protest in their majority.

3) «The actual life of people around the world differs greatly. Some do better, some do worse, and a fraction may find some satisfaction in their work. But almost all products we consume anywhere, within our deep capitalism, have been produced by workers who are merely hired hands. Marx's work mentions workers being thereby "alienated," and this has been chosen by some for an emphasis. But he also develops concepts to explain how capitalists are able to appropriate ever more surplus value. He explains the motivation for technology changes experienced much more in capitalism than in prior societies. He describes the forces around the accumulation of capital, and the division of surplus value into industrial profits, rent and interest. He provides analyses for financial expansion. He even addresses environmental issues appropriate to his time so that we can find those insights useful today, and exhibited a foresighted analysis of the US Civil War as it was developing».

It should be emphasized that the capitalist spends net industrial profits on depreciation of equipment, advertising, new technologies, expansion of production. He is unable to eat surplus value after taxes! For example, a billionaire like Carnegie did not spend much on himself, walked in an old suit, drove a cheap car.

In contrast, Stalin lived in such a way that any sheikh would envy: first-class cooks, the best doctors, the best cars, the best sanatoria ...

Similarly, the profits of any Soviet enterprise were spent: taxes, depreciation, new technologies, expansion of production.

Capitalism is such a mode of production in which the labor force becomes a commodity. It was this definition that resolved the contradiction of the old political economy, which did not know where the profit comes from. After all, the

goods are sold at a cost, with an equivalent exchange, profits can not arise. Nevertheless, it exists. Marx dialectically resolved the contradiction: a new type of commodity, labor power, generates surplus value in exchange.

Hence we see that there was one more identity between the USSR and the capitalist countries: there was a hiring institute in the USSR, labor power was also a commodity. The only difference was that its buyer was not a separate capitalist, but an aggregate capitalist, represented by the state.

The absence of a labor market should not be embarrassing: you do not exchange rudders for bodies inside one monopoly that manufactures trucks. And, no matter how Stalin denied, the law of value operated in the USSR with regard to the labor force, which was brilliantly proved by the worker from Zelenograd-town Yu. Radostev.

If one wants to know, there was great unemployment in the USSR in Stalin period and much less in 1987 – about 1,7 million people.

As for ecology, it is unlikely that Marx could foresee that the West will exaggerate environmental problems for the destruction of the USSR, Russian oligarchs will fight for resources by deceiving the population about environmental threats, and Greenpeace will be used as an instrument for suppressing competitors, in that power in the Arctic, as well as for surveillance of the Northern Fleet of Russia. Note that Greenpeace was not active against British Petroleum, which organized a world ecological catastrophe.

4) «Of course, aspects of his work need to be readdressed. For example, Rosa Luxemburg, a revolutionary for Poland and Germany, criticized Marx's lack of full awareness that accumulation of capital could not go on forever - if nothing else because of the problem of continually finding markets for increasing production of commodities ordered by capitalists for no other purpose than profits, at the same time that they want restricted wages».

As we know, Marx pointed to one of the manifestations of the basic contradiction of capitalism - the discrepancy between the growth of production and the limited effective demand of the working people, that is, the capitalist's desire to limit wages (In Russian: Works, Vol. 25, p. 268).

Secondly, Lenin demonstratively criticized the criticism of Rosa Luxemburg, in a number of articles on the markets he showed that capitalism can develop even without seizing foreign markets. Thus, the end of capitalism with the end of globalization is a false thesis.

5) «Moving on, Marx describes what workers actually did when they had power in Paris in 1871. But he also describes the ferocity of the subsequent opposition by capitalists, namely, a bloodbath. He would not be surprised at all by the Chilean coup by Augusto Pinochet in 1973 nor the US hostility to the Chinese or Cuban revolutions. He would not be surprised that May Day with origins in the US is not celebrated as a holiday in its country of origin. However, and this is important, great intellectuals can be misused. They can be objects of misuse precisely because of their penetrating insights. When Marx exposes capitalism in the raw for workers, some can refer to his insights for their own nefarious purposes, purposes that have nothing to do with the emancipation of workers, even as they might so suggest. This problem is not a simple one as we have to first understand correctly what motivated Marx.

It is not good enough to say that Marx wanted a society free of exploiting classes. The very next question would be how to get there. In fact, "how" is perhaps far more important and difficult. We must respect people, but we also must respect the power of those against the people, and that power is greater now than in Marx's time. As an illustration, the US government used nuclear weapons openly, and proudly, twice for mass extermination. If push comes to shove for any government of capitalists - and that was not even the case for Hiroshima and Nagasaki - Marx's understanding would tell us that there are no limits. I repeat: no limits. With the Middle East a modern flashpoint and Israel with its nuclear weapons potentially facing revolution sooner or later, Marx is giving us a message. And we are obligated to take account of it if we are to be really for the people».

By the way, the Kaiser Wilhelm suggested Marx to move to him to fight together against the bourgeoisie with the help of his political economy. Marx refused.

It would seem that with the introduction of new technologies, with the increase of labor productivity and the mass of capital, the ruling classes have more and more opportunities to suppress the proletariat, to buy it, to use even Marxism-Leninism against the proletariat. Is not the CPRF, this pocket "communist" opposition, serving this purpose?

The contradiction of capitalism is that with the growth of production, the administrative apparatus is less and less capable of mediating the entire aggregate of economic ties. There are only two options for the ruling class: either to start redistributing power from the top down, that is, to start destroying oneself. Or simplify the system by breaking the economy into components. The latter option was implemented in the USSR in December 1991.

The growth of centrifugal tendencies is also observed in the USA, and these trends will intensify in view of the expansionist policy of the United States. By the way, Harriman predicted the disintegration of the United States.

On the other hand, capital in its development uses everything that comes to hand. But, in turn, the development of capitalism develops and productive forces.

Many workers in Russia have put forward to me the thesis that the proletariat in its struggle can not go beyond certain limits - because of the threat of use of nuclear weapons.
On the contrary, this capital has limits to the struggle against the proletariat. The bourgeois can arrange a lockout, but can not do anything without those who bring him a profit.

Capital can not already use nuclear weapons in a competitive struggle. Only the 2nd World War could give the US the opportunity to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki. But the US could not use nuclear weapons in China, nor in North Korea, nor in Vietnam, Cuba, Yugoslavia, Iraq, Libya or Syria.
The total use of nuclear weapons is impossible in principle, it threatens nuclear winter. Around 1982, a discussion was broadcast on television between a certain NATO colonel and the Soviet political scientist Arbatov. Arbatov criticized the American buildup of nuclear weapons. However, the colonel retorted: the presence of nuclear weapons is a factor restraining wars. Colonel repeated the words of Engels: "Someday mankind will accumulate so much weapons that wars will become impossible."

There is another, more significant error in the thesis of the threat of the use of nuclear weapons by the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. It presupposes such a ridiculous practice of the struggle of the proletariat, which is not directed to the army. The army, meanwhile, consists of people.

Therefore personally I have no respect for those who are against the people. Moreover, those who are against the people are becoming more and more fascists, all over the world: in the USA, Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia.

But we, the Marxists, are always obliged in our practice to think whether our bourgeois clan is using our activity. Examples of such use are left-handed. Thus, various Trotskyist and so called "goscap" (state capitalism in the USSR) groups were used by the US State Department to clear the NATO road to Yugoslavia, Libya, Syria in mass consciousness. All the leftists of the world applauded the disintegration of the USSR. Cretins. 35 million extra deaths in Russia, 13 million - in the Ukraine.

Washington commands "Milosevic!" And the leftists are against Milosevic. Washington commands "Gaddafi!" And the leftist - against Gaddafi. Washington commands "Assad!" And the leftist - against Assad.
More of that, many Trotskyist groups supported Bandera fascists on maidan in Kiev!
More of that, the most rich people in the world privatized revolution itself! In Georgia, Libya, Syria, Ukraine.

6) «Turning to my own country, the US, I had not expected the political situation we are now in. It is worse than expected. Some aspects are front-page news, but there are horrible details too numerous to single out without distorting the message. Basically it is total disrespect for humanity by the federal government. Yet the candidacy of Bernie Sanders in the last presidential campaign surprised many, and he said and continues to say that he is a "democratic socialist." He even has a photo of the great US socialist Eugene Debs in his office. He had and has considerable popularity, particularly among younger people, in a country that had been taught by propaganda to hate "socialism." And, suddenly, there is now a new uprising by teenagers against gun violence who speak for themselves about it, not through adults. Changes are occurring».

There are only 20% of thing production in the USA, speculative capital dominates. Thus, the US lives at the expense of the rest of the world, USA consume 50% of the world's energy and throw 50% of the world's emissions into the atmosphere.

Changes in the richest country of the world began immediately after the legalization of bourgeois relations in the USSR and the disintegration of the country. As the counterweight disappeared, the USA carried out aggression in Iraq, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Libya, Syria.

On the other hand, the welfare was liquidated, the minimum wage was reduced. The military-industrial complex in the field of high technologies was reduced. Negro protests began.

In 1992, 9,000 policemen, 10,000 National Guards, 3,300 US Army and Marine Corps, 1,000 FBI officers were introduced, armored vehicles, combat and police helicopters were deployed to Los Angeles to suppress a peaceful demonstration. The fire was opened to defeat, about 100 people were killed, more than 11 thousand people were arrested. About 500 people from among the detainees received from 25 years to life imprisonment. Claims from the UN and the world community were not. Officials guilty of using force against peaceful demonstrators were not punished.

Similar changes occurred in other developed countries. In the UK, powers refused free of charge medicine, curtailed educational programs, shut down the mines, unemployment jumped. In Japan, with its institution of lifelong recruitment, 5% unemployment arose, which was a shock to the Japanese. In France, money from public schools was transferred to private schools, social programs were reduced, and the pension qualification was increased.

That is: all over the world labor and capital collided nose to nose, without an intermediary in the form of the so-called camp of "socialism". The working people realized that they should fight on their own. In this connection, and also in connection with the fact that after the disappearance of the USSR not only the national consolidating image of the enemy

disappeared, but also the international consolidating image of the enemy. It was possible to observe, as wars broke out with the strengthening of the euro.

In 1999, the non-cash currency of the euro was introduced to the world, replacing the ecu, which was equated to the dollar. In the spring, bombardments of Belgrade followed, after which the exchange rate of the non-cash euro becomes less than 1 dollar.

By the autumn of 2001, it is planned to introduce cash euros. There is a "terrorist attack" on September 11. Euro cash is introduced only 1.1.2002, the euro starts to crowd the dollar. The British "The Economist" draws the euro as a viper. By the end of January 2003, the euro for the first time exceeded the dollar at 1.06, in March the bombing of Baghdad followed, NATO invading Iraq.

On September 11, Swedish Foreign Minister Anna Lindh was killed. She was a key figure in the campaign for the country's entry into the euro area. On September 14, a referendum on this issue was planned in Sweden. The euro is again rolling back.

By the summer of 2008, the euro exceeds the critical threshold of \$ 1.5 and is not going to stop. In September, Washington authorizes Georgia's actions in South Ossetia. For 4 days the euro falls against the dollar from 1.52 to 1.34, and then to 1.26.

Dmitry Medvedev ruled In Russia during this period, he had no accounts with foreign banks, because he easily cut off the gas pipe "for repairs." The barrel immediately rose, the ruble returned to its positions.

But at the end of 2013 the euro again approached the \$ 1.5 mark. The United States had no choice? US arranged a Maydan in Kiev. After the forced annexation of Crimea, Putin was appointed a world evil, the image of the external enemy was successfully reanimated.

Although Putin is not a world evil at all! There is no totalitarianism in Russia, the bourgeoisie in Russia has not yet ripened from the class-in-itself to the class-for-itself, because the state is so weak that it is unable to collect a progressive tax. There is no Putin regime, Putin is just a protege of the ruling class of the raw-material bourgeoisie.

Although attempts to resuscitate the image of the enemy in the face of Putin were made in 2001, and in 2006 (after the "Munich speech"). Inside Russia, Putin confidently plays the role of the enemy of the United States.

However, one can not judge the changes in moods in the USA according to Sanders. Rather, on the contrary. The fact is that the US copied from Russia not only the electoral "roundabouts", but also the tactics of "torpedoes". "Torpedo" - this is clearly not the favorite, which the ruling party launches in elections, so that he can steel votes from a competitor. And Sanders performed well his role - he bought a left-wing electorate, for the credibility of hanging in the office photo Debs. And he gave his votes to the shark of imperialism - Hillary Clinton.

According to Sanders, one can judge the naivete of the lefts, who believe that something can be changed by presidential elections. Right, only a herd believes that the owner changes when a shepherd changes.

The shift to the left is in the other: more than half of American voters did not come to the polls.

As for the youth - personally I have no illusions about it. As people say in Russia: "For youth! For the courage! For the fresh wind! In your strong heads".

7) «Perhaps the single most important message from Marx is that "another world is possible." Why possible? First, we obviously have had other worlds before. And, second, we have no choice but for yet another and better, given the truth about capitalism! Workers of the world unite!»

The Soviet Union is understood under the "other world", obviously. And in vain, because its disintegration showed that the level of productive forces was too low. It was so low that the USSR lagged far behind the developed countries according to the main criterion noted by Lenin in the pamphlet "The Great Initiative": on labor productivity.

Secondly, I would object to such ideas about Marx. "Worlds", "schemes", "systems", choice between "worlds", etc. are the essence of bourgeois illusions. And the truth about capitalism is also not the main thing, as Marx said, the weapons of criticism will not replace criticism with weapons. In view of the fact that fascism is a natural feature of capitalism, without bloodshed it will not be possible to change the society without bloodshed, alas.

The socialist revolution will be realized not because of the idea of "other worlds", but when the obsolete production relations will hinder the development of the productive forces.

Alas, today the main slogan of strikes is "Do not make us worse!" It is impossible to unite workers even one factory shop. What kind of world association can we talk about. The so-called "mobilizations", flash mobs, antiglobalism, altreglobalism, etc. - chickens are laughing.

The world is in a protracted crisis, the productive forces are weakened, and a period of regression has come. What is clearly visible on drunk Sarkozy, on the pedophile Berlusconi, on the barking on the entire air of Hilary Clinton, on the inadequate Therese May, etc.

Now let us turn to the main question formulated by the author in the most bourgeois form: "How to get there". I.e. in the "other world", and supposedly there are specialists, lamps of reason, shines of mind, who know the right path.

First, note the wrong paths.

The first path is the creation of such a remarkable correct party, which, at last, will lead the working class and lead it into socialism. Many adhere to such views, apparently, the collapse of such a powerful structure as the CPSU, taught them nothing.

As for the workers. The workers are fed up with the fact that they are not considered to be people, but are considered a herd of sheep who need a shepherd. They are people, and therefore they are going to think with their own head, and not with the head of the party general secretary. And this is not a hint at anarchy. No one renounces the power of the Soviets. Simply Marx defined socialism as "the living creativity of the masses". The mass, not the party lights of mind.

The second wrong path is the lack of understanding of Marxism. Marxism as a method, not works of Marx.

Everyone is convinced that the evil of capitalism is concentrated in money, money expresses the value of the commodity. In the article "Criticism of the Gotha Program" Marx writes that the value of the commodity is generated by the abstract labor of a worker. What is needed for the product of labor to dump its commodity form? Marx is convinced that labor becomes abstract in the process of market alienation, in the sphere of exchange. Therefore, in order to destroy the value, it is necessary to liquidate the market. What the Bolsheviks tried to do.

However, the same Marx wrote in the "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844" about the stultifying, depersonalizing labor of the worker, and Ilyenkov points out ("Dialectics of the abstract and concrete in the Capital of Marx") that the physical labor of the worker is already abstract in the process of production. It is this production abstraction that generates abstractness in the sphere of exchange.

Lenin in practice understood Marx's mistake and in 1921 introduced a new economic policy (NEP). It was designed for decades, but Stalin turned NEP in 1927.

That is: socialism by definition is a transitional period when the old social division of labor that divides society into classes is being eliminated. First of all, the contradiction between mental and physical labor is resolved, as Marx writes in the same article, "Criticism of the Gotha Program."

In 1953, Stalin, in his pamphlet "The Economic Problems of Socialism", denied the contradiction between mental and physical labor in the USSR and repeated Marx's mistake from beginning to end.

But still - "how"? No way.

Because this question can be answered only by the practice of the struggle of the working class, which, according to Lenin, is above theory. As Marx said: every practical step is more expensive than a dozen programs.

To begin with, we must forget the words from the "Manifesto..." about the leading role of the party. We must understand that Lenin's book "What to do?" is obsolete. The situation has changed! The labor movement - can independently break free from the framework of economism, without introducing into the inert dark matter of the working class the divine political consciousness by party priests.

One may note strikes against abstract conveyor labour in USA at the end of 60th or Soviets at Italian plants at the same period or acts of workers of Sud Aviation in 1968. Finally, examples of the Paris Commune and the first Soviets in Russia!

And you see - authorities pay the left parties for their participation in the elections. The authorities made from all parties from ultra to ultra security buffer between themselves and the masses. Parties have discredited themselves around the world, absenteeism is growing all over the world.

By the way, the editions of most Marxist journals are concentrated in the USA and Great Britain, even Indian and German ones. This means that most of the left organizations are controlled by the CIA and MI-5. Consequently, workers must create their own independent factory political organizations.

The role of left parties is only to help workers in their self-organization, like Lenin wrote in his project of the first program of Russia social democratic workers party.

Lenin's book "The Childhood Illness of Leftism in Communism" is also obsolete, in the part where Lenin writes about the vanguard of the working class. If the vanguard is a minority, the working class is not ripe for dictatorship, it can not control its vanguard in the role of state officials. If the vanguard is a majority, this term loses its meaning.

We must understand that the disintegration of the USSR was logical. But this does not mean that the October revolution in backward agrarian Russia in 1917 was a theoretical error of smb, like wrote Menshevik Kuscova in her "Credo". The bourgeois revolution has been walking for a whole century only over one small France. The era of regression will pass, the era of socialist revolutions will continue.

22.5.2018

After the publication of the article, 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' 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 profitoriented 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:

“ You are right, I am not good hand at English, thank you, you have caught me.

1. You write that Sunders is able to say “socialist” about himself. But why he is socialist? Did he organize strikes, blockings of highways, did he organize workers committees etc.? No. He's only crowing. In one way or another, in fact, objectively, he co-served large-capitals by his transfer of votes to Hillary Clinton.

As for us working class is our social address, so we are not lost!

I understand that the powerless Western Lefts are happy to recruit women's movement, pederasts, even schoolchildren! But their teams do not have a working class. So he's kicking his feet in the air, so capital is using their activity.

On the other hand, Mitterand and Holland are socialists, but they rule just like the bourgeois.

2. I did not write that nuclear weapons are paper tigers. You can be sure, Engels said exactly what I indicated. Lenin said the same thing: "... Wars will be impossible in view of the immensity of damage" ("Memoirs of N. K. Krupskaya")/ I did not write that nuclear weapons are useless. Nuclear weapons are a deterrent. As for Israel, I do not think it will risk using nuclear weapons. One may say about sanctions, but to my mind it is such a game. Israel has not complied with any UN resolution concerning it.

I understand that you agree with all the other parts of my article relating to you, don't you?

PS

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.

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!

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