FF

"Marx's whole point is that the commodity-form only became general when it extended to the particular commodity, labor itself or rather the capacity to labor. To this and Marx created his third original economic categoryx: labor power. In Volume II he reiterates once again:

FF

"Marx's whole point is that the commodity-form only became general when it extended to the particular commodity, labor itself or rather the capacity to labor. To this and Marx created his third original economic categoryx: labor power. In Volume II he reiterates once again:

"imperialism." Lenin's method of analysis had helped him to find out the objective reasons for the collapse of the Second International and to chart its future course. He drew a sharp class distinction between the Second and the Third International.

What exactly is it that Comrades Warde and Wright are trying to prove by clinging to the mere listing of the "five essential features?" How does the mere re-listing of these features of the 1914 economy help Comrades Warde and Wright to understand the economy of 1951 to the end that they find the economic basis, the class nature of Stalinism?

.....

" The vanguard today faces a very concrete enemy in the counter-revolutionary theory of the party put forward by the Stalinists all over the world. The Stalinists are not bad leaders while we offer ourselves as good ones. For what they intend to do - suppress the self-mobilization of the proletariat - the Stalinisgs are as good leaders as could be imagined. ...

Leninism is not a matter of "essential features." Leninism is the struggle for annihiliation of whatever stands in the way of proletarian power. Comrades Warde and Wright must first decide what kind of party it is they are fighting against before they can decide what is the correct Leninist theory of the party for 1951. What kind of party are we trying to build? We are trying to build a party which will destroy, not Menshevism in 1903, nor the Social Democracy in 1919, but Stalinism in 1951. ...

"The mastery of the capitalist over the work is in reality the mastery of dead over living labor." (ARCHIVES OF MARX-ENGELS, Vol. II (VII) Russian.)

Marx says the same thing in a thousand different ways throughout the three volumes of CAPITAL and THE THEORIES OF SURPLUS VALUE, because it is this which sums up the whole essence of capitalism. . . . . .

"The consequence of the complete inversion in the relationship of machines to men, with its misery for labor and anarchy of the market, could not help but impress the intellectuals. They were ready with plans for everything

FF - 3

except the reorganization of the productive process by labor itself. Consistently Marx posed the cooperative form of the labor process in opposition to those intellectual planners who could not comprehend this new power. Marx warned; not to see the plan inherent in the activity of the revolutionary proletariat must force one to pose an external factor to do the planning. He dismissed with utter contempt Proudhon's plan to do away with exchange. For the practical and violent actions of the proletariat, Marx wrote, Proudhon substitutes the "evacuating motion of his head."

Proudhon was neither the first nor th last of the planners. Planning is not limited to idealists. The abstract materialist who views technological development outside of the class relationship also slips back into considering the capitalistic factors of production as mere factors of any social form of production. That is why Marx created new categories - constant and variable capital - to describe the manner in which machines and labor united under a capitalist economy. In opposition to all the planners abstract materialist as well as idealist - Marx elaborated his analysis of capitalist production." . . . .

"Marx transformed the entire science of political economy. From a study of things, it became an analysis of production relations. He wrote some 4,000 pages, or 2,000,000 words, in his analysis of the economic system of capitalism. And for all that, except in three instances, he could use the categories of classical political economy. For those three, however, he had to create new categories altogether. Now Comrades Wardo and Wright take two of those three new categories and assert that they are applicable "to any and all societies." . . . . .

How is it possible for Marxists to go so completely off the class rails theoretically? The error is no accident. It never fails to appear among Marxist theoreticians who have failed to grasp the essence of Marxism for their specific epoch in strict relationship to the revolutionary activity of the masses. Each stage of capitalist production has posed only two alternatives; either the self-activity of the workers or the plan over the workers. A terrible trap awaits those who do not hold tight to this.

Marx concluded, it would be impossible to advance from the position of the classical economists who, despite their discovery of labor as the source of value, "remained more or less prisoners of the world of illusion which they had dissolved critically ..." (CAPITAL, Volume III, p. 967) ....

Lenin lists five essential features of imperialism. Comrades Warde and Wright re-list these as if that were the whole significance of the book. Were that the issue, Lenin's book would have to take second place to Hobson's IMPERIALISM, and Hilferding's FINANCE CAPITAL, on which works Lenin based his book.** (** Indeed, bourgeois theoreticians dismiss Lenin's IMPERIALISM precisely because the "primary sources" had already been covered in these other books.)

As five "essential features" of imperialism, the five phenomena listed were, more or less contained in both these books. What was theoretically and politically new was Lenin's singling-out the quintessence of those five features to be the transformation of competition into its opposite, monopoly.

Lenin's central thesis was that the transformation of one thing into its opposite was a dialectical law which explained the actual, the concrete problems that faced him, both economically and politically. In the economic political sphere it meant the development within the labor movement of a stratum of labor into its opposite, an artistocracy of labor. Thereupon Lenin changed his entire method of approach to the Second International. He wrote his IMPERIALISM: A POPULAR OUTLINE to show the economic roots of the betrayal. Although his book was a profound description of the economics of his epoch, that was not the point of the book. The point, as he had phrased it in the Preface, was to disclose that "the split in the labor movement is bound up with the objective conditions of