06a. Background to Marx

I. Problems with liberalism

A. **Basic tenets of liberalism**

1. Basis of society: the individual
2. All humans are free and equal
3. All humans have a right to private property
4. Government's role: protect property and person
5. Government should be a representative government
6. Individual rights (speech, assembly, religion)
7. Economic system: capitalism

B. Locke establishes a key tenet of liberalism, the **right of autonomy** for individuals. I rule myself, within the bounds of nature, unless we all agree, voluntarily, to rule each other in some other way.

C. He's also setting up the basis for **limited government**: Humans are to be free of arbitrary power. The only power we should submit to is the power we grant over us through our consent. The **purpose of government** is to protect individual's liberty and estate (i.e. "property" in Locke).

D. But isn't there a contradiction between the government's obligation to protect both liberty and private property? What happens when the life or liberty of one person comes into conflict with the property of another? For example, what happens when a poor person cannot make ends meet, in part because it is her boss's "right" to pay her as little as he can? Whose side will a liberal government take?

E. Ultimately, Marx argues that liberalism is primarily an ideology suited to defend capitalism and only secondarily about protecting individual freedom. Further, the kind of human freedom liberalism promotes is not the only or ultimate type of human freedom. Humans can be much freer than liberalism and capitalism provide for.

II. The immiseration of the working class

A. Again, the starting place to examine the changes the world went through is England. The **enclosure movement** began in the late 1600s and went through the mid-1700s. What happened was land once held in common for the poor to farm or raise cattle or sheep was enclosed or privatized, sold to a local entrepreneur. The enclosure of common land forced many peasants off their land and put them out of work. They migrated by the thousands to the cities, seeking work in textile factories or in the mines. Others emigrated to America. (It's not a coincidence that the enclosure movement began at about the time the Industrial revolution was under way; it helped to create a vast pool of labor for industry.)

B. This group of people, bunched together in squalor in the big cities, made up the British working class. Unlike the peasantry, the working class did not make their living off the land, nor did they own any tools or property. Instead, they worked for a wage. They were "**free labor**", not tied to any noble or lord, but nevertheless forced to work for just about any wage. Lived in conditions of incredible poverty. [**Read** vol. 4, 331-333 (Engels' *The Condition of the English Working Class*)]. They also lived in conditions of

terrible uncertainty: of losing a job, of losing children to illness, of being one small disaster away from total ruin.

C. The work week was often 6 or 6.5 days a week, 12-15 hours a day. The pay was just barely enough for a single person to survive on, let alone support a family. This meant that the whole family often had to work. Children under 13 made up 13% of the English labor force in the cotton industry. Women also formed a large proportion of the workforce.

D. This was the **ugly side to progress**: with the vast accumulation in wealth and technology came a vast increase in misery for the majority of the population. With enlightenment came alienation; with reason, repression; progress, powerlessness; with civilization, intolerance and terror.

E. There was also an **incredible arrogance** on the part of the English capitalists, who seemed concerned with nothing else but making money. [**Read** vol. 4, 562-3 (Engels' *The Condition of the English Working Class*)]. In this poverty and absolute indifference and greed arose working class resistance.

F. **But along with exploitation, misery, and absolute poverty arose organization against these conditions and the power of the capitalists**. Worker's associations, secret societies, gatherings in taverns, reading groups, newspapers, cooperatives were formed, often secretly. Some workers attempted to form unions and the **Chartist Movement** (which began in 1839) sought the vote for working class men. And of course there were riots, sabotage of machinery, and other spontaneous uprisings.

III. Karl Marx (1818-1883) **& Frederick Engels** (1820-1895)

A. **Marx**

1. Was born in 1818 in Germany. His grandparents were Jewish (both his grandfathers were rabbis) but his dad converted to Christianity because he was a lawyer and the government had decreed that Jews could no longer practice law.

2. Grew up middle class and went to the University of Bonn. He spent too much time in the beer halls there—he was president of the "Trier Tavern Club"— and he even fought a duel with another student, so his parents transferred him to the University of Berlin, where he immediately fell in love with philosophy and gave up law. Especially into Hegel. Got his Ph.D. in 1841. Diss was on Greek philosophy.

3. Couldn't find a teaching job because he was too radical, so he got work as a journalist and an editor. Never could keep a solid job in his entire life, and as a result he and his family often lived in poverty (three of his six kids died of curable diseases). Engels often supported him. His wife and his daughters were staunch supporters.

4. Eventually his radical ideas forced him to flee Germany. He moved to Paris in 1843 but got kicked out of there, too. Same with Brussels and other places. Finally settled in London, where he lived for the rest of his life. Marx was a ferocious reader and writer, and he spent much of his life engaged in these activities. (Often spent 10 hours a day studying in the British Museum, and then worked more at home.)

5. He and Engels were also very active politically. They joined the Communist League in 1847. The *Communist Manifesto* was the manifesto for that organization. In

1864 he helped found the International Working Men's Association. Served on its General Council for 7 years. The International sought to link up revolutionary working class organizations throughout the world and offered strike support and help for political refugees. Especially notorious during the Paris Commune of 1871.

B. **Engels**

1. Was born in Germany in 1820. Was the son of a wealthy capitalist family, and was himself a capitalist. He moved to Manchester, England in the early 1840s to run the family's threadmaking factory. Already politically radical, he was horrified by the poverty and misery brought on by capitalism, which inspired him to write *The Condition of the English Working Class* in 1845. He and Marx met around the same time and they immediately became close friends, a friendship which would last a lifetime (no mean feat for Marx). He was also one of Marx's main financial supporters.

2. In addition to co-writing several books and pamphlets with Marx, Engels also wrote several works of his own. He also edited and put together several of Marx's works that were unfinished after Marx's death.

3. In addition to being a member of the Communist League and the International, he also helped found the Second International in 1889 (the first one disbanded in 1872 when Marx moved the headquarters to NYC in order to keep it out of the hands of anarchists). Died in 1895.

06a. Marx
October 5, 10, 12, 17, 2000

Announcements:
web page updates: Crisis on Locke, Marx bio posted
- Papers back Tuesday
- RP #6 posted
- Make sure you get a copy of the extra pages of *Capital* I handed out

Upcoming response papers:
- RP #6 due October 10: How is it that the bourgeoisie produces its own grave-diggers? What is Marx's conception of freedom?
- To consider for today: What is Marx's critique of "political emancipation"? Is his argument anti-Semitic?
- To consider for October 12: On *Capital:* What is surplus value and where does it come from? How is the length of the working day determined? (have them write on either one)
- RP #7, due October 17: What is the significance of the Paris Commune for Marx? What kind of democracy does Marx advocate? Is his strategy to achieve communism in Gotha a good one?

Marx, "On the Jewish Question,"
[quotes from *Collected Works Vol. 3* / Simon anthology]

I. From Locke to Marx

A. **Q:** Did anyone read the "a recent interpretation of the DoI" I posted on the web site? Who wrote it? What's its significance?

B. The DoI is clearly a revolutionary document.

2. **Q:** Is it a pro-capitalist document? Can it be used to justify socialism? Does the changing of Locke's "life, liberty, and estate" to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" pave the way for challenges to capitalism as well?

C. **The central goal of Marx is *freedom*.** If Locke's goal is to discover the form of government needed to preserve individual freedom, Marx's goal is to discover the economic conditions necessary for the full and free development of the individual.

D. **Q:** What is political emancipation? What is Marx's critique of it?

II. Bauer's argument

go thru quickly

A. **Q:** Marx writes, "The formulation of a question is its solution." 147/3 What does he mean by that?

1. Sometimes the solution to a problem doesn't lie in the evidence or in reason, but in the way a question is posed. If you pose a question differently you can make an intractable problem soluble.

2. **Example**: Kant transformed metaphysics not by answering the old question, "How do our ideas about the world correspond with reality?" but by asking a new question: "How do our ideas *constitute* reality?"

3. Example: How can Bf be integrated into Am society? Malcolm X asked. Why should Bf integrate? Asked a diff Q, got a diff answer: Nat'lm

3. Marx is going to do the same thing. He's going to reformulate Bauer's question so it can be answered.

B. Bauer on Jewish emancipation

1. **Q:** What is Bauer's question?

2. The question Bauer addresses is should Jews be granted the same rights as Christians in Germany?

3. Bauer argues that in order to be emancipated, Jews have to give up their religion in order to be emancipated *as citizens*, just like Christians will have to give up their religion to be free. **Emancipation requires the abolition of religion; specifically, the separation of religion and the state.**

4. **Q:** What is Marx's criticism of Bauer's formulation of the Jewish question?

5. Don't ask "who is to emancipate?" or "who is to be emancipated?" Ask instead, **"What kind of emancipation?"** The kind of emancipation Bauer is talking about—freedom from religion—is a limited, partial form of freedom.

C. **Marx's critique of Bauer's argument**

1. Bauer argues that when religion and the state are separated, religion will disappear. Thus, Jews shouldn't be asking for state recognition of their religion, they should be trying to abolish state religion. Thus, they have to abolish Judaism as well as Christianity.

2. Marx replies, then how do we explain the situation in **North America**, in which state and religion are distinct yet it is a very pious country? Religion has in no way disappeared in the U.S. despite it being a secular state. If anything, **religion is *stronger* when it is detached from the state.** (E.g. x/13-14) Thus, the solution to the Jewish question can't be to simply abolish state religion. Instead, **we have to look at the nature of the state itself, and how freedom is defined in the modern state.** x?/6

3. **Only a critique of political emancipation, that is, freedom under the modern state, can answer the "Jewish Question." And in order to critique it, we have to compare it to real, full, human emancipation.**

4. **Read** 149/6-7 We explain the limits of religious belief and practice in terms of the limits of political freedom granted by the state The key is to attack the secular restrictions on citizens, not the religious ones

5. Thus, **we need to examine not religion, but the secular state**, the state that grants "political emancipation" but not human emancipation. **Once we see the limits of human freedom under liberalism** (i.e. political emancipation), **the critique of religion will follow**, not the other way around. Bauer does not criticize political emancipation or the relationship between political and human emancipation. He therefore can't hope to resolve the JQ.

III. Political emancipation

A. **Q:** What is political emancipation?

1. Essentially, the system of **civil & political rights** first elaborated by Locke: the government doesn't tell us what to do or what religion to worship but instead exists to preserve our life, liberty, and estate. It's the right to participate in government and the set of "inalienable" rights we possess. It's **liberalism**.

B. For example, political emancipation or liberalism "frees the state from religion" by abolishing state religion. **Religion is transformed from a state obligation into an individual right. Religion and the state are separated into public and private realms**

C. The same goes with property. **When the state abolishes the property requirement for voting, is private property abolished?** No. In fact, it thrives because private property is simply relegated to the private realm. Once it is relegated to the private realm, like religion it becomes a private matter that is not subject to public intervention. All the state can do is protect and regulate property; it can't legislate it away. If anything, **the politically emancipated state *presupposes* private property**. Its main function becomes to protect and regulate private property.

1. **Read** 153/8.

2. Consider **feudalism:** Property, church and state exist within the same sphere: only those who own property and worship the appropriate church may be a part of the state. Thus, **the feudal state is not universal**. It openly exists for the benefit of one class and religion.

3. **KEY POINT:** But under political emancipation (i.e. liberalism), property and religion are separated from the state. **Liberalism creates two spheres**, public and private. **In the public sphere of the state, we are to act universally**: that is, as citizens we act not in our own selfish interests but in the best interests of all citizens. **In the private sphere, we act "egoistically"**, i.e. in our own self-interests. We worship the religion we please, we exercise our rights as they please us, and most importantly, we try to acquire as much property as we can, even at the expense of others.

4. **Draw on board**: the division of humans into public and private persons:

Public	Private
universal interests	egoism/self-interest
citizenship	bourgeois/private person
rights	property
the state	civil society (inc. church)
"lion's skin"	real power

D. **Alienation and the twofold life**

1. Thus, **under political emancipation we divide society into two spheres**: public and private.

2. **We also divide ourselves into two**: citizen and bourgeois, i.e. public person vs. private individual.

3. **Read** 154/8-9 & 154/9. Political emancipation is *by definition* a situation of **alienation**, a **twofold life**. Part of who we are is separated from ourselves.

4. **Q:** What does Marx mean by "political lion skin"? Also, what does he mean by "man's species-life" (153/8) or "species being"?

5. **KEY POINT:** For Marx, **humans are by nature social creatures**. What it means to be human, what it means to be a human species, is to live and work socially, in concert with others. Political emancipation alienates us from our species-being, from what it means to be human, because while it talks piously about our obligations to our fellow man as citizens, it's really just a cover or a "political lion's skin" for a society that's actually based on self-interest, greed, and *separation* from our fellow humans. In political emancipation, we are led to believe that our "real life" lies in the life of the citizen, of the human interested in the common good, but the side of us with real power is the private self. Our actual humanity lies in the privatized, egoistic civil society, while our supposed true or universal life is really an abstraction, a "political lion's skin."

6. It's not "liberty and justice for all," it's "C.R.E.A.M."

7. This split, in society and within the human, Marx calls **alienation**. **Liberalism is premised on this alienation. It can therefore only bring about a partial freedom** because it is a freedom that alienates us from our species-being, from other humans, and ultimately, from ourselves.

IV. Human emancipation

A. In order to achieve real, full freedom, then, we have to abandon liberalism and struggle for true or human emancipation. **Human emancipation means ~~the abolition of the alienation between~~ reuniting our public and private selves**. In human emancipation the private and public selves are brought back into the same individual, so her communal life is her real life, not an abstraction. **Read** 168/21.

1. Soon, Marx is going to replace the term "human emancipation" with a single word: communism. We can define communism as **the ~~regaining~~ development of our ~~humanness~~ humanity through the abolition of private property**.

2. **~~regaining~~ development of our humanity**: Becoming fully free and equal humans with the ability to fulfill our capacities for self-development.

3. **the abolition of private property**: Replacing the competitive, exploitative, and dehumanizing system of capitalism and class society in general (which is based on owners and non-owners of property) with a cooperative, democratic society where property is owned by the community. "From each according to ability, to each according to need." **Reminder:** by property Marx means the means of production—land, factories, technology, etc.—and not homes, cars, stereos, etc. He's not out to collectivize our underwear.

4. **Draw on board:**

Human emancipation

public power = real power
abolition of private property
transcending of alienation
realization of the capabilities of the species
later name: communism

– the complete div. of
p man into pub/priv.
SXM is the multiple con
hope for in this society.
– i.e. merges the 2 together
so that our communal selves real

start here

B. **Q:** Does Marx dismiss political emancipation, or liberalism?

1. No. Political emancipation is "a great step forward for humanity" compared to feudalism. It's the best form of emancipation "within the prevailing order of things," i.e. within the liberal state. (155/10)

2. **Two problems with liberalism:**

a. It doesn't go far enough its the "half-hearted approach" to freedom

b. It pretends it is the ultimate, highest form of human freedom, when it's not. Political emancipation has to be carried through into human emancipation.

C. Therefore the solution to the Jewish question is not for Jews to renounce Judaism in order to be emancipated, as Bauer claims. **Jews can and should fight for political emancipation**, i.e. for full civil and political rights, and they can do this without renouncing Judaism. However, this just proves that political emancipation is not human emancipation. **To fully emancipate the Jews will require the full emancipation of all humanity** from the twofold life we are forced to live under the liberal state. In this instance the situation of Jews is no different from that of every other member of society. **Read** (if time) 160/14

[just do V.A.; skip the rest unless you have time]

V. The critique of natural rights

A. The "natural rights" that Locke and the American and French revolutionaries talk about appear "natural" because all conscious, collective human activity get relegated to the political sphere, not the private. "Egoistic man" therefore appears as what exists "naturally" beneath an "artificial" community.

1. This is, of course, exactly what Locke does with his SoN. Man is by nature absolutely free and by nature has as right to acquire property. Civil society is an artifical invention created to protect one's life and property for Locke. Marx says this is upside down. Humans aren't atomized subjects, they are social creatures. Living with humans is our natural state, not isolated from them. 167

2. **In modern society the "bourgeois" or private side of man becomes man itself, i.e. it becomes *naturalized*.** The solitary individual, equal to all other solitary individuals, becomes the basis of society.

del

3. **Political emancipation and natural rights therefore normalize social inequality**. Since all people are equal in the public realm and since the private realm is governed by personal self-interest, the ability to fight against inequality is removed. "Inequality" becomes a "private" concern. Some people are rich and others are poor due to "human nature," not the workings of society. In this way the politically emancipated state sanctions inequality even as it proclaims equality of rights.

B. Marx crits the definitions of liberty, equality, and security from a natural rights perspective.

1. **Liberty** is the right to do what you want so long as you don't harm others. **It is therefore "based not on the association of man with man, but on the separation of man from man."** 162-3/16 It's the right of the individual to withdraw from society into oneself. The practical application of this conception of liberty is, of course, the right to own property without regard to others on the basis of self-interest. This conception of liberty and its practical application, private

property, form the basis of civil society. "It makes every man see in other men not the realization but rather the limitation of his own freedom." 163/16-17 **For Marx, private property is the *limit* on humanity's freedom, not its basis**, as Locke argues.

2. **Equality** is nothing but the definition of liberty extended to all members of civil society. "every man is equally viewed as a self-sufficient monad." 163/17

3. **Security** is "the supreme social concept of civil society, the concept of the police, the concept that the whole society exists only in order to guarantee to each of its members the preservation of his person, his rights, and his property." 163/17 So security is nothing but the guaranteeing of the above definition of liberty, and the establishment of society for that purpose alone.

4. All three of these "inalienable rights" serve the self-interested nature of civil society, i.e. man *versus* the community rather than man as part of the community. **Read** x/17 if time.

C. **None of the rights of man, therefore, go beyond egoistic, private man separated from the community**. When the community is reduced to a means (ensuring the rights of man), the *citoyen* becomes the servant of the bourgeois, i.e. the public becomes the servant of the private realm, despite all talk about the state and citizen's universalism to the contrary. It is man as private individual, as bourgeois, who is the true man, while man as *citoyen* is an abstract universal.

1. **Read** if time 167/20.

stether →

VI. Is Marx's argument anti-Semitic?

[Source: Dennis Fischman, "The Jewish Question About Marx," *Polity* 21, no. 4 (Summer 1989): 755-776.]

A. **Q:** Is Marx's argument anti-Semitic?

1. Marx first of all distinguishes between the "sabbath Jew" and the "everyday Jew."

2. **Q:** What does he mean by this?

3. "Everyday" Judaism is the concrete, non-religious or "secular" situation of the Jew in the modern world, not the Jewish religion.

B. **Q:** What is the "secret" of the everyday Jew?

1. Capitalism, or "huckstering/bargaining." 170/22

2. **Explain** the status of Jews in 19th c. Europe and the **socialism of fools.**

3. "The Jew" is thus a symbol of capitalism for Marx. Judaism represents civil society, while Christianity represents the liberal political state.

C. **Q:** Why is the political state "Xian" and civil society "Jewish" for Marx?

1. The liberal state ~~is Xian because in relegating religion to the private sphere the state~~ imitates the Christian model of an all-powerful, transcendent God (i.e. the state) ruling over humanity (i.e. civil society). The state, like God, is supposedly transcendent, universal and all-powerful, but in actuality (for the materialist, anyway) it's not the real power at all.

2. **Draw diagram**

Christianity		**Liberal state**	
God	<-false universals->	State	<—public (Xian)
↓		↓	
humans	<-real power->	society	<— private (Jewish)

3. Thus, even though the Jewish religion is oppressed, in a way the Jew rules over the Christian in modern society. "The Jew has already emancipated himself in a Jewish way," 170/23. The egoism of civil society rules over the political lion's skin of the universal Christian state. As Fischman puts it, "In other words, Jewish civil society only dominates the Christian political state once Christianity succeeds in separating the state from civil society. By attempting to banish human need, Christianity succumbs to it." 767

D. Thus, **OJQ is just as harsh a critique of Christianity as it is of Judaism**. He has contempt for both religions, it is safe to say.

1. Fischman argues that Marx kind of gives tribute to Judaism, in a backhanded way, because he recognizes it as a "skilled and potent adversary." 767 "Everyday Judaism," or the triumph of civil society is the triumph of capitalism, with both its modern benefits (such as political freedom, the overcoming of feudalism) and its drawbacks (such as alienation). "Judaism" is the ever-present reality of human need driving history forward. **To "abolish" Judaism is to abolish human need, to abolish alienation and capitalism** and to leave the realm of political emancipation for that of human emancipation. To abolish Xianity, on the other hand, means nothing because it is nothing. The state is a false universal.

2. Thus, Judaism must be abolished or transcended, but as that which overcomes feudalism **it also makes human emancipation possible**.

E. **Criticisms of Marx's metaphor**

1. Marx's reformulation of Bauer's original question (from "who is to emancipate the Jew?" to "what kind of emancipation is necessary?") ironically makes the "Jewish Question" disappear in his critique. [Fischman, 758]

2. Marx's use of Jews as metaphors for capitalism reflects the anti-Semitism of Germany at the time. Jews, in their customs, their demeanor, etc. were not seen as fit for public life by German Christians. Marx essentially buys into this, even though he argues for the incompatibility of "everyday Judaism" with human emancipation, not individual Jews or the Jewish religion.

[skipped this time]

Marx, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Introduction"

[Pages refer to volume 3 of *Collected Works*/Simon reader]

I. The critique of religion

A. Man makes religion, religion does not make man.

B. Religion as the opium of the people. It eases their pain but drives them further into their misery, like any addiction does. **Read** 175/28.

C. The critique of religion is also a critique of idealism. By criticizing religion Marx aims not just to criticize religion but to get at the real, material practices (i.e. "unholy forms") that cause alienation.

II. The purpose of philosophy

A. The task of philosophy is to "unmask human self-alienation in its *unholy forms*," i.e. as it exists in actual life, not simply by religion. Humanity's spiritual immiseration (religion) is but the reflection of humanity's material immiseration; philosophy must expose that misery in order to abolish it. **Read** 176/28-29

B. **Theory as a material force. Read** 182/34.

III. Critique of German philosophy

A. German philosophy is dominated by idealist philosophy obsessed with the critique of religion, etc. It needs a good dose of history, while at the same time, German history needs to catch up with its philosophy.

B. Germany hasn't had a revolution that has achieved political emancipation like England (Glorious Revolution) and France (French Revo) has. But it has shared the *sufferings* of these nations' economic transformations.

C. Germany has a strong proletariat but a weak and ineffectual bourgeoisie. It thus lacks a class that can achieve political emancipation. Germany's future lies in a radical social revolution for human emancipation, led by the working class and its "radical chains." 184-85/36-37

D. **The proletariat as a "universal class." Read** 186/38

E. Philosophy (the head)and the proletariat (the heart) will bring about social revolution. 187/39

Marx, "Theses on Feurbach"

[Pages refer to McLellan *Selected Writings* / Simon reader]

Q: What is human nature? Challenge within that communism built work call it "human nature"

I. The critique of idealism

A. Marx begins his philosophical work by criticizing idealism. His main target here is GWF **Hegel**, a German philosopher who was very influential on Marx, despite Marx's criticisms. Hegel argues that ideas create the world. He says that Geist, or spirit or reason, guide the world. This view, that our ideas, consciousness, or a spirit such as God create the world is called **idealism**.

B. Ludwig **Feuerbach** said Hegel has the true relationship reversed. Actually, it is the world that creates ideas. I.e. material reality (the natural, sensuous world) creates our ideas. Man makes God, God does not make man. "You are what you eat." This perspective that argues that philosophy should focus not on abstract ideas but on actual material reality (which produces these ideas) is called **materialism**. (It's not about how many cars or toys you own—it's not that kind of materialism.)

C. **Marx agrees with Feuerbach's critique of Hegel**. Philosophy needs to stand Hegel on his head. It's not ideas —> world, but world —> ideas.

D. However, Marx is critical of Feuerbach's materialism, too. He has three main criticisms, from the *Theses*:

1. Feuerbach's materialism is **static and ahistorical**. Feuerbach sees the world as static and unchanging. He has no sense of development, no sense that actually the world is a dynamic and ever-changing place. By creating this static or "contemplative" materialism, Feuerbach has taken human beings out of history. The third thesis says "The materialist doctrine concerning the changing of circumstances and education forgets that circumstances are changed by men and that the educator himself must be educated." (156/99) Humans act in and on material reality and thus they change the world. Materialist philosophy has to recognize that.

2. Feuerbach thinks **liberation is a mental act**. He assumes that just by changing our consciousness we can be free. Marx argues that this is wrong and in fact idealistic: changing our heads won't make us free, only changing our circumstances will. It's true that we do have to change our consciousness and give up our "illusions" about the world (religion, liberalism, etc.), but this entails freeing ourselves from the material *conditions* that produce these illusions. In the 8th thesis Marx writes "All social life is essentially practical. All mysteries which lead theory to mysticism find their rational solution in human practice and the comprehension of this practice." (157/100) Note that he also throws these two criticisms at the various forms of socialism he and Engels disagree with in chapter 3 of the Manifesto.

3. Feuerbach, Hegel, and all previous philosophers **misunderstand the purpose of philosophy**.

a. **Q:** What is the task of philosophy for Plato? (truth, justice, the good) Machiavelli? (strategies of war) Locke? (reveal the purpose of govt.) Marx?

b. The task of philosophy is not to be reflective, not to contemplate what has happened in the past. Instead, its purpose is to change the world. As the famous 11th thesis states, "The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to *change* it." (158/101)

E. **Question**: How can philosophy change the world?

1. Answer: Through **a "ruthless criticism of everything existing."** Criticism, or theory, is the inducement that will inspire humanity to change the world. Once theory has exposed the lies of idealism and revealed that our oppression is not our "lot in life" or due to our "laziness" or due to the "will of God" but is instead a product of very real material social forces, we can then use theory to unmask these oppressive social forces. Once we've done that, we've opened the way to then change these forces.

2. Theory must also become a "material force." **Read** vol. 3, 182, 34 in Simon: "The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism by weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force, but theory also becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses. Theory is capable of gripping 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."

3. Theory must help discover what the needs of the people are if it is to be useful, and this requires going to the root of the problem, and being radical. This requires linking up theory with action (eg. criticism by weapons).

4. **Theory must be ruthless in two senses**, Marx says: criticism must not be afraid of its own conclusions, however radical they may be, and it must not be afraid of being in conflict with the powers that be. (Tucker 13; vol. 3 p. 142)

- Comparison:
1) Locke
2) Does M resolve the tension between M & P?

Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*
[page numbers refer to vol. 6 of *Collected Works*/Simon reader]

I. The contradiction of liberal democracy

A. Every ideology or theory has its contradictions. The contradiction of liberal democracy is the following:

move to **, p. 23 & 224 next

1. **Liberal democracy is based on two things**: a) a belief in the fundamental **equality** of all persons and each person's right to liberty and b) a **market economy**, or capitalism. But these two things exist in tension with each other. Capitalism, even though it is based on equality of opportunity and free markets in theory, is still a mode of production in which one class, which owns the capital and controls the means of production, hires another class to work for them for wages. Obviously the former class, the capitalist class, possesses more wealth than the lower or working class. It therefore also commands more power in society.

2. Marx brings out this contradiction in "OJQ" in his analysis of the division of society and man into citizen and bourgeois spheres.

B. **The contradiction is this**: we live in a society in which we all possess equal political rights, but in which wealth (and therefore actual power) is held unevenly: one class has a disproportionate share of the wealth and power for their size. ~~[use the recent article from the NY Times to provide some data]~~.

3. **Question**: How democratic is a society where people possess equal political rights but unequal social rights?

4. The demand for socialism is based on the desire to abolish this contradiction, which means the abolition of private property and the desire for a cooperative economy. It also means the abolitions of poverty and misery.

move to ** p. 3

5. So **the very principles that liberalism has built** itself upon (individual freedom, private property, universalism, individual autonomy, etc.) also **threaten to undermine liberalism**, because it is based on a class society. It's a source of strength *and* weakness for the ideology.

II. Bourgeois and proletarians: History as class struggle

A. Chap 1 of Manifesto starts out by saying "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."

1. **Question**: What do they mean by that?

2. They mean first of all that history is dynamic: it's about change, struggle, rupture, and disruption. There's no smooth evolution or progress. History moves through a series of clashes.

3. Furthermore, all human history has been divided into social classes: master/slave, lord/serf, peasant/landlord, etc. In the modern era, the two main classes are capitalists and workers, or bourgeoisie and proletarians. **Read** 485/159. The **"two hostile camps."**

B. **The bourgeoisie**

1. **Q:** Does Marx think the bourgeoisie is all bad?

2. **The bourgeoisie have been the most revolutionary class in all of history.** They have brought about incredible changes. Many of these changes are good. They eliminated feudalism and its notion that some men are "naturally" superior to others, it has tamped down religious superstitions, it created the modern nation-stateand perhaps most importantly, it has created vast wealth and immensely powerful productive forces. Instead of societies with very little technological change, capitalism is based on constant change in technology and in methods of production. It's always trying to improve itself, to become more efficient, faster, better, more powerful. **Read** 487/161-62.

3. So capitalism unleashes what Marx calls "colossal" productive forces in the world. It also **centralizes the means of production**: more people live in cities, they work in larger factories, and fewer and fewer people accumulate more and more wealth. With this economic centralization comes **political centralization**: instead of a bunch of principalities, each with its own laws, tariffs, tax codes and the like, capitalism has created nations with one set of laws, systems of taxation and one frontier. This makes life much easier for the capitalist, of course.

4. Many of these changes are good. In fact, they are necessary for the social advancement of humanity, especially improving our productive forces. Marx certainly appreciates these "colossal" changes wrought by capitalism. **Read** if time 489/163.

5. However, as useful as capitalism is, for every good it's brought, it has brought with it much more **misery**. "It is true that labor produces wonderful things for the rich—but for the worker it produces privation. It produces palaces—but for the worker, hovels. It produces beauty—but for the worker, deformity. It replaces labor by machines, but it throws one section of the workers back to a barbarous type of labor, and it turns the other section into a machine. It produces intelligence—but for the worker, stupidity, cretinism." (1844 Manuscripts, vol.3, 273)

6. These dynamic, revolutionary forces of capitalism are progressive but they are also too powerful for even the bourgeoisie to control. Capitalist production often leads to overproduction (what Marx sarcastically calls "too much civilization") and to crises and depressions. These crises feed on itself and lead society spiraling out of control. Arising out of capitalism's crises are the gravediggers of capitalism itself: the proletariat.

C. **The proletariat**

1. "But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians." (490/164)

2. **Q:** How does Marx's dynamic model of history compare to Plato and Machiavelli's conceptions?

3. Under capitalism, workers are enslaved, to the factory machinery, to the boss, to his pittance of a wage that ensures his survival, to the entire capitalist system. It drags people down into poverty, alienation, boredom, and desperation. People are brought down so low that **they have nothing to lose by fighting back**: "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains." (519/186)

4. In addition to giving them good reason to revolt (their poverty and degradation), **the bourgeoisie has unwittingly given the working class the weapons they'll need to overthrow capitalism**. The same processes of industrialization that immiserate the prole also strengthen it by teaching the wc how to work collectively with others and to get workers to see themselves as sharing a common exploited condition with others. This class consciousness leads to revolutionary consciousness and political action.

5. Eventually, the fetters of capitalism and the rise of the working class work simultaneously to make it impossible for capitalist society to continue to exist. "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, above all, is its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable." (496/169)

III. Proletarians and communists: The role of the revolutionary

A. The proletariat as a universal class.

1. **Q:** In the Manifesto and the "Contribution: Intro" Marx writes that the proletariat is a "universal class." What does he mean by that?

2. The proletariat is the key agent of human freedom. It is beyond just looking out for its own interests at the expense of other people. The prole is the universal class because it has no one beneath it to lord over. The struggle for its own self-interests, therefore, is the struggle in the interests of all of humanity.

B. The role of the communists

1. **Q:** What's the role of the communists in all this?

2. The communists are a political party created in the interests of the wc.

3. The **two goals of the communists**: a) overthrow of the bourgeoisie and b) the abolition of private property.

4. **They aim to achieve this goal by organizing the proletariat** to take on its historic mission of overthrowing capitalism and bringing about a free society

   a. To form the proletariat **from a class-in-itself to a class-for-itself.**

   b. The party is **internationalist**: against all divisions within the party according to nationality, gender, race, etc.

   c. The party is also **radical**: in all social struggles by the wc, even moderate ones, it **shows the wc the big picture** and points to the big picture as the real goal of any struggle. They point out the logical conclusions of any struggle.

C. **Q:** Is the Communist party elitist according to Marx?

1. Nowadays when we think of a communist party we think of a **vanguard party**: An elite organization of self-selected individuals who know the "objective" or real interests of the working class and therefore take it upon themselves to lead the working class to socialism. [Get Lenin's definition, next time] It's the vanguard Communist Party who seized the state in Russia, China, and elsewhere and who took power "on behalf of" the proletariat.

2. This is **not** Marx's conception of what a communist party or organization should do. Marx did not invent or envision the concept of a vanguard communist party like we think of today. Lenin did that.

3. For Marx, capitalism was to be overthrown not by a small party but by the entire working class of a country. "All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority...." (495/168)

4. The role of the Communists, then, is not to assume leadership and rule in a dictatorship. Nor is it to create a revolutionary situation out of thin air. Communists haven't invented anything new, Marx argues, **they just explain in clear terms the historical movement that is happening right before our very eyes**. They use their knowledge of historical processes to show the rest of the working class their common source of exploitation and the need for the working class to unite, whether it's inside a factory, within a nation, or internationally.

D. **The abolition of private property**

1. The key to M&E's conception of freedom is the abolition of private property. **Read** 498/170: "the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."

2. **Q:** What does Marx mean by private property?

By property Marx means the means of production—land, factories, technology, etc.—and not homes, cars, stereos, etc. He's not out to collectivize our underwear.

3. **Question**: Why does Marx believe this?

4. Property is capital. **Capital is sucked out of the labor of the working class through the normal processes of capitalist production**. I'll explain his theory how this happens next class.

5. The bourgeoisie attacks communists for wanting to abolish the right to acquire property. But who are the biggest destroyers of property, especially of the small farmer, craftsperson, or businessperson? Why, the capitalist, of course. The ability to own private property is already eliminated for 90% of the population who will never be able to afford it. Further, the only reason why 10% of the population can have the "freedom" to actually own property is because the rest of us can't: that's the way private property works. **Read:** (500/171) (498/170)

IV. Freedom under communism

A. From the critique of property M&E move on to criticize the **bourgeois conception of individuality.**

1. In present bourgeois society, **individual freedom is little more than the freedom to buy and sell.**

2. Under communism, people will still be able to produce and consume the products of society, they just won't be able to subjugate the labor of others in order to produce and consume it. "Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labor of others by means of such appropriation." 500/172

B. Marx does not want to squash the freedom of the individual. **He wants to abolish one particular kind of individuality and replace it with another.** It's a myth to believe that individuality is based only on a person's abilities or ideas. Even in bourgeois society, individuality is still dependent on particular social relations, such as the relation between boss and worker, buyer and seller, etc. It's not a purely individualistic, "self-made man" kind of thing. Furthermore, the social relations on which bourgeois individuality depend are relations of *inequality*.

C. Marx wants to replace it with a fuller, more human conception of individuality that is based on equal social relations. **He does not want to abolish individuality itself and make us all alike or bring us all down to the same level.** He says **if anything that's what capitalist society does**: it brings most of us down to the level of struggling to survive while only a few people get to "express themselves" artistically or exercise their option to own property. Marx argues that individuality will fluourish under conditions of social equality because, as they write on 499/171, (**Read:**) "In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality."

1. **Question**: What does Marx mean by this?

2. In class societies, labor is alienating and exploitative. In communist society, where labor would no longer be alienated, labor would be used to as "a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the laborer." (499/171) It would be used to promote the full flowering of the individual, not stifle it by forcing them to work a crap job for 40-60 hours a week so some capitalist could accumulate that labor (in the form of profits and expansion).

D. So, by abolishing private property (i.e. class society, i.e. capitalism) you abolish alienation. In the process **one form of individuality is abolished**, but it's a stunted form of individuality that only allows the "free" development of the few, just like ancient Greek notions of citizenship was one particular notion of individual conduct, directed toward that society's elite. **In its place arises a new, much more fuller individuality**. Further, "private property can be abolished only on condition of an all-round development of individuals, because the existing character of intercourse and productive forces is an all-round one, and only individuals that are developing in an all-round fashion can appropriate them ...." (GI 191)

1. **Read** 506/176: "In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonims, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the conditons for the free development of all."

E. **Getting from here to there**

1. Look at the 10 measures M&E advocate in going from capitalism to communism on pp. 505/175-76.
2. **Q:** Do these measures seem radical to you?
3. **Q:** Is anything missing from them?

Politics. This is the key problem of Marx's thought: lacks a democratic political theory of how humans are to govern themselves in a free society, and how a movement for a free society should be organized. Locke provides at least the outlines of a theory of the basis of political authority (consent) and how it will rule (majority rule, parliamentary government); Marx only provides the basis of authority (the prole) but doesn't say how it will rule.

add to *te, p5

4. Marx makes an attempt to address this (and in the course of things significantly revises his 10 points in the Manifesto) in CWF and Gotha Programme. When we read them next week let's discuss how well he addresses this.

07b. Marx, *Capital* and after

Marx, *Capital* short notes
chaps. 1 (section 1), 4, 6, 10 (section 1), 13, 26, 32
October 12, 2000
[page references are from the International edition / Simon reader]

For Tuesday: Skip "Gotha," re-read "Theses on Feurback" and "Preface"

I. Commodities (chap. 1 sxn 1)

A. **Commodity**: Something bought or sold.

B. **Use-value vs. exchange value**:

1. Two separate properties of the same commodity
2. **use-value**: The usefulness of the commodity for its consumer. It cannot be quantified, for it varies for different people and in different circumstances.
3. **exchange value**: That which allows commodities to be compared (and therefore exchanged). The exchange value of a commodity represents that which is equal in all commodities.

C. **How do you measure the magnitude of value?** By reducing them to a third commodity, labor.

1. You measure not labor but **labor-power**
2. Labor power is measured as **socially necessary labor time**: "The labor time socially necessary is that required to produce an article under the normal conditions of production, and with the average degree of skill and intensity prevalent at the time." (47/223) **The value of a commodity is determined by the SNLT it takes to produce it.**
3. **Example**: cotton shirt in 1775 vs. today, or a computer today

II. Circulation of commodities (chap. 4)

A. **C—M—C** (mere circulation, or selling in order to buy)

B. **M—C—M'** (creation of capital)

C. **surplus value**: $M' = M + \Delta M$

1. In the creation of surplus value (i.e. in M—C—M), capital becomes an end in itself.

D. **Definition of a capitalist**: One whose job is to accumulate capital.

1. **Read** 151/261-62

E. What's at the bottom of capital? Value, i.e. **labor**

F. **Definition of a worker**: one who owns no capital and works to produce value (for use and exchange). Thus a capitalist produces no value, he only accumulates it. Thus, he does not labor in Marx's definition of the term.

G. **S-v is produced out of the exploitation of the laborer**

1. Value - subsistance = s-v (A—B—C in *Capital*)
2. **Example**: 12 hrs labor - 6 hrs subsistence = 6 hrs free labor
   or: $12/hr - $6/hr subsistence = $6/hr profit for the capitalist.
3. **Surplus value is theft.**
4. **Political vs. economic extraction** of surplus value

III. How does the capitalist acquire the labor necessary to produce s-v? (chap. 6)

A. He has to buy it.

B. **Preconditions of buying labor: Read** 164-65/264-65, 166/266

1. Laborer owns one's self and is free to sell it (i.e. not a serf or slave)
2. A marketplace of labor where buyer and seller of labor meet
3. Laborer has no access to the means of production herself. She has to sell her labor to survive.
4. Laborer has rights: to sell to whomever she can, and to sell her labor for only a definite period of time in the day.

C. **Free labor is therefore free in the "double sense"**: free as in not a slave, and free as in owns no capital of their own. 166 & chap. 26

IV. Struggle over the length of the working day (chap. 10)

A. **Right of capitalist**: to get a day's labor out of the laborer.

B. **Right of the worker**: to preserve her labor so she can work another day.

C. **Antinomy of "right vs. right": Read** 225 (Tucker 363-64)

D. **KEY:** This is a **critique of liberalism**. Power, not contract, is at its heart. Conflict and coercion is inherent to capitalism, not consent.

E. Leads to a **struggle over the length of the working day**

1. Length of a working day is the result of **class struggle**

V. Cooperation (chap. 13)

A. One one hand, cooperation is good.

1. It "develops the capabilities of the species"
2. It rationally organizes and coordinate labor for maximum efficiency

B. But on the other hand, it is a **despotic power**, a means to control the worker. The role of the manager is to suppress worker resistance, to inhibit the very solidarity capitalism begets.

C. **docility-utility**

skip **VI. Primitive accumulation** (chap. 26)

A. The objective of capitalism is to make workers **free in the "double sense":** to end their peonage or feudal ties to the land or guild, and to free them from any means of production they might own. This turns them into proletarians, or wage laborers.

skip **VII. Communism overthrowing capitalism** (chap. 32)

A. This chapter largely recapitulates the *Manifesto*

Marx, *Capital*
~~October 12, 2000~~
[page references are from the International edition / Simon reader]

I. The labor theory of value (from chapter 1 section 1; chapter 4)

A. **The commodity**

1. **Q:** What is a commodity?

2. Something that satisfies human wants and is produced in order to be bought and sold. For a thing to become a commodity, it must be transferable. That's why air or ocean waters, for example, are not commodities.

a. **Q:** What are some other things that are not or cannot be turned into commodities in this society?]

3. Every commodity has two properties, quality and quantity.

4. **Every commodity can be analyzed in two ways**, as a use value and as an exchange value.

B. **Use value**

1. The usefulness of the commodity for its consumer. It cannot be quantified, for it varies for different people and in different circumstances.

C. **Exchange value**

1. That which allows commodities to be compared (and therefore exchanged). The exchange value of a commodity represents that which is equal in all commodities. You can't compare u-v's in a similar way; what is valuable to me may be useless to you. The only way for value to be expressed in society is through exchange, i.e. exchange value. 46/

2. Exchange value, then, is the expression of value, though it is not value itself. [Cos value is labor power]

3. **Q:** What is the thing that is common to all commodities?

4. **Labor**. The only way to equate (and therefore exchange) two commodities is to reduce them both to a third commodity, i.e. labor.

D. **SNLT**

1. Value is "a congelation of homogenous human labor." It's human labor in the abstract.

2. **Q:** How do we measure human labor abstractly? Don't some folks work faster or harder than others? Aren't some folks just lazy?

3. Marx defines value not as labor simply but as **labor power**. Labor power is measured as **socially necessary labor time**: "The labor time socially necessary is that required to produce an article under the normal conditions of production, and with the average degree of skill and intensity prevalent at the time." (47/223) **The value of a commodity is determined by the SNLT it takes to produce it.**

a. The SNLT of a product can vary due to changes in the production process.

b. **Example**: manufacturing a ~~computer~~ candle – by hand vs. mass produced (or bread, etc.) tortilla

4. **The value of an article lies in the labor put into it, *not* supply and demand**, according to Marx.

5. Producing and exchanging commodities is therefore a human or social relationship. **At the heart of commodities is social relations**. Nothing "natural" about a commodity's value; value is only determined *relative* to other commodities. Even if the commodity is created by a private individual, the labor is still social in character because the object produced only has value in relations to other objects. We think we are just exchanging objects but really we are involved in social relations. When I buy that CD I am engaged in a social relationship with the band, the workers at the record company, the distributor, and the clerk at the store where I bought it. These relations are built into and disguised by the commodity, but they are there.

E. **Q:** Okay, so that's value and how to measure it. But what is capital and how is it acquired?

1. The answer lies in Marx's concept of surplus value.

F. **Surplus value**

1. The circulation of commodities

a. **C—M—C**: the transformation of a commodity into money, then back into a commodity (selling in order to buy). **Example:** I sell some used CD's to make some cash so I can buy something to eat at the local Mexican restaurant. **Q:** Can I make any profit in this kind of transaction?

b. **M—C—M**: the transformation of money into commodities, then back into money (i.e. buying in order to sell). **Example:** I buy a bunch of Levis for $40 here in the states, then go over to Europe and sell them for $100 each. What I've done, basically, is exchange money for money.

c: Both relationships can be resolved into the same two "antithetical phases": **C—M (a sale/seller)** and **M—C (a purchase/buyer)**, but the difference is the order of succession of these two phases. The former ends in a purchase of a commodity, which serves as a u-v. Once it becomes a u-v, it goes out of circulation and ceases to be a commodity. But the latter ends in the sale of a commodity; the commodity is bought for the purpose of selling it. Money is put into circulation in order to withdraw it again later (at a profit). "He [the buyer in M—C—M] lets the money go, but only with the sly intention of getting it back again! The money, therefore, is not spent, it is merely advanced." 147/257

2. **Surplus value**: "The exact form of this process is therefore M—C—M', where M' = M + ΔM = the original sum advanced, plus an increment. This increment or excess over the original value I call 'surplus value.' The value originally advanced, therefore, not only remains intact while in circulation, but adds to itself a surplus-value or expands itself. It is this movement that converts it into capital." 149/259

a. The $60 I make off each pair of Levis, then, is surplus value.

3. **Example**: ask if anyone works in sales or production line stuff. Show them the surplus value the boss earns off your labor.

4. **The circulation of commodities vs. capital**: When you sell something in order to buy something else, i.e. to satisfy a need, that's the circulation of commodities. No surplus is made from that: I sell something I have too much of or don't want in order to buy something I do need. The circulation of commodities is used to obtain use-values. The circulation of capital, on the other hand, is an end

in itself. You sell not to obtain another use-value but to augment your exchange value.

G. **The political extraction of a surplus vs. economic extraction:**

1. In feudalism, for example, wealth/labor is extracted politically and directly; the serf is not deceived as to the appropriation of his labor for the lord. He knows when he is working for himself and when he's working for the lord. In commodity production, however, the social relations between producer and owner are masked and appear as social relations (i.e. exchanges) between the *products* of labor.

~~a. [For more on this, see 1054 or 350 notes]~~

2. ~~b.~~ **Example:** taxes vs. your boss's profits.

H. **Definition of a capitalist**

1. **Capital:** Surplus value. Wealth used to obtain more value/wealth. The heart of surplus value is **labor**.

2. **Capitalist: Read** 151/261-62.

a. **Q:** What's the difference between a capitalist and a miser? What makes a capitalist a "rational miser"?

the source of SV

II. The relation between capital and labor (chapter 6; chap. 10 section 1)

A. **Q:** Where does surplus value come from? What is the one kind of use-value that expands value when you use it rather than is depleted? **Labor power**. Labor power is the only commodity whose consumption *increases* value. 164/264

B. Free labor and the market

1. **Labor is a commodity:** it is something to be bought and sold.

2. Before labor can be used to create value it must be made into a commodity. There are **two conditions** that must be met for labor to be offered for sale as a commodity. First, the laborer must have possession of her own body in order to offer it for sale. I.e. **the laborer must be free**. Second, **the laborer has only her labor-power to sell** and not any commodities her power has produced. So the laborer is free in a second sense: free from owning any wealth. See 40 668: free in the Heyoc sense of the MoP (i.e. stuff) + that they own no part of the MoP

3. **Read** 164-65/264-65; 166/266. Because a laborer must possess her labor-power in order to sell it, equal rights and freedom are inherently linked to commodity production. Both buyer and seller of labor power meet in the market and deal with each other as free persons on the basis of (formally) equal rights. The seller sells her power only for a definite period of time; if she sold it "rump and stump" she would be a slave, not a free person. She would become a commodity instead of the owner of a commodity (labor power).

a. **Crit of Marx:** The problem with this formulation is that while we can see how selling one's labor power "rump and stump, once and for all" would hurt the seller, it's not clear how it would hurt the buyer, at least in the abstract. Why couldn't, for example, slave labor or prison labor be equally or more profitable than free labor? Would it be fair to say, then, that slavery is not economically impermissable in capitalism but only *politically* impermissable? If so, what makes it impermissable; the demand for equal rights by the worker or the system of commodity production itself?

4. **Q:** What is the consequence of this "double-sense" of freedom? **Class conflict**

(x, the worker is free in a double sense. Read 668/295.

5. **Q:** What does this conflict between labor and capital revolve around?
   a. The struggle over the length of the working day.

C. **The working day**

1. **Q:** What's the conflict over?

   a. The value of a worker's labor-power is determined by the amount of time she needs to work in order to subsist and to be able to work another day. Anything over that is surplus value for the capitalist.

   b. Thus, it's in the capitalist's interests to make the working day as long as possible. On the other hand, the worker doesn't want to be worked to death. She has to rest and replenish herself to work another day, because her labor power is all she owns. She can't allow a capitalist to suck it all up. So, it's in the worker's self-interests to have as short of a working day as possible.

2. **Example**: Say it takes 6 hours of work a day to sustain a human being.
   a. **Q:** How do we determine that?

   b. Sustaining a human is not simply a matter of meeting natural needs, since such needs vary country by country and according to the stage of history the worker lives in, as well as by that culture's "habits and degree of comfort." Unlike other commodities, there is a "historical and moral element" in determining the value of labor power. (168) So part of a worker's subsistence is living a dignified life. There is therefore a political element in the determination of labor power's value: it depends, in part, on what constitutes a "dignified life" in a region, which is always a contested concept.

   c. **A—B—C**. The length of the working day is variable on both AB and BC sides. With technological innovation the length from A—B could be reduced from 6 to 5 or 4 hours or less. The boss wants to stretch out the time for surplus labor (B—C) for as long as possible. He wants you to work 8, 10, 12 or more hours/day, and if A—B shortens he doesn't necessarily want to shorten A—C.

3. **The result is a political struggle over the length of the working day**: the 10 hours bill advanced by the chartists, etc. A working day is *politically* determined thru struggle, led by the wc itself

   d. **Read** 225 (363-64 in Tucker)

for chp 10

4. **Read** 225 (364 in Tucker). **Q:** What does Marx mean by the **antinomy of "right against right"?**

   a. He is **criticizing liberalism**. The cap has a "right" to try to extend the working day and the worker has a "right" to try to decrease it. Force or power determines who wins. Liberalism presents itself as a conflict-free social system, with buyer and seller coming together freely, as equals, in order to exchange according to a contract. There is no conflict or coercion in such a contract; in fact, conflict is seen as disruptive in the liberal model. Marx, however, shows here that conflict is *inherent* in the liberal social contract. Each side enters into the contract, but each has different interests that lead to conflictual interpretations of how that contract's terms should be fulfilled. We've seen before that the free nature of the "**free labor market**" is free to the worker only in that she is "free" to sell her labor because she has nothing else to sell. Her "agreement" is compelled by social conditions. Now we see that the **equal rights inherent in the market** exchange/contract are in fact not equal because they are understood differently by

the two parties. This sets equal "right against right." Finally, he reveals that in this antinomy, this conflict that liberalism masks, that **the contract is in fact enforced not by mutual agreement but by force**: whoever is most dominant and can win the right to insist that the contract be carried out on his/her terms. So enforcing and meeting contracts in capitalism is done not through agreement but through force and struggle. Hence, getting the workers to work and getting capitalism to function is a political task born of the struggle of the antinomy between two bearers of "equal rights."

D. **Capitalist-worker relations are social relations**, not natural ones like bourgeois economists claim. Compare Marx's account with Locke's glib comment in passing about his servant.

~~[skip: save for Foucault]~~

III. Managing capital (chap. 13)

A. **Cooperation**

1. The output of workers working together is larger than the sum of the same workers working individually. Cooperation in the production process, therefore, creates a "new power, namely, the collective power of the masses." This power is greatly amplified under cap, in which more and more workers have to cooperate in the production process. The benefits of cooperation accrue to the capitalist.

B. **The role of social control** in managing labor

1. Cooperative labor requires coordination and supervision. Further, as the number of workers working in combination increases, so will their resistance to their exploitation. Capital has to overcome this resistance with "counterpressure."

2. Management thus serves two functions:

a. Ideally, it serves as a plan to rationally organize labor. It coordinates labor in order to squeeze the maximum s-v out of production.

b. Practically, it serves as a means to subject workers' wills to the capitalist's. It tamps down resistance. This control, Marx argues, is "**despotic**." 314 (385 in Tucker)

3. Marx is describing what Foucault will later call ensuring relations of **docility-utility**.

C. The purpose of management, then, is to counter the very tendencies of cooperation that capitalism begets (i.e. worker solidarity). Management grapples with problems that capital itself creates.

D. Cooperation in capitalist vs. ancient societies. 361-317 (387-88 in Tucker)

needs revision — go back to text & take more notes

IV. Primitive accumulation (chap. 26, 32)

A. **Q:** What is accumulation?

1. "the gradual increase of capital by reproduction as it passes from the circular to the spiral form". 588

2. **Q:** What was the original accumulation upon which capitalist accumulation began, and how was it acquired?

3. ~~It's~~ acquired through **conquest, enslavement, theft**. It has little to do with the "industriousness" of the capitalist, as Locke argues in his theory of accumulating property in the SoN. 668/295

B. **From feudalism to capitalism**

1. How the abolition of private property would be different from feudalism's "universal mediocrity."

a. There are two kinds of private property, pp owned by the cap and pp owned by the laborer. The latter is basically feudal or peasant agriculture. Marx criticizes it because it prohibits collective, cooperative, labor and the "free development of the social productive powers" of humanity. It hence breeds a "universal mediocrity."

C. **From capitalism to socialism**

1. Chapter 32 is essentially a recap of the *Manifesto*

2. The general law of capitalist accumulation: the greater the wealth produced by a capitalist nation, the greater the industrial reserve army, the greater that country's poverty. Accumulation, therefore, has an antagonistic character. 603-4. "It [capitalism] establishes an accumulation of misery, corresponding with accumulation of capital." 604

a. **Q:** How valid is that law today, with consumerism and the welfare state?

V. Capitalism today

A. **Q:** What did Marx get wrong about capitalism?

B. **Q:** What did he get right?

Stuff not included above:

• commodity fetishism

x. Locke & other liberals tell us it was acquired through hard work, thrift, & intelligent efforts of some, who left the lazy & shiftless behind. 667/294-5
[the fore-bears of caps, the latter workers.]
[this is the liberal cap' version of "original sin."]

xx. Remember, marx on "free" in a double sense: free they're not tied to the MoP (land, etc.) of slaves or serfs, but also that they're "free" of any wealth, i.e. they don't own any M. P. The process of primitive accumulation — colonialism — is the process of stripping the MoP away from people.

Marx, historical materialism
October 17, 2000

Pick this reader to Macleellan/Simon analysis

I. The materialist conception of history

A. Private property is alienated labor.

Forget all this Soul stuff let's start w/ the parts about political economy. Simon 106, 107 59.

B. Labor

1. For Marx, history begins with labor. Thus, theory must begin with labor, too.

2. The first things humans have to do is survive; that is, to satisfy their material needs: food, shelter, clothing. The first historical act, therefore, is the production of ~~the means to satisfy~~ basic needs. We also, of course, need to reproduce ourselves in order for the species to survive. Production and reproduction involve altering nature. However, we don't do these things alone. **We produce to meet our needs in cooperation with others.** The production and reproduction of human life, therefore, involves a "**double relationship**": natural and social (GI 166). / Simon 116 **Production**, therefore, **is a fundamentally social relationship.**

3. Locke's conception of labor is idealistic and ahistorical, according to Marx. In actual human history, it's not just individuals that labor, *individuals labor in cooperation with each other*. Now this cooperation can be voluntary or coerced, exploitative or free, but it is in some way cooperative, or social.

4. **These needs and our capacities to produce our needs constitute human nature.** There is no abstract "human nature" (eg. original sin, self-interest, etc.); human nature depends on the material conditions of humans' production and the social relationships they enter into. **Human nature is a social product**, a social product that is based on labor. What individuals are "coincides with their production" (what is produced and how). Read 107-108 (Simon)

5. **Humans are fundamentally social beings**; we cannot be abstracted from society. Furthermore, **we are social beings because we labor**, therefore labor is the essence of humanness. People labor—that's what distinguishes us from other species.

6. Our distaste for labor and the kind of crap jobs most of us do now is proof of how separated we've become from our human nature. **Human labor is productive, aesthetic, and creative** for Marx. It is not just toil.

7. The problem is, we've become separated from our human nature, from the essence of labor ~~and our humanity~~. Marx calls this separation alienation.

C. Alienation

(move to after C.E.)

get a better use of an example

1. To be an alien ~~is to be a stranger.~~ As Mary Dietz says, alienation is "being a stranger in a strange land of buying and selling."

2. Alienation exists in two senses: political and economic

a. **Political**: "a cleavage between the particular and common interest." (GI 169) The distinction between citoyen and bourgeois, as we found out in "OJQ."

b. **Economic**: Capitalism turns humans and their labor into commodities, into things that are to be bought and sold. When workers are turned into commodities, the more wealth they produce, the poorer they become, and the cheaper a commodity they become. As things increase in value, human life is devalued. This is alienation, when the products of labor confront humanity and — Simon 59

humans' labor as something alien, "as a power independent of the producer." (1844, 272).

3. Alienation separates humans' labor from their physical existence. We are a "worker" (or teacher, bricklayer, engineer, etc.) for part of the day, and then a **physical subject** the other part of the day (who receives the means of subsistence: eating, sleeping, procreating, etc.). What is ironic is that under capitalism what we do as workers maintains us physically, but what we do as humans or physical subjects (i.e. in our leisure time) is really our "animal functions": eating, sleeping, procreating, etc. ~~**Read** 1844, 273 [weak section]~~

4. **Alienation works in four ways**:

   a. Alienation from the products we produce

   b. Alienation from the process of production. The human becomes animal

   c. Alienation from our **species-being**. Alienation from ourselves and from what defines us as a species (to labor creatively).

   d. Alienation from others. We become atomized and isolated, and compete against each other.

5. But if the products of labor are alien to the worker, to whom do they belong? To the capitalist. Alienation exists in all stages of history, but most acutely under capitalism, because private property turns people into commodities. It alienates humans from labor, from our human essence.

D. **The rise of class society**

1. Different societies have different levels of production. In early societies, production was based on subsistence: gathering, hunting, horticulture. Seeing that little or no surplus was produced, the produce of these societies was distributed roughly evenly among its members.

2. However, as agriculture, herding, and other forms of sedentary production developed, two things happen:

   a. The existence of a **surplus**: Society can produce more than it needs. The surplus produced by these societies tend to go to a relatively small elite, who therefore doesn't have to work itself. Power, along with the surplus, accrues with this elite.

   b. The rise of a **division of labor**: Certain people assigned to particular tasks. Marx argues that the degree of production a society has attained is shown by the extent of its division of labor. But there's another way in which the division of labor works besides different people doing different jobs. In hunter-gatherer societies, the division of labor was gendered. In sedentary societies, it is gendered but also based on relations of subordination: those who work and those who live off of the surplus of society. This division is the division between those who own property and those who don't. (And gender relations become relations of subordination, too.)

3. **Rise of classes**. Production since the hunter-gatherers, therefore, has been characterized by the existence of different social classes. One class owns the wealth and property (i.e. the surplus), while the other class or classes work for them.

E. **Modes of production**

1. Human history, therefore, is characterized by class societies. Marx outlines five different kinds of class societies, i.e. five different modes of production: a) hunter-gatherer (gendered or familial division of labor), b) ancient communal and state ownership (slave/citizen division of labor), c) feudal ownership (serf labor and nobles, craft industry), d) capitalist ownership (workers and capitalists), e) socialism (classless). Also sometimes talks of an "Asiatic" mode of production in India, China, etc. Sinn 108 -

2. Each mode of production or stage in human history is characterized by different social relations between who controls the surplus of a society and who doesn't, i.e. between ruling and subordinate classes. The social and political structures of humans are in each case connected with the MoP and the particular class relations of that society.

F. **The purpose of materialism**

1. Materialism must "bring out empirically… the connection of the social and political structure with production." (Selected Writings 164) - Read Sinn 111 Q1

2. **Materialism attempts to explain social and political phenomena by seeing how it connects to that society's mode of production.** The production of ideas, concepts, consciousness, religion, politics, law, morality "is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men, the language of real life." (SW 164)

3. Materialism flips idealism on its head. We go from earth to heaven, not from heaven to earth. 1. Read Sinn 111-112 Q2, 211

II. **Base and superstructure** (CM-503-4; GI 166; Intro to Crit of Poly Econ)

See Mary's diagram in your 1041 notes for Base/superstructure explanation

A. **Base**

1. **Forces of production**:
   a. Tools, technology, natural resources, labor skills, science, capital.
   b. FoP correspond to particular RoP.
2. **Relations of production**:
   a. Class relations; property relations. "Two great hostile camps."
   b. The RoP simultaneously organize the process of production of a society and establish a class division in the society: those who have access to society's surplus and those who don't.
   c. These relations are relations of **exploitation**: one class extracts a surplus from the labor of the other class.
3. The FoP and RoP together form the economic structure, MoP, or economic "base" of a society. The base conditions or "determines" the superstructure.

B. **Superstructure**

1. Politics: the state, laws, political institutions, parties
2. Culture: religion, morality, art, literature
3. Forms of social consciousness: ideology, values
4. How consciousness is formed and how it functions in a class society.

Q. — example: Protestant work ethic (weber) - work through it

— helps students understand base-superstructure (cap. — Protestant

C. **Our laws, morals, and the way we see the world are fundamentally conditioned by our mode of production**. Furthermore, the dominant ideas of a society are inevitably the ideas of the ruling class, because they dominate the mode of production as well. "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class." 503/174

E. ~~D~~. Therefore, Marx argues **two things about bourgeois ideology**:

1. Liberal or bourgeois notions of freedom, of individuality, and of "rights" (to property, etc.) are not natural, inevitable, or necessarily the best possible conception. It is one understanding of freedom, individuality, and equality: there have been and there can be others.

2. These liberal notions are products of particular social conditions. Liberal ideology didn't spring up from nowhere, nor was it invented because it was a good idea and then implemented; liberal ideology is a product of history. It's a response to particular social conditions and, Marx and Engels argue, it's a justification of these social conditions. Bourgeois ideology exists to justify bourgeois property. Liberalism (and modern conservatism) are therefore justifications of capitalism.

3. **Read** 501/172 ("But don't wrangle...").

E. **Q:** Which moves history for Marx? Humans or the relations of production, agents or structures? Compare Marx's theory of history with Machiavelli's fortuna and ability. Which side does Marx come down on?

1. This is the question of **determinism**.

Marx, *The Civil War in France, Critique of the Gotha Programme*
~~October 17, 2000~~
[page references are from the Simon reader]

Questions for discussion:
1) What's the significance of the Commune for Marx?
2) What kind of democracy does he advocate?
3) Does Marx put the individual or the collective at the center of his political theory? How does that compare with Locke and others we've read?
4) Are there politics in the Commune, or has political power been swept away? Would a world without politics (conflict, debate, ideology, etc.) be good or bad?

Envisioning communist society: *The Civil War in France*

I. The CWF vs. the *Manifesto*

A. Look at the 10 measures M&E advocate in going from capitalism to communism on pp. 505/175-76 of the *Manifesto*

1. **Q:** Do these measures seem radical to you?
2. **Q:** What do you notice about them? Is anything missing?
3. ***Politics and democracy***. The *Manifesto* lacks a democratic political theory of how humans are to govern themselves in a free society, and also how a movement for a free society should be organized. Locke provides at least the outlines of a theory of the basis of political authority (consent) and how it will rule (majority rule, parliamentary government); Marx provides the basis of authority (the prole) but doesn't say how it will rule.
4. Marx makes an attempt to address this ommission (and in the course of things significantly revises his 10 points in the Manifesto) in CWF and Gotha Programme. It's up to us to see how well he does.

B. **What would communist society look like?**

1. Marx and Engels refused to make blueprints of what communism would look like: "we do not attempt dogmatically to prefigure the future, but want to find the new world only through criticism of the old." (Tucker, 13) Communist society will be so different because social relations will be so different that we cannot even imagine it, because our imagination today is limited by the only world we know, capitalism and bourgeois liberalism and conservatism.
2. One suggestive quote is on page 169 of the GI (**Read**). However, Jim Farr suggests that this quote may be a bit tongue-in-cheek criticism aimed at pastoral, idyllic, back-to-the-land kinds of communism.

C. A more concrete suggestion is his analysis of **the Paris Commune**, not so much for what it was but for its potential, for what it revealed to the future: "**The political form at last discovered** under which to work out the economic emancipation of labor."

1. With the commune, **Marx has discovered his kallipolis** but in an actually existing city. The Paris Commune itself is not communism, but it is the kernel of the new society within the shell of the old.

II. Paris Commune: Background and achievements

A. Louis Bonaparte (1852-1870), Prussian invasion, Versailles govt. of M. Thiers, Paris uprising (March-May 1871).

B. The Paris Commune was elected by universal male suffrage on March 26, 1871. Trapped between the exiled but incensed French government of Adolphe Thiers and invading Prussian troops, the commune acted quickly.

C. Abolished conscription and the **standing army** and replaced it with a citizens' militia (the National Guard). 304 The **police** were stripped of their political function, and were made subservient to and their power revocable by the commune. Same with **judges**. 305

D. It made all official positions in the commune **elected positions** subject to immediate recall. Its government consisted of representatives or "municipal councillors," elected by universal suffrage and whose term was revocable. These were members or "the acknowledged representatives of" the working class, and all public service was performed at a "workman's wages." 305

1. **The working class was governing itself.**
2. **This body was both executive and legislative.** Made the Commune's laws and carried them out.

E. Other accomplishments

1. It remitted all payments of rent for houses from October 1870 to April 1871.
2. Separation of church and state. The Church's role in governance was abolished.
3. Free public education. Secular education, freed from church or official government propaganda.
4. It burned the guillotine, abolished night work for bakers, workers' protections against wage cuts, no taxation without representation, and began to draw up plans for the control and operation of abandoned factories by the workers who worked in them, as well as to unite them in "one great union," as Engels put it.

F. Overall, **pretty modest accomplishments**. No redistribution of property, etc.

1. **Q:** How different does the commune look from standard liberal representative government?
2. **Q:** Why is Marx so enthusiastic about the Commune, then?

III. The "political form at last discovered"

A. The biggest achievement of the Commune isn't so much what it did but what it represented: the political form at last discovered under which a communist society would be organized. **Read** 307

1. In many ways the institutions seem the same, but Marx argues they served fundamentally different roles, since the state's function was no longer to serve capital but to serve labor. Thus, **the same or similar institutions now served radically different roles.**

B. **The Commune was the first step on the long road from capitalism to communism.** 308

1. For example, the effect of paying commune officials workers' wages and electing all adminstrative, judicial, policing, and educational posts was to **transform the character of poly power into an agent to abolish class society instead of defend it.**

C. **Federalism**

1. The commune model was to be replicated throughout France, and eventually the world. The commune was the basic political unit, which was united by delegates into larger "district assemblies," and these assemblies in turn would form a National Delegation.

2. This is federalism, only unlike our federalism, **power flows from the bottom up rather than from the top down.** The real power lies in the people. **Power is no longer a lion's skin but is real.** This is the political form by which alienation is overcome and our communal powers are brought back into our selves.

3. Thus, the Commune was not a state, at least not in the sense in which we'd understand it.

D. **The abolition of alienation**

1. Last week we defined communism as **the regaining of our humanness through the abolition of private property.**

2. Communism = abolition of alienation = abolition of private prop = ab of classes

3. Human emancipation is **the overcoming of alienation between our private and public selves** and the public/private split in society.

4. This what the Paris Commune represented. **The Commune sought to abolish the "fake universality" of the modern state and replace it with a truly universal association of humanity**, one in which the political and the social were not divided. The Commune provided the means toward human emancipation because it was a working political body that overcame the split between the executive and legislative and the citizen and individual. Many of the mechanisms used by the Commune were the same as in a liberal democracy—suffrage, representation, etc.—but their character was completely transformed when used by the working class for the purposes of building a socialist society governed by all, not a society of property ruled by an elite few.

5. The Commune, in other words, was the political form that would have united the citizen and the bourgeois.

IV. The critique of the state

A. **Q:** Is Marx's notion of a proletarian government dictatorial? Is he advocating a strong central state?

1. Compared to the CM, **Marx here appears as a ruthless critic of the state.** The capitalist state cannot be simply taken over by the workers as he and Engels had written in the CM, now it has to be smashed and replaced with something new. "But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes." 302

1. **Read** 303.

B. The Commune is the "direct antithesis" of the State & Bonaparte's Empire. 304

C. **Q:** Is there politics in the Commune? I.e. is there debate, conflict, struggle, and a means for resolving it, or does it presuppose the absence of conflict. Would it attempt to make all government "like a post office," as Lenin claimed?

Getting there: ***Critique of the Gotha Program***

[cites are from the Simon reader]

I. From capitalism to socialism: the dictatorship of the proletariat

A. The task of the working class is to overthrow the capitalists and seize political power for the wc. This is sometimes known as the DoP.

B. By DoP he does NOT mean a dictatorship in the sense in which we understand the term. Marx was not a dictator nor did he advocate one. In Marx's day, the term "dictatorship" did not mean despotism or tyranny or rule by a tiny vanguard party. Instead, **dictatorship meant the class character of a regime**, or what social group or class held power.

1. So, for example, in a capitalist society we live under a **dictatorship of the bourgeoisie**. Marx is not saying that our democratic systems are really dictatorships; he's saying that no matter what the political form of a particular capitalist society (democratic, constitutional monarchy, despotism, fascism, etc.), the ruling class in power is the bourgeoisie. Because the class character of our political system is run by the bourg., we live under a DoB.

2. Same goes with the DoP: All it means is the working class holding political power. It does not say anything about *how* they exercise power: direct dem, etc.

C. So the Communists want to encourage abolishing the class DoB and replace it with the class DoP. Don't want to rule themselves, necessarily. They just want the wc to seize political power, because you can change society to your liking only after you have political power.

D. The **DoP exercises political power to make sure that the bourgeoisie doesn't rise up again**. Because it comes out of capitalist society, it is still stamped with many of the economic, moral, and intellectual conditions of that older society. It will take a while to change them.

1. Economically, society at this stage will be organized along the principle: **To each according to ability**. This is in fact **"bourgeois equality"** and is really **"a right of inequality"** because people, in their individual capacities, are really *not* equal. Some people can do more, some people need less, etc. Communist society will eventually have to recognize that. At this stage of society, however, we can't recognize these differences. 321

2. **Read** 321

E. The reason for this is that "Right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and its cultural development which this determines." 321

1. ~~[this would be a good place to go into Marx's base-superstructure theory.]~~

think again of the relationship bet. base & superstructure here.
Communism as a poly system is possible only when the MoP can handle it.

II. From the DoP to communism

A. But once labor is no longer alienated and once the individual is no longer enslaved by the division of labor, then society shall be organized along the principle: **From each according to ability, to each according to need.** This is communist society, the highest stage of human history.

1. **Read** 321.

III. Freedom and individuality under communism

isn't this in CM now already?

A. **Q:** Based on what we've read, what is Marx's conception of individual freedom under communism? Does he want to make all people the same?

B. In present bourgeois society, **individual freedom is little more than the freedom to buy and sell.** Under communism, people will still be able to produce and consume the products of society, **they just won't be able to subjugate the labor of others in order to produce and consume it.** "Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labor of others by means of such appropriation." CM 500/172

C. Marx does not want to squash individuality. **He wants to abolish one particular kind of individuality and replace it with another.** Marx wants to replace bourgeois ideology with a fuller, more human conception of individuality that is based on equal social relations. **He does not want to abolish individuality itself and make us all alike** or bring us all down to the same level. He says **if anything that's what capitalist society does**: it brings most of us down to the level of struggling to survive while only a few people get to "express themselves" artistically or exercise their option to own property. Marx argues that individuality will fluourish under conditions of social equality because, as M&E write on CM 499/171, **(Read:)** "In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality."

1. ~~**Question**~~: What does Marx mean by this?

2. In class societies, labor is alienating. All it does in capitalism, for instance, is accumulate wealth. In communist society, where labor would no longer be alienated, labor would be used to as "a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the laborer." (499) It would be used to promote the full flowering of the individual, not stifle it by forcing them to work a crap job for 40-60 hours a week so some capitalist could accumulate that labor (in the form of profits and expansion).

D. So, by abolishing private property (i.e. class society, i.e. capitalism) you abolish alienation. In the process **one form of individuality is abolished**, but it's a stunted form of individuality that only allows the "free" development of the few, just like ancient Greek notions of citizenship was one particular notion of individual conduct, directed toward that society's elite. **In its place arises a new, much more fuller individuality.**

1. CM 506/176: "In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonims, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the conditions for the free development of all."

E. **Example: artistic talent under communism.** He argues ~~not~~ that we all will have to do the same job or jobs we don't want to do. Instead, we will be able to develop our talents without being hindered by a life-deadening low-paying job.

1. Artistic talent, like any other part of the superstructure, is conditioned by the technology of the time, the economic and social organization of the society, the division of labor, etc. So it's not just talent that makes a Raphael or Da Vinci, it's the structure of society, which creates a particular demand for such art and who creates the class from which most artists come from. **Read** GI 190. Is this a society in which "mediocrity" rules? Is this Marx's own answer to mediocrity and the tyranny of the majority feared by Mill?

2. **Marx vs. Plato:** Compare this conception of the many-sided individual with Plato's notion that humans should do only one task and that it's injustice to "meddle" in others.

IV. The anarchist critique of socialism: The Conspectus

[*notes from Simon Reader*]

A. The debate is over what the political form of a communist society will be: who will rule?

1. Will the rule by the workers lead to the abolition of all forms of exploitation and class rule or will they simply transform themselves into a ruling class?

2. See 336-37 especially.

V. Defining Socialism

A. **Socialism is about five things**:

1. It's about collective control of the means of production (central or decent.)
2. It is a critique of capitalism
3. It provides a method of interpreting history
4. It provides a strategy for political change
5. It is fundamentally about democracy: about giving people a say in those affairs that affect their life, especially those economic affairs.

[move to Manifesto notes, around. p. 15 or so]

C. Abolishing alienation therefore requires revolution. **Revolution has three necessary premises** (GI 170-71):

1. The immiseration of the masses.

2. "An existing world of wealth and culture," i.e. a society that has highly advanced productive forces. Without such advanced means of production "want is merely made general."

3. Political organization of the proletariat. From a **class-in-itself to a class-for-itself**. The working class has to organize itself politically to take power from the capitalists. This is where Marx's own activism comes in: to encourage the development of a politically conscious proletariat that is capable of seizing state power and transforming the state and society from a DoB to a DoP, to communism and the withering away of the state.