Two Views of State-Capitalism

State-Capitalism and Socialist Revolution by Tadayuki Tsushima

(Ed. Note: We present here two views on state-capitalism. The first view is by a Japanese Marxist Todagahi Tsushima, except for the quotations from K. Marx. The second view is from a group unknown in the U.S., the text is exactly as written. A few quotations were abbreviated, but there are from whom the reader can refer to easily. The other view, once written, expected that this issue, before December 25, would appear the first, in 1941, to develop the theory of state-capitalism.)

I. Introduction

During the First World War Lenin said: "A Marxist cannot have any doubt that a revolutionary situation is the crystallization of objective conditions which, taken together, spell the end of the existing state-capitalist order. All the symptoms of a revolutionary situation: (1) when there is a crisis... which causes fissures, through which the dissatisfied and indignant... (2) when a revolution breaks out, then begins an epoch of social revolution..."

In his Theories of Surplus Value (Vol. II, Part 3), Marx wrote: "All contradictions in bourgeois production are transformed into objective possibilities for the socialist transformation of industry and society, when, to the above-mentioned objective changes, there is added a subjective change, namely, the ability of the revolutionary class to carry out revolutionary mass actions strong enough to break (or undermine) the old government, which never, not even in a period of crisis..." (2) In short, a revolution is improbable without a full-scale crisis which envelops all levels of society (both the exploiters and the exploited). A revolution can occur only when some subjective conditions are fused into the objective circumstances.

Traditionally, Marxists have usually presupposed that some objective economic or social crises would create such revolutionary situations (severe national crises). I wonder, however, if we should still consider the problem of a revolution or a revolutionary situation in such a traditional way of thinking? I believe that the traditional presupposition should be reexamined. Here I will present my opinion about this problem for the purpose of inviting active discussion.

II. Can an Economic Crisis Still Be a Leverage For Political Revolution?

A well-known formula of historical materialism states: "At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the relations in which they have so far existed. When these relations become so closely bound up with one particular mode of production as to hamper further development of the productive forces, these relations turn into an obstacle for their further development. Usually, for a revolution to break out, it is not enough for the 'lower classes' to rise in the old way; it is necessary also that the upper classes should be unable to live in the old way; (2) when the tendency and suffering of the oppressed classes have become more acute than usual; (3) when, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses..."
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The state-capitalism that is in need of analysis is not the one theoretically envisaged by Karl Marx in 1867-1883 as the logical conclusion to the development of English competitive capitalism. It is true that "the law of motion" of capitalist society was discarded and profoundly analyzed by Marx. Of necessity, however, the actual results of the projected ultimate development to concentration and centralization of capital differed surprisingly from the abstract concept of the centralization of "the hands of one single capitalist, or in those of one single corporation." (1) Where Marx's own study cannot substitute for an analysis of existing state-capitalism, the debate we are concerned with here in this discussion can hardly do so, even where these have been up dated to cover the changes in, with the end of World War II, to turn these disputes for any other than methodological purposes, appears to this writer altogether枉然.

The state-capitalism that is in need of analysis is the one that emerged and died during the first world war, but the one which emerged on a world scale in myriad forms during the world Depression and survived World War II. It is the state-capitalism that has the appearance of affluence in the industrially advanced countries and that of non-affluence in the technologically underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America. The fact that within each affluent country there are the unskilled laborers and the national minorities who remain the ill-paid, ill-clad, ill-fed and ill-housed, seems to be of less significance to many Marxtists.
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(Continued from Page 1) It is, however, incorrect to assume that the characters of class struggles are not always mechanically dependent on each other, but are related in complex, interdependent relations. It is possible that a crisis is disadvantageous for the class struggles to originate, but the boom lasts over a prolonged period. As Trotsky emphasized many times, when the working class has been defeated heavily in a struggle preceding an economic crisis, a prolonged crisis would cause a stagnation, different from a collapse, to make them revive. Here I will remind my readers of another statement by Trotsky which should be remembered. In his “Dialectics of theInputElement Class Struggle,” he spoke of the “World Economic Crisis and the New Epoch,” and said: “The working class is a force of history, not a product of it. It is the working class that creates history, not history that creates the working class.”

...In the present day world capitalism, which is called state monopoly capitalism or state-capitalism, the basic curve has been rising, and the cyclical curve also shows that state monopoly capitalism has been proliferating over the crisis, instead of the opposite. First of all, we must know the facts. The table shows the index of industrial production. It is a basic element in the basic curve.

Locating the table, I cannot say that the basic curve shows a downward trend. (We can exclude the war and the immediate post-war periods.) It is obvious that the basic curve has been going upward since World War II especially and so-called economic crises have not been more severe than they were during the 1929-32 crisis. Moreover, the number of the world’s unemployed in 1929 was 10 million, while in 1939 it is estimated to have climbed so high that by 1932 it had tripled reaching between 30 to 40 million. These figures speak for themselves. The world crisis of 1929-32 lowered by no less than 46.7 percent, lowering it down to the level of 1900.

Never had a such clear instance occurred as that of the world crisis of 1929-32, which demonstrated that “an economic crisis is one of the most powerful forces in causing political changes.” However, a revolution requires, as Lenin pointed out, not only the objective conditions which are ripe for revolution but also the subjective conditions, that is, the subject of the Stalin clique over the Opposition group (Trotsky, Zinoviev and others) in the Russian Communist Party and in the Comintern after the death of Lenin allowed capitalism to survive and hindered the development of the crisis into revolution. As Trotsky criticized most severely, Stalinist theories and practices of economic policies have caused the shameful annihilation in the history of revolution from the broad perspective of the world economy. It is impossible to avoid a crisis rather than waiting for it.” (Keizai Dokusen Shihonsuigiron Note) (A note on State Capitalism), Ouchi Tsutomu (Prof. of Tokyo Univ.) wrote: “...this is the victory, to the two giants of our era, an economic crisis can be caused, but it cannot be fully avoided. As we see after the war, the government and the governments of many countries use the instruments which prevent a crisis rather than waiting for it.”

I cannot entirely agree with Mr. Ouchi. However, I can point out some of the ways by which a big
crisis is prevented from occurring. These are (1) strengthened control and improved techniques of production brought about by technical innovations, (2) expansion of military production, and (4) development of private monopoly capitalism. However, because there are various types of state-capitalism, depending on the degree of capital development and the development of monopolies, the direct cause of the state-capitalism. (Incidentally, I consider that the concept of "state-capitalism" is not a "socialist state" but a "state-capitalist country". In this context, the failure of the October Revolution appears as a Thermidorian phenomenon and a necessary condition of the economic development formula.)

The Thesis, "The International Situation and the Tasks of the Communist International" (August 29, 1929), which was drafted by Bukharin and revised by the Bukharin's Economic of the Transition Period, We cannot deny that Bukharin's analysis of state-capi- presents a highly-developed stage of state-capitalism, periodic crises make periodical crises salient for different reasons than at the beginning of capital-

III. Is the Slogan "Turn the Imperialist War into Civil War" Still Valid?

As we have shown in the previous section, the situation after World War II is different from that before World War II in various respects: in the war, even if the economy of boom has prevailed over an economic crisis, the war, as an economic factor, has been eliminated politically. Therefore, some may believe that the prosperous era of capitalism, or the period of the "long boom", is over, and the world is turning towards socialism. However, this is not the case. The prosperity of capitalism is not only a product of the world war, but also a result of the state-capitalism. The state-capitalism is a transitional phase between capitalism and socialism. It is a method to evaluate Stalin's incorrect view of the world economic problem.

The state-capitalism differs from what books conceived up till now. It is a method to evaluate Stalin's incorrect view of the world economic problem. The state-capitalism is a transitional phase between capitalism and socialism. It is a method to evaluate Stalin's incorrect view of the world economic problem. The state-capitalism is a transitional phase between capitalism and socialism. It is a method to evaluate Stalin's incorrect view of the world economic problem. The state-capitalism is a transitional phase between capitalism and socialism. It is a method to evaluate Stalin's incorrect view of the world economic problem. The state-capitalism is a transitional phase between capitalism and socialism.
products," Lenin wrote: "It cannot be expected that socialist revolutions will have the condition of existence (in the same sense as state-capitalism) in the world in the near future. Therefore, the theory of the state-capitalism of the world will be transformed into a new theory of political revolution."

The basic idea of the theory of state-capitalism is that imperialism is the fundamental cause of social revolution. This theory is based on the idea that imperialism is a system of economic and political domination, which leads to the destruction of capitalist societies and the rise of socialist ones. The theory of state-capitalism is also based on the idea that the development of imperialism is a necessary condition for the development of social revolution.

The theory of state-capitalism is a complex and controversial concept. It has been subject to criticism from various quarters, including some Marxist-Leninists and some non-Marxist scholars.

One of the main criticisms of the theory of state-capitalism is that it is too idealistic and fails to take into account the complexities of the real world. Critics argue that the theory is based on a simplified model of imperialist relations, and that it does not take into account the political and economic influences that exist in the contemporary world.

Another criticism of the theory of state-capitalism is that it is too deterministic and fails to take into account the role of subjective factors in social revolution. Critics argue that the theory is too focused on the objective conditions for revolution, and that it does not take into account the role of主观 factors, such as the role of the working class and the role of the state.

In summary, the theory of state-capitalism is a complex and controversial concept. It has been subject to criticism from various quarters, and it remains a topic of debate among Marxists and non-Marxists alike.

---
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II. Lenin vs. Bukharin: the Dialectic and Its Methodological Enemy: Abstract Revolutionism

Because the transformation of reality is central to the Hegelian dialectic, Hegel's philosophy comes to life, and over and over again, in all periods of crisis and transformation. With its foundation as the world becomes a new turn point, Hegel himself pointed in history the French Revolution; the dialectic has rightly been called the "algebra of revolution." (4) What Mill said just when the Russian Revolution made real "the algebra of revolution," is still more. If one doesn't understand the Marxist dialectic, just when "workers organized as the ruling class" was concretized as Soviet power, and the worker self-government (unions) led to open revolt against the totalitarian state.

The absolutely unprecedented developments throughout Eastern Europe culminating in the Hun­
garian Revolution of 1956, the very year which ushered in the time of the Russian Revolution in the United States. (3) By the end of the 1950's that new wave of freedom was large enough to cover a new, a third world — Africa, Latin America. Among these epochal developments came a search for new philosophy of freedom, a new, a Marxist Humanism.

In the third section of this essay we will deal with the contemporary philosophy of freedom. Here it is not sufficient to assert that the theoretical void in the Marxist philosophy of freedom has been filled, not for lack of life and death struggle through Stalinism's mantle of Lenin, nor for lack of a boatload of "abstract" solutions of political theses. Rather, the void exists be­cause, as has always been the case, mystification failed to face up to the shattering truth of Lenin's wartime breach in stating that "the material basis in the development of the relationship of mon­opoly capitalism to the collapse of the Second Inter­national is the work of one's own contribution of a'still different epoch, of one's own contribution of a'still different epoch, of his Bolshevik co-leaders, how can "Leninists" think they can coast along politically without such a philosophic foundation? Naturally, this is not a mere matter of showing "respect" for the dialectic. That would be the "smallest cell." Thus: "The philosophy of freedom, a new, a Marxist Humanism.
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fully understood the dialectic." (12)

In the revolutionary process that Lenin considered methodological enemy, the kind of abstraction that Lenin criticized in Bukharin. Once, however, he had broken with the concept of "productive" and with the question of the sumation of a whole decade of theoretical disputes, the realization begins to dawn that this is a generalization based on what had started with the beginning of the new, monopoly stage of capitalism. Bukharin's emphasis has also been the collapse of the Second International. At the turn of the year, the new development of capitalism had leading Marxists searching for answers to new problems. The results of the new research and analysis of the situation are illustrated in the following table: Rudolf Hilferding's Finance Capital (1919), Rosa Luxemburg's Accumulation of Capital (1912-13), Nikolai Bukharin's The World Economy and Imperialism (1915), and Lenin's Imperialism (1916).

Lenin, it seems, always had a solid background in the new revolutionary forces. Thus, Lenin held that, just as the "second negative," or as Marx expressed it, going in the stage of imperialism, a new urgency for the line, or via a quantitative ratio, Lenin's own work could be so uncompromising in his criticism of the bureaucrat's co-leader in words that would make you conscious that this is but the "first negative."

In truth, the methodology of the two works shows they are poles apart. Thus, as opposed to Bukharin concept of capital growth in a straight line, or via a quantitative ratio, Lenin's own work holds tightly on the dialectical principle. "Transformation into opposite" is the key point in tracing revolutionary forces. Thus, Lenin held that, just where the "second negative," or as Marx expressed it, going in the stage of imperialism, a new urgency for the line, or via a quantitative ratio, Lenin's own work could be so uncompromising in his criticism of the bureaucrat's co-leader in words that would make you conscious that this is but the "first negative."
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technologically underdeveloped, but politically mature, countries, in the throes of birth, is unfur­

shakes. This started from West Africa where Leopold Sedar Senghor still ruled as president of the most contemporary and profound aspect of Marxism, (18) to Latin America where Fidel Castro also at first called himself a Marxian (19). Even the most pragmatic, most undeontological and unMarxist man would agree that this is the frame of reference was the humanism of the Exist­
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determination of nations both before and after the conquest of power.

Our theory of state-capitalism differs from the older one because it is based not only on concrete problems, but also on the concrete problems in each of the social aspects which you will, must differ from Bukharin's abstract rev­

olution, which represents itself, as is revealed from the German by Egon H. E. Lass in the original ending of this. The practical utility of the article which is to be a commodity, and its function as a commodity. The article in the form of the conditions of society, and therefore independent value which creates a surplus value different from itself. Only through the transformation into capital during the process of the production, is the nature of the labor process, is greater than the sum of values amounts to the process of production, is due to the capacity to labor. Insofar as the commodity, it represents capital as much as the living labor, which he must sell. The separa­
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