

THE THEORY OF STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

by

Paul ~~Wenlock~~

Submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to examine the origin and development of the theory of state monopoly capitalism and its significance for the politics of contemporary Western European Communist Parties. The theory is shown to have its origin in Lenin's interpretation of Marx's Das Kapital, and his assessment that capitalism has entered an ultimate stage of development called imperialism which is characterised by the intensification of the contradictions of capitalism. The thesis then examines Lenin's argument that this stage of capitalism transforms the relations of economic and political power which existed in the preceding stage of capitalism, called "free competition capitalism", into a transitional society called variously and interchangeably "monopoly capitalism", "state capitalism" and "state monopoly capitalism". In turn, it is considered how this theory is represented in the inter-war years, especially under Stalin's codification of Lenin's writings into a system of "Leninism". The thesis shows as a consequence that the politics of the Comintern vis-a-vis social-democracy on the one hand, and fascism on the other, are justified in terms which originate in Lenin's theory of imperialism and its subsequent development in the Third International. It then considers how the continuation of this interpretation of the theory of monopoly capitalism and the strategies of Western European Communist Parties is first brought into question in the Stalin-Varga controversy on the nature of capitalism in the immediate post-war period. Although Varga is defeated, the themes which he raises are typical of those which gain wider acceptance after the death of Stalin and provide the premises for the new version of "state monopoly capitalism" which begins to be formulated in the period of "de-Stalinisation". Another important

stimulus to the "liberalisation" of the theory of state monopoly capitalism to be investigated and also advanced independently from the Soviet Union, is found in the work of K. Zieschang. The themes identified in this and subsequent discussions are then shown to form the basis upon which the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism emerges. The principal components of this theory which are examined concern: the analysis of the monopoly; the theory of the state; state interventionism in the economy; and the international relations in which capitalist systems exist. These in turn are shown to express the characteristic features of the theory of state monopoly capitalism from which the class politics of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties are formulated in Western European societies. The thesis then critically evaluates the general economic and political themes associated with the theory of state monopoly capitalism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor R. Miliband for giving me academic encouragement and undertaking the supervision of the research which has resulted in this thesis. I am also grateful for the valuable advice which he has contributed at the various stages of its development.

Also, I would like to thank my supervisor Mr. J. Grossman for his help and administrative assistance, and Dr. J. Gleisner for his consideration and instructive comments on the final drafts of the thesis.

Finally, I am grateful to the S.S.R.C. for financing the research, and to Mrs. J. Caiger for her patient typing of the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Abbreviations</u>	
CHAPTER 1 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	
1.1 <u>The theory, state monopoly capitalism</u>	1
1.2 <u>The structure of the study</u>	4
CHAPTER 2 <u>THE LENINIST THEORY OF IMPERIALISM</u>	
2.1 <u>Free competition capitalism</u>	10
2.2 <u>The transformation of free competition capitalism into monopoly capitalism</u>	40
2.3 <u>Monopoly capitalism</u>	45
2.3.1 Imperialism as monopoly capitalism	47
2.3.2 Imperialism as decaying capitalism	58
2.3.3 Imperialism as dying capitalism	69
CHAPTER 3 <u>TRANSITIONAL CAPITALISM AND THE STATE</u>	
3.1 <u>Lenin's theory of the state</u>	92
3.1.1 Imperialism and the state	92
3.1.2 Lenin and state monopoly capitalism	92
3.2 <u>Marxism-Leninism and Stalinism</u>	123
3.2.1 Stalin and imperialism	135
3.2.2 The General Crisis of Capitalism	144
3.3 <u>Marxism and social-democracy</u>	147
3.3.1 Organised capitalism and state socialism	147
3.3.2 State capitalism	163
3.3.3 Ultra-imperialism	168
3.4 <u>State monopoly capitalism and fascism</u>	177

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 4 <u>THE TRANSFORMATION OF MONOPOLY CAPITALISM INTO</u> <u>STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM</u>	219
4.1 <u>The Stalinist analysis of monopoly capitalism</u>	219
4.1.1 The theory of "modern capitalism"	220
4.1.2 The "subordination" of the state to the monopolies	225
4.1.3 Class strategies in the "General Crisis of Capitalism"	235
4.2 <u>The "liberalisation" of the analysis of state</u> <u>monopoly capitalism</u>	245
4.2.1 State monopoly capitalism and the "collapse" of capitalism	246
4.2.2 State monopoly capitalism and "revisionism"	256
4.2.3 State monopoly capitalism and class strategies	272
 CHAPTER 5 <u>THE CONTEMPORARY THEORY OF STATE MONOPOLY</u> <u>CAPITALISM</u>	 305
5.1 <u>The "fusion" of the state with the monopolies</u>	305
5.2 <u>The monopoly form of capital</u>	324
5.2.1 Competition and capital	324
5.2.2 The concentration and centralisation of capital	330
5.2.3 The socialisation of capital	332
5.3 <u>The imperialist state in the reproduction process</u> <u>of capital</u>	339
5.3.1 Economy and political	340
5.3.2 Capital laws and state-planning	348
5.4 <u>State monopoly capitalism and the General Crisis</u> <u>of Capitalism</u>	364

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 6	<u>CLASS STRATEGIES AND STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM</u> 399
6.1	<u>State monopoly capitalism and anti-monopolist strategies: (a) economics</u> 400
6.1.1	State monopoly capitalism 406
6.1.2	The internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism 411
6.2	<u>State monopoly capitalism and anti-monopolist strategies: (b) politics</u> 415
6.2.1	Ideology and the state 422
6.2.2	Transition and the state 432
CHAPTER 7	<u>AN EVALUATION OF THE THEORY OF STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM</u> 453
7.1	<u>Theoretical issues of economy</u> 453
7.2	<u>Theoretical issues of the state</u> 498
7.3	<u>State monopoly capitalism and class strategies</u> 513
CHAPTER 8	<u>CONCLUSION</u> 555
	<u>Selected Bibliography</u> 574

Abbreviations

- AK Autorenkollektiv.
- Archiv Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung (Ganz-Wien, 1964-66).
- BDIP Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik (Köln, 1956-).
- CA Collective authorship.
- CEP Critique de l'économie politique (Paris, 1965-).
- CM Critica Marxista (Roma, 1963-).
- DA Das Argument. Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Sozialwissenschaft (Berlin, 1958-).
- DA-S Das Argument-Sonderbande.
- DZP Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie (Berlin, 1952-).
- Einheit Einheit. Zeitschrift für Theorie und Praxis des wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus (Berlin, 1946-).
- EP Économie et Politique. Revue Marxiste d'Économie (Paris, 1954-).
- GBMT Gesellschaft. Beiträge für Marxschen Theorie (Frankfurt, 1974-).
- IMD Internationale Marxistische Diskussion (Frankfurt, 1969-).
- IWKGDA Internationale Wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz für Geschichte der Deutschen Arbeiterbewegung (Berlin, 1965-).
- JWG Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institute für Geschichte (Berlin, 1960-).
- LCW Lenin. Collected Works (Moscow, 1960-70).
- LTM Les Temps Modernes (Paris, 1945-).
- LSW Lenin. Selected Works (Moscow, 1970).
- LS Lenin Studienausgabe, 2 Bände (Frankfurt, 1970). Herausgegeben von Iring Fetscher.
- LNC La Nouvelle Critique (Paris, 1949-).
- MD Marxismus Digest. Theoretische Beiträge aus marxistische und antiimperialistischen Zeitschriften (Frankfurt, 1970-).
- MEW Marx-Engels-Werke (Berlin, 1975).
- PFS Probleme des Friedens und des Sozialismus. Zeitschrift der kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien für Theorie und Information (Moskau, 1958-).

- PL Probleme des Leninismus. Zeite Folge. Marxistische Bibliothek (Leipzig, 1929).
- PS Problemi del Sozialismus (Milano, 1958-).
- PK Projekt Klassenkampf. Zeitschrift für politische Ökonomie und sozialistische Politik (Berlin, 1971-).
- SCW J. Stalin. Collected Works (Moscow, 1954-5).
- SP Sozialistische Politik (Berlin, 1969-).
- SW Sowjetwissenschaft. Gesellschaftswissenschaftliche Beiträge (Moskau, 1948-).
- UBM Unter dem Banner des Marxismus (Wien-Berlin, 1925-1936).
- WW Wirtschaftswissenschaft (Berlin, 1953-).
- WZFSUJ Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Friedrich - Schiller - Universität Jena. Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe (Jena, 1951-).
- WZHUB Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt Universität zu Berlin. Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe (Berlin, 1951-).
- WZKMUL Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl Marx Universität Leipzig. Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe (Berlin, 1951-).
- WZMLUHW Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin Luther Universität Halle-Wittenberg. Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe (Halle, 1951-).
- WZWPUR Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhem-Peck Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe (Rostock, 1951-).

CHAPTER 1INTRODUCTION1.1 The theory, state monopoly capitalism

The purpose of this thesis is to examine and evaluate the central themes of the theory of state monopoly capitalism and the class strategies of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties in Western European capitalist societies. Here we may distinguish between different areas of research. Our concern is neither an historical interpretation of the development of Western European capitalism from "classical capitalism" to "state monopoly capitalism", nor a history of the theory and politics of the Communist International. Rather, in our methodology we will consider these relationships only to the extent in which they contribute to the theoretical and historical premises of a general theory of state monopoly capitalism and the class strategies of Western European Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties.

Despite the historical and contemporary importance of communist theory and politics in Western Europe, there remains little published material on the theory of state monopoly capitalism in the English language. We suggest that this may be explained by three factors. Firstly, the full range of the literature of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties is not available in English. Secondly, the lack of popular support for the British Communist Party not only consigns their theory and politics to the periphery of political life but precludes the formation and organisation of its theoretical organs to the extent and proficiency made possible in Western Europe and the Soviet-bloc. Thirdly, the traditions of Stalinism inside the international communist movement bring the theoretical research of Communist Parties into disrepute to such a degree that the genuine advances made after the death of Stalin have remained largely unnoticed.

In recent years, however, the theory of state monopoly capitalism has been the subject of a critical debate outside orthodox Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties. But these contributions have tended to either concentrate upon specific aspects of the theory, or where its general features are investigated at all, they are limited to particular Communist Parties. In the latter regard, the most comprehensive contributions to the analysis of state monopoly capitalism are to be found in West Germany. We explain this in part by the influence of Soviet and Soviet-inspired theoretical research in the "Socialist Unity Party of Germany" (Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands) and the D.K.P. in addition to the traditional importance of Marxism-Leninism in German society. From the secondary literature, we consider several areas of research which contribute to the examination of the theory of state monopoly capitalism.

The first evaluates the methodological and theoretical aspects of Lenin's analysis of capitalism and imperialism from the perspective of the Marxist theory of capitalism and the world market competition of capitals. Here the work of C. von Braunmühl, D. Jordan, C. Neuss, and A. Lennard are particularly noteworthy⁽¹⁾. However, while these analyses discuss important theoretical and methodological relationships of relevance to the subsequent formulation of the theory of state monopoly capitalism, they do not aspire to examine the theory as a whole. Alternatively, the group of West German authors known as the "PKA-group" (Projekt Klassenanalyse) offer the most comprehensive examination of Lenin's interpretation of Marxist theory and revolutionary class tactics⁽²⁾. Nevertheless, the research focuses on Lenin and is not specifically concerned with the theory of state monopoly capitalism. Other contributors of note who consider aspects of Lenin's theory pertinent to the themes which we will examine are L. Basso, C. Berger, C. Bettelheim, L. Magri, R. Miliband, U. Santamaria and A. Manville,

and W. Tristram⁽³⁾.

The second area of research examines the economic character of state monopoly capitalism. The most comprehensive work here is that of M. Wirth⁽⁴⁾. However, this important analysis deals overwhelmingly with the post-1945 S.E.D. literature on the development of capitalism in West Germany, and neither considers the theoretical traditions of Marxism-Leninism in the Comintern nor its relation to Lenin's analysis of state monopoly capitalism⁽⁵⁾. Similarly, R. Andoche, A. Granou and A.D. Magaline examine the economic character of the theory developed by the Communist Party of France⁽⁶⁾. Alternatively, the research of the "PKA-group" considers the literature of several principal theorists of the Communist Parties of France, the D.D.R. and the Soviet Union⁽⁷⁾.

Finally, there are a number of texts which relate to the general themes of state monopoly capitalism and the theory and tactics of Western European Communist Parties. Here we may note the important contribution of W. Petrowsky which discusses the post-1945 literature of the C.P.S.U. and its significance for the formation of a theory of state monopoly capitalism⁽⁸⁾. Other literature of note is that of H. Asseln and F. Deppe, R. Ebbighausen and P. Kirchhoff, R. Ebbighausen and R. Winkelmann, J. Esser, W. Olle, J. Schubert and R. Winkelmann⁽⁹⁾. We may also acknowledge the contribution of F. Kissen who discusses the comparative political status of Lenin's analysis of state monopoly capitalism with that of contemporary Marxism-Leninism⁽¹⁰⁾.

We will consult these texts at various stages of the exposition and evaluation of the theory of state monopoly capitalism where we consider that they contribute to its elaboration. However, our objective is not to evaluate these texts.

1.2 The structure of the study

In Chapter 2, we will consider the origin of the general premises of a theory of state monopoly capitalism from Lenin's analysis of "free competition capitalism" in the "orthodox Marxism" of the Second International. On this basis, our investigation leads us to consider how Lenin's interpretation and continuation of Marx's examination of the laws and contradictions of capitalism introduces new propositions into communist theory from which the revolutionary politics of the international communist movement are subsequently constructed. Of fundamental importance here is the theory of the "collapse" (Zusammenbruch) of imperialist economies which informs the communist prognosis on the historical course of development of capitalism and the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into socialism.

This leads us to continue the analysis of monopoly capitalism in Chapter 3 by considering how its "transitional" character contributes to the "Marxist" theory of the state. Here we examine Lenin's theory of transitional political forms of class domination in Western European capitalist societies in the epoch of imperialism which postulates the usurpation of the traditional bourgeois-democratic political systems by politically authoritarian states. We will also show how Lenin's analysis of state monopoly capitalism contributes to the theory and politics of the Third International.

Since "state monopoly capitalism" is identified as the principal Bolshevik theory which founds the Comintern's analysis of Western European capitalism, we will investigate its development under Stalin's formalisation of a system of "Marxism-Leninism" and the importance which Soviet Communism assumes as a theoretical and historical model of Marxism in the Comintern's perception of the "General Crisis of Capitalism".

This leads us to examine the status of the ideological and

political functions which the theory of monopoly capitalism sustains for the unification of the European labour movement under Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties. It is expressed as an objective analysis of capitalism which supplies the social basis for both a critique of the social-democratic theory and politics of "organised capitalism" and the "Right-deviationist" theory of "state capitalism". From the foregoing analysis of the economic and political system of power in state monopoly capitalism, we will present the Comintern's analysis of fascism.

The discussion contained in Chapters 2 and 3 establishes the general theoretical and historical premises upon which the immediate post-1945 analysis of the socio-economic and political conditions of Western European capitalist societies is conducted.

Duly, in Chapter 4 we examine the character of the post-war theory of monopoly capitalism and the process of its transformation into a theory of "state monopoly capitalism". In turn, we will discuss the problems and perspectives that emerge for the theory and tactics of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties with the prospect of the stabilisation of Western European capitalist societies after the historical experience of European fascism.

This leads us to consider the first phase of the "de-Stalinisation" of Marxism-Leninism and the growing autonomy of Western European Communist Parties. We will investigate how these Parties undertake the reconstruction of Marxism-Leninism and lay the foundations for a new analysis of state monopoly capitalism.

Chapter 5 examines the four principal themes of the post-Stalinist theory of state monopoly capitalism. These are:

(a) the methodology and class character of the "fusion" (Verschmelzung) of the monopolies and the state; (b) the role of the monopoly-category in the critique of political economy; (c) the analysis of

state interventionism in the economy; (d) the analysis of "state monopoly capitalism" in the "General Crisis of Capitalism".

Chapter 6 examines the connection between the economic and political structures of the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism, and the political theory of anti-monopolist class strategies advanced by Western European Communist Parties. Here we will show how anti-monopolist strategies contain new propositions on the social and political form of social emancipation.

Finally, in Chapter 7 we undertake a critical evaluation of the issues which have been raised in the formation and development of the theory of state monopoly capitalism.

CHAPTER 1REFERENCES

1. C. von Braunmühl, 'Weltmarktbeziehung des Kapitals, Imperialismus und Staat', in Probleme einer materialistischen Staatstheorie (Frankfurt, 1973), pp. 11-91; A. Lennard, 'Lénine et la Théorie Marxiste des Crises', CEP, 11-12 (Paris, 1973), 25-65; D. Jordan 'Der Imperialismus als monopolistischer Kapitalismus: Zur Imperialismus-Analyse Lenins als Basis der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', in Monopol und Staat, Zur Marx-Rezeption in der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus. Herausgegeben von R. Ebbighausen (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 212-244.
2. P.K., Leninismus - neue Stufe des wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus? (Berlin, 1972).
3. L. Bass, 'Attualita di Lenin: "Stato e Rivoluzione" cinquant'anni dopo', PS, 26 (1968), 34-46; C. Berger, 'Faut-il détruire l'État', Politique Aujourd'hui, 5 (Paris, 1971), 63-80; C. Bettelheim, Les Luttes des Classes en USSR 1917-23 (Paris, 1974); L. Magri, 'L'État et la révolution aujourd'hui', LTM, 266 (Paris, 1968), 388-430; R. Miliband, 'Lenin's "The State and Revolution"', Socialist Register (London, 1968), 309-319; U. Santamaria and A. Manville, 'Lenin and the Problem of Transition', Telos, 27 (1976), 79-96; W. Tristram, 'Revolution und Staat: Zum Verhältnis von Analyse und Taktik bei Lenin', in Monopol und Staat, pp. 245-278.
4. M. Wirth, Die Kapitalismustheorie in der DDR (Frankfurt, 1973). However, see pp. 21-26, p. 71, p. 76.
5. See here Wirth's later publication 'Zur Kritik der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', Prokla, 8-9 (Berlin, 1973), 17-44. This discusses the role of Lenin's contribution to the theory of state monopoly capitalism. It also expresses a critical perspective on several issues less evident in Die Kapitalismustheorie, see pp. 219-220.
6. R. Andoche, 'La "Théorie" de la suraccumulation - dévalorisation', CEP, 6 (Paris, 1972), 164-179; A. Granou, 'La Nouvelle Crise du Capitalisme', LTM, 328, 329, 330-332 (1973), 808-831; 998-1025; 1178-1210; A.D. Magaline, Lutte de classes et dévalorisation du travail (Paris, 1975).
7. P.K., Stamokap in der Krise, (Berlin, 1975).
8. W. Petrowsky, 'Zur Entwicklung der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', Prokla, 1 (1974), 129-176.
9. H. Asseln and F. Deppe, 'Die "Staatsfrage" und die Strategie der Arbeiterbewegung', DA, 16 (Berlin, 1977), 84-128; R. Ebbighausen and P. Kirchhoff, 'Zum historisch-politischen Hintergrund der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus: Kommunistische Einheitsfront - und Bündnispolitik vor und nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg', in Monopol und Staat, pp. 293-321; R. Ebbighausen and P. Kirchhoff, 'Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus und politische Praxis der DKP', in Monopol und Staat, pp. 312-353.

9. (Continued)

R. Ebbighausen and R. Winkelmann, 'Zur aktuellen politischen Bedeutung der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus und zum Stellenwert einer Kritik ihrer Marx-Rezeption', in Monopol und Staat, pp. 9-44; J. Esser, Einführung in die materialistische Staatsanalyse (Frankfurt, 1975); W. Olle, 'Zur Theorie des Staatskapitalismus - Probleme von Theorie und Geschichte in Theorien der Übergangsgesellschaft', Prokla, 11-12 (1974), 91-144; J. Schubert, 'Die Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus - Kritik der Zentralen Aussagen', Mehrwert, 4 (1973), 1-102; R. Winkelmann, 'Grundzüge und Probleme der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', in Monopol und Staat, pp. 45-97.

10. F. Kissin, 'Communists: all revisionists now?', in Fabian Research Series, 299 (January, 1972), 1-36.

CHAPTER 2THE LENINIST THEORY OF IMPERIALISM

The Leninist theory of imperialism is a historical-materialist analysis of the genesis of capitals through the inner-connection and transformation of the structure of "free competition capitalism" into "monopoly capitalism". This theory is also characterised by the revolutionary political conjuncture of imperialist wars and European revolutions which determine its function for the praxis of the European labour movement. It consequently represents a theoretical and historical analysis of the developed forms of capital in imperialist economy, and an ideological and political critique of the theoretical representation of Marxism in the non-revolutionary forms of Second International political praxis. The Leninist theory of imperialism is therefore not a "pure" general theory of capitalist development, but a sufficient theoretical elaboration for its political function in the constitution of coherent revolutionary tactics and unified praxis for the European labour movement.

This Chapter will develop the theory of capitalism and its transformation into imperialism through the principal methodological and theoretical relations which form the foundations of Lenin's analysis. The theory of imperialism will be shown to be a "logical" consequence of the characteristic relations of the analysis of capitals developed in the Second International problematic, and not a departure from them. The significance of this conclusion will also be examined from Lenin's critique of the capitalist socio-economic system in the stages of its development, and his conceptualisation of socialism which is based upon it.

2.1 Free competition capitalism

Lenin undertakes the examination of capitalist socio-economic formations through the development of the material and spiritual forms of social-interaction (Verkehrsformen) in economic and political superstructures. The philosophical and methodological foundations of the objectivity of this scientific approach to the analysis of history and society establishes that historical-materialism identifies production relations as the structure of society⁽¹⁾. The derivation of materialist production relations are established with the criteria of "repetition", "recurrence" and "regularity" of social phenomena which distinguishes the "essence" from the generality of "appearances"⁽²⁾. Consequently, Lenin compounds the logical status of the theoretical laws of capitalism through the systematic generalisation of the historical appearances of several capitalist social formations to "present, on the basis of summarised returns of irrefutable bourgeois statistics, ... a composite picture of the world capitalist system"⁽³⁾.

This confers a theoretical and historical quality on the categories of capital epistemology and the formation of the general laws of capitalism. Lenin subsequently interprets Das Kapital as a "theoretical and historical analysis of capitalism"⁽⁴⁾ in the specific historical period of capitalism in which "free competition"⁽⁵⁾ constitutes the defining characteristic of the general theory of capitalism, and the normal historical form of social interaction of capitalist society. This theoretical foundation examines the structure of total social capitalist production processes in the free movement of individual capitals through the market relation. The fundamental law of "free competition capitalism" can be

provisionally stated in the principal constitutive relations of Lenin's analysis of the general theory of capitals. Competition is defined as the "relation of isolated producers working for a common market"⁽⁶⁾ in which the free "exchange of commodities .. expresses .. the connections between isolated producers through the market"⁽⁷⁾. The class relations and economic crises of these capitalist systems are characterised by "private property in the means of production" and "anarchy in production"⁽⁸⁾. This class structure of private property expresses the historical form of social production relations in the autonomous existence of private individual producers, and the delimitation of their specific production functions from the fragmented structure of social labour processes.

From the determination of the structure of capitalist competition, Lenin derives the laws of the capitalist crises in the anarchy of total social production from the atomistic structure of the social relations of capitalist production and the consequent structural lack of consciousness in the economic form of social interaction. Individual producers enter into direct commodity-exchange transactions through "market fluctuations, which are unknown to the producer and independent of him"⁽⁹⁾. This expresses the inherent incapacity of this economic form of production relations to generate a total social subject in the form of a consciously determined apparatus of social planning, at the level of individual or total social production, from the laws and mechanisms of the market relation. As Lenin's analysis of capitals interprets the cause of capitalist crises in the anarchical structure of total social production under the primacy of market relations upon individual capitalist producers, the governing social relation and purpose of capitalist production appears in the inter-capitalist struggle for profits on the market⁽¹⁰⁾.

The consequent functioning of capitalist systems are thereby characterised in the process of anarchical and disproportional development of production powers under the class character of private property in the means of production, and the subordination of their socialisation to the capitalist profit-motive. The generality of these relations of the natural form of capitalist social interaction establishes the structure from which the classical theories of capitalism are constructed⁽¹¹⁾, and the theoretical foundation from which Lenin examines the genesis of capitals.

The concept of historical-materialism

However, this analysis encounters a theoretical problem which concerns the mode of development capitalist socio-economic formations through the reproduction of their material and spiritual forms of social interaction, and the dynamics of capital accumulation. Lenin represents the connection of economic substructures and political superstructures from the contradictory relation and primacy of the development of production powers upon social relations of production as the materialist conditions of existence and historical motive force of society⁽¹²⁾. The contradiction of these relations constitutes the foundation of an epoch of social revolution and transformation of the political superstructures when production powers develop in contradiction with their last antagonistic form (letzte antagonistische Form) of social production relations⁽¹³⁾. This analysis of the laws of historical-materialism interprets the objective development of production powers from the science of history and society in the autonomous development of materialist categories of social causality from the determined social forms of consciousness. As Lenin argues, "the highest task of humanity is to comprehend .. (the) .. objective

logic of economic evolution (the evolution of social life) in its general and fundamental features, so that it may be possible to adapt to it one's social consciousness and the consciousness of the advanced classes of all capitalist countries"⁽¹⁴⁾. Consequently, political superstructures are presented in exterior relations to the primacy of the objective materialist movement of history, while the subjective relations of social formations are in "epiphenomenal" theories of consciousness.

The important conclusion that follows from Lenin's analysis of the relations of domination and servitude (Herrschafts-und Knechtschafts-verhältnisse) in Marx's Das Kapital⁽¹⁵⁾, interprets not only the definitive economic form of capitalist economy in free competition capitalism but also the political form of bourgeois society in the democratic republic: "Das Kapital is devoted solely to a study of capitalist society - a materialist analysis of that society⁽¹⁶⁾ and its bourgeois political superstructures that protects the rule of the capitalist class with the bourgeois ideas of liberty (and) equality ..."⁽¹⁷⁾.

The relation of theory and history

At this juncture it is possible to identify a preparatory distinction between Lenin's evaluation of the relations of capitalism to those of Marx's "general concept of capital". Although the categories of "competition", "anarchy", "disproportionalities", and "markets" etc., which Lenin identifies are important real relations of capitalist economy, Marx's analysis of political economy is not only a theoretical representation but also a critique of the form of these real relations of capitalism. This is significant for Lenin's derivation of the economic structure of capitalist relations

of production from the generalisation of the "essence" of social appearances and the materialist methodology for the demystification of the real appearances of capital movements. Two relations can be identified here. The first considers the theoretical priority of the general concept of capital in the Marxist critique of political economy: "the exact development of the concept of capital is necessary since it is the fundamental concept (Begriff) of modern economy, the abstract counterpart (Gegenbild) of capital, the foundation of bourgeois society"⁽¹⁸⁾. The second considers the examination of the theory-history relation contained in the analytical representation of the economic structure of bourgeois society in Das Kapital.

Lenin's characterisation of capitals through competition, the "form of existence of capitals" (Existenzform des Kapitals)⁽¹⁹⁾, establishes an alternative analytical "starting-point" (Ausgangspunkt) to Marx's examination of the capitalist mode of production in the capitalist commodity form; the commodity "forms historically and conceptually (begrifflich) the starting-point (Ausgangspunkt) of capitalist production"⁽²⁰⁾. Consequently, competition and circulation relations cease to be examined on the foundation of "capital in general" (Kapital in allgemeinen) before a "particular form of capital" or "an individual capital" (einzelnen Kapital) as distinct from other individual capitals (einzelnen Kapitalien) etc."⁽²¹⁾. Competition is determined within the internal structure of capital in the relation of the "inner nature of capitals" (inner Natur des Kapitals) to "appearance-forms" (Erscheinungsformen). As the "scientific analysis of competition is only possible if the inner nature of capital is conceived"⁽²²⁾, it follows that the analysis of capitals in their immediate form of existence does not supply the

concept of the inner-nature of capital. As Marx argues, "competition generally, the essential locomotive force of bourgeois economy does not establish its laws but is rather their executor"⁽²³⁾. The importance of this distinction establishes the "general and necessary tendencies of capital" (die allgemeinen und notwendigen Tendenzen des Kapitals) from their "appearance-forms",⁽²⁴⁾ through the analysis and critique of the relations of social-interaction in the inner-regulation and value-determination of the laws of movements of total social production⁽²⁵⁾.

In distinction to Lenin's methodology and characterisation of capitalism through free competition, the concept of competition in Das Kapital functions within the analytical representation of the theoretical structure of capital⁽²⁶⁾. Three distinguishing qualities may be identified. Firstly, the "representation" (Darstellung) of the "pure movement" of capitals is a logically necessary category in the form-determination of capital⁽²⁷⁾ for the explication of the direct production process and inner-organisation of total social labour producing capital in commodity-form. Secondly, the representation of competition in the concretisation⁽²⁸⁾ of the "pure-form" of capital categories to their appearance-forms in the "surface" (Oberfläche) of bourgeois society. Thirdly, the actual movement of individual capitals in the relations of capital contradictions, crises and market prices, etc.⁽²⁹⁾. The importance here of Marx's capital methodology is that the "actual movement of competition lies outside our plans; ... we have represented the inner-organisation of the capitalist mode of production in its ideal average"⁽³⁰⁾. This representation of the inner-structure of capital is not a historical analysis of circulation and realisation processes⁽³¹⁾ but the capitalist mode of production as a unity of production and the

abstract representation⁽³²⁾ of circulation processes. Conversely, Lenin interprets this mode of representation of the free movement of capitals as the definitive historical form of capital.

This mode of abstract representation of capital which Marx establishes has a double-function in the cognitive primacy of the logically necessary form-connections of capitalist production relations over their historico-analytical representation in the duplication of the specific commodity-form of labour in commodity and money.

The first function establishes the specificity of the commodity form of labour in the economic "form-determinations" (Formbestimmungen) of capitalist social production relations⁽³³⁾ in that for "bourgeois society, the economic commodity-form of labour products or value-form of the commodity is the economic cell-form"⁽³⁴⁾. While free competition is tendentially a real-form and historical category of concrete exchange processes in the development of production powers under generalised capitalist commodity production and the dissolution of feudalism, the analysis of the commodity value-form cannot be accomplished without the analysis of the duplication of the commodity in commodity and money-form.

The second function establishes however, that in circulation the laws of capitalist commodity production appear in the fetishised forms of social production relations⁽³⁵⁾. Consequently, to analyse the capital-formation in commodity-exchanges⁽³⁶⁾, Marx does not represent the genetical development of the money-form but demonstrates its logical necessity in the abstract form of representation of the real connection of commodities in the exchange-process, as the theoretically necessary determinations of the inner-connection of the commodity-form of capitalist production (C-M-C) transformed into its most general formula of capital (M-C-M)⁽³⁷⁾.

The pure-theoretical representation of the commodity-form to the general concept of capital contains the materialist forms of social-labour. In the capitalist mode of production, abstract social labour constitutes the specific social-form of labour and the substance of the inner-connection of the value-form, money and capital in the double form of labour.

Conversely, in the historical interpretation of Das Kapital, Lenin identifies the theoretical representation of the general laws of capital as a historical chronology of capitalism. What is presented by Marx as the "logical" development of capital in simple commodity circulation through the "surface" relations of total capitalist production processes is for Lenin the historical genesis of European capitalism in a single stage of capitalist commodity production⁽³⁸⁾, of "embryonic commodity economy from simple exchange to its highest forms to large-scale production"⁽³⁹⁾. What appears in Lenin's analysis as a historically specific characterisation of capitalist epistemology and structural disproportionality of the spontaneous development of capitalism are for Marx, "appearance-forms" of the necessary mode in which the total social capital formation is reproduced. Consequently, this analytical representation of the real "accomplishment" (Durchsetzung) process of capitalist commodity-exchanges "behind the backs of producers" (hinter den Rücken der Produzenten) is not equivalent to Lenin's concept of the "unknown market". As Marx argues, the individual producer "does not see that the relations of production themselves, the social forms (gesellschaftlichen Formen) in which he produces 'appears' (Erscheinen) to him as natural relations, the permanent product - and for that reason, the permanent foundation - of this specific mode

of production"⁽⁴⁰⁾. The synthesis of production and circulation processes unifies "capital in general" - capital as a process of the limitless surplus-value extraction transformed into capital with the circulation-forms of the accomplishment of the social reproduction of capital - as a continual "process of movement of capitals as a whole" (Bewegungsprozess des Kapitals als Ganzes)⁽⁴¹⁾. Here, Marx considers neither the "relation of capitalist and wage-labour in the course of the production process" nor the further "form determinations of capitals" (Formbestimmungen des Kapitals),⁽⁴²⁾ but rather the important consideration that the accomplishment of capital in the unity of production and circulation relations consists in the "life-process of capitals in its movement as the self-valuation of value" (sich selbst verwertender Wert)⁽⁴³⁾.

The distinction between theoretical and historical relations in Marx's Kapital-analysis are of major importance not only for Lenin's examination of capitals, but also the interpretation of the socio-political conditions in which the "normal form" of classical capitalism develops. Rather, the analysis of generalised capitalist commodity production in Das Kapital has no specific relation with the political superstructures of bourgeois society and thereby with the democratic republic as the "normal" political form in which the development of capitalism unfolds. Although Das Kapital abstracts from the genesis of capitals, this is not an arbitrary abstraction⁽⁴⁴⁾ but is founded upon the attained historical level of capitalist development⁽⁴⁵⁾, and therefore the presupposition of the social and political conditions of existence of bourgeois society with capital as the dominant mode of production⁽⁴⁶⁾. Only on these presuppositions does Marx represent the theory-history relations of Das Kapital as a combination of

relations of economy and "surface" of bourgeois society.

This involves two sets of analytical connections. The first considers the theoretical representation of the logically necessary and general conditions of the "capitalist mode of production and its corresponding production and exchange relations"⁽⁴⁷⁾. The second considers the theoretical "unmasking" (enthüllung) of the "economic laws of movement of modern society"⁽⁴⁸⁾. While this combination suggests a real historical relation of capital through the inner-structure and general laws of capital, the theory-economy structure is only a preparatory theoretical stage in the concrete-historical examination of the real relations of bourgeois society under the general laws of capital accumulation which approximates the history-society relation through the increasing concretisation of the categories of capital in the "surface" of bourgeois society⁽⁴⁹⁾.

This distinction between theory and history is of paramount importance in the analysis of capitalist society. The formation of the Marxist analysis of capitals does not develop autonomously from the general historical conditions of capitalism and the real total structure of production and circulation relations, but rather is only methodologically represented in the separation of theory and history, the general concept and the genesis of its form on the presupposition of the historical existence of capital as the dominant social mode of production. Conversely for Lenin, the "science" of Das Kapital is interpreted as a completed analysis of capitalist society in its historical mode of existence⁽⁵⁰⁾.

This situates the problem of Lenin's capital methodology which establishes the laws the capitals from the generalisation of the

average appearances of "social phenomena", and is thereby unable to submit "bourgeois statistics" to a full critique through the demystification of the appearances of capitals in the analytical methodology of theoretical abstractions of value laws. Consequently, the systematisation of the empirical forms of capital leaves Lenin unable to distinguish the "general and necessary tendencies of capital" and therefore the theoretical status of the laws of the capitalist mode of production from the categories of bourgeois social science. On the foundation of this methodology and formation of economic laws, competition becomes the essential locomotor and generalised model of capitalist economic processes in the spontaneity of the market mechanism of total social production⁽⁵¹⁾.

The consequence of this analysis of capitals which Lenin develops does not establish the connection of the forms of accomplishment of capital from the general laws of capital accumulation. This is expressed both in the status of the critique of capitalist economy, and the problem of analysing the realisation and circulation processes of capitals which are characterised for the Second International by the generalisation of the reproduction schemas⁽⁵²⁾ as the "starting point" of the analysis of the socialisation processes of capitals. In Lenin's analysis, this interpolates the reproduction schemas in the class contradictions of capitalism and the cause of capitalist crises through the existence of private property in the means of production and their socialisation: "crises are inevitable because the collective character of production comes into conflict with the individual character of appropriation"⁽⁵³⁾.

The problem identified in the analysis of the value-form of the capitalist commodity is now expressed in the examination of the laws of value⁽⁵⁴⁾ and the error of representing a proportional total

social reproduction in value-material relations⁽⁵⁵⁾ through the direct exchange of commodities without money.⁽⁵⁶⁾ This both extends the analysis of the genetical development of capital categories in the direct socialisation-process of capitalist production, and also contradicts the value laws of commodity production. As value laws are interpreted as a continuation of classical political economy⁽⁵⁷⁾, Lenin obviates the specificity of the theory of value in the explanation of exchange-value from the value-form of the labour product as the "most abstract but also the most general form of the bourgeois mode of production and thereby ... a special kind of social production ..., equally historically characterised"⁽⁵⁸⁾. The subsequent nature of Lenin's theory is contained in the critique of the theories of capitalist crises through the various appearance-forms of capital disproportionalities.

However, the derivation of Lenin's theory of capitalism should be seen in the historical context and controversy regarding the development of capitalism in Russia. Lenin confronts both the Narodniks and the Legal Marxists. For the Narodniks, the development of industrial capitalism in Russia is impossible because capitalism cannot overcome the limitations to the means of subsistence of the proletarian masses (the "miseration"-theory) - underconsumptionism, and the impossibility of realising the product which prevents the inner-development of capitalist markets. This is exacerbated as foreign markets are inaccessible because of their domination by Western Europe and the United States of America⁽⁵⁹⁾. For the Russian Legal Marxists, the development of capitalism is possible, and is examined through the utilisation of the "reproduction schemas" to establish a total social equilibrium without an intractable

"miseration" of the "masses"⁽⁶⁰⁾.

On the one hand, Lenin's critique synthesises these two theories. Lenin argues against the Narodniks that capitalism is capable of extending the internal market through the realisation of the total social product in the general theory of capitalism⁽⁶¹⁾. The expansion of the internal market can be sustained given the correct proportions between individual branches of production as represented in the theory of proportionalities - disproportionalities of the reproduction schemas. Capitalism is a historically progressive system of economic development which identifies the revolutionary development of socialism in the formation of a proletariat in industrial capitalism against the peasantry of the agrarian sector⁽⁶²⁾. On the other hand, Lenin argues against the "Legal Marxists" that Marx's concept of proportional harmonisation of production and consumption is a theory, and not a representation of the historical contradictions of capital realisation: "Struve confuses the abstract theory of realisation with concrete historical conditions governing the realisation of product"⁽⁶³⁾. The critique of the theory of proportionalities is developed in the crises of disproportionalities (anarchy) and the "miseration" of the proletarian masses in the contradiction of production and consumption⁽⁶⁴⁾.

Subsequently, it is not possible to find a general theory of capitalism in Lenin's analysis, but only the characteristic components of the model and critique of capitalism - here represented in "free competition capitalism". This analysis can be interpreted through the general concept of disproportionalities which is also developed by the important "Austro-Marxist" theoretician Hilferding, and in turn constitutes the theoretical structure from which the consequent analysis of the development of capitalism unfolds.

Lenin's theory of capitals thereby sanctions the expansion-
capabilities and competition of capitals on the internal market for
the realisation of the total social product. However, the development
of capitalism is expressed from the stand-point of the expansion of
the material-technical relations of the scale of production and
specialisation-functions of labour - which are components of the
socialisation of production, and the extension of the means of
consumption in the general contradiction of the means of production
and the means of consumption⁽⁶⁵⁾. The relatively faster growth of
the means of production therefore creates the necessity of external
markets for the realisation of production powers beyond the national
state⁽⁶⁶⁾. This theory of capitalist crises demonstrates both the
possibility and necessity of this disproportional development of
capitals in Russia through the historically progressive⁽⁶⁷⁾ character
of its expansion and socialisation of production powers⁽⁶⁸⁾.
Consequently, Lenin interprets the theory of crises as the anarchy of
capitals (disproportionalities)⁽⁶⁹⁾ expressed in the underconsumptionism
of the proletarian masses as the capital foundation of class
contradictions in the historical development of capitalist production.
The crises of capitalist development unfolds through the expansion
and contradiction of capitals determined in the continually disturbed
proportional-disproportional relations within and between the branches
of total social production. On the one hand, the "market fluctuations,
which are unknown to the producer and independent of him, are bound to
cause inequalities among producers, are bound to accentuate inequality"⁽⁷⁰⁾.
On the other, the "conformity between the parts of social production
which was necessarily assumed by the theory of the reproduction of
social capital, and which is actually established as the average
magnitude of a continual fluctuation is constantly disturbed in capitalist

society owing to the separate existence of different producers working for an unknown market ... it indicates a lack of proportion in the development of different industries"⁽⁷¹⁾. The character of this theory of disproportionalities results from Lenin's analysis of capitals and interpretation of reproduction schemas in Das Kapital which demonstrates the theoretical proportionality of the reproduction of total social production and the historical crisis-free realisation of capitals that accomplishes the reproduction and circulation of total social capital⁽⁷²⁾ as the Marxist theory of realisation⁽⁷³⁾.

Proportionalities and the laws of value

However, the theoretical-historical foundation of Lenin's capital analysis in the isolated existence of individual producers to the market does not represent the form of economic interaction as a social process and consequently, the conceptualisation of the circulation processes of individual capital in the circuit of total social capital under the general laws of total capitalist reproduction processes⁽⁷⁴⁾. The theoretical and methodological problems indentified in this analysis directly contribute to the total theoretical characterisation and consequent development of the historical analysis of capitalism. Rather, on the presupposition of the historical formation of the capitalist mode of production and the subordination of circulation relations to total social production processes, Marx examines the reproduction schemas in the theoretical forms of the real abstraction-process of the capital-methodology to stipulate the theoretical conditions of abstract equilibrium for the proportional reproduction of total social capital. As Marx argues in "order to conceive these forms in their pure state, one must abstract from all moments which have nothing to do with the changing or building of forms as such (Formwechsel und der Formbildung)"⁽⁷⁵⁾. These are not socio-

theoretical constructs of a total planning apparatus in the real relations of developed or developing capitalism. Rather, when the reproduction schemas are appropriated independently from the capital-methodology, they assume the character of static constructs for the examination of total social reproduction.

The sphere of competition is here represented in the form-determined unity of production and circulation relations⁽⁷⁶⁾ for the explication of the "logical" unfolding of the structure of capitals. To identify this theoretical analysis with the historical conditions of total capitalist reproduction mistates the relation of the theoretical to the historical. Consequently, the historical proportional reproduction of total social production fails through the spontaneous operation of the market mechanism of equilibrium thereby causing disproportionalities between the relations of Departments I (means of production) and II (means of consumption). This expresses both the methodological error of identifying theoretical with historical relations, and the theoretical problem of examining the laws of value through the harmonisation of capitalist proportionalities in the reproduction schemas⁽⁷⁷⁾.

However, in the analytical Kapital-methodology, the reproduction schemas presuppose the relations of capital accumulation of Volume I for the theoretical examination of constitution of individual capital to total social capital in the process of the division of the already expanded mass of surplus value. These connections can equally be represented through the totality of private commodity exchanges without recourse to the stipulation of the reproduction schemas⁽⁷⁸⁾: the logic of capital unfolds in the historical relations of the total production processes as a specific materialist labour and value-creating process,

and an exchange-value and material proportionality regulated by the laws of value⁽⁷⁹⁾. Conversely, Lenin's analysis of a direct commodity exchange in value and material relations fails to distinguish the specificity of the commodity-form⁽⁸⁰⁾, and thereby reduces the "reproduction schemas" to the axiomatic representation⁽⁸¹⁾ of the material and value components of total social production in means of production and means of consumption. Moreover, the "planning-principle" contained in these schemas is further diminished for even in historical relations of proportionality where commodities exchange at their values, it cannot be "known" a priori⁽⁸²⁾ by which relative proportions commodities must be produced to equilibrate production branches.

Rather, the reproduction schemas represent total social capital from the stand-point of the capitalist Weltanschauung. This expresses the connection of individual capital in the circulation of total social capital so as to establish the theoretical conditions between Departments I and II for simple and expanded reproduction of capital⁽⁸³⁾. These relations isolate determined aspects of the total connection of capital in its individual movements, for the examination of the circulation of capitals through the abstract concept of competition to establish the logically necessary connection of the transition from direct capitalist production processes into a production and circulation unity. This demonstrates through the representation of the exchange-processes of general commodity equivalents that if all commodities exchange at their values⁽⁸⁴⁾, total supply is equilibrated with total demand and consequently no over-production of commodities can take place in the proportions of total social capital exchanged⁽⁸⁵⁾.

On this capital methodology, a theoretical proportionality logically precludes both realisation crises and the historical examination of the specific forms of accomplishment of capitals at the level of real competition. The corollary of proportional reproduction demonstrates that the examination of disturbances to the circuit of reproduction issue from the value composition of total social capital, and consequently, that the fundamental relations of capitalist crises do not arise in circulation, but are developed from the total reproduction process of production and circulation relations in which the reproduction process depends upon the accumulation of capitals and the mass of surplus-value⁽⁸⁶⁾. Thereby, the proportional-disproportional relations of total social production must be examined from the total capitalist mechanism of accumulation and the formation of a general rate of profit. Lenin's examination of capitalism in the reproduction schemas and domination of market relations in an important respect abstracts from this value analysis of capitals, and thereby fails to discern that the equilibrium of capitals in the reproduction schemas is itself a form of the crisis-movements of capitals to a general profit-rate. Consequently, with the substitution of the laws of value and the general concept of capitals with the concept of disproportionalities, social exchange-processes of general commodity circulation are denuded of their form-determination,⁽⁸⁷⁾ and thereby the "fundamental" limits and dynamics to the total social movement of production in value laws and capital accumulation⁽⁸⁸⁾.

While reproduction essentially involves the circulation and exchange of capitals, this is a subordinate moment to the direct surplus value production processes⁽⁸⁹⁾. The fundamental form of capitals exists in two moments. The first is considered as a

production and circulation unity⁽⁹⁰⁾ of capitalist reproduction processes in which the circulation of commodities on the market realises commodity capital as money capital, and the process of its reconversion into the accumulation of capital in the general commodity metamorphosis. The second, as a dis-unity of the totality of production and circulation relations which are consequent moments in the necessary separation of the conditions of surplus-value production from the conditions and forms of its realisation⁽⁹¹⁾. As Marx argues, "the separation (Scheidung) between the conditions of labour here and production there ... forms the concept of capital (Begriff des Kapitals)"⁽⁹²⁾. Here it is important to explain why capitalist crises assume market appearance-forms in relations external to production. The necessity of this separation in capitalist commodity production establishes the commodity-money connection of the general nature of commodity metamorphosis. The actuality of the appearances of capitalist crises as the "anarchy of capitals", "disproportionalities", "realisation", etc. in the "spontaneous formation" (naturwüchsigen Gestaltung)⁽⁹³⁾ of production necessarily appear in the circulation relations of commodity and money although they have their foundation in the real structure of the total social capital formation.

The capitalist reproduction schema relate to the circulation of capital and the general laws of surplus-value production. Consequently, the structural constraints to an enlarged reproduction expressed in capital crises are not primarily circulation phenomena but issue from the class production relations of total social capital to total social labour.

The "socialisation" moment contained in the general concept of

capital necessitates the circulation of commodities for, "it is impossible that the owners of commodities expand values (wertverwerte) outside the sphere of circulation without coming into contact with other commodity owners to transform money or commodities into capital"⁽⁹⁴⁾.

The logical examination of capital from the value-form of the capitalist commodity precludes the examination of the fundamental form of capitalism out of competition because "competition cannot be explained out of competition"⁽⁹⁵⁾, although "conceptually, competition is nothing other than the inner nature of capitals"⁽⁹⁶⁾. This also points to the importance of examining the economic organisation of capitalist society from the economic form-determination of commodity production which establishes that the capitalist mode of production logically cannot be transformed through circulation relations.

The specificity of the commodity labour-power has the "specific use-value of being a source of value and surplus value"⁽⁹⁷⁾ and the "production of surplus-value or Plusmacherei is the absolute law of this capitalist mode of production"⁽⁹⁸⁾. Surplus value is the difference in the magnitude of the value of labour-power and the value which labour creates in the labour process ⁽⁹⁹⁾. However, when commodity equivalents are exchanged on the market, "no surplus value is created. Circulation, the exchange of commodities, does not create value"⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ and therefore "no more value is withdrawn from circulation than is thrown into it. No creation of surplus value takes place"⁽¹⁰¹⁾. This is not contradicted by the historical relation of competition and market mechanisms "in the real world, ... (where) ... things do not occur in pure form"⁽¹⁰²⁾, where market prices "deviate" from the socially necessary average labour time embodied in commodities - and commodities exchange to production prices⁽¹⁰³⁾ - because an empirical non-congruence can only signify

that value is distributed in different forms of profit, enterprise profit, trade profit, ground rent, etc., and this is irrelevant from the stand-point of total social capital. As Marx argues, "the formation of surplus value and therefore the transformation of money into capital cannot be explained either through the sale of commodities by the seller above their value or the purchaser of commodities by the buyer, below their value"⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ because the "sum of values in circulation cannot be increased by a mere change in distribution" and therefore the "totality of the capitalist class of a country cannot over-reach itself"⁽¹⁰⁵⁾.

Thereby, the proportional-disproportional relations of the socio-technical process of distributing the existing mass of use-values do not obviate the fundamental form of capital in the expanded reproduction of total social capital in which the circulation process of individual and total capital receives its structural limitations in capitalist relations of production. This designates the fundamental cause of capitalist crises outside circulation processes⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ in the value relations of total social production⁽¹⁰⁷⁾.

As Lenin's analysis of disproportionalities and the "unknown market relations" does not advance a rigorous concept of "capital in general" and the forms of labour organisation in capitalism, there is an insufficient theoretical determination of capitalist circulation and reproduction processes⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ which leaves the theory unable to structure the real appearance-forms of crises from the general laws of capital accumulation. However, this interpretation of capitalism is not confined to a purely "economic" theory of social development through disproportionalities but founds Lenin's critique of capitalism, the process of its transformation and the consequent conceptualisation of the superiority of socialist production over capitalism. This in

turn contributes to the political dimension of Lenin's thought which relates to the programmatic requirements of proletarian socialist praxis.

Examined independently from Marx's total capital-problematic of Das Kapital, Lenin's interpretation of the proportional relations of capitalism in the objective historical social existence of the reproduction schemas appear as an exact form of scientific proof of an equilibrated exchange of total social production. Consequently, the socialist critique of capitalism is theoretically and historically delimited to the characteristic incapacity of capitals to permanently accomplish the "proportionality" of social production relations. This establishes the structural polarities of social systems of production in the opposition of the unplanned anarchy of capitalism to the planned proportionalities⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ of a "constant harmony between production and consumption"⁽¹¹⁰⁾ in socialism. As Marxist orthodoxy interprets the theory of socialist revolution from the general laws of the "collapse" (Zusammenbruch) of capitalism, the disproportionalities theory of capitalist crises enters the inter-Marxist disputes of the Second International⁽¹¹¹⁾ over the historical form of its occurrence. The consequent distinctions in the theory of capitalist crises constitutes the foundation from which to separate revisionist from revolutionary theory.

In distinction to the theoretical variants of the planning capacity of trusts⁽¹¹²⁾ and total social production proportionalities⁽¹¹³⁾, Lenin interprets the general collapse character of Marxism against the revisionism of Russian "legal Marxists": "Mr. Struve says that Marx conceived the transition from capitalism to the new social system as a sudden downfall, the collapse of capitalism. He thinks that

certain passages of Marx give grounds for the view; as a matter of fact, it runs through all the works of Marx"⁽¹¹⁴⁾. Equally, Lenin interprets the theory of capitalist transition from the general theoretical exposition of the "collapse" of capitalism in the reproduction schemas: "the contradictions of capitalism testify to the historically transient character, and make clear the conditions and causes of its collapse and transformation to a higher form"⁽¹¹⁵⁾.

The necessity and possibility of socialism in the critique of capitals establishes the contradictions of social development in which capitalist anarchy in the form of social interaction of bourgeois society cannot aspire to a harmonised system of total social planned production without the revolutionary destruction of the capitalist class system of production. However, the theory of disproportionalities does not represent the full importance of this process for the mode of socio-economic organisation of capitalist society, and consequently, the transformation of capitalism. This is derived from the theory of social development in the proportionalities-disproportionalities which interpolates the historical contents of socialism, and thereby its possibility, through the materialist socialisation-logic contained within the development of social production powers in the anarchy of capitals. In this respect, once the attained historical epoch of materialist production powers confronts the necessity of socialism in the anarchy of capitals with the possibility of its realisation through the socialisation of production, the historical contents of socialised production processes (e.g. proportional planning, technology, instruments of production, rational allocation of resources, social division of labour, etc.) are common to both capitalism and socialism. Consequently, with Lenin's examination of the contradiction and crises of capitalism in the class structure of private property in the means

of production and the socialisation of production, the class critique of capitalist systems exists in the political conceptions of the transformation of the private property structure of capitalism rather than the inner-structure of capitalist production processes.

Having argued that the laws of surplus value are not unambiguously formulated in Lenin's examination of capitalism, the significance of this for the critique of capitalism can now be formulated.

The class contradictions of capitalism

The derivation of social classes from the theory of the proportional-disproportional development of capitalism produces two principal "models" of social relations in the opposed structures of class harmony, the proportional regulation of capitalism and class contradictions and the disproportional development of capitalism. However, this reveals the real substance of the problem of the reproduction schemas and the constitution of class relations from the stand-point of circulation processes. Lenin's conceptualisation of the class contradiction of capitalism functions in the critique of the theory of the proportionalities of unlimited capitalist production, in that the general form of the reproduction of the total classes of capital and labour are not situated in the specific form in which surplus-value is extracted from total labour⁽¹¹⁶⁾, and therefore the value relation as the limit to capitalist reproduction.

It follows that for Lenin, the distribution of social production agents in social classes tends to appear in the exterior forms of the inner regulation and class character of the material forms of the capital relation. On the basis of the reproduction of production from the general laws of capital accumulation, this constitution of class is derived from the "surface"-Weltanschauung of the "appearance-

forms" of capital which Marx analytically designates through the methodology of Das Kapital. This reveals that socio-economic appearances possess a "mystified form" (verdinglichter Form)⁽¹¹⁷⁾: "everything appears reversed (verkehrt) in competition and thus in the consciousness of the agents of production"⁽¹¹⁸⁾. Consequently, under capital mystification, the expression of the laws of social development in proportionalities-disproportionalities are interpreted by the production agents of the classes of capital and labour as the cause of social contradictions.

Here, the mystification of social production processes is associated with market relations in distinction to Marx's concept of the mode of action of value-laws:

"only as an inner law against individual agents, acts the law of value as a blind law of nature, and the social equilibrium of production in the midst of its accidental fluctuations"⁽¹¹⁹⁾.

The solution to the contradictions of disproportionalities is consequently developed in the planning capacities of the laws of proportional reproduction in distinction to Marx's concept of the "blind" nature of the general laws of capitalism:

"the proportionality of the individual branches of production spring as a continual process of disproportionalities because the cohesion of the aggregate production processes imposes itself as a blind law upon the agents of production, and not as a law which, being understood and hence controlled by the common mind brings production processes under their joint control"⁽¹²⁰⁾.

The necessity of disproportionalities for Lenin are expressed by the underconsumptionism of the proletarian masses as the specific limitation on capital accumulation in the general contradiction of the relations of production and consumption⁽¹²¹⁾. This general

contradiction in the theory of disproportionalities establishes the specific critique of capitalism which directly defines the formation of a "revolutionary" class consciousness from the economic mechanism of the "immiseration" (Verelendungs) of the proletarian masses⁽¹²²⁾.

However, as the contradiction of production and consumption is a special case of disproportionalities⁽¹²³⁾, it does not clearly demarcate Lenin's theory and critique from the Austro-Marxists, Russian legal Marxists and the general theory of the Second International. Consequently, the economic mechanism of the "miseration" is developed from a partial capital analysis of the appearance-forms of social classes, and the experiential relations of social agents in circulation relations. Rather, the social labour process in capitalism is both a material and value-forming process which produces the socially necessary means of production and consumption for the materialist reproduction of society. Lenin's analysis of disproportionalities does not thereby show that contained within the reproduction schema is the reproduction of labour's means of consumption in the form of commodity capital as the property of the capitalist class, and the reproduction of the means of production in capital conditions for the intensification of labour exploitation. Although value relations of production produce an over-accumulation of capital, this appears either as underconsumption or overproduction of commodities and therefore as the disproportionalities of use-values. The economic mechanism of the consciousness-formation of the proletarian "masses" is then determined by the structural limitation to the production of use-values through the priority of the exchange-value form in which social wealth is capitalistically developed for the means of subsistence of the proletarian masses.

The necessity of commodity circulation expresses the fact that the social character of labour is only developed in the realisation of commodity values, and therefore the social consumption of use-values out of circulation relations⁽¹²⁴⁾. Here, Marx argues that "wealth confronts direct forced labour not as capital but as a relation of distribution"⁽¹²⁵⁾, and therefore expresses disproportionalities/underconsumptionism. As the difference between the value of paid labour and exchange-value produced under equivalent commodity exchange in capitalist production relations contains the product which labour purchases in commodity-form, the extension of the consumption capacities of labour is then in the exploitation rate of the average social conditions in individual capital⁽¹²⁶⁾ in the reproduction of total social capital⁽¹²⁷⁾.

However, the theory of disproportionalities does not locate the cause of capitalist crises in the dynamics of capital accumulation and the law of the tendential fall in the general profit rate. Marx describes this as the "most important law of modern political economy and essentially the most difficult to understand"⁽¹²⁸⁾, to be conceived before competition and without consideration of competition"⁽¹²⁹⁾. In this mode of capitalist crises, the cyclical movement of total social capital⁽¹³⁰⁾ contains the relative "immiseration"⁽¹³¹⁾ of labour. This is expressed in the relation of total consumption and accumulation processes, and the general over-accumulation of capital which structures the conflict and development of the relations of production and market. Consequently, as the "immiseration" of the proletarian masses is not "permanent", it cannot constitute a fundamental critique of capitalist production relations. Moreover, as a disproportionality it connects the class critique of capitalism through the relations of appropriation rather than the

economic structure of production and labour exploitation.

In the concept of disproportionalities, the reproduction of the social means of subsistence are expressed in the surface-categories of capitalist production relations and the characterisation of the class structure of capitalism through private property in the means of production. However, this is not clearly distinguished from capital-mystification where the social domination of the production powers of labour appear autonomously from the material property of capital, and express the fact that social agents of production only possess power as personifications of capital.

This simultaneous critique of capitalism in the consciousness-raising of the "proletarian masses" is governed by the relations of distribution and the economic constitution of classes in the form in which total surplus value is divided rather than produced⁽¹³²⁾. Consequently, the specific form of social labour in the capital constitution of social classes in bourgeois society is not clearly distinguished from the Second International variants of the critique of capitalism, and the examination of class consciousness beyond the fetishised forms in which capitalist circulation processes are developed⁽¹³³⁾. The critique of capitalist crises thereby connects social classes to the contradictions of production and consumption, production and appropriation, anarchy and planning.

The priority of reproduction relations in Lenin's analysis signifies that in the theory of proportionalities-disproportionalities, "socialisations" are a "revolutionary" concept which produce socialist forms of production out of the genesis and anarchical development of the scale of capital production. The economic emancipation of labour is thereby construed in the technio-organisational relations of the

extended scale of capitalist production⁽¹³⁴⁾, and the materialist conditions of socialism that transcend the anarchical, unplanned social relations: "modern capitalist production displays the tendency of large-scale production to eliminate petty production, and create the conditions that make a socialist system possible and necessary"⁽¹³⁵⁾. What are in fact analytical representations of the organisational-forms of the social division of labour in relative surplus value production⁽¹³⁶⁾ (Chapters XII-XIII Volume 1, Das Kapital)-co-operation manufacture, great machinery - are for Lenin the genetical developments of emancipatory socialist forms of social labour processes in real historical stages in the development of capital. This technicist conception of social production does not function in the critique of capital but constitutes the materialist foundations of social organisation: "scientific socialism is based on the fact of capitalism's socialisation of production"⁽¹³⁷⁾. The socialisation of labour processes are conceived in the technical relations of capitalist production. These extend the scale of specialisation functions of production processes as a result of the transformation of the "form of production"⁽¹³⁸⁾ beyond the "scattered and isolated functions into a concentrated organisation of the whole of society"⁽¹³⁹⁾, and in a "single social production process"⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ - not regulated by the market mechanism - to "organise large scale production with employers" in a society of workers⁽¹⁴¹⁾.

Already there appear problems in Lenin's conceptualisation of the demystification of commodity fetishism in the "capital constitution" of classes and the theory which establishes the socialist aims and organisation of the labour movement. This is evident in the concept of property relations which separate the class structure of capitalism

from its economic form in the conjunctural relations of economy and society. As Lenin argues, "is it not clear that the form of production comes into irreconcilable contradiction with the form of appropriation? Is it not evident that the latter must adapt itself to the former and must become social - that is socialist?"⁽¹⁴²⁾. Here, the formation and fragmentation of social classes through the capitalist social division of labour and distribution of production agents to their economic positions in the totality of capitalist reproduction processes⁽¹⁴³⁾ is no longer accomplished in a unified movement of production and circulation relations, but exists primarily at the conceptual level of "superstructural" consciousness of the material forces of bourgeois society in which class divisions become questions of knowledge and culture⁽¹⁴⁴⁾.

The limitations to the free competition concept of capitalism are here manifest when class relations do not examine the significance of the movement-form of the capitalist mode of production in the double determination of the labour product in the commodity contradiction of use value/exchange value, concrete/abstract labour, absolute/relative value-form. In this form of social production relations, labour exists for the "self-determination of capitals" and is reproduced under the historically equilibrated "model" of total social reproduction. It thereby expresses the proletarianisation of labour and the direct producers' loss of control over the means of production under the capitalist form of production relations in bourgeois society. Consequently, the dialectical methodology of "capital-logic" establishes the social form in which the historical relations of the "capital constitution of classes" are reproduced under the general laws of capital accumulation. As a result, where capital is the ruling

economic mode of production in bourgeois society"⁽¹⁴⁵⁾, the relations of capital and class are combined under the unity and separation of production and circulation in the cyclical process of total social reproduction. This establishes the significance of the Marxist critique of political economy for the analysis of the "laws of movement of bourgeois society" in that the capitalist form of "modern crises ... raised on total social production threatens the foundations of bourgeois production and society"⁽¹⁴⁶⁾.

The examination of the themes identified in free competition capitalism will now be extended with Lenin's introduction of the monopoly-concept into the theory of capitalism.

2.2 The transformation of free competition capitalism into monopoly capitalism

In Lenin's analysis of capitalism, the distribution of total social labour among the branches of production under the structure of private property and anarchy of production is not the necessary product of the general capital relation but the expression of the inferior organisational level of the social exchange-processes⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. This is expressed in the delimitation of the performance of individual production functions to determined fractions of total social labour processes. From the historical and theoretical relation of these disproportionalities, the critique of the capitalist system can equally be expressed through the insufficiency of the socialisation of production. To this extent, capitalist anarchy is another expression of the under-developed socialisation of capitalist production processes. The superiority of the development of capitalism in its classical stage of industrial capital over all previous modes of production consists in the identification of the world-historical civilising forces of the development of production powers. For European capitalism in general and the Russian economy in particular,

the possibility of socialism is conceptualised in the materialist foundation of the historical superiority of the socio-economic relations of capitalist production.

What is fundamental to Lenin's examination of the historical transformation of free competition into monopoly, is the interpretation of the new economic conditions of the reproduction of total social production under the monopoly form of accumulation processes which function in the class contradiction of private property and the socialisation of production. The consequent technico-organisational transformation of the conditions of social labour under the monopoly-form introduces another economic form of social-interaction in the structure of reproduction: "competition becomes transformed into monopoly. The result is the immense progress in the socialisation of production. In particular, the process of technical innovation and improvement become socialised ... This is quite different from the old free competition between manufacturers, scattered and out of touch with each other and producing for an unknown market"⁽¹⁴⁸⁾. In Lenin's analysis of capitals, "the rise of monopolies as the result of the concentration of production is a general and fundamental law of the present stage of the development of capitalism"⁽¹⁴⁹⁾, in which the laws of anarchy are progressively transformed under the planning-potential of monopolies and the extended scale and concentration of capitalist production processes. The extension of capitalist socialisations through market relations of competition constitutes a component part of the contradiction of capitalism and also negates the normal form of classical capitalism - "monopoly is the exact opposite of free competition"⁽¹⁵⁰⁾. Consequently, the permanent domination of the monopoly in the total social reproduction process contradicts the historical and theoretical "starting-point" (Ausgangspunkt) of Lenin's analysis: "the monopoly which has grown

out of capitalism exists in the general environment of capitalism, commodity production and competition, in permanent and insoluble contradiction to this general environment"⁽¹⁵¹⁾.

As Lenin identifies a structural lack of consciousness in the free competition of capitals on the market, the dissolution of competition under monopoly concentration and socialisations of production consequently transforms the inherent anarchy in capitalist production processes and the consciousness-constitution of capitalist classes when markets become "known". The monopoly-form of capitalism thereby creates a potential historical solution to the anarchy of capitals with the regulation of markets in conscious monopoly-planning and distribution of profits⁽¹⁵²⁾. In the new analysis of capitals, the monopoly represents the substitution of the regulation of total social production under the laws of value in the consciousness-formation of individual producers through the totality of individual production acts, and the dissolution of the capitalist organisation of social labour in the direct organisation of labour under the combination of individual capitals into a total social- "universal" capital⁽¹⁵³⁾. The increasing disposition of command over the structure of the market-relation by the monopoly constitutes a negating quality of socialisations of production against the anarchical structure of competition and the disproportionalities of capital planlessness⁽¹⁵⁴⁾. The significance of the monopoly introduces the historical development of a system of proportionalities into bourgeois society.

With the emergence of a total social subject, the crises that were interpreted as a "lack of social control of the production process"⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ are confronted with a social-planning mechanism of capitals. As Lenin argues, "once there are trusts, there can no

longer be lack of planning"⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. From the structure of the contradiction of anarchy and planning, the monopoly-form consequently initiates an intermediate and transitional form of social-production between capitalism and socialism: "monopoly is the transformation of capitalism to a higher system"⁽¹⁵⁷⁾. On this foundation, Lenin's analysis of the monopoly-form of capital leads to the examination of the genesis of socialism out of capitalism as a convergence of capitalist and socialist system-concepts. However, the analysis of the genesis of the monopoly-form cannot be abstracted from Lenin's examination of the class contradiction of capitalism⁽¹⁵⁸⁾. While the monopoly domination of the concentration and centralisation of capitals establishes a planning apparatus, at the level of total social production it intensifies the disproportionalities of capitalism within the fundamental contradiction of the socialisation of the means of production under the class structure of private property. This in turn exacerbates and extends the contradiction of the social class domination of monopoly property on a historically socialised production foundation: "private property relations ... constitutes a shell which no longer fits its contents"⁽¹⁵⁹⁾, as "production becomes social but appropriation remains private"⁽¹⁶⁰⁾. Consequently, the contradiction of capital and consciousness that was identified primarily as a theoretical problem in "classical capitalism" assumes an explicit historical dimension within the genesis of the monopoly for the total capitalist system.

Conjointly, under the contradictory structure of capitalism, the monopoly determines the rationale for both class domination of socialised production relations and the necessity of socialism from the crises of disproportionalities. The theoretical problems examined in Lenin's analysis of capitals are now historically realised with the

genesis of the monopoly transitional form of capitals. The theoretical proportionality of the reproduction schemas tendentially become a real historically equilibrated system of total socialised production relations: "the socialisation of labour ... in the growth of large scale production, capitalist cartels, syndicates, trusts as well as the gigantic increase in the dimensions and power of finance-capital, provide the principle material foundation for the inevitable advent of socialism"⁽¹⁶¹⁾.

However, Lenin's concept of the socialisation process in the governing form of production disproportionalities in the reproduction schemas appear as tendentially socialist socialisations in which the social character and historical contents of the social development of production powers are denuded of their capital and class quality. As the concept of disproportionalities abstracts from the general concept of capital, the value-form of the labour product in which the form-determined social connection of private commodity exchanges is established in capitalist commodity producing society is undermined in its unity as a totality of capitalist production and circulation relations⁽¹⁶²⁾. Consequently for Lenin, the contradiction of capitalism appears in the socialisation of production and the appropriation of the social product in the private property of the relations of distribution. This expresses the fact that socialisations are not defined through the characterisation of capitalist production as a material labour and value-creating process, which forms the foundation upon which Marx determines the structure of antagonistic relations of distribution by the functional requirements of the expansion of capitalist reproduction through the automaticity of the value determined relations of private commodity exchanges.

The transformation of free competition into the monopoly, and the significance of the monopoly category was shown to develop from Lenin's concept of "free competition capitalism". The examination of the concept of monopoly in the theory of imperialism will now be developed so as to establish its theoretical significance and the revolutionary political Weltanschauung for the labour movement.

2.3 Monopoly capitalism

With the collapse of the Second International and the precipitation of imperialist wars, monopoly capitalism develops as the qualitatively distinct general theory of European capitalism and capitalist world economy. The theoretical problem confronting Marxist analysis is that the capitalist appearance-forms in imperialism historically diverge from the general laws of classical capitalism and therefore cannot be substantiated at the level of categorical historical analysis. According to Lenin, Marxism must therefore develop a new general theory of capitalism as a direct theoretical representation of the transformation of the historical relations of capitals. Lenin undertakes this initial construction with the development of the theory of imperialism as an "exclusively theoretical, especially economic analysis ... (of the) ... economic essence of imperialism"⁽¹⁶³⁾. This establishes the concept of imperialism in its theoretical status as a communist theory, for "without having understood the economic roots of the appearance, without having weighed its political and social significance, it is impossible to take a single step to the solution of practical tasks of the communist movement and the coming social revolution"⁽¹⁶⁴⁾.

The monopoly transcendence of the theoretical elements of "classical capitalism" are actualised in the development of

imperialism and the formation of an imperialist epoch of world capitalism⁽¹⁶⁵⁾. These historically developed appearance-forms of capitalism create the possibility for alternative analyses of capitalism expressed in competing theoretical claims for the extension and completion of the theoretical representation of the historical development of capitals. The theoretical and ideological expression of this political commitment against the Second International is embodied in Lenin's categories of imperialism which develop the central category of monopoly.

The representation of this historical conjuncture of international imperialism and international revolution functions through the epoch-determination of world capitalism. The methodological and theoretical presuppositions of Lenin's analysis of capitals are directly connected to the genesis of European capitalism in periodised stages of capitalism. The transition of capitalism into a "third epoch" of capitals⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ characterises imperialism⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ as the "epoch of finance-capital"⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ with a series of substantive contents of world capitalism - "monopoly", "decaying" and "dying" capitalism⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ - which confirm the expectation of the revolutionary destruction of world capitalism in world proletarian revolution⁽¹⁷⁰⁾. This establishes the theoretical presuppositions of Lenin's analysis of capitals in the historical course of the development of European capitalism into objective periodised stages of the development of capitalism⁽¹⁷¹⁾.

The theoretical foundations of imperialism will be developed out of the transformation of free competition into monopoly-forms of capital accumulation, while recognising that this theory purports to represent a systematic analysis of monopoly capitalism only to sufficiently satisfy the conjunctural political and tactical exigencies of socialist praxis.

2.3.1 Imperialism as monopoly capitalism

The theoretical and historical development of Lenin's analysis of capitals has a global significance for the periodised structure of world capitalism and the examination of the "economic root" of imperialism in the monopoly. As Lenin argues, "the supplanting of free competition by monopoly is the fundamental economic feature, the quintessence of imperialism"⁽¹⁷²⁾. What is definitive for the theory of imperialism is the evaluation of the initiation of imperialist wars and the contradiction of capitals on the world market in the historical precipitation of the "collapse" of capitalism. In the imperialist periodisation of capitalism, "the epoch of capitalist imperialism is one of ripe and rotten ripe capitalism which is about to collapse, and is mature enough for socialism"⁽¹⁷³⁾.

The concept of the "collapse" is not original to imperialism, but is already expressed in the analysis of the crises and harmonisation relations of capitalist proportionalities-disproportionalities. Its development in the monopoly-form has the particular characteristics of expressing both the general theory of the objective historical necessity of socialism through the critique of the limitless accumulation possibilities of capital, and the historical manifestation of the terminal character of world capitalism. This is expressed in the classical theories of imperialism as the world competition of capitals in their highest and "ultimate stage" (Schlussphase)⁽¹⁷⁴⁾. Analogously, Lenin's theoretical and historical construct of the monopoly-form of capital signifies that capitalism in its imperialist stage of development is a consummating crisis-periodisation in the history of world capitalism.

The explanation of the terminal character of the crisis-form of

capitals in monopoly capitalism is derived from the form of disproportionalities in free competition capitalism. The recurrence of disproportionalities as a deviation of the real form from the "ideal average" in the competition of individual producers on the market is contained in the genesis of the concentration and centralisation of individual production branches. The anarchical crisis-form remains for total social production, while the monopoly control of market relations enables a circumvention of the general laws of free competition capitalism within the production-spheres of monopoly operation. The nature of capitalist crises are now drawn from the contradiction of monopolised and non-monopolised sectors of the economy: "monopoly, which is created in certain branches of industry, increases and intensifies the anarchy inherent in capitalist production as a whole"⁽¹⁷⁵⁾. Crises now occur for two reasons. Firstly, the monopolisation process does not embrace the entire social production process⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ as a real total social capital. Secondly, the monopolies do not establish a total social planning mechanism because the economy is structured to the class interests of private monopoly capitalist property.

Here we can identify a problem in emphasising the intensification of capitalist crises in total social production disproportionalities while simultaneously advancing the planning capacities of monopolised production processes, thereby locating the crises of monopoly capitalism at the level of total social reproduction rather than the internal dynamics of monopoly capital accumulation. Further, we consider that Lenin's initial examination of capitalist disproportionalities and markets in Russian already exists upon the analytical foundation of his theory of capitalism. This normal form of uneven economic development of capitalism is generalised as a crisis-theory of imperialism under the "law of uneven economic and political development ... (as) ... an absolute law of capitalism"⁽¹⁷⁷⁾. As Lenin continues: "war does

not contradict the fundamentals of private property - on the contrary, it is the direct and inevitable outcome of those fundamentals under capitalism; the smooth growth of individual enterprises or individual states is impossible. Under capitalism there are no other means of restoring the periodically disturbed equilibrium than crises in industry and war in politics"⁽¹⁷⁸⁾. The external militaristic - war expression of this inner-law development of "capitalism's transition to the stage of monopoly capitalism, is connected with the intensification of the struggle for the partition of the world"⁽¹⁷⁹⁾. The historical formation of monopoly capitalism transforms the structure of world capitalism through the expansion of national monopoly capitals on the world market in a crisis-system of total world capital.

It is important to distinguish the formation of imperialism from the monopoly economic structure and not the political superstructure to demonstrate that imperialism is not a political expression of state foreign policy, but an irreversible process, and that imperialist politics must be derived from the specific monopoly form of the "collapse" of production as a historical moment in the genesis of capitals. These factors motivate Lenin's critique of both Kautskianism, and the Luxemburgist definition of imperialism as the "political expression of the processes of capital accumulation caused by the competition of national capitalisms for the last remaining free non-capitalist territories of the world"⁽¹⁸⁰⁾.

This is derived from the methodological analysis of the reproduction schema which demonstrates the incapability of an expanded capital reproduction within the national framework, and thereby the development of the means of production in terms of their "inner connection" to the means of consumption and the relation between Departments⁽¹⁸¹⁾.

Consequently, a "third person" surrogate - which Lenin has employed (the peasantry) in the examination of the development of capitalism in Russia to show the expansion of inner-markets⁽¹⁸²⁾ - must be defined outside the "two-class economy" of the capitalist mode of production upon which the reproduction-schema is based. For an expanded reproduction of capital when that fraction of the value of commodities equals the accumulated fraction of surplus value, capitalist economies must necessarily strive to incorporate the non-capitalist world milieu into the reproduction conditions of European capitalist metropolies. The separation of production and consumption leads to the contradiction between the production and reproduction conditions of capital and the structuring of world accumulation possibilities of capitalism through the non-capitalist markets for the realisation of accumulated surplus-value. Consequently, the terminal character of capitalism is thereby connected to the consummation of the territorial expansion of metropolitan capitals in non-capitalist spheres for the expanded reproduction of capitalistically produced commodities through non-capitalist consumption⁽¹⁸³⁾.

The "collapse" theory now depends upon the existence of the non-capitalist milieu, and as a corollary, the continued existence of capitalism is not specifically dependent upon the inner laws of national capital accumulation. This historical perspective of the "collapse" does not directly implicate inter-imperialist competition of capitals within European imperialist metropolies. The "general root" (Hauptwurzel) of imperialism is derived out of the "capitalisation of surplus-value" (Kapitalisierung des Mehrwerts)⁽¹⁸⁴⁾ necessitating the contradiction of the reproduction of total social capital through the competition of developed national capitals for non-capitalist markets⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ in the "concrete power of imperialist politics"⁽¹⁸⁶⁾. The general issue for the principal Bolshevik theorists of imperialism is

that as Bukharin argues, this formulation omits the "specific form of competitive struggles ... (which) ... spring from the monopoly structure of modern capitalism"⁽¹⁸⁷⁾, and not the policy of imperialist politics in which "trade-capital and mercantalism, industrial capital and liberalism, finance-capital and imperialism" disappear as phases of capitalist development⁽¹⁸⁸⁾.

Although the realisation of surplus-value is an indispensable moment of the process of expanded reproduction, it is developed as a total process of capitalist production and circulation relations because "a production outside production without production is an absurdity"⁽¹⁸⁹⁾. Therefore, capital accumulation and expanded reproduction are not constituted from the exterior world market connection of capital with the non-capitalist world milieu, but the realisation of accumulated surplus-value under monopoly capitalist relations of production. Further, as world markets are already appropriated in Lenin's concept of imperialism, "realisation-crises" are forced upon national capitals from the degree to which the monopoly-character of inter-imperialist struggles for the domination of world markets fails to maintain or extend their relative spheres of influence in the world economy.

For Lenin, imperialism is not exclusively a political super-structure of capitalism but relates to the inner-disproportional expansion of national monopoly capitals, expressed in the monopoly periodisation of capitalism as the export of capital compared with the export of commodities in free competition capitalism⁽¹⁹⁰⁾, and an "outlet" for surplus-value from the increasing disparities of production and consumption. Nevertheless, it remains unclear how "disproportion-alities" establish the economic mechanism by which a general over-accumulation of capital assumes the form of an export of money capital rather than commodity capital for direct investment⁽¹⁹¹⁾, nor the necessity of capital export⁽¹⁹²⁾.

Comintern theoretician E. Varga expresses these difficulties when he argues that: "the economic theory of Marx in general, and his theory of crises in particular, are developed in industrial capitalism and in the capitalism of free competition. The present capitalism is a monopoly capitalism, imperialism. The monopolist character of capitalism, developed unavoidably out of free competition - through concentration of capitals by way of accumulation and centralisation - in general, further limits the consumption power of capitalist society and thereby the effectiveness of markets"⁽¹⁹³⁾. Therefore, the limitation to internal expansion is through the inability to employ produced surplus-value from accumulated means of production to its realisation through the increased consumption of the "masses"⁽¹⁹⁴⁾. The motive for monopoly expansion on the world market for the investment of surplus capital is for differential profits "extracted" from the colonies, the "non-capitalist milieu".

The development of Lenin's analysis of capitals in disproportionalities into imperialism appears in the formation of the new law of uneven economic and political development. However, here the world market domination of the monopoly has not been established unambiguously from Luxemburg's concept, as a purely economic relation in the economic mechanism of the world market movement of capitals determined by the general laws of imperialism, but primarily as the combination of economic categories with political relations of generalised political imperialism of interventionist nation states. This outcome follows from the inner logic of the theory of disproportionalities.

The law of uneven development of national capitals on the world market accentuates the contradictions and crises already prevalent at the national level. Under the domination of monopoly property relations, no mechanism exists for the solution of capitalist contradictions except

crises in the economy and war in politics. However, this does not explain the economic mechanism of imperialism, only its appearance-forms as militaristic political imperialism, and as a corollary of the critique of Luxemburg's derivation of the "collapse" through the incorporation of the non-capitalist world milieu into the reproduction relations of European imperialist metropolies. In the epoch of pre-monopoly capitalism, the genesis of a world capitalist system unfolds through the "free competition" of national capitals and a historical period of its relative "peaceful" development. This epoch continues into the initial inter-imperialist relations of international co-operation of nations⁽¹⁹⁵⁾. However, with the complete colonisation and re-division of world markets, international "peace" and co-operation of imperialist powers cedes place to international imperialist struggles and war⁽¹⁹⁶⁾. The imperialist stage destroys the peaceful development of capitalism and precludes a return to the free competition of "classical capitalism" as the "Right Socialists" (Kautsky, Renner, Bauer, Hilferding, et. al.) maintain⁽¹⁹⁷⁾. With the domination of national economies by finance and monopoly capital, the economic and political content of imperialist wars appears in the inter-imperialist struggle of national state capitals on world markets for the division of profits, competition of sales markets, spheres of capital investment, raw material sources, the territorial division of the world and subjugation of weaker nation states and non-capitalist territories to international finance-capital⁽¹⁹⁸⁾.

On the suppositions of Lenin's analysis of capitals, imperialism is derived from the "starting-point" of the historical forms of reproduction of national capitals. The imperialist relations of world capitalism appear as a new form of existence of capitalism with the domination of the monopolies of European nation states on world capitalist

markets⁽¹⁹⁹⁾. As a further consequence, the expansion of national monopoly capitals enters the world market under the economic and militaristic functions of bourgeois states. This establishes the characteristic form of domination of monopoly capitalism: "domination, and violence that is associated with it, ... are the relationships that are typical in the latest phase of capitalist development. This is what inevitably had to result, and has resulted from the formation of all-powerful economic monopolies"⁽²⁰⁰⁾. With the unification of economic and political relations in the law of uneven development, national markets become "known" and the world economy subjected to conscious division by national state capitals, "state capitalist trusts"⁽²⁰¹⁾. The world is divided in "proportion to capital" and in "proportion to strength" - "there cannot be any other method of division under commodity production and capitalism. But, strength varies with the degree of economic and political development"⁽²⁰²⁾. The consequent inequality of the stages of development of imperialist states on the world market demonstrates that the system of "world finance capital" employs methods of direct military struggle and intervention in the exercise of its domination on the world economy⁽²⁰³⁾.

In conclusion, Lenin argues that the "question as to whether ... (these) ... changes are 'purely' economic or non-economic (e.g. military) is a secondary one which cannot in the least affect the fundamental view on the latest epoch of capitalism"⁽²⁰⁴⁾. As Bukharin also argues, "as war is nothing other than the 'continuation of politics with other means' so ... politics are nothing other than the method of reproduction of determined relations of production"⁽²⁰⁵⁾.

Imperialism and the nation state

Despite the derivation of a theory of imperialism from the crises of disproportionalities of monopolist capitalist reproduction schemas, Lenin supplies no clear theoretical criteria of the conceptual interconnections of imperialism in "markets", capital export, the anarchy of capital production, etc. Notwithstanding the simultaneous function of the concept of imperialism as ideological-critique of Second International theory and analysis of world capitalism, it purports to also theoretically demonstrate the absolute inability of world capitals to accumulate and the inner capacity of capitalist systems to be reproduced, and in this sense, the "collapse".

Two principal conclusions follow from this for European imperialist metropolis's. Imperialist wars are a necessary outcome of the crisis theory of disproportionalities of European capitalism, and the historical materialist foundations of the "victory of socialism is possible first in several or in one capitalist country alone"⁽²⁰⁶⁾. Rather, Lenin's emphasis on market-relations in the theory of imperialism is identified in the context of the "revolutionary" development of capitalism in Russia, and subsequently generalised as the theoretical problematic of imperialism in European capitalism.

Although the theory of imperialism seeks to represent the appearances of world capitalism from the new laws of the uneven development of capitalism, the explanation remains unclear as to why they necessarily assume this form, and therefore why the terminal crisis-mechanism of monopoly capitalism, imperialism and the dynamics of world capital accumulation functions against the general over-accumulation theory of capital. Grossmann points to the definitive critique of the capitalist theory of disproportionalities in that the tendency to crises and the "collapse" (Zusammenbruch) do not arise out of the anarchy of production and competition but are a

a function of the over-accumulation of capital⁽²⁰⁸⁾, and the insufficiency of surplus-value at a specific stage of capital accumulation⁽²⁰⁹⁾. The "logical" structure of the theory of the "collapse" relates to the value laws of the totality of capitalist production relations and the consequent fall in the general profit-rate in distinction to the circulation of capitals based upon the reproduction schemas⁽²¹⁰⁾. Conversely, Lenin's "capital-methodology" and theory of monopoly capitalism introduces the dissolution of the logical structure of capital into Marxism. This is because the importance which the market-movement of individual capitals comes to assume in the structure of the theory conceals the full contradictory character of capitalist commodity production and thereby the regulation of total social production under the laws of value⁽²¹¹⁾.

The Aufhebung of the laws of value in the monopoly is first given theoretical expression by R. Hilferding in Das Finanzkapital - an influential text for both Lenin and the Second International - when he argues that "the realisation of Marx's teaching with monopolistic associations, appears to transcend the Marxist theory of value"⁽²¹²⁾. Subsequently, Lenin et. al. equate the value laws, however formulated, with capitalist commodity production of "free competition capitalism"⁽²¹³⁾.

With the omission of an elaborated structure of competition and value laws in "classical capitalism", monopolies appear to move on world markets in conjunction with the economic functions of nation states during the crisis of world capitals, and are interpreted as post-Kapital phenomena of the historical "collapse" of capitalism in imperialism. This is articulated in the new laws of uneven development and the movement of monopoly capitals on the world market in conjunction with the conscious political agencies of nation states. As monopoly

capital no longer produces for unknown markets, the theory of imperialism must respond to the transformed conditions of its own theoretical and historical foundations. The competition of capitals under the laws of value submit to the power politics of nation states and monopolies, and the laws of disproportional development. From these relations, the formation of a world market cannot be connected to the inner-laws of capital accumulation and the specific mode of action and accomplishment of value laws.

The substitution of the total process of the cyclical development of capital crises on the world market⁽²¹⁴⁾ with the law of uneven development of capital accumulation abandons the inner-mechanisms of the devaluation of capitals expressed in the totality of circulation relations of capitals on national and world markets. Rather, disproportionalities and underconsumptionism are permanent features of the capitalist mode of production. What is transformed in the social appearances of capital crises is a relative expansion and contraction of the disproportionalities of capitalist accumulation processes⁽²¹⁵⁾. As uneven development unfolds as an abstract law of capital-disproportionalities and consummating crisis of capitalism, capital crises appear in a linear, mechanistic process of imperialist collapse which generalises economic and political appearances of the imperialist war conjuncture as the determining and characteristic relations of the imperialist periodisation of capitalism and thereby to, on Lenin's capital methodology and analysis, the level of laws and theoretical explanation.

However, the monopoly-form of capital crises does not exhaust the particularities of terminal disproportionalities and the dissolution-forms of capitals. The remaining ones can be represented under the two rubric categories of "decaying" and "dying" capitalism.

2.3.2. Imperialism as decaying capitalism

From the periodisation of the development of capitalism, industrial capital functions as the dominant form of capital in free competition capitalism. This historically situates Marx's definitive statement on industrial capital in the pre-monopoly capitalist epoch:

"industrial capital is the only mode of existence of capital which is not only the appropriation of surplus value, respectively surplus product, but equally the creative function of capital. It conditions therefore the capitalist character of production; its existence includes the class opposition of capital and wage-labour. To the extent that it governs social production, the technical and social organisation of labour processes are transformed, and thereby the economic-social type of society (ökonomisch-gesellschaftliche Typus der Gesellschaft)" (216).

However, while the fundamental form engenders the civilising tendencies of industrial capital, this does not represent the total reproduction process of capitals as a unity of production and circulation processes, nor their concretisation in the historical forms of capital. It is here that the new theoretical and historical development of finance-capital is accredited with a strategic significance in the theory of imperialism. Finance-capital expresses the historical dissolution of the economic form of bourgeois society and the supersession of the progressive functions of capital in its ascendent epoch for the regressive functions of its degenerative forms of social domination. The tendency to "stagnation" and "decay" expressed in Lenin's theory of monopoly capitalism consequently characterises the new historical form of class contradictions. Here, the permanence of the "immiseration" critique of capitalism is given

a revolutionary connotation with the precipitation of permanent crises and imperialist wars for the ascendancy of the spontaneity of socialist consciousness⁽²¹⁷⁾.

Consequently, the "fusion" of industrial and bank-capital into financy-capital is not merely an economic form of the development of capitals, but signifies the negation of the world-historical civilising forces of the materialist development of production powers in "industrial capitalism" for degenerate forms of bourgeois political domination. This capital-developement determines the total economic and political Weltanschauung of Lenin and the Bolsheviks on world capitalism. Therefore, the theoretical elaboration of finance-capital is a subordinate moment to the political significance of its formulation for the world communist movement.

While Lenin discusses the positive socialisation-functions of capital, these are contrasted to the predominate tendency to "decay" as a "characteristic of every monopoly under the system of private ownership in the means of production"⁽²¹⁸⁾. The monopoly constitutes a new fundamental law of capital which cannot transcend its inner limits but reproduces them through the inadequacy of the social mode of production to realise the development of production powers. This produces under monopoly competition the tendency to stagnation and decay of the total unfolding of social production powers as the general historical tendency and appearance of capitals. With the lack of congruity between the private economic and property relations with socialised production, this "shell which no longer fits its contents must inevitably decay. If its removal by artificial means be delayed, a shell which may continue in a state of decay for a fairly long period ... but which will inevitably be removed"⁽²¹⁹⁾. The terminal character of this relation is increasingly the form in which the

intensification of class contradictions function in capitalism, and the revolutionary class consciousness of the proletariat is directly formed in the contradiction of means of production and consumption, the "miseration" - thesis. As Lenin argues, "both uneven development and a semi-starvation level of existence of the masses are fundamental and inevitable conditions and premises of this mode of production"⁽²²⁰⁾. This historically constituted form of capital in the monopoly expresses revolution as a historical moment of capitals⁽²²¹⁾, derived from the permanent disproportionalities of monopoly capitalist relations of production. Consequently, the monopoly-form of capital produces both "decay" of production powers and the "miseration" mechanism of the creation of revolutionary class consciousness and socialism with the socialisation of production⁽²²²⁾.

Despite the categorical imperatives of Lenin's capital analysis, it theoretically remains unclear as to whether the predominant tendency in the analysis of capitals is to stagnation or accumulation, and how the world market competition of monopolies precludes the expansion of production powers. These dynamics are examined out of the domination of the monopoly-form on circulation relations in that monopoly profits are raised through tributes in the colonies, in distinction to world commodity-exchanges, and the national price determinations of the monopolies. Moreover, the priority of this imperialist relation creates: "the economic possibility of deliberately retarding technical progress"⁽²²³⁾ and thereby of the realisation of a "conscious limitation of production and the development of production powers"⁽²²⁴⁾. Conversely, Lenin argues from the law of uneven development of capitals that the "monopoly under capitalism can never completely, and for a long period of time, eliminate competition in the world market, the possibility of reducing the cost of production and increasing profits by introducing improvements operating in the

direction of change"⁽²²⁵⁾, and that "it would be a mistake to believe that this tendency to decay precludes the rapid growth of capitalism"⁽²²⁶⁾.

However, Lenin's direct representation of the categories of imperialist crises are predicated through "stagnation" and "decay" as the prevalent characteristics of imperialism. Yet without the value foundation of capitals, this analysis can only be paradoxically developed out of the systematisation of the appearances of disproportionalities of capitals in "growth", "uneven development", "decay", etc. As Lenin states, "on the whole, capitalism is growing more rapidly than before; therefore this growth is not only becoming more and more unequal in general, its unevenness also manifests itself, in particular, in the decay of countries which are richest in capital (England)"⁽²²⁷⁾.

The reduction of the capital mechanism to a "conscious motive" in the "stagnation" and retardation of technical progress further demonstrates the abandonment of the value analysis and general laws of capital: "the law of the determination of value by labour-time is a law which brings under its sway the individual capitalist who applies new methods of production by compelling him to sell his goods under their social value. The same law acting as a coercive law of competition, forces his competitors to adopt the new method"⁽²²⁸⁾.

With the substitution of the general laws of capital for the monopoly, the "general tendencies" of historical accumulation processes cannot be given, because for the "abstract level of capital in general, such practical difficulties are only a concrete-historical reflex of the general contradictory nature of the capitalist mode of production"⁽²²⁹⁾. Here we see how the "theory-history" relationship in Lenin's methodology has important consequences for the examination of capitalism and the interpretation of the new features of capital accumulation.

The concept of increasingly severe disproportionalities of capitalist production abolishes the cyclical valuation and devaluation of capitals in the contradictory movements of tendencies and counter-tendencies in the accumulation process and thereby the rational explanatory principle of "historical appearance-forms" of the accumulation cycle of capital in which the stagnation of socially developed production powers is expressed out of the general laws and mechanisms the reconversion of money capital into industrial capital⁽²³⁰⁾. In the world market connection of capitals, this necessarily involves inferior accumulation rates of national capitals and their impact on the stability and volume of world markets⁽²³¹⁾. The difficulty in determining these "appearance-forms" reflects the theoretical ambivalence over the historical direction of capitals in the monopoly stage that both sanctions an expansion of production powers and the preclusion of further world historical accumulation functions of production processes. However, the historical priority of one such "decaying capitalism" is only fully represented out of the economic and political forms of domination in the new class production relation of "finance-capital".

The concept of "finance-capital"

On the basis of the concentration and centralisation of capitals, Lenin characterises the dominant tendency within monopoly capitalism to the formation of a "finance-capital", the "fusion" of industrial and bank-capital: "finance-capital produces the epoch of monopoly"⁽²³²⁾. This brings out the connection of Leninist capital theory to that of the Second International. While Lenin does not accept Hilferding's concept of "finance-capital" without important qualifications regarding the "juristic" nature of the interpretation of the economic forms of

centralisation, of money entering exchange without value⁽²³³⁾ and the political concept of imperialism, Lenin does not contradict this basic conceptualisation of the new category of capital but interprets its "incompleteness". Finance-capital "is not an accidental excrecence of capitalism, but its ineradicable continuation and product", the "content" of which embraces the characteristics of imperialism as the division of world markets, territorial division of the world, "parasitism" and "opportunism" etc.⁽²³⁴⁾. As an accomplished form of capital, the category becomes a central theoretical component of Lenin's derivation of imperialism which develops on the dissolution forms of "free-competition"⁽²³⁵⁾: "the characteristic of modern capital forms those concentration-processes which appear in the transcendence (Aufhebung) of free-competition through the formation of cartels and trusts on the one hand, and in the increasing internal connection between bank-capital and industrial-capital on the other"⁽²³⁶⁾. This new form of capitals is founded in the functional separation of capital property from its functions⁽²³⁷⁾ which creates the possibility not only of the formation of a class of "rentiers" separated from production⁽²³⁸⁾, but more generally, the foundation for the "two mainstreams of the labour movement"⁽²³⁹⁾. This fraction of the total capitalist class derives its "parasitical" existence to pecuniary gains from capital export, income from interest and dividends, the issue of securities and tributes from the colonies"⁽²⁴⁰⁾.

Implicit within this concept of "finance-capital" are the transformed social relations of production which Hilferding has already distinguished out of the separation of the material contents of production from the juridical-property relations of capitals: "finance-capital has transcended (aufgehoben) the anarchy of production

inside the great capitalist countries. The monopolist enterprise-associations .. have created a new type of relations of production in which the unorganised commodity capitalist system is transformed into a finance-capitalist organisation"⁽²⁴¹⁾. This historical impact of capital contradictions in the transformation of the classical class relations of production is expressed in the historical initiation of socialised production forms that can no longer be sustained in the contradictory and limited foundation of private property in the means of production and the limited social consumption of the proletarian "masses": "the immense progress of mankind which achieved this socialisation goes to benefit .. the speculators"⁽²⁴²⁾. The appropriation of the social product in the property relations and political Gewalt of finance-capital secures its limited socio-economic foundation in the concrete political praxis of imperialist states. Consequently, the extension of the direct suppression functions of states constitutes a new categorical content of the conceptual foundation of monopoly-analysis, the real relations of capitalist society and the particularities of the class domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie. This relation of domination reflects the transformed social relations of production by finance-capital. As Lenin argues, "capitalist monopolies occupy first place in economics and politics"⁽²⁴³⁾ such that a "finance-oligarchy throws a close network of dependence relationships over all economic and political institutions"⁽²⁴⁴⁾.

Moreover, we may note that the general political conceptualisation of these relations of economy and political are derived from Hilferding's analysis of the conversion of the state into an instrument of the bourgeoisie. As Hilferding argues, the "Aufhebung of the free competition of individual capitals" transforms the "relation of capitalist classes to state-power"⁽²⁴⁵⁾;

"cartellisation unifies economic power and thereby directly its political effectiveness. Equally, it also unifies the political interests of capitals and allows the whole force of economic power to act directly upon state-power"(246).

However, as a consequence of Lenin's interpretation of historical-materialism, the political superstructures of bourgeois society are necessarily transformed to the necessary social mode of existence of production powers within which the appearances of economy and political are analysed. In this respect, Lenin's concept of political state - Gewalt represents the general functions-mechanism of monopolies out of the terminal crisis-tendencies of capital. Consequently, the transformation of free competition capitalism into monopoly capitalism develops international economy in the form of the relation of the domination of finance-capitals on a world scale. The explicitly finance-capitalist character of imperialism extends to the political determination of world market functions of states for the realisation of monopoly and finance-capitals on the world market. The derivation of finance-capitalist states from the general conditions of "decaying capitalism" construe the determination of its functions-radius out of intensification of the anarchical reproduction of the disproportionalities of capitals. With the formation of a world market, the imperialist system of production is only unified and reproduced through the exercise of national functions of imperialist states for the protection and conquests of national monopoly and finance capitals; in the terminal "collapse"-periodisation of capitalism, the general form of bourgeois states are "imperialist state capitalisms". With the domination of finance-capitalism on

the law of uneven development, "modern states ... become an exact expression of the interests of finance-capital"⁽²⁴⁷⁾. This characterises imperialist states as "rentier states"⁽²⁴⁸⁾ founded upon the national and international interests and functions of finance-capital in a world system of "rentier states"⁽²⁴⁹⁾. Inter-imperialist struggles unfold on the world market through a "handful of usurer states and a vast majority of debtor states" as a general tendency of the imperialist stage of capitalism⁽²⁵⁰⁾ in which this "non-economic superstructure grows up on the basis of finance-capital, its politics and its ideology (and) stimulates the striving for colonial conquest"⁽²⁵¹⁾.

The concept of "rentier states"

The interpretation of bourgeois states as "rentier states" in "decaying capitalism" is only sustained from the strategic importance of "finance capital" as a new quality of capital accumulation through the designation of the domination of total social production through the control of total money capital in a centrally planned banking-system⁽²⁵²⁾. Rather for Marx, interest bearing capital must be determined through the self-valuation of capitals as the most abstract form of social wealth⁽²⁵³⁾ and its appearance to the production agents in the fetishised relations of capital. As interest-bearing capital is only sustained out of the separation of capital property and functions, its significance for the totality of capitalist production and circulation relations⁽²⁵⁴⁾ unfolds from the logic of capitals rather than its dissolution in the articulation of "new" categories of finance-capitalism. Consequently, capital accumulation (industrial capitalism) now receives a subordinated function to the new forms of credit and interest bearing capitals derived through the sphere of realisation as the dominant and controlling functions of total social production.

The collective implications of finance-capital abandons the specificity of capitalist commodity production in the laws of value. Grossman's evaluation of finance-capital establishes the general premises for the subsequent examination and critique of its theoretical development. The fundamental issue we may identify here is that Hilferding is "not in a position to derive the appearances of the capitalist environment (Umwelt) out of Marx's laws of value"⁽²⁵⁵⁾. When the money commodity transcends the laws of value, "value" is no longer determined by socially necessary labour-times, and commodity production is reduced to a means of calculating and accounting rather than a necessary moment in the form of commodity-exchange⁽²⁵⁶⁾.

The generalisation of the dependence of industrial to finance-capital as the historical expression of capitalist socialisation processes results from the development of Lenin's analysis of finance-capital beyond Hilferding's formalistic concept to the examination of production as the "content of finance-capital"⁽²⁵⁷⁾ in the capitalist contradiction of socialised production relations and private property in the means of production. However, as the fundamental categories of imperialism are not developed from "finance-capital"⁽²⁵⁸⁾ this does not constitute the socially dominant production relation nor permit the theoretical articulation of the structural transformation of world economy and the reproduction of national capitals through the world market connections vis-a-vis the theoretical hybrid of economic and political imperialism, finance capitalism and world rentier states. Lenin's categorical capital analysis of the competition of national capitals on the world market with a new concept and historical content represents the imperialist relation analogous to the historical mode of existence of merchant capital⁽²⁵⁹⁾. Profits are "protected" on the world market trade relations through the extra-economic means of the

political functions of national states in the reproduction of total national capitals. This concept of imperialism reformulates the appearance of the genesis of capital accumulation through the interventionism of either mercantilist or bourgeois states. In the period of "original accumulation", the mercantilist state is essential for the construction of the conditions of the "first epoch of capitals" when capital is not yet socially dominant and does not produce its own conditions of reproduction. The subsequent subordinated and diminished functions of the interventionist state under the ideology of "free competition" of international trade and the classical Rechtsstaat arise only after the modes of production in the "colonies" have been transformed and subordinated conjointly with the creation of a world economy - the national reproduction of capitals on the foundation of its general laws only function without systematic state interventionism in the dominant centres of capital accumulation after the initial process of world colonisation by conquest and force⁽²⁶⁰⁾ ("rentier states"). Various forms of state interventionism in national accumulation processes are necessary moments in the formation and reproduction of the capitalist mode of production in the world market connection⁽²⁶¹⁾ and receive their historical characterisation in the particularities of national accumulation processes in the general constitution of national capitals. In these respects, the formation of state-power is not independent of the constitution-process of the capitalist class⁽²⁶²⁾. Rather, the advent of the "private use of power (Gewalt) of the bourgeois class and constitution process of states, as the public institution and monopoly of the physical use of power, forms the direct expropriation, robbery and dispossession etc. through the state, developed as an essential foundation in the genesis process of capitalist society"⁽²⁶³⁾.

The historical content of the new imperialist capital forms of co-determined economic and political relations of inter-imperialist conflicts, imperialist wars and bellicose relations of nation states⁽²⁶⁴⁾, are examined in the Leninist theory of imperialism as being equivalent appearances to the period of the "pre-history of capital". Consequently for Lenin, war and armed struggle between monopolies and nation states reduces the total capital relation to robbery, plunder and pillage, and bourgeois nation states to imperialist "robber states". Capital no longer constitutes the concept of imperialism and the world market functions of states out of the political form in which total social capital is reproduced in national bourgeois states. While this does not preclude militaristic interventionism of national political states, their general economic praxis functions are within the economic structure of world capital. As a result, the historical contingency of imperialist wars and their "collapse" crisis-appearances cannot be determined as a permanent condition of the "periodisation" of the laws of capitalism. Although the formation of an international structure of capital production exacerbates the contradictory movements of economy and national bourgeois states⁽²⁶⁵⁾, the world market competition of capitals (imperialism) is derived from the internationalisation of capital accumulation processes and the reproduction of national bourgeois economies on the world market.

2.3.3 Imperialism as dying capitalism

The revolutionary significance of the theory of imperialism extends the characteristics of decaying capitalism in the contradictory development of the "collapse" of capitalism to determine the "world historical end of capitalism"⁽²⁶⁶⁾. While this process is not without qualification in respect of the combined features of monopolistic "development and decay" as represented in Bukharin's concept of the contradictory nature of

capitalism as a "unity of opposites"⁽²⁶⁷⁾, it is accepted that capitalism has entered the epoch of its "collapse"⁽²⁶⁸⁾. Since this constitutes the imperialist quality of capitalism as the preparatory foundation of proletarian revolution, it theoretically and programmatically confirms the terminal character of capitalism. Lenin designates both the "collapse" character (dying capitalism) and transitional-form (socialism) out of the double determination of the monopoly-category.

With the transformation of free competition into monopoly, certain fundamental characteristics of capitalism "change into their opposites when the features of the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves all along the line"⁽²⁶⁹⁾: the monopoly constitutes the "transition from the capitalist system to a higher social order"⁽²⁷⁰⁾. The "monopoly" gives the form in which socialism is to be realised through the "actualisation" of the principles of the reproduction schema of "classical capitalism". The organisational potential of the monopoly form of capitals over the anarchy of capitalist disproportionalities appears in the theoretical and historical Aufhebung of capitalism through the socialisation of the materialist foundation of production.

The transformation of capitalism is thereby designated through a contradictory composite of imperialist relations: "imperialism is a moribund capitalism, capitalism in transition to socialism. Monopoly, which grows out of capitalism, is already dying capitalism, the beginning of its transition to socialism. The tremendous socialisation of labour by imperialism ... has precisely this significance"⁽²⁷¹⁾. While Lenin often unconditionally states the relation of monopoly such that "free competition has become impossible after it has given rise to monopoly"⁽²⁷²⁾, the monopolies do not eliminate competition for this

would signify the total Aufhebung of capitalism. Lenin therefore examines the contradictory relation of opposed principles of monopoly and competition sectors of the economy under monopoly domination in the disproportionalities of capitals which "gives rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, frictions and conflicts. Monopoly is the transition of capitalism to a higher system"(273).

However, the "decaying" character of capitalism emphasises the intermediary form of the contradictions of imperialism through the realisation of its transitional characteristics within the social domination of monopoly and finance capitalist property and appropriation relations. The transitional and contradictory relations of monopoly capitalism result from the maintenance of the structure of private property when the "changing social relations of production"(274) necessitate the creation of a socialist property structure to realise the organisation of capitals in their socialised form. Here, capitalist socialisations which reorganise the social conditions of relative surplus value production, for Lenin signify not only the materialist foundations of socialism but the actual transformation of existing capitalist relations of production to an intermediate-transitional capitalism: "capitalism in its most imperialist stage leads right up to the most comprehensive socialisation of production, it so to speak, drags capitalists against their will and consciousness into some sort of new social order, a transitional one from complete free competition to complete socialisation"(275).

This expresses the epoch of the decline of world capitalism in its internal relations of accumulation and external loss of sovereignty over world economic processes. Lenin thereby characterises the historical inception of the "collapse" out of the monopoly-form: "the forms, the sequence, the picture of particular crises has changed

but crises remained an inevitable component of the capitalist system. While uniting production, the cartels and trusts ... aggravated the anarchy of production, the security of existence of the proletariat and the oppressed of capital, thereby intensifying the class antagonisms to an unprecedented scale. That capitalism is heading for a breakdown - in the sense of both individual political and economic crises and the complete collapse of the entire system - has been particularly clear, and on a particularly large-scale, precisely by the new giant trusts"⁽²⁷⁶⁾. However, the contradictory nature of capitalist "collapse" in the development of the economic essence of imperialism and the disproportionalities of capitalism simultaneously designates socialism out of the materialist forms of capitalist production: "we must define it as capitalism in transition, or more precisely as moribund capitalism"⁽²⁷⁷⁾. This follows from the representation of the historical forms of production as both the destruction of the imperialist system of world capitalism and the socialist content of monopoly⁽²⁷⁸⁾. The Leninist theory of imperialism thereby signifies that capitalism has lost its world historical civilising functions creating the international conditions of world proletarian revolution. Its character as a "dead capitalism" is expressed in the ineluctability of the historical decline of the world capitalist system through imperialism in the ultimate stage in the development of capitalism. Consequently, the "collapse" becomes a historical moment in the development of world capitals, and the monopoly-form, the structure through which socialism unfolds from capitalism in the convergence theory of social systems.

The political function of imperialism

To a certain extent, the political function of Lenin's analysis of capitalism and imperialism has emphasised the untenability of a

theory of monopoly capitalism from the programmatic requirements of socialist praxis, rather than the examination of the historical formation of a general system of monopoly capitalism as a logical unfolding of the inner-dynamics of the capitalist mode of production. In this respect, the significance of the analysis of revolutionary crises in the imperialist epoch for the world communist movement is derived from Lenin's examination of the historical categories of free competition capitalism. The theoretical development of imperialism expresses the new appearance-forms of capitalism, their historical and transitory character through the continuation and realisation of these general parameters in the genesis of the monopoly-form. However, Lenin's formulation of the development of capitalism is problematically developed from the dissolution of "classical capitalism" and the general concept of capitals. This follows from the theorisation of the special conditions of the historical conjuncture of the world crisis of capitals, expressed in the "empirical categories" of the new laws of uneven economic and political development. Consequently, what functions as a historical crisis of world capitals appears for Lenin's analysis under the historical form of the "collapse" and transition of capitalism.

This conclusion establishes the political significance of Lenin's theory for Bolshevism and the Third International. The subsequent connection of Lenin's theory of imperialism to class politics in the political superstructures of capitalist society will be the object of discussion in the next Chapter.

CHAPTER 2REFERENCES

1. V.I. Lenin, 'What the Friends of the People are', LCW, 1, (Spring-Summer, 1894), p. 136, 139, 140.
2. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 140.
3. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, (Peking, 1970), p. 3. This text was written in the first half of 1916 and first published in mid-1917. Lenin also argues that the analysis of "materialist social relations at once made it possible to observe recurrence and regularity and to generalise the systems of various countries in a single fundamental concept: social formation. It was this generalisation alone that made it possible to proceed from the description of social phenomena ... to their strictly scientific analysis, which isolates ... that which distinguishes one capitalist country from another and investigates that which is common to them all". See V.I. Lenin, 'What the Friends', p. 140.
4. V.I. Lenin, 'The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism', LSW, 1, (March, 1913), p. 25. See also K. Kautsky, Karl Marx's ökonomische Lehren (Jena, 1887), p. VIII; W. Sombart, Der proletarische Sozialismus, (Jena, 1925), p. 300.
5. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, pp. 17-18 (emphasis added).
6. V.I. Lenin, 'On the So-called Market Question', LCW, 1, (Autumn, 1893), p. 93, 95.
7. V.I. Lenin, 'The Three Sources', p. 68.
8. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 26.
9. V.I. Lenin, 'The Economic Content of Narodnism and the Criticism of it in Mr. Struve's Book', LCW, 1, (Written towards the end of 1894 and the beginning of 1895), p. 407; 'On the So-called Market', p. 93.
10. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 407, 430, 443. Also, Lenin advances this argument against the Narodnik's theory of realisation.
11. See for example, R. Luxemburg, Die Akkumulation des Kapitals. Ein Beitrag für ökonomischen Erklärung des Imperialismus. Rosa Luxemburg Werke, 5, (Berlin, 1975), p. 22. First published in 1913.
12. V.I. Lenin, 'The Three Sources', pp. 67-8. See also 'Karl Marx', pp. 37-8. Here Lenin follows Karl Marx's 'Vorwort Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie' (MEW, 13) and interprets the general laws of social development under the materialist conception of history, as the primacy of materialist production powers on capitalist social relations of production.
13. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', pp. 37-8.

14. V.I. Lenin, 'Materialism and Empirico-criticism', LCW, 14, (September, 1908), p. 325.
15. As Lenin argues, "man's social knowledge ... reflects the economic system of society. Political superstructures are a superstructure on the economic foundation. Therefore, the various political forms of the modern European states serve to strengthen the domination of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat". See V.I. Lenin, 'The Three Sources', p. 25.
16. V.I. Lenin, 'What the Friends', p. 149.
17. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 142.
18. K. Marx, Grundrisse (London, 1974), p. 331 (emphasis added with a modified translation).
19. K. Marx, Das Kapital, 3 Bände, Band I, MEW, 23, p. 38.
20. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 341.
21. K. Marx, Grundrisse (Frankfurt, 1953), p. 217. All other references to the Grundrisse will be to the German edition unless otherwise stated.
22. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 335 (emphasis added).
23. K. Marx, Grundrisse (London), p. 552.
24. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 335.
25. K. Marx, 'ibid.', Band III, MEW, 25, p. 219.
26. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 23, p. 335.
27. K. Marx, Grundrisse (London), pp. 306-7; Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 278.
28. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 33. This is because "capital in general" does not "exhaust" (erschöpft) the life-circuit (Lebenlauf) of capital.
29. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 199 (emphasis added). Further, Marx, states that in the "representation (Darstellung) of the materialisation and autonomisation (Verschlichung und Verselbständigung) of the relations of production against the agents of production we do not proceed in the manner in which the connection through the world market and its conjunctures - the movement of market prices, periods of credit, industrial and commercial cycles of the alternation of prosperity and crises - appear to them as overwhelming natural laws that irresistibly enforce their will over them, and confront them as blind necessity. Thus, we do not proceed in this manner because the actual movement of competition lies outside our plans and we have only represented their inner-organisation of the capitalist mode of production, so to say, its ideal average".
30. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 839.

31. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 657.
32. See H. Reichelt, Zur logischen Struktur des Kapitalbegriffs bei Karl Marx (Frankfurt, 1970), p. 133; von H.-D. Kittsteiner, "'Logisch" und "historisch". Über Differenzen des Marxschen und Engelschen Systems der Wissenschaft', IWKGDA, 1 (Berlin, 1977), 1-47, (p. 33).
33. K. Marx, 'op. cit.', p. 218.
34. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 12 (emphasis added).
35. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 107. See also H. Reichelt, 'Zur Staatstheorie in Frühwerk von Marx und Engels', in K. Marx/F. Engels Staatstheorie. Materialien für Rekonstruktion der marxistischen Staatstheorie. Herausgegeben E. Hennig, J. Hirsch, H. Reichelt and G. Schäfer (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. XI-LVIII (p. LIII).
36. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 180.
37. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 161. See also 'Zur Kritik', p. 49.
38. See K. Busch, Die multinationalen Konzerne. Zur Analyse der Weltmarktbeziehung des Kapitals (Frankfurt, 1974), p. 256; P.K., Leninismus, pp. 70-83.
39. V.I. Lenin, 'The Three Sources', p. 27.
40. K. Marx, Theorien über den Mehrwert, MEW, 26.3, p. 503.
41. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 23.
42. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 23, p. 328. The historical development of these relations is "form-determined" (Formbestimmt) by the socio-economic mode of production. In Marx's methodology, the "differentia specifica" of capital is "both logical development ... (and) ... the key to understand the historical". See K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 565. However, the significance of this for the critique of political economy is that "the existence of free wage-labour forms the foundation for the conceptual construction (Verarbeitung) of total capitalist systems in the form of the dialectical representation (Darstellung) of categories; this form of representation however, on the other hand, is not identical with the characterisation (Nachzeichnung) of the historical genesis of capital and free wage-labour". See H. Reichelt, Zur logischen Struktur, p. 132.
43. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 329. The reproduction of the conditions of capital contains the capital relation. As Marx states: "the capitalist production process ... produces not only the commodity, not only surplus-value ... (but) ... on the one side the capitalist, and on the other, wage-labourers". Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 604.
44. Marx argues that "general commodity production first makes the production of commodities general and then by degrees, transforms all commodity production into capitalist commodity production". See Capital, Volume II (Moscow, 1967), p. 36; Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 152.

45. As Marx formulates this point, "capital creates its own foundations (so bald das Kapital als solches geworden ist, schafft es seine eigenen Voraussetzungen)". The "capitalist production process reproduces by its own precedence (Vorgang), the separation between labour-power and labour conditions. It reproduces and eternalises (verewigt) thereby the conditions of the exploitation of labour". Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 603; Grundrisse, p. 313.
46. Marx contends, "it is not necessary to describe the actual history of the relations of production to develop the laws of bourgeois economy" (K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 364) because already in "the existence of products as commodities are specific historical conditions of existence". K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 183. These historical relations do not exist with commodity circulation but "arise only where the owners of production and the means of subsistence find free labour as the seller of its labour-power on the market, and these historical conditions embrace a world history". K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 183.
47. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 12.
48. K. Marx, 'ibid.', pp. 15-6.
49. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 25, p. 33. See H. Grossmann, 'Die Wert-Preis-Transformation bei Marx und die Krisenproblem', in Aspekte der Marxschen Theorie, I, (Frankfurt, 1973), pp. 195-227, First published in 1932.
50. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 25, p. 324. The "analysis of the actual inner-connections of the capitalist production process are a very difficult thing and a very detailed work. If it is a work of science to reduce the visible, mere appearance movements to the inner actual movement so it is self-evident that the conceptions about the laws of production in the heads of the capitalist and circulation agents, which diverge completely with these laws, are only the conscious expression of appearance-movements".
51. Lenin's interpretation of the relation of "essence" and "appearance" diminishes the significance of the logical representation of capital categories which "neglects" (vernachlässigen) the "accidental and unessential" (zulässig und unwesentlich) in the general theoretical analysis of the capitalist mode of production: "in such a general examination, it is in general always presupposed that the actual relations correspond to their concept, or what is the same thing, the actual relation is only represented in so far as it expresses its own general type". See K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 152. Consequently, we see that the "general concept of capital" is not based upon the "averaging" of the appearances of social phenomena.
52. The importance of the examination of capitalism under the "reproduction schemas" influences all the principal Marxist theorists of the Second International, for example, Kautsky, Hilferding, Luxemburg and Bauer. See here H. Grossmann, Marx, L'économie politique classique et la problem de la dynamique (Paris, 1975), p. 149.

53. V.I. Lenin, 'A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism', LCW, 2, (Spring, 1897), p. 170; 'The Development of Capitalism in Russia', LCW, 3, (March, 1899), pp. 65-6.
54. See V.I. Lenin, 'Karl Marx', p. 26. Here Lenin argues that the "doctrine of surplus value is the cornerstone of Marx's economic theory".
55. V.I. Lenin, 'On the So-called Market', pp. 79-80.
56. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 80.
57. V.I. Lenin, 'The Three Sources', p. 25.
58. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 95.
59. P. Sweezy, The Theory of Capitalist Development (New York, 1970), p. 104. First published in 1942.
60. P. Sweezy, 'ibid.', p. 184. "Disproportionalities" as a theory of capitalist crises and social development originates with Tugan-Baronowsky as a critique of Marx: (a) to show that crises do not issue from the fall in the general rate of profit and (b) from underconsumption. See also P. Mattick, 'Krisen und Krisentheorien' in Krisen und Krisentheorien (Frankfurt, 1974), pp.7-156(p.86). Herausgeber C. Pozzoli.
61. V.I. Lenin, 'A Reply to Mr. P. Nezhdanov', LCW, 4, (May, 1899), p. 162; 'A Note once more on the Theory of Realisation', LCW, 4, (April, 1899), p. 75.
62. V.I. Lenin, 'A Reply to Mr. P. Nezhdanov', p. 162.
63. V.I. Lenin, 'A Note once more', p. 75.
64. V.I. Lenin, 'A Characterisation', p. 134, 155, 167, 180. See here A. Lennard, 'Lénine et la Théorie',. However, this important text itself expresses the fundamental form of capitalist crisis as the contradiction of production and consumption.
65. V.I. Lenin, 'On the So-called Market', p. 101; 'A Reply to Mr. P. Nezhdanov', p. 161; 'A Note on the Question of Market Theory', LCW, 4, (January, 1899), p. 58.
66. As Lenin argues, the laws Marx examines "depict only the ideal of capitalism, and not its reality". See 'Once more on the Theory", p. 86, 87.
67. V.I. Lenin, 'A Characterisation', p. 172; 'The Development of Capitalism', p. 167.
68. V.I. Lenin, 'Once more on the Theory', p. 79, 87; 'A Characterisation', p. 167.
69. Compare with P. Mattick, 'Die Unvermeidbarkeit des Kommunismus', in Kritik der Neomarxisten und andere Aufsätze (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 13-71. First published in 1935. Here Mattick expresses this as "underconsumptionism", although in point of fact it is only a partial characterisation of Lenin's economic crisis-theory. See V.I. Lenin, 'A Characterisation', p. 167.

70. V.I. Lenin, 'The Economic Content', p. 407.
71. V.I. Lenin, 'The Development', pp. 65-6 (first emphasis added).
72. V.I. Lenin, 'Once more a Theory', pp. 77-80.
73. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 74.
74. This expresses a questionable interpretation of "socialisation" in Lenin's analysis of capitalism.
75. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, Band II, MEW, 24, p. 32.
76. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 25, p. 836. See also H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations - und Zusammenbruchsgesetz des kapitalistischen Systems (Frankfurt, 1967), p. 246. First published in 1929.
77. Two problems can be identified here which relate to (a), the theory-history relationship and (b), the laws of value. The former relates to the classical theories of capital accumulation as shown in Rosdolsky's critique of Luxemburg's interpretation of the "reproduction schema" as a "reproduction process of social capitals, not only in its 'abstract expression', in its 'fundamental form', but also in its historical course" of development. R. Rosdolsky, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Marxschen "Kapital" (Frankfurt, 1974), p. 90. The latter, relates to the methodology of Das Kapital which interprets the "reproduction schema" from the "framework of Marx's total system and especially his teaching on accumulation". See H. Grossmann, 'ibid.', p. 246; P. Mattick, 'Anton Pannekoek et la révolution mondiale', in Histoire du marxisme contemporaine, 2, (Paris, 1976), pp. 314-354 (p. 321).
78. See P. Mattick, 'Preface' to Marx, L'économie, p. 18. However, compare with H. Grossmann, 'Die Änderung des Ursprünglichen Aufbauplans des Marxschen "Kapital" und ihre Ursachen', Archiv, XIV, (Wien, 1965), 305-338 (p. 313). First published in 1929. To a certain extent, "reproduction" has already been considered with the transformation of surplus value into capital in Chapter 22 of *Das Kapital*, MEW, 23. See also H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations, p. 332.
79. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 24, p. 408, 393. See also P. Mattick, 'Preface' to Marx, L'économie, (1974), p. 12.
80. K. Marx, 'ibid.', pp. 41-2.
81. Lenin is however familiar with this criticism already made of the "axiom that products exchange against products". See 'A Note on the Question', p. 16. Nevertheless, it appears that Lenin has not acknowledged the full importance of this criticism - which Marx sustains against Ricardo - with the reply that the "abstract theory of the realisation of the product between various branches of capitalist production" does not represent a real proportional distribution of products in capitalist society". V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 77.
82. This follows because laws are only given effect in competition.

83. The inner-connection of Departments I and II are inversely proportional to their organic compositions on the basis of Marx's Kapital-methodology.
84. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 24, p. 393.
85. Moreover, this is neither a theoretical nor historical "starting point".
86. P. Mattick, 'Krisen und Krisentheorien', (p. 61).
87. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 836.
88. In this respect, Lenin's analysis exhibits theoretical errors. Crises are not caused by "underconsumptionism" but the contradiction of socialisation and individual private appropriation. This determines the anarchical quality of "free competition capitalism" in its lack of planning. "Underconsumptionism" is further rejected because it places the cause of the crisis in circulation, while "anarchy" (disproportionalities) places the crisis "inside" production! See V.I. Lenin, 'A Characterisation', p. 167. Here Lenin expresses a clear problem in the interpretation of the laws of value which contradicts Marx's theory of the duplication of the commodity in commodity and money.
89. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 591.
90. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 178.
91. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 25, p. 340.
92. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 256.
93. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 24, p. 491.
94. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 23, p. 180; Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 835.
95. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 23, p. 178.
96. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 317. Marx continues, "its essential determination appears, and is realised as the exchange of the many capitals (viele Kapitalien) amongst one another, the inner tendency as external necessity. Capital exists, and can only exist, as many capitals and its self-determination appears thus as the exchange of many capitals amongst one another".
97. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 208.
98. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 647.
99. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 208.
100. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 178.
101. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 174 (emphasis added); Grundrisse, p. 219, 230.
102. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 174. See also H. Grossmann, 'Die Änderung', p. 316.

103. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26, 3, p. 78.
104. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 175.
105. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 177.
106. P. Mattick, 'Krisen und Krisentheorien', (p. 61).
107. H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations, p. 123; P. Mattick, 'ibid.', p. 62.
108. P.K., Leninismus, p. 73.
109. See R. Luxemburg, Die Akkumulations, pp. 273-4, 411, and H. Grossmann, 'Die Wert-Preis', p. 24 for a critique of the reproduction schemas as supplying a model of socialist construction.
110. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 155.
111. K. Kühne, Ökonomie und Marxismus, I and II (Luchterhand Verlag Neuwied, 1974) p. 263, Volume II.
112. E. Bernstein, Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie (Stuttgart, 1904).
113. See H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations, p. 256, pp. 53-9.
114. V.I. Lenin, 'The Economic Content', p. 439. This also follows Kautsky who examines the expansion of production powers from the limitation of markets. See V.I. Lenin, 'Review S.N. Prokopovitch. The Working-Class Movement in the West', LCW, 4, (Written at the end of 1899), p. 184. The expansion of production powers presumes productive consumption: "the contradiction between the tendency towards the unlimited growth of production and limited consumption that is inherent precisely in capitalism and that must bring about its collapse". 'Review S.N. Prokopovitch', p. 187.
115. V.I. Lenin, 'The Development of Capitalism', p. 58, (emphasis added).
116. We can illustrate the questionable nature of Lenin's analysis of the laws of value with the concept of "exploitation": "the theory of capital assumes that the workers receives the full value of his labour-power. This is the ideal of capitalism but by no means its reality". V.I. Lenin, 'A Note on the Question', pp. 86-7. Here the concept of exploitation suggests that of Ricardian theory.
117. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 219.
118. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 235.
119. K. Marx, Capital, Volume III, p. 880.
120. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 257.

121. See N. Bukharin, Imperialismus und die Akkumulation des Kapitals (Berlin - Wien, 1926), p. 58, 68, 80. For Bukharin, this contradiction separates Marx, Lenin and the "orthodox Marxists" from Tugan-Baronowsky and Hilferding.
122. See V.I. Lenin, 'Reply to Mr. P. Nezhdanov', p. 164.
123. Consequently, this is an insufficient theoretical distinction between Lenin and Bukharin, and the Second International theorists of Marxism.
124. P. Mattick, 'Krisen und Krisentheorien', (p. 93).
125. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 326. As the means of production must first be expanded to enable the expansion of the means of consumption, Lenin expresses the difficulty of relating the reproduction schema to capital accumulation and therefore the limitation to the consumption of the proletariat in exchange-values.
126. This rests on the assumption of the exchange of capitals in their "ideal average".
127. This establishes the movement of individual capitals on the basis of the laws of value.
128. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 634.
129. K. Marx, 'ibid.', pp. 637-8.
130. K. Marx, Capital, Volume II, p. 257.
131. The converse reveals the weakness of the "miseration"-critique of capitalism. The organic composition is governed by contradictory and opposed movements which do not preclude an expansion of the means of consumption even though their rate may be less than the means of production.
132. This is another aspect of Lenin's error as "Ricardianism".
133. Lenin's distinction between "trade-union consciousness" and "revolutionary political consciousness" does not obviate this criticism. Firstly, because "trade-union consciousness" contains a political dimension of posing the Party "outside" the totality of capitalist production processes. Secondly, because the materialist analysis of class consciousness through the social organisation of the mode of production is not unambiguously the basis of "revolutionary" class consciousness.
134. V.I. Lenin, 'The Development', p. 66 (emphasis added).
135. V.I. Lenin, 'Our Programme', LCW, 4, (Written in the second half of 1899) p. 210.
136. Marx explicitly states that these "forms of social labour" are "forms of the development of capital". See Theorien, MEW, 26.1, p. 390.

137. V.I. Lenin, 'Socialism demolished again', LCW, 20, (March, 1914), p. 205.
138. V.I. Lenin, 'What the Friends', p. 247.
139. V.I. Lenin, 'On the So-called Market', pp. 100-2.
140. V.I. Lenin, 'What the Friends', p. 247.
141. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 241.
142. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 247; 'A Characterisation', p. 167, 121.
143. See W. Tristram, 'Revolution und Staat', (p. 250).
144. C. Claudin, Lénine et la révolution culturelle, (Paris, 1974), p. 17, 19.
145. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 617.
146. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 314.
147. P.K., Leninismus, p. 377.
148. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 24.
149. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 12.
150. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 105.
151. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 119. As Bukharin expresses this, the "process of the formation of capitalist monopolies is logically and historically, a continuation of the process of concentration and centralisation". See Imperialism and World Economy (London, 1972), p. 65.
152. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 30.
153. P.K., Leninismus, pp. 374-5. See also R. Hilferding, who interprets the regulation of total social production under subjective action rather than the objective laws of value in Das Finanzkapital (Wien, 1927), p. 296. This is first published in 1909.
154. As Comintern theorist Varga argues, "the prerequisite (Vorbedingung) of crisis is commodity production for an unknown market, 'planlessness'. The basic cause of crisis is the contradiction between the socialisation of production and private appropriation". E. Varga, 'Die Krisentheorie von Marx und die Problem der Weltwirtschaftskrise', in Die Krise der Kapitalismus und ihre politischen Folgen (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 198-218 (p. 202, 207). First published in 1931.
155. This also gives the possibility of a permanently planned economy without over-production crises. See N. Bucharin, Imperialismus, p. 83.
156. V.I. Lenin, 'The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), April 24-29 (May 7-12), 1917', LCW, 24, (April 24, 1917), p. 240.

157. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 105; Bukharin expresses these tendencies from the concentration and centralisation of capital into "one gigantic combined enterprise" as the foundation of an "organised production on a higher non-capitalist level". See N. Bukharin, Imperialism, p. 73.
158. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p.105.
159. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 154.
160. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 25; E. Bernstein, Voraussetzungen, p. 14.
161. V.I. Lenin, 'Karl Marx', LSW, 1, p. 51 (emphasis added).
162. As Grossmann argues, "the development of production powers has in and for itself nothing to do with the capitalist valuation process". Das Akkumulations, p. 5.
163. W.I. Lenin, Der Imperialismus als höchsten Stadium des Kapitalismus (Berlin, 1967), p. 6.
164. W.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 13 (emphasis added).
165. See V.I. Lenin, 'Imperialism and the Split in Socialism', LCW, 23, (October, 1916), pp. 105-6.
166. V.I. Lenin, 'Under a False Flag', LCW, 21, (February, 1915), p. 21.
167. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, pp. 148-50.
168. The general usage of this concept confirms the importance of Hilferding's theory of "finance capital" on Bolshevik economic analysis.
169. V.I. Lenin, 'Imperialism and the Split', p. 105.
170. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 10.
171. Lenin identifies three stages in the development of monopoly capitalism. See Imperialism, p. 20, 92.
172. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 105.
173. See for example, V.I. Lenin, 'Marxism and Revisionism', LCW, 15, (Written no later than April 13, 1908), pp. 35-6; 'A Caricature of Marxism', LCW, 23, (August-October, 1916), p. 38; 'Tasks of the Proletariat in our Revolution', LSW, 2, (September, 1917), p. 63.
174. Compare with R. Luxemburg, Die Akkumulations, p. 392, 365.
175. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 28.
176. See C. Neuss, Imperialismus, p. 91.

177. V.I. Lenin, 'On the Slogan for a United States of Europe', LSW, 21, (August 23, 1915), p. 155 (emphasis added); 'A Caricature of Marxism', p. 60; 'Marxism and Revisionism', p. 74.
178. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 155.
179. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 92.
180. R. Luxemburg, L'accumulation du capital (Paris, 1972), Tome II, p. 111.
181. We have already argued that the Departments of production and consumption have a defined relationship.
182. V.I. Lenin, 'Once more on the Theory', p. 91.
183. See H. Grossmann, 'Eine neue Theorie über Imperialismus und die Revolution', Archiv, XII, (Wien, 1966), pp. 141-192, (p. 160). First published in 1928. This analysis belongs to the realisation of capitals. The significance of Luxemburg's analysis here is that the derivation of imperialism connects the "problem of realisation" in Marx's analysis of capitals to the theory of imperialism under the expansion of capitals as a solution to the realisation and circulation of capitals.
184. R. Luxemburg, Die Akkumulations, p. 316.
185. Although Luxemburg notes the "fall in the general rate of profit", this is not led to the valuation-conditions of capital. See R. Luxemburg, 'ibid.', p. 391.
186. N. Bucharin, Imperialismus, p. 101, pp. 108-9.
187. N. Bucharin, 'ibid.', p. 112 (emphasis added).
188. N. Bucharin, 'ibid.', p. 109.
189. N. Bucharin, 'ibid.', p. 94.
190. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 72.
191. Moreover, the development of capital export is neither unconditional nor an irreversible feature of imperialism. See K. Busch, Die multinationalen Konzerne, p. 258. The identification of the importance of capital export is first given by Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, pp. 294-5.
192. In turn, it is not shown how over-accumulation assumes the form of the export of capital rather than commodity capital for direct investment.
193. E. Varga, 'Die grosse Krise und ihre politischen Folgen-Wirtschaft und Politik 1928-1934', in Die Krise, pp. 231-261, (p. 231). First published in 1934.

194. Equally, Luxemburg interprets the "miseration" of the working-class as a limitation to the "inner-markets". See Die Akkumulations, p. 241.
195. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, pp. 105-6.
196. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 106.
197. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 116.
198. V.I. Lenin, 'Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination', LCW, 22, (January-February, 1916), p. 157; 'Resolution on the War', LCW, 24, (May, 12, 1917), p. 270.
199. C. Neuss, Imperialismus, p. 32; W. Tristram, 'Revolution und Staat', (p. 255).
200. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 27 (emphasis added).
201. See N. Bukharin, Imperialism, p. 106, 119, 69.
202. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', pp. 88-89.
203. N. Bucharin, Ökonomik der Transformationsperiode (Hamburg, 1970), p. 16. First published in 1919.
204. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 89.
205. N. Bucharin, Imperialismus, p. 113; Imperialism and World Economy, p. 112.
206. V.I. Lenin, 'The Military Programme for Proletarian Revolution', LCW, 23, (September, 1916) p. 342; 'On the Slogan for a United States of Europe', p. 664.
207. H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations, p. 606.
208. H. Grossmann, 'ibid.', p. 606.
209. Rather, the essential mechanism remains the "fall in the general rate of profit" from an over-accumulation of capital from which the attempt to "value" existing invested capital is undertaken through the export of capital.
210. Grossmann's concept of the "collapse" has this significance.
211. C.v. Braunmühl, 'Weltmarktbewegung des Kapitals', (p. 26); P.K., Leninismus, p. 380, 376.
212. R. Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, p. 286.
213. See M. Wirth, 'Zur Kritik der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', (p. 24).
214. Although this "generalisation" cannot be sustained equally for all Comintern theorists. For example, see N. Bucharin, Imperialismus, p. 121.

215. We see here that despite the theoretical derivation of imperialism by Bukharin, Lenin and Varga, it does not overcome the limits to what may be termed the "Bukharinist-Leninist" theory of imperialism.
216. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 24, p. 61.
217. Lenin in fact argues that the organisation and experience of class struggle leads the proletariat to the conviction that the "complete economic reconstruction of capitalist society is essential". See 'The Forms of Working-Class Movement', LCW, 20, (March 20, 1914), p. 210; 'Draft Resolution of the Zimmerwald Left', LCW, 21, (August 20, 1914), p. 347.
218. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 119.
219. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 154.
220. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 73.
221. See C. Neuss, Imperialismus, p. 22.
222. The "ideological critique" is important here. As Luxemburg notes, the "collapse" theory of capitalism has a polemical quality. See R. Luxemburg's 'Sozial Reform oder Revolution', Rosa Luxemburg Werke, 1/1, p. 436 and R. Spesso, 'Caratteri e Modificazioni del capitalismo monopolistico di Stato', CM, (Roma, 1969), 57-71.
223. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 119.
224. E. Varga, 'Die Krisentheorie', (p. 215).
225. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 119.
226. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 150.
227. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 159, 119.
228. K. Marx, Capital, Volume I, p. 319 (modified translation).
229. D. Jordan, 'Der Imperialismus', (pp. 233-4).
230. On this latter point, see W. Tristram, 'Revolution und Staat', (p. 256).
231. The problem here can be related to the fact that: (a) "stagnation" is an appearance of the over-production of commodities and (b) that its dynamic is produced from the valuation-conditions in which national capitals are circulated on the world market under the tendential formation of the laws of international surplus-value production.
232. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 77. See also N. Bukharin, Imperialism, p. 108. The issue here is less the concept of "finance capital", the implications of which are already known to Marx (Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 454), but the significance of the monetary transmissions mechanisms under the monopoly structure of social circulation processes in both Hilferding's and the Bolshevik's analysis in distinction to the quantitative and qualitative determinations of the value relations of capital accumulation.

233. V.I. Lenin, 'Notebooks on Imperialism', LCW, 39, p. 334. However, we have argued that Lenin's theory of imperialism has not been rigorously developed from the laws of value.
234. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 366 (emphasis added).
235. See V.M. Bader, H. Grossmann, W. Goldschmidt and B. Hoffmann, 'Sulla teoria del 'capitale monopolistico' di Baran e Sweezy', PS, 41 (1969), 778-783 (p. 778).
236. R. Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, pp. 295-6.
237. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 69.
238. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 106.
239. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 120.
240. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', LCW, 22, p. 268, 258; 'A Caricature', p. 47.
241. N. Bucharin, Ökonomik, p. 13 (first emphasis added).
242. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, pp. 26-7.
243. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 130.
244. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 149. The impact of Hilferding's Das Finanzkapital on the theory of imperialism can be seen with the dissolution of "classical capitalism". However, with the "Aufhebung of the free competition of individual capitals", Hilferding argues that the "relation of capitalist classes to state-power" is transformed. Das Finanzkapital, p. 375, 385.
245. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', p. 474.
246. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', p. 431.
247. N. Bukharin, Imperialism, p. 108.
248. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 150.
249. This characterisation of international imperialist economy is the expression of the "collapse" postulate of capitalism in the Bukharinist-Leninist theory of imperialism. Importantly, it interprets the "collapse" of capitalism less through the "economic" mechanism of the general laws of capital accumulation than war-capitalism and "extra-economic" functions of states. See H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations, pp. 46-8.
250. V.I. Lenin, 'op. cit.', p. 121.
251. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 100.
252. See R. Hilferding, 'op. cit.', p. 296.
253. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 24, p. 395.

254. Grossmann argues that the predominance of banks "corresponds only to a specific phase of capitalist development, and is in no case as Hilferding generally characterises, a 'historical tendency' of capitals". Das Akkumulations, p. 574. Rather, it responds to the specific requirements for the expansion of German capitalism when confronted with the insufficiency of its capital formation. Das Akkumulations, p. 574. Also see P. Sweezy, The Theory of Capitalist, pp. 266-7.
255. H. Grossmann, 'ibid.', p. 608. Hilferding identifies credit as a socialist form in which capitalism is transcended. Its full development in a central bank opposes the anarchical character of free competition capitalism. See Das Finanzkapital, p. 218.
256. H. Grossmann, 'ibid.', p. 609.
257. See F. Oelssner, 'Vorwort zur Neuauflage des "Finanzkapital"', IMD, (Frankfurt, 1974), p. 48. First published in 1947.
258. P.K., Leninismus, p. 374. As Marx argues, "the division of surplus value must always be first in the hands of the individual capitalist". K. Marx, Capital, Volume II, p. 425.
259. Lenin's comments to the effect that profit is not connected to production bears this out.
260. See H. Gerstenberger, 'Elemente einer historisch-materialistischen Staatstheorie', Kritische Justiz, (Frankfurt, 1972), 125-141, (pp. 136-7).
261. See C. v. Braunmühl, 'Die nationalstaatliche Organisiertheit der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft', GBMT, 8-9 (Frankfurt, 1976), 273-334.
262. C. Neuss, Imperialismus, p. 128.
263. C. Neuss, 'ibid.', p. 128.
264. We believe that this cannot be derived from a "pure-theory" of imperialism.
265. See P. Fröhlich, Rosa Luxemburg (Frankfurt, 1967), p. 78.
266. C. Neuss, Imperialismus, p. 68.
267. See N. Bucharin, Imperialismus, p. 120.
268. N. Bucharin, 'ibid.', p. 120.
269. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 104.
270. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 105, 148.
271. V.I. Lenin, 'Imperialism and the Split', p. 107 (emphasis added).
272. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 127.
273. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 105 (emphasis added).

274. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 153.
275. V.I. Lenin, 'A Caricature', p. 63.
276. V.I. Lenin, 'Marxism and Revisionism', pp. 35-6.
277. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 153.
278. V.I. Lenin, 'Imperialism and the Split', p. 106; Imperialism, pp. 148-9. We have shown the importance of the reproduction schemas in relation to Lenin's theory of capitalist crises under the laws of uneven development of production. In "monopoly capitalism" they possess the socialist content of rational social planning because of the perceived resolution of capitalist contradictions - in terms of the material elements of production (production powers) - in the monopoly form of total social circulation processes. However, this is not only an insufficient analysis of the dynamics of capital accumulation under the social form determination of reproduction processes - which presupposes the fundamental problems of capital accumulation - but is also unable to examine the materialisation of class relations of production in the development of social production powers and thereby the laws of capital accumulation to class struggle. This theoretical problem is central to the analysis of imperialism and the politics of the world communist movement under Bolshevism.

CHAPTER 3TRANSITIONAL CAPITALISM AND THE STATE

Lenin's analysis of capitals and political superstructures introduces the concept of an "ultimate stage" of capitalism into Marxism. This establishes the theoretical foundation of the general historical form of transition from capitalism to socialism through the "collapse-conditions" of monopoly capitalism. As Lenin states:

"the intensification of contradictions constitutes the most powerful driving force of the transitional period of history, which began from the time of the final victory of finance-capital."⁽¹⁾ Moreover, the categories of this analysis have both a theoretical, ideological and political significance in that they directly encapsulate the historical process of the "collapse" and transition of capitalism and the inevitability of world proletarian revolution⁽²⁾.

With the dissolution of the Second International, Lenin develops this analysis as the foundation for a qualitatively distinct theory of the new economic and political appearances of monopoly capitalism, and an evaluation of their significance for the revolutionary political praxis of the European labour movement⁽³⁾. In this Chapter we will discuss these themes under the following:

Firstly, Lenin's theory of the state in the epoch of "transitional capitalism", and its function as an ideological and political critique of the "revisionism" of the Second International.

Secondly, Stalin's contribution to the interpretation and development of the concepts of "monopoly capitalism" and "transitional capitalism".

Thirdly, the continuation of the Second International's analysis of Marxism in the "social-democratic" theories of "organised capitalism" and "state socialism" will be compared and contrasted with the communist theory of monopoly capitalism in the Third International.

Fourthly, we shall discuss how the Comintern's examination of fascism is connected to the analysis of "state monopoly capitalism" and the critique of social-democratic theory.

3.1 Lenin's theory of the State

The significance of the precipitation of imperialist wars and protracted crises of capitalism for the world communist movement is expressed in the re-examination of the traditional Marxist characterisation of world capitalism, and the movement of bourgeois society and states. With the transformation of the laws of capitalism under the absolute law of uneven economic and political development, Lenin formulates a new theory of socialist revolution and proletarian politics. This theory and politics articulates the reconstitution of a revolutionary Communist International and is deployed by the "Zimmerwald Left" against both "Kautskianism" and "sectarianism" in the European labour movement.

We have examined the imperialist formation of monopoly relations of domination and their connection to the world market functions of nation states in Lenin's theory of imperialism. Parri passu we will discuss the genesis of Lenin's theory of the state from the Second International, its new features in the epoch of imperialism, and the functions it performs in the theory and politics of the communist movement.

3.1.1 Imperialism and the state

The Leninist analysis of the historical movement of capitals through the concept of the periodisation of capitalism governs the examination of the theoretical relation of capitalist economic substructures to the political superstructures of bourgeois states.

In the ascendant epoch of free competition capitalism, the progressive epoch of the bourgeois-democratic movement⁽⁴⁾, the competition of individual capitals creates a political superstructure commensurate with its economic substructures. As the characterisation of the "normal" functioning of classical capitalist systems is through free competition of individual capitals, so the bourgeois democratic republic is considered an historical attribute of political superstructures and a "normal" form of bourgeois states.

However, Lenin modifies this argument when emphasising the practicability of democratic programmatic demands for both capitalism and imperialism: "in general, political democracy is merely one of the possible forms of superstructure above capitalism (although it is theoretically the normal one for "pure" capitalism)."⁽⁵⁾ This "normal form" is the "most perfect, the most advanced type of bourgeois state, the parliamentary democratic republic"⁽⁶⁾. However, with the dissolution of the self-regulation of individual capitals through the market and the initiation of the transitional epoch of the "collapse" of capitalism⁽⁷⁾, both the structure of the economy and political⁽⁸⁾ are transformed under monopoly and finance-forms of capitals.

The impact of "transitional capitalism" on the structuring of class relations and state-functions is expressed in the direct determination of the political by the historical movement of capitals, and the substitution of the democratic, with the imperialist republic. As Lenin maintains, there no longer exists a "democratic, but a reactionary-bureaucratic state, an imperialist republic"⁽⁹⁾. On the basis of the imperialist periodisation of capitalism, Lenin argues that "the political superstructure of the new economy of monopoly capitalism is the change from democracy to reaction. Democracy corresponds to free-competition. Political reaction corresponds to

monopoly"⁽¹⁰⁾, and that politically, imperialism is a "general striving towards violence and reaction"⁽¹¹⁾. Consequently, the tendency to political repression is generalised for the epoch of the "collapse" and transition of capitalism. Here, Lenin speaks of the "reaction all along the line, whatever the political system"⁽¹²⁾.

The characterisation of the imperialist periodisation of capitalism through the crisis of capitals in the law of uneven development and imperialist wars has two related features of importance for our discussion here.

Firstly, those concerning the internal "stagnation" and "decay" of national state capitalist war economies, the activation of the "miseration" of the proletarian "masses"⁽¹³⁾, and the subordination of bourgeois states to the economic and political interests of the imperialist structure of social production relations within the contradiction of private property and the socialisation of production. Secondly, those concerning the world market militarisation functions of nation states for the domination of the world economy in a global system of "rentier states".

The intensification of both these contradictions of world capitalism on the political superstructures of capitalist societies in the imperialist epoch circumscribes the economic and political programmatic demands for the realisation of democratic republics. As Lenin states, "private property based on the labour of the small proprietor, free competition, democracy ... are things of the distant past"⁽¹⁴⁾. We shall discuss whether the democracy-negating significance of imperialism is in fact coherently formulated by Lenin, given that we have already established limitations to the analysis of the imperialist structure of capitals.

Imperialism and the democratic republic

Before the April Theses of 1916, Lenin supports the class tactics of a "non-sectarian" politics for the accomplishment of the bourgeois-democratic stage of revolution. While this is derived from the specific historical conditions of Russia in which the bourgeois-democratic revolution had not been accomplished and bourgeois parliamentary democracy was still an historically progressive political form of constitutional states, Lenin also seeks to generalise the analysis European capitalist countries. This "stage" of social revolution politically organises the class consciousness of the proletariat and establishes the social and political preconditions for the transition to a socialist "stage" of revolution which are realised under the "fusion" of "scientific socialism" with the labour movement. Since no special consideration is given to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as a general theoretical and political principle⁽¹⁵⁾, the political conception of socialist revolution is not advanced independently of the preparatory stage of social-democratic revolution.

However, two events contribute to Lenin's reformulation of this political structure of social emancipation. The first is the recognition that the existence of "dual" state-power in the "provisional government" of the bourgeoisie and the 'Soviets of Workers' and Peasants'' makes the promotion and defence of social-democratic demands untenable for the interests of the labour movement without simultaneously advancing socialist programmatic demands. The second shows the significance of a system of world imperialism for a non-sectarian politics through the creation of an international capitalist economy, the class contradictions of which are mature enough for international socialist revolution. Only then does Lenin reassess the political praxis of the international communist movement through the production of a new analysis of

capitalism (imperialism), democracy and the state⁽¹⁶⁾. The law of uneven economic and political development creates the conditions for "Socialism in One Country" as a corollary of the non-simultaneity of international proletarian revolution, and thereby the possibility and necessity of the direct transformation of the democratic into the socialist stage of revolution for the organisation of the emancipatory proletarian form of class power.

The objective now for Lenin and the "Zimmerweld Left" is the creation of a new revolutionary strategy and tactics for the international communist movement. This is undertaken through the co-ordination of the revolutionary principles and social contents of democracy and socialism in a general non-sectarian politics defined against both "revisionism" and "sectarianism". Subsequently, the specificity of the imperialist war-conjuncture characterises the general strategic line of the conversion of imperialist wars into civil wars, which as Lenin argues, is "inherent in the objective conditions of capitalism in general and the period of the end of capitalism in particular"⁽¹⁷⁾.

The formulation of this co-ordination of democratic and socialist principles in the determination of a non-sectarian proletarian political praxis of the "masses" seeks to unite democratic reforms with socialist revolutionary transformations. Consequently, the democratic republic is not rejected after the imperialist periodisation of capitalism but constitutes an essential strategic component in the general formulation of proletarian politics: "the political form of a society wherein the proletariat is victorious in overthrowing the bourgeoisie will be a democratic Republic"⁽¹⁸⁾.

However, while Lenin formulates these tactics from the specific historical conditions of Russia, they are confronted with opposition from two quarters.

Firstly, those sections of the European labour movement (Radek, Gorter, Luxemburg, Pennecock, Liebknecht) which consider that Western Europe has already accomplished the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Therefore, revolutionary transformations are rooted in political traditions which already have a history of socialism defined in relation to parliamentary democracy. The proposition advanced here is that the realisation of the democratic republic in historically developed capital relations is not the political form of socialist emancipation. We may add to this classification those Bolsheviks (Bukharin, Preobrazhensky) who reject programmatic reforms of the democratic republic.

Common to both of these variants is that the programmatic demands of international proletarian politics are to be defined in purely socialist terms. Lenin, however, characterises these "Left Communists" as the "sectarian wing" of the communist movement and a "deviation" from Marxism because they do not constitute the socialist, in the democratic movement: "socialist revolution is impossible without the struggle for democracy. This is unquestionable, and this is just the weakness of Radek and Bukharin"⁽¹⁹⁾. Here, Lenin does not equate democratic and socialist movements but rather states that "one should know how to combine the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialist revolution, subordinating the first to the second"⁽²⁰⁾.

Secondly, those sections of the European labour movement (Kautsky, Hilferding, Bauer, Renner, Cunow et. al.) which are characterised as the political centre of the Second International and thereby the practitioners of social-democracy.

Lenin assesses these "Right Socialists" as the "revisionist" section of the labour movement which substitutes socialist with social-democratic demands. These demands are untenable in the

imperialist epoch: "all the fundamental demands of political democracy are only partially 'practicable' under imperialism, and then only in a distorted form"⁽²¹⁾. The "Kautskian" political strategy attempts to "split and check the revolution by foisting limited, democratic aims on it"⁽²²⁾, and thereby fails to establish the new general relationship between imperialism and democracy:

"capitalism in general and imperialism in particular turn democracy into an illusion - though at the same time capitalism engenders democratic aspirations in the masses, creates democratic institutions, aggravates the antagonism between imperialism's denial of democracy and the mass striving for democracy. Capitalism and imperialism can be overcome only by economic revolution. They cannot be overcome by democratic transformations, even the most 'ideal'. But a proletariat not schooled in the struggle for democracy is incapable of performing an economic revolution"⁽²³⁾ - "victorious socialism must establish a full democracy"⁽²⁴⁾.

While the combination of these programmatic demands sustains the critique of "revisionism" and "sectarianism", it must be examined whether it does not in fact conceal rather than expose important issues in the conceptualisation of bourgeois states.

Here, Lenin gives no fundamental critique of the democratic republic but rather affirms that the imperialist critique resides in the imposition of monopoly constraints on democracy. Monopoly capitalism "accentuates the antagonism between democratic aspirations and the anti-democratic tendency of trusts"⁽²⁵⁾. Consequently, the structural contradiction of monopoly and democracy omits to examine the democratic republic as a form of class-rule. Lenin duly perceives no ambivalence in defining the democratic republic as the pre-condition

for both revolutionary socialist politics and the Aufhebung of capitalism. Rather, the rejection of the political foundation of the democratic republic for Lenin is an "imperialist economism", an "anarchism" or a "sectarianism" which expresses a contemptuous attitude to democracy"⁽²⁶⁾. Therefore, Lenin opposes "imperialist economism" not because it designates a renunciation of political praxis, but rather the incorrect formulation of proletarian politics.

Three principal features can be identified in the "Left Communists'"theory of the state. Firstly, the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not a necessary political stage in the transition to socialism. Secondly, the economic and political power of the proletariat is incompatible with the formation of state-capitalism. Thirdly, the transition to socialism through state-capitalism represents the social organisation of the labour movement in state-bureaucracies. Conversely for Lenin, such "sectarian" politics express the "direct struggle for the conquest of power, while at the same time rejecting democratic demands"⁽²⁷⁾. The consequence of this political practice is a "distortion" of the "Marxist position on democracy" that becomes a "theoretical and practical error"⁽²⁸⁾ which opposes the struggle for reforms and democracy as being "contradictory to socialist revolution"⁽²⁹⁾. This fails in the task of forming a non-sectarian politics which connects proletarian politics to the periodisation of capitalism: sectarianism "cannot solve the problem of how to link the advent of imperialism with the struggle for reforms and democracy - just as economism of blessed memory would not link the advent of capitalism with the struggle for democracy"⁽³⁰⁾.

Lenin draws two conclusions from this critique. On the one hand, the renunciation of political democracy in sectarian politics potentially leads the labour movement into an "apology for imperialism"⁽³¹⁾.

On the other, the opposition of socialism to democracy interprets democracy as militating against socialism; it "would be a radical mistake to think that the struggle for democracy was capable of diverting the proletariat from socialist revolution"⁽³²⁾.

While Lenin's critique of "sectarianism" and "revisionism" has alternately emphasised different aspects of the combination of democratic and socialist principles, it has not established the relation of democracy to the political power of bourgeois states on the specific class foundation of bourgeois society. The problem this creates for Lenin's analysis of the Marxist theory of the state can be developed through the tactics of non-sectarian politics.

In this important consideration, Lenin defines the "democratic republic" as a "state-form". Consequently, the complete rejection of the democratic republic is equivalent to the rejection of the bourgeois democratic state. For Lenin, this is the anarchistic theory of the "destruction" of the state (Staatsnegation), and is a "sectarian" deviation from Marxism. As Lenin contends, the "distinction between the Marxists and the anarchists on the question of the State has been defined absolutely incorrectly"⁽³³⁾. This establishes the general theoretical and political point which distinguishes the Marxist from "anarchist" theory of the state in the transition from capitalism to socialism: "Marxism differs from anarchism in that it recognises the need for a State and for a State-power in the period of revolution in general and in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism"⁽³⁴⁾.

However, with the insufficient class determination of bourgeois states, it is unclear as to which state and configuration of political power Lenin refers. The attempted resolution to the relation of democracy and socialism in the opposed politics of "sectarianism" and "revisionism" is expressed in the formulation of a general theory of

non-sectarian politics. Here, Lenin interprets the Marxist theory of the state as both the "utilisation" of bourgeois democratic states against Bukharin, and their "destruction" in the process of their "withering away" against Kautsky. Consequently, the political form of emancipation under the "dictatorship of the proletariat" in the transition from capitalism to socialism is determined through the realisation of the democratic republic⁽³⁵⁾.

This preliminary conceptualisation of "Bolshevism" in the Zimmerwald Left is primarily a political critique of "deviations" from Marxism in the labour movement, expressed in the synthesis of social-democracy (reformism) and socialism (revolution). Several important considerations follow from this combination of democratic and socialist principles in the analysis of the state.

A fundamental component of proletarian politics is the "utilisation" of bourgeois states as the political form of accomplishment of the social and political emancipation:

the "Marxist solution of the problem of democracy is for the proletarian masses to utilise all democratic institutions and aspirations in its struggles against the bourgeoisie in order to prepare for its overthrow and assume its own victory"⁽³⁶⁾.

However, this functions not only for the preparation of the destruction of bourgeois states, but for the actual destruction itself in that the "political form of a society wherein the proletariat is victorious in overturning the bourgeoisie will be a democratic republic"⁽³⁷⁾. Further, the concept of state utilisations is a principal component in the Marxist theory of the state: "socialists are in favour of utilising the present state and its institutions in the struggle for the emancipation of the working-class, maintaining that also the state should be used for

the specific form of transition from capitalism to socialism. The transitional form is the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is also a state"⁽³⁸⁾.

This concept of state-utilisation unfolds from the definition of democratic republics as democratic state-forms, and results in the retention of bourgeois states as the political form of transition from capitalism to socialism. Consequently, the "withering away" of the state in classical Marxist theory refers to the "withering away" of the bourgeois state:

"democracy is also a form of state which must disappear when the state disappears, but that will only take place in the transition from conclusively victorious and consolidated socialism to full communism"⁽³⁹⁾.

The general political form of social emancipation is therefore accomplished with the "democratisation" of states through mass participation in its apparatuses, and the socialist republic becomes the "democratisation" of the institutional orders of bourgeois states in the socialist "stage" of revolution.

Democractic political praxis is converted into socialist praxis through the quantitative extension of the programmatic demands of reformism into "socialism". Programmatic demands must be:

"formulated and put through in a revolutionary and not a reformist manner, going beyond the bounds of bourgeois legality ... extending and intensifying the struggle for every fundamental democratic demand up to a direct proletarian onslaught on the bourgeoisie, that is, up to the socialist revolution that expropriates the bourgeoisie"⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Here, the insufficiency of the capital critique of social relations of production with the monopoly-form of capitals is expressed in the quantitative extension of bourgeois Right and law into socialist Right. As socialist demands are accomplished with the full

participation of the total social-labouring classes in bourgeois state apparatuses, the state is defined as a necessary political moment of the realisation of the economic and political forms of social emancipation. Consequently, "socialist states" and "socialist production" are developed through the general democratic components of political state forms which are interpreted in the conceptual grid of the primacy of a democratic stage of non-sectarian politics.

The class character of the democratic republic is only expressed in the exclusion of the "popular masses" from participation in the political order⁽⁴¹⁾ rather than the conceptualisation of the "political" in capitalist society. As Lenin states:

"parliamentary democracy hampers and stifles the individual political life of the masses, their direct participation in the democratic organisation of the life of the state-form from the bottom up. The opposite is the case with the Soviets"⁽⁴²⁾.

Here, we argue that the initial formulation of the "new type of state"⁽⁴³⁾ in the Soviet (of Workers' Soldiers' Peasants and other Deputies) of which Lenin speaks, is interpreted politically as the perfection of the democratic principles of democratic state-forms and the criterion for the dissolution of its class character. The qualitative distinction between the dictatorship of the proletariat (Soviets) and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (imperialist republic) is defined as that of complete democracy vis-a-vis the various class forms of the political utilisation of bourgeois states.

On this basis, Lenin gives neither a fundamental class critique of bourgeois-democracy nor the bourgeois state. The proposed abolition of the political form of the bourgeois state through the structure of its constitutionalism demonstrates that the political form of the bourgeois

Rechtsstaat has no necessary "inner-connection" to the relations of "domination and servitude" (Herrschafts-und Knechtschaftsverhältnisse) of bourgeois society. Consequently, the structural constraints to the political system of parliamentary democracy are not connected to the social existence of classes. This leaves Lenin's analysis without a critique of the "alienated" political form of bourgeois society in the illusory constitutionalism of the Rechtsstaat already criticised in the Marxist theory of the state⁽⁴⁴⁾.

While the Paris Commune⁽⁴⁵⁾ is the "most perfect political form", a "higher type of democratic state"⁽⁴⁶⁾ for the "emancipation of labour"⁽⁴⁷⁾, the partial nature of Lenin's critique of capitalist relations of production and commodity fetishism obscures the inherent limitations to the Commune both in its political form and class character. Rather, its significance for the labour movement resides less in the historical abolition of the systems of national capitalist economy and the political representation processes of bourgeois constitutional states, than the historical experience of the necessity and superiority of the self-emancipation (spontaneity) of the proletariat for the destruction of the political power of bourgeois states⁽⁴⁸⁾.

While Lenin has established the democratic republic as a necessary political condition for economic revolution, its characteristic programmatic contents unfold within the limits of monopoly theory. "Revolutionary" programmatic demands can be illustrated as the "taking over ... (of) ... the banks and all large-scale enterprises"⁽⁴⁹⁾, of "repealing ... private ownership in the means of production ... (which) ... cannot be implemented without organising the entire mass of working people, the proletariat, the semi-proletariat ... and small peasants for the democratic organisation of their ranks, their forms, their participation in state affairs"⁽⁵⁰⁾. The conceptualisation of these

revolutionary demands are accomplished in the "democratisation of the mode of production"⁽⁵¹⁾, and through the existing "socialised" economic structures of capitalist production relations conceived in their juridical property-form.

This critique of social production processes indicates the tendency to "vulgar socialism" in Lenin's analysis. Consequently, there is evidence to question the central proposition contained in the critique of "sectarianism", that the foundation of socialist politics in the democratic republic does not economically or politically impede the advance of the "revolutionary" communist movement. We also see here that Lenin's examination of political consciousness is separate from the examination of the economic mechanism of class consciousness. While the epoch of imperialism transforms the materialist foundations of society in the contradictory movements of "collapse" and transition, the "objective" conditions of the consciousness-formation of social classes are derived from the underconsumption/overconsumption of the total class of labour in which the experiential relations of the "immiseration" (Verelendungs-underconsumption) of the "masses" contradicts the over-consumption of the labour and finance aristocracies. In this relationship, the social division of labour and the formation of class consciousness are separated from the general laws of capital. Rather, they are expressed through the "parasitism" and "corruption" of the "upper-echelons" of the working class⁽⁵²⁾, in which the "implementation" of the conditions of "opportunism" by the imperialist bourgeoisie⁽⁵³⁾ are created from payments out of "imperialist profits", and the bureaucratic control of the economic and political organisations of the labour movement by the social democratic leadership.

However, even this process of the fragmentation of the labour movement is only accredited with a temporary potential. As "finance-capital" is a "fictitious capital", it is only capable of accomplishing a "spurious delaying of crisis"⁽⁵⁴⁾ and consequently no permanent "fragmentation" and "integration of the working-class"⁽⁵⁵⁾. Consequently, the formation of class consciousness is not examined from the material relations of social classes in the totality of capitalist social reproduction-processes, but the "collapse" problematic of capitals in which revolutionary class consciousness is "activated". That spontaneously generated class consciousness does not automatically produce a revolutionary political capital-negating consciousness admits at this stage of Lenin's argument, less its resolution in vanguard organisational functions of Communist Parties as "foreign-bodies" in democratic republics, than the democratic participation of the working-class in the economic and political institutional orders of bourgeois society.

On the basis of this discussion, we may indicate the central ambiguity in the genesis of Lenin's theory of the state from the Second International. While the democratic republic is "invalidated" in the imperialist epoch, its realisation nevertheless remains an essential pre-condition for socialist programmatic demands. The governing principle of Lenin's analysis of proletarian politics is that the imperialist "collapse" of capitalism and the dissolution of democratic republics places socialist republics upon the historical agenda, even though there is no clear conceptualisation of these relationships in the theory of the state⁽⁵⁶⁾.

3.1.2 Lenin and state monopoly capitalism

With the historical unfolding of the revolutionary movement in Russia, Lenin becomes increasingly aware that the political critique of "revisionism" and "sectarianism" has not sufficiently developed the Marxist theory of the state. Lenin subsequently re-examines the relationship between democracy and the state through the concept of "state monopoly capitalism". This acts as a "rectification" of the former analysis of the state which now recognises that the revolutionary transformation of society through political revolution cannot be advanced without examining the class nature of political power⁽⁵⁷⁾.

The examination of state monopoly capitalism extends the theory of the state and the tactics of the Zimmerwald Left for a coherent theory of bourgeois states in the period of the dissolution of the Second International. For Lenin and the Bolsheviks, the contradiction that emerges with the transformation of free competition capitalism into monopoly capitalism is expressed in the formation of the general world-historical conditions of proletarian internationalism in opposition to the economic impact of imperialism, and the political impact of the "revisionist" leadership of Social Democratic Parties on the fragmentation of the world labour movement. Consequently, the functions which social-democracy fulfils for the politics of the labour movement necessitates a re-evaluation of democracy and the requirements of new organisational functions of interventionist Communist Parties. These are subsequently formalised under the revolutionary constitution of the Third International.

The theory of the destruction of states

Although Lenin continues the polemic against the "anarchists" (Bukharin) and the "revisionists" (Kautsky)⁽⁵⁸⁾, this is from the standpoint of the new theory of the state⁽⁵⁹⁾. Moreover, the populist

and spontaneous character of the Russian Revolutionary movement in 1917 and the significance of the soviets as a new form of state power in opposition to the Provisional Government, acts as a further stimulus to Lenin's analysis of the state.

Lenin duly reports, "I am preparing an article on the question of the attitude of Marxism to the state", and that "I have come to conclusions which are even sharper against Kautsky than against Bukharin"⁽⁶⁰⁾. The principal component and distinguishing feature of the Marxist vis-a-vis the social democratic theory of the state is now the thesis of the destruction of capitalist states⁽⁶¹⁾. The destruction of states is the

"chief and fundamental point in the Marxist teaching of the state. And it is precisely the fundamental point which has not only been completely forgotten by the dominant social-democratic Parties, but simply distorted by the foremost theoretician of the Second International, Karl Kautsky"⁽⁶²⁾.

Kautsky has now become the theoretician of the Second International as well as the ideologue of the capitulation of the social-democratic sections of the labour movement to class compromise with the national bourgeoisie, and to "social-chauvinism".

This critique of Kautsky is extended further to the concept of socialism. Lenin states, "I only see and know in the firmest way possible that the question of the programme and tactics of a new socialism, genuinely revolutionary Marxism, and not rotten Kautskianism, is on the agenda everywhere"⁽⁶³⁾, and later, "we can now observe as we investigate the history of Kautsky's latest betrayal of Marxism, his systematic gravitation towards opportunism precisely on the question of the State"⁽⁶⁴⁾.

These theoretical errors on the state signify to Lenin that "Bolshevism", and eventually the Third International, must demarcate the new political conception of democracy, socialism and the state. This is undertaken with the retrospective evaluation of the Second International, whose theoreticians are now "ex-Marxists"⁽⁶⁵⁾. However, the issue to be subsequently discussed is whether "Bolshevism" can establish a qualitatively distinct socialist theory of the state given its genesis in the problematic of the Second International.

The new appraisal of the praxis of the European labour movement leads Lenin to "deepen the analysis of the Marxist theory of the state"⁽⁶⁶⁾ with the derivation of the "state ... (as) ... the product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms"⁽⁶⁷⁾, and the identification of democratic states as forms of class-rule. Lenin now distinguishes bourgeois "state-forms" (for example, democracy) from their "essence" as "state-types" (class states):

"the forms of bourgeois states are extremely varied, but their essence is the same. All these states, whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie"⁽⁶⁸⁾. This distinction subsequently plays a crucial function in the Comintern's analysis and critique of democracy and the state⁽⁶⁹⁾.

Conversely, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologues represent the Marxist theory of the state as an "organ for the conciliation of classes"⁽⁷⁰⁾, without connecting the political power of states to the existence of classes. As the capitalist state is a repressive instrument of the monopoly bourgeoisie, there can be no destruction of the ruling form of class power without the destruction of the mechanisms of its social domination constituted in the political forms of state-power. With the precedence of repressive states over the democratic state-form, the political emancipation of the proletariat

cannot be posed without violent revolution⁽⁷¹⁾. As "civilised society is split into antagonistic classes"⁽⁷²⁾, a state is a necessary centralised apparatus of political power to serve the interests of the ruling classes. The proletariat must destroy this state and replace it with another state, a socialist state.

While Lenin has made a clear distinction between Marxist and social-democratic conceptions of bourgeois states, it remains a point of contention whether or not the ambiguities of the prior conceptualisation of the state has been successfully resolved.

As the concept of the destruction of the state which Bukharin had represented is now a "consistent part of orthodox Bolshevik theory"⁽⁷³⁾, the theories of the gradual "withering away" of states are now conceived of as abandoning the aim of revolution:

"only one point has become an integral part of socialist thought among modern socialist parties, namely, that according to Marx, the state 'withers away' - as distinct from the anarchist doctrine of the 'abolition' of the state. To prune Marxism in such a manner is to reduce it to opportunism, for such an 'interpretation' only leaves a vague notion of a slow, even gradual change, of the absence of leaps and storms, the absence of revolution. The current, widespread, mass, ... conception of the 'withering away' of the state undoubtedly means a toning-down, if not repudiating, revolution"⁽⁷⁴⁾.

By the "destruction of the state", Lenin understands the abolition of the class functions of repressive capitalist "state-types" and the transformation of the remaining state functions into representative functions of civil society. This is achieved through the elimination of the social privileges of state functionaries, and political power of state officials through the "reduction of all remuneration of all servants of the state to the level of 'workmen's wages' and the election

and full revocability of state officials"⁽⁷⁵⁾. It involves a "gigantic replacement of certain institutions by other institutions of a fundamentally different order"⁽⁷⁶⁾. With these measures, the state ceases to be a "special force for the suppression of a particular class" and becomes a social organ of the majority of the population - and as such, is not "really a state"⁽⁷⁷⁾. Because of the connection of democracy to bourgeois states, this process of the "destruction" and "democratisation" of states establishes the "turn from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy"⁽⁷⁸⁾.

However, despite Lenin's formulation of the concept of state monopoly capitalism for imperialist metropolies, this is not completely divorced from the theoretical structure of his previous analysis. Democracy remains a state-form, but is articulated through the structures of state monopoly capitalism and their political significance for the materialist foundation of socialism and the repressive mechanisms of bourgeois states. Three components can be identified here: Firstly, the repressive state - the "organised, systematic use of violence against persons"⁽⁷⁹⁾. Secondly, the bourgeois constitutional state - the "formal recognition of the equality of citizens, the equal Right of all to determine the structure of, and to administer, the state"⁽⁸⁰⁾. Thirdly, the system of interventionist state planning-mechanisms established under the monopoly domination of the socialisation of reproduction processes. This structure confronts the anarchical character of capitals with the extension of the inherent planning capabilities of trusts, cartels, and monopolies⁽⁸¹⁾.

In Lenin's analysis, the formation of these general socio-economic mechanisms of capitalist systems are inseparable from the character of political power that dominates them. Consequently, they

function under the monopoly laws of capitals in a "unified-mechanism" of "state monopoly capitalism". This expresses the "higher regulated form" of capitals developed under the "war-capitalist" interventionism of imperialist states which prepares the "machinery for the social regulation of the process of production and distribution of products"⁽⁸²⁾. Nevertheless, under the politics of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the contradictory extension of the state-planning capacity of capitals within the total structure of capitalist anarchy is subordinated to the profit-motive of private monopoly capitalist enterprises⁽⁸³⁾.

However, the socialist potential contained in the structure of capitalist socialisations - already identified in the analysis of the "reproduction schemas" of "classical Marxism" - is increasingly realised as an historical process in the social production mechanism of state-capitalism. As Lenin contends, "state controlled capitalist production, combining the colossal power of the state into a single mechanism ... brings tens of millions of people within the single organisation of state capitalism"⁽⁸⁴⁾. This objective structure of socio-economic production relations in state capitalism⁽⁸⁵⁾ possesses the positive socialising attributes of simplifying the economic and specialisation functions of the social division of labour which facilitates the direct control of production and distribution through the managerial functions of "socialised" state apparatuses⁽⁸⁶⁾:

"organised on the lines of state monopoly capitalism, imperialism is gradually transforming all trusts into organisations of a similar type in which, standing over the 'common' toilers, who are overworked and starved, is the same bourgeois bureaucracy. But the mechanism of social management is here already at hand. We have but to overthrow the capitalist, to crush the resistance of the exploiter with the iron hand of armed workers, to crush the bureaucratic machine of the modern state - and have a splendidly equipped mechanism, freed from

the 'parasite', a mechanism which can very well be set going by the united workers themselves"(87).

Taken in isolation as a "higher regulated form" of social production, state monopoly capitalism suggests the formation of a post-"collapse" economy, if not the actuality of socialist production within a total socially planned economy. As Lenin argues, state-capitalism is "demonstrating in a practical manner how a planned social economy can and should be conducted, not in the interests of capitalists, but by expropriating them under the leadership of the proletariat in the interests of the masses"(88).

However, in monopoly capitalism, "state capitalist tendencies" function under the repressive character of bourgeois states for the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie. For Lenin, the "repressive state" is the "extraordinary strengthening of the state machine and ... the unprecedented growth of its bureaucratic and military apparatus in connection with the intensification of the repressive measures against the proletariat"(89). As the political form of states governs the state-economy structure under the monopoly⁽⁹⁰⁾, Lenin's state-concept responds primarily to the "dissolution" of democracy in imperialist economies, while state monopoly capitalism creates the "socialist" form of production in contradiction to the political form of its realisation.

Lenin's theory of states consists of the destruction of the class character of the repressive functions of capitalist "state-types" with the creation of the Soviet political form of workers' militia, and a democratisation of the public functions of bourgeois state apparatuses with the full extension of constitutional state-Right. This not only effectively denudes them of their political character, but "such a degree of democracy implies overstepping the boundaries of bourgeois society, the beginning of its socialist reconstruction.

If all take part in the administration of the state, capitalism cannot retain its hold"⁽⁹¹⁾: "all citizens become employees and workers of a single nation-wide state 'syndicate'"⁽⁹²⁾. This entails the "conversion of all workers and employees (into) one huge 'syndicate' - the whole state - and the complete subordination of the entire work of this syndicate to a genuinely democratic state, to the state of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies"⁽⁹³⁾.

The state in the period of transition

However, this process of state-destruction remains limited in two related aspects:

Firstly, the analysis of the state-economic structure forms a component in the socialisation of processes of production examined in the "vulgar socialist" problematic of the Second International. Therefore, the socio-economic organisation of labour processes expressed in the genesis of developed forms of capital are not fundamentally transformed.

Moreover, as the capitalist state functions as a social instrument in the construction of socialism, this reveals that the primary significance of the Soviet in Lenin's analysis consequently resides in its discharge of political functions.

Secondly, the democratic republic remains both a state-form and the political form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. With the "destruction" of state-types, the Soviets function in a "mixed-form" of states through which the realisation of the democratic state is a necessary moment in the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Thereby, despite the characterisation of state monopoly capitalism as an "imperialist republic", the limitations to the process of the "destruction" of states does not qualitatively demarcate the socialist state from the bourgeois state⁽⁹⁴⁾. This follows from the fact that the "rectification" of the theory of the state remains within the conceptualisation of the political transition from capitalism to

socialism in a combination of democratic and socialist stages of revolution.

Although Lenin develops new critical theses on democracy and the state, these do not fully transform the fundamental character of the Second International problematic. The democratic republic thereby establishes the political foundations of revolution. The solution to the contradiction of imperialism and democracy is accomplished through the Aufhebung of democratic state-forms as necessary stages through which the socialist revolution must pass:

"democracy is of enormous importance to the working-class in their struggle against the capitalists for their emancipation. But democracy is by no means a boundary not to be overstepped ... it ... is only one of the stages on the road from feudalism to capitalism, and from capitalism to communism"⁽⁹⁵⁾.

For Lenin, recalling his earlier analysis, the revolutionary character of constitutional republican state-forms supply the political principles for the "destruction" of states: "at a certain stage in the development of democracy, it first welds together the class that wages a revolutionary struggle against capitalism - the proletariat"⁽⁹⁶⁾. Upon the consequent "destruction" of the state, the state is replaced with a "more democratic state-machine"^(96a). This maintains the proximity of the democratic republic to the socialist form of political emancipation, of democratic and socialist principles. As Lenin argues:

"the fundamental idea which runs like a red thread through all of Marx's works ... (is) ... that the democratic republic is the nearest approach to the dictatorship of the proletariat"⁽⁹⁷⁾. Socialist revolution is "not separated from bourgeois-democracy by a 'Chinese Wall'"⁽⁹⁸⁾.

These statements go beyond the polemical character of Lenin's conflict with "imperialist economism"⁽⁹⁹⁾ and express a relation of

general theory. Consequently, we may identify a close connection between democracy and socialism⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ in the analysis of proletarian politics in European metropolies, and the relationship between the democratic state-form and the "genuinely democratic state"⁽¹⁰¹⁾.

However, with the transcendence of the separation of economy and the political in imperialism⁽¹⁰²⁾, the problem this raises for the analysis of the state is that the connection between the economy and the state is not established through the reproduction of society as society and state. Consequently, the socialist dissolution of capitalist society is not examined through the primacy of the capital constitution of the reproduction conditions of society, but the combined relations of economy and political in state monopoly capitalism. As this does not establish the form-determined relations of the political from the economic conditions of social reproduction, for Lenin there appears to be no contradiction in conceptualising a "higher phase of communism" which yet retains the bourgeois state:

"under communism there remains for a time not only bourgeois Right, but even a bourgeois state without the bourgeoisie"⁽¹⁰³⁾.

Equally, the identification of the democratic republic with the form of bourgeois state construes socialist revolution through republican forms of democracy:

"democracy will also disappear when the state disappears." Revolution alone can 'abolish' the bourgeois state. The state in general, that is, the most complete democracy can only 'wither away'"⁽¹⁰⁴⁾.

Lenin still suggests here that the pure-form of republican democracy is a class neutral form of state, and consequently that the "destruction" of the bourgeois state is accomplished through the democratisation and collective appropriation of those components not reducible to the "repressive state".

Under this political concept of states, both the capitalist form of economy and state apparatuses appear to be amenable to "utilisation" under either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. Consequently, Lenin's replacement of Kautsky's "inter-class theory of states" (Interklassentheorie des Staates), of the "mere conquering, without the destruction" of states⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ has not been completely undertaken⁽¹⁰⁷⁾, and thereby the Second International problematic of states.

This analysis of the political form of social emancipation is not contradicted with the formation of state monopoly capitalism as the structural relation through which the material powers of developed capitalism establish the objective conditions of socialist production. Rather, as the utilisation of the functions of state apparatuses receive an instrumentalist relation of control, the "mechanism of social management" which Lenin identifies in state monopoly capitalism assumes a class neutral character⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. The concept of state monopoly capitalism follows the examination of the reproduction schemas in which the specific form of analytical representation of the division of total social production is developed in forms of socialist planning, and supplies the rationale for the positive evaluation of state-planning in total social reproduction processes. Consequently, the theoretical and historical precedent of the "model" of state-capitalism presents the social structures of the emancipation of the social classes of labour in analogous terms to both imperialist and Soviet state-capitalism. Reflecting upon the development of the European revolution Lenin compares Soviet Russia and imperialist Germany. "History ... has taken such a peculiar course that it has given birth in 1918 to two unconnected halves of socialism". Germany is the "most striking embodiment of the economic, the production and socio-economic conditions of socialism", and Soviet Russia, the "political

conditions"⁽¹⁰⁹⁾.

In identifying the material foundations of socialism in "state-capitalism", Lenin advances new precedents in the theory of transitional economies which returns the politics of the transition-period to the "Left Communist" controversy. State-capitalism is compatible with socialist emancipation. As Lenin argues, "the modern state possesses an apparatus which has extremely close connections with the banks and syndicates, an apparatus which performs an enormous amount of accounting and registration work; this apparatus must not and should not be smashed"⁽¹¹⁰⁾. Lenin theorises state-capitalism as a resolution to the crisis-conditions of the Russian revolution in the absence of a developed total social capital relation and a general history of bourgeois-capitalist culture in Russia. Under party-political hegemony, the socio-economic organisation of the production relations of state capitalism is defined as a theoretical and historical object of capitalist epistemology once social relations of production are conceptualised in the labour-liberating socio-economic criteria of science, planning and management.⁽¹¹¹⁾ State capitalism accomplishes the genetical growth process of capitals by creating the concrete organisational and technical forms of large-scale production as a historical moment in the accumulation of national capitals, and the world-historical substratum of the production powers of human freedom. This not only legitimates the functions of state-planning and social bureaucracy for socialist construction, but also inculcates the belief and doctrine that with the development of "modern state capitalism", the necessity for the complete destruction of states has been terminated⁽¹¹²⁾.

The mechanisms which transforms imperialist state capitalism into Soviet state capitalism are subordinate to the political forms of the transformation of bourgeois into socialist democracy through the

conquest and democratisation of bourgeois state institutions⁽¹¹³⁾. The realisation of socialised production processes is accomplished by the "democratisation" of state-capitalism as the political form of community in which socialist construction unfolds. As Lenin argues, "Russia cannot advance without traversing the ground which is common to state-capitalism and to socialism (national accounting and control)", and that this "high appreciation of state capitalism" was given before the Bolsheviks seized power"⁽¹¹⁴⁾. This establishes the continuity of "state capitalism" with the Second International problematic of "free competition capitalism", and expresses the incompleteness of Lenin's rectification of the Second International's theory of the state.

For Lenin, "state monopoly capitalism is a complete material preparation for socialism, the prelude to socialism, a rung on the ladder between which and the rung called socialism there are no intermediate rungs", and socialism "is merely state monopoly capitalism which is made to serve the interests of the whole people and to that extent, ceased to be a capitalist monopoly"⁽¹¹⁵⁾.

However, "complete democracy" is still bourgeois democracy which only appears to be independent from the economic structure of bourgeois society in the constitutional form of the bourgeois Rechtsstaat. As the political representation of the class foundation of bourgeois society, the general political form of republic must be connected to the social relations of production. The attempt to realise the democratic republic in the "interests of the whole people", and as a necessary stage in the transition to socialism is no more than the attempt to realise the "illusory political community" of the "alienated" social institutions of bourgeois society. The consequent act of democratisation of state functions denudes them of their class character in that they are amenable to dispensation under the "pure democracy" of proletarian politics.

Conversely, it can be advanced that state-functions cannot be transformed by their "democratisation" in the "personal-union" variant of "mass participation" in the structures of state apparatuses, nor through their socialisation independently from the relations of production⁽¹¹⁶⁾. Therefore, in Lenin's analysis, the constitution of proletarian states and socialist democracy responds to the existing political form of bourgeois society from the separation of the economy and political, rather than the socialist mode of production with its new relations of economy and political. In Lenin's theory, this produces the conceptualisation of socialist states under the theoretical surrogate of "half-states", as a contradictory combination of bourgeois and socialist states, which conceals rather than clarifies the incompatibility of bourgeois and socialist political forms, and the problems involved in the transformation of class relations through the state. Subsequently, "half-states" must retain a repressive state apparatus in the conditions of class struggle which remain under the dictatorship of the proletariat, to suppress capitalists with state-violence, and to direct the semi-proletariat, farmers, poor peasants and "all the exploited against capitalism"⁽¹¹⁷⁾. Although we may note that the class configurations may prove to be more complicated than this and may not be reduced to the contradiction of the capitalist class against all other social classes.

Therefore, despite the "anarchistic" and revolutionary character of Lenin's examination of the state and revolution, the analysis is structured within the "theory" of state monopoly capitalism and the democratic "stage" of revolution. This evaluation reveals that Lenin construes socialist revolution from two antagonistic relations which are never clearly resolved.

Firstly, the contradiction of production powers and social relations of production that produces the social transformation of political superstructures is conceived of as creating a socialist consciousness from the spontaneity and democratic aspirations of the proletarian masses.

Secondly, the necessity of a Party vanguard is to assume the hegemonic direction of the labour movement under a revolutionary socialist politics.

In this analysis, the economic and political institutions of social transformation are not determined by the form of self-emancipation of the proletariat but a hybrid of combined principles of democratic and socialist stages of revolution. Consequently, Lenin attempts to establish the historical course of transition through the direction of interest-representation of the "whole people" in the political form of democratic state-capitalism⁽¹¹⁸⁾ and the economic form of the socialisations of production in state-property⁽¹¹⁹⁾. However, this critique of capital does not contradict the Kautskian conclusion that "large scale production" admits "two systems of ownership", private and socialist⁽¹²⁰⁾. Lenin thereby confuses a transformation of the form of labour exploitation with the liberation of labour in state-capitalism⁽¹²¹⁾. The fundamental questions this raises relate to the constitution of the transitional economy, the regulation of total social production and distribution in the planning of state relations of property, the dissolution of the capitalist mode of production through the state and monopolist character of capitalist accumulation processes, and the abolition of the commodity character of social labour.

Rather, we have argued that with the formation of state monopoly capitalism, the socio-political functions of "Soviet" and "Party" do not have a sharply defined role in this conception of transition.

This is because the decisive moments of social-mediation are given by the proximity of the economic and political structures of state monopoly capitalism to socialism, and the spontaneous formation of a revolutionary political consciousness of the proletariat as the subject of social transformation. This former relation is implicit in Lenin's concept of monopoly capitalism and is reinforced by the spontaneity and "populist" character of the Russian Revolution. However, there is evidence to show that the concept of "spontaneity" has no necessary relation to the theory of the state monopoly capitalism, but is developed from a specific historical conjuncture in which "state monopoly capitalism" is formed. Consequently, it must be questioned as to whether these relationships can be generalised for European capitalism, and whether or not the resolution to the problem of the transformation of the democratic into a socialist stage of revolution has been clearly posed in terms of either the institutional orders of state capitalism or the conceptualisation of the interventionist functions of Communist Parties.

Bolshevik politics and the state

The result of the Leninist analysis of state monopoly capitalism is the tendential reduction of the critical theory of bourgeois states to the "repressive state"⁽¹²²⁾. This expresses the attempt to synthesise the "reformist" and "sectarian" programmatic demands of the labour movement for the formulation of a general political tactical line which relates the revolutionary programmatic demands of the Zimmerwald Left to the state. However, Lenin's analysis has led to a quasi-political "volontarism" regarding the functions of bourgeois states under the "primacy of the political". In this respect, the political concept of Bolshevism is not integrated with the analysis of capital. State monopoly capitalism subsequently forms the total social structure upon which the political form of transition regulates the

social contents of "capital". The "specificity of the political" in turn results from the materialist analysis of production powers as the motive force of social production processes and the foundation upon which political superstructures are transformed.

While it may be inappropriate to seek a general theory of economy and state⁽¹²³⁾ under the primacy of Bolshevik politics, this cannot however obviate the theoretical problems which have their origin in the examination of economy and political in the Second International.

3.2 Marxism - Leninism and Stalinism

Lenin's concept of imperialism is the theoretical foundation for the analysis of capitals and the politics of the labour movement during the First World War. While Lenin polemically affirms the monopoly-periodisation of capitalism against the "revisionist" sections of the Second International, this also represents a general theory of capitals from which the historical evaluation of world capitalism enters the Third International. However, after the First World War a series of events suggest that the theory of imperialism, and its special character as monopoly capitalism, may not be a sufficient means with which to analyse the praxis of the world communist movement. This creates a crisis in the theory of imperialism which Lenin perceives and "tactically" attempts to overcome.

The first "modification" to the theory of imperialism in 1919 is indicated with the concept of "mixed-capitalism"⁽¹²⁴⁾. Here, Lenin argues from the tactical standpoint of opposing Bukharin's "ultra-left" politics of "non-compromise" regarding the Brest-Litovsk Treaty that imperialism is a "superstructure on capitalism"⁽¹²⁵⁾, and implicitly against the understanding that capitalist relations of production are irreversibly transformed under imperialism. This new proposition in the theory of imperialism responds less to the stabilisation of German

capitalism⁽¹²⁶⁾ as an historical contradiction to the Comintern's expectation of the "collapse", than the first event which confronts the world communist movement with the necessity of the self-preservation of the Soviet Union in the conditions of world capitalism while aspiring to promote world communist revolution. This raises the significance of the relationship between socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. on an underdeveloped capital foundation and the dilemma of a national socialist revolution in the conditions of world capitalism.

Moreover, this "modification" to the concept of imperialism suggests a theoretical and political concession to Second International theoreticians, that imperialism is a political superstructure analogous to the political concepts of Kautsky's "ultra-imperialism" and Hilferding's "finance-capital". Lenin's argument is consistent insofar as he refers to the political concept of imperialism and also the political power of finance-capital. However, as Lenin has explicitly stated that imperialism is a "mixed-capitalism", thereby acknowledging the continued existence of capitalism without its predominating features of imperialist war-expansion, this contradicts the rationale of monopoly capitalism. Then taken literally, this would create a substantial revision of the Comintern's analysis of world capitals and a major problem for the theoretical critique of "opportunism" in the world communist movement.

In addition to Lenin's "modification" of the theory of imperialism we may also note the subsequent critical evaluation of the retention of the bourgeois state apparatus in the theory of "state monopoly capitalism" for socialist construction. Lenin claims:

"our mistake concerning the state apparatus was that we have accepted (übernommen) the old state apparatus, and that was our misfortune. The state apparatus very often works against us. The thing was that the state apparatus we seized in 1917 afterwards

sabotaged us"⁽¹²⁷⁾.

However, this acknowledgement follows from reflection upon the historical relations of political contingency. It therefore does not address itself to the theoretical basis of the problem developed in the "Left Communists" critique of state-capitalism, that state-capitalism may be incompatible with socialist forms of economic and political praxis.

In Lenin's examination of the theoretical relationships of economy and state, the concept of political power is not interpreted as a social-theoretical category of the historical particularities of class domination from the mode of production. Consequently, the class organisation of labour in social reproduction processes has no necessary connection to the socialist organisation of state-power. Therefore, state capitalism represents the concrete relations of the economy in the transition-period through "formalistic" and "technical" resolutions to the class contradictions of social production relations.

We will now discuss the issues raised by the imperialist periodisation of capitalism upon the concept of the Party and the formulation of the class strategies.

Lenin's "modification" to the theory of imperialism also implies that "state monopoly capitalism" is not directly transformed into socialism but may be "stabilised" under a "mixed" form of "free competition capitalism" and "monopoly capitalism". While the concept of transitional capitalism is not revoked, it is advanced that there are "transitional stages" between capitalism and socialism⁽¹²⁸⁾.

However, the full implications of these developments are neither theoretically examined nor shown to militate against the Comintern's acceptance of the theory of monopoly capitalism. In so far as Lenin seeks to sustain the validity of this theory when there is evidence that it has ceased to be a theoretically sufficient explanation of

the historical development of world capitals, this suggests a fundamental problem which enters Comintern theory and the formulation of the tactics of the world communist movement. Subsequently, the Comintern's interpretation of the historical contents of world capitalism expresses a completed theory of capitals in which "scientific socialism" is "fused" with the labour movement under the organisational ageis of vanguard Communist Parties.

With the formation of a world imperialist chain, international proletarian revolution forms a historical moment of world capitals, and in consequence, dictates the necessity of a centralised world Communist Party of confederated national delegations under the "21 conditions of acceptance into the Communist International"⁽¹²⁹⁾. This constitution of the Comintern continues the conflicts of the Zimmerwald Left both against the "revisionism" and "sectarianism" of the social-democratic and communist sections of the labour movement⁽¹³⁰⁾. It thereby defines the Third International politically in terms of the necessity to separate Communist from Social-Democratic Parties, the "social-democratic enemy", and tactically to re-assert its vanguard functions:

"the Communist Party must constitute the avant garde, the most conscious and revolutionary Party of the working class"⁽¹³¹⁾.

The Comintern subsequently formalises the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary political Weltanschauung in the organisational character and implementation of the Comintern's programmatic demands in a democratically centralised Party structure against the different political positions of the various sections of the world labour movement. This formal act for the unification of the world labour movement also creates a general tactical line to which opposes the Left (sectarian) and Right (revisionist) "deviations"⁽¹³²⁾ of the

federated Communist Parties and their Party-membership. The consequent struggle over the form of Party organisation conceals a more fundamental political problem of the conceptualisation of revolution and proletarian tactics for Europe. This is expressed in the Third International's rejection of the theory of "spontaneity" and its contribution to a critique of the Bolshevisation of the Party-structure⁽¹³³⁾.

As this period is defined as one of the "decomposition and 'collapse' (écroulement) of the total capitalist world system"⁽¹³⁴⁾, the strategy of the European proletariat is derived directly from the analysis of imperialist crises and their impact upon the revolutionising of the world proletariat. In opposition to the influence of social-democratic politics in the labour movement, the Comintern's evaluation of the revolutionary character of the European labour movement defines the "task of the proletariat in the immediate conquest of political power"⁽¹³⁵⁾ and the continuation of the Zimmerwald Left's strategy⁽¹³⁶⁾ of the conversion of "imperialist wars into civil wars"⁽¹³⁷⁾. The law of uneven development in the imperialist war conjuncture determines the objective conditions of the non-simultaneity of world revolution in imperialist metropolies, in which Lenin formulates the possibility of "Socialism in One Country" through the civil-war strategy. This is defined against both the imperialist bourgeoisie⁽¹³⁸⁾, which follows "logically from, and ... dictated by the whole objective development of capitalist militarism"⁽¹³⁹⁾, and Kautskian "opportunism" and "social-imperialism" in the European labour movement which conceals the "connection between the present war and revolution and other concrete questions of revolution"⁽¹⁴⁰⁾. The political "frontist" strategy of Bolshevism defines the "fundamental method of struggle ... (as) ... the action of the proletarian masses, understood as overt armed

struggle against the state power of capital" for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat⁽¹⁴¹⁾.

As a Comintern strategy, this reflects both the generalisation of the concrete conditions of revolutionary struggle in Russia to the universal labour praxis of the world communist movement and the spontaneity of revolutionary class action. However, how this class strategy is articulated with the combination of democratic and socialist revolutions is not clearly expressed in Bolshevism, and remains an unresolved problem of the Third International. Moreover, it is formulated without a prominent role for the Party because of the crucial assumption that the proletarian masses are automatically invested with revolutionary consciousness, given the precipitation of the imperialist contradictions of European capitalism.

The typical programmatic demands under the dictatorship of the proletariat are defined against the total capitalist system: "the immediate expropriation of capital"; the abolition of private property in the means of production with "popular property"; the socialisation of the means of production and distribution; the socialist organisation of "great industry and banks"; the "introduction of workers' administration and the centralisation of economic functions in the hands of the organisations emanating from the dictatorship of the proletariat"⁽¹⁴²⁾.

With the historical defeats of European revolution (1919-21), the Comintern strategy is confronted with several problems. The first and most pressing problem is posed by the failure of a European revolution to occur. The Third World Congress of the Comintern in 1921 acknowledged this fact by announcing a temporary foreclosing of the period of European "revolution and collapse (Zusammenbruch)"⁽¹⁴³⁾, and the initiation of a period of the "political offensive" of

international fascism in "narrow connection with the offensive of capital on the economic terrain"⁽¹⁴⁴⁾. Further, the acknowledgement of the restoration of imperialism⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ by Marxist-Leninist theoreticians⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ signifies that European capitalism enters a period of "stabilisations", with the acceptance of the praxis of "organised capitalism" in the German labour movement. Although we may note, in so far as these conditions of "stabilisation" cannot be generalised for Western Europe⁽¹⁴⁷⁾, this marks a premature foreclosure of the period of European revolutions.

The Comintern subsequently reassesses the economic "collapse"-conditions of the strategy and tactics of the European labour movement in the period of the "restoration" of the production powers of European capitals and the displacement of the impetus of world revolution from Europe to the periphery of world capitalism, the colonies and semi-colonies⁽¹⁴⁸⁾. While the "collapse" is only temporarily deferred by capitalist stabilisation, it nevertheless expresses the Comintern's recognition of the incapacity of the proletarian masses to act as a revolutionary subject, and the suspension of the revolutionary strategy of the immediate conquest of state-power under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Two factors can be identified here which confront the Zimmerwald Left's revolutionary strategy. Firstly, the "success" of the "revisionist" social-democratic leadership of the European labour movement into "chauvinistic" social-imperialist compromises with the national bourgeoisies. Secondly, the "insufficiency" of a direct revolutionary assault on state-power produces spontaneity and sectarianism in the communist sections of the world labour movement. The corollary to be derived from these two factors is that the failure

of European revolution is interpreted as the ideological, political and organisational immaturity of the labour movement. Consequently, the essential obstacle to proletarian revolution is defined in terms of political and ideological superstructures⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. Equally, this determines the specificity of Lenin's politics as a response to the "integration" of the proletariat into bourgeois society under the social-democratic leadership of the labour movement.

As the evaluation of the social-democratic tradition in the European labour movement appears in the supremacy of its ideological and hegemonic factors, this establishes the necessity to accentuate the vanguard organisational functions of Communist Parties⁽¹⁵⁰⁾. The commitment of the European labour movement to the democratic republic further demonstrates that spontaneously developed forms of consciousness do not generate an anti-capitalist praxis nor necessarily lead the labour movement into a socialist stage of revolution. This prompts the consideration that the spontaneity of class action precludes the "self-emancipation" of the labour movement. Consequently, the concept of the Party exists in the specific historical conditions in which the European labour movement must be formed as a revolutionary class subject in capitalist societies. The constitution of the Party is thereby structured from the requirements of the formation of class consciousness, rather than the construction of a total socialist programme.

Lenin subsequently asserts the importance of the vanguard organisational and ideological functions of Communist Parties as a resolution to the contradiction of spontaneity and organisation, and as the communist practice for the emancipation of labour through the "fusion" of "scientific socialism" with the labour movement.⁽¹⁵¹⁾

However, the manner in which the resolution of the relationship of spontaneity and organisation is developed follows from Lenin's interpretation of history and the formation of the laws of capitalism. This necessarily places the organisation and "consciousness" of classes in an "external" relationship to the materialist forms of social production relations because they are already in "transition", as the analysis of state monopoly capitalism shows. Consequently, the revolutionary functions of vanguard Parties appear as governing superstructural moments vis-a-vis social-democratic ideology. The Party therefore fulfils both a socio-epistemological as well as an organisation function in the formulation of the strategy and tactics of the labour movement.

The Comintern's re-evaluation of the immediate conditions of world revolution after 1921 defines the organisational and political requirements of Communist Parties to transcend the fragmentation of the labour movement in the "United Front" (Einheitsfront) strategy⁽¹⁵²⁾, as the tactical solution to the perceived causes of the failure of European revolution. To establish the unity of the labour movement, Communist Parties must consider the subjective dimension of the "activation" of revolutionary class consciousness. The consequent "general tactical line" of the Comintern is defined as the "United Front from below" (Einheitsfront von unter), under the slogan of "to the masses" (Heran an die Massen). The Comintern's strategy has two principal components.

Firstly, the Comintern advocates the full participation of the "proletarian masses" in parliamentary democracies as a preparatory foundation from which to promote socialist demands for the transformation of democratic into socialist republics⁽¹⁵³⁾. With this objective, the Comintern's strategy attempts to control national sections of the

European communist movement⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ under "democratic centralism" and the rejection of alternative forms of organisation of the labour movement.

However, the strategy maintains the ambiguities of Lenin's analysis of democratic and socialist revolution. While "all democratic bourgeois republics are, and can be nothing other than a machine to suppress the workers through capitalism, a tool of the political power of capital, a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie"⁽¹⁵⁵⁾, the tactic of a "revolutionary utilisation of bourgeois parliamentarianism"⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ encounters the problem of preparing the ideology and hegemony of the proletariat in bourgeois-parliamentary democracies.

The foregoing change in the direction of Comintern tactics for the European communist movement produces two opposed communist responses. Those propositions of the "Left Communists" which reject the reconstruction of Marxism and the generalisation of Leninism for the Comintern, and identify the introduction of "reformism" into the world communist movement in the Fifth World Congress of the Comintern in 1924; those propositions of "Gramscian" political theory of hegemonic states and "socialist gradualism" (gradualismo socialista) which articulate the premises of the "United Front" strategy⁽¹⁵⁷⁾.

The problem to be considered here, is that with the completion of the democratic revolution in Europe and the historical precedents of a European labour movement which conceives socialism in democratic republican terms, it remains unproven that the "preparation" of the consciousness of the labour movement in bourgeois parliamentary democracies establishes its maturity for socialist struggle or acts for the "integration" of labour into bourgeois society through "parliamentary socialism".

Secondly, the major emphasis of the "United Front" strategy attempts to unite the labour movement by the usurpation of the revisionist

social-democratic and trade-unionist leadership of the labour movement. This is achieved through the penetration of communists into their organisational structures for an ideological and propagandist struggle to free the labour movement "from below" for a "United Front" strategy against capitalism under the hegemonic leadership of Communist Parties.⁽¹⁵⁸⁾

The problem identified here, concerns the functions which the strategy exercises for the unification of the divisions in the labour movement primarily in terms of an ideological and moralistic critique of the politics of sections of the labour movement without an analysis of the objective conditions of capitalism and the social reproduction of classes.

The theoretically unresolved problem of a "United Front" strategy in Comintern theory follows from the continuing assessment that history has entered the "epoch of the disintegration (désagrégation) of ... (the) ... interior collapse (effondrement) of capitalism"⁽¹⁵⁹⁾, when the immediate historical conditions of capitalism do not conform to the theoretical and historical prognosis of the theory of imperialism. This proposition is of major importance because it determines the rationale for both the analysis of capitalism and derivation of class strategies.

Two issues are of relevance here. Firstly, following the logic of monopoly capitalist planning developed in the Second International problematic and extended in "state monopoly capitalism", the historical motive force of capitalist production processes is not identified in the class relations of capital accumulation. The introduction of this analysis into Marxist theory follows from the separation of the monopoly from the capital concept. This leaves the theory unable to pose the resolution to the problem of "class consciousness" in terms of the reproduction of labour in capitalist social reproduction processes under the capital-mechanism. Therefore, the nature of capitalist

ideology and "trade-union consciousness" is not established in the commodity fetishism which governs the formation of the consciousness of social production agents in capitalist production relations, but is a "superstructural" consideration. In the Comintern's theory, the resolution of the contradiction of spontaneity and organisation is proposed with the concept of a vanguard Party within the logical structure of capital⁽¹⁶⁰⁾. However, this leads us to the second issue in that the concept of a vanguard Party is rejected by sections of the European labour movement as an inadmissible generalisation of the "Jacobin" character of the Party formulated under the specific historical conditions of Russia⁽¹⁶¹⁾. This also suggests that the formulation of strategy and tactics and their relationship to the labour movement requires a different conceptualisation.

Moreover, we may also point to the coincidence of the "United Front" strategy with the events that lead Lenin to "modify" the theory of imperialism, and the C.P.S.U. under Stalin, to develop socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. through the N.E.P. These factors express the impact of the failure of an international revolution upon the Soviet Union, both in terms of the general means with which to defend the Russian Revolution and the specific form by which socialist construction is introduced into the Soviet Union through the primacy of primitive socialist accumulation in the state capitalism of N.E.P. The subsequent development of "Stalinism"⁽¹⁶²⁾ has its origin in the crisis of the revolutionary transition-period which confronts Bolshevism. This expresses the incapability of the proletariat to constitute the subject of socialist transformation in the organisational relations of the "soviet", and the recognition of the necessity to extend the transition-period for the expansion of production powers through the

translation of the logic of state capitalist planning into the conditions of socialist construction. "Stalinism" represents both the realisation of the principles inherent in the necessity to transform Bolshevik praxis, and its qualitative impact upon the formulation of the strategy and tactics of the world communist movement.

We will now discuss how the Comintern, with particular reference to Stalin, seeks to maintain the imperialist periodisation of capitalism.

3.2.1 Stalin and imperialism

In Stalin's analysis of imperialism, the periodisation of capitalism is maintained in an increasingly "mechanistic" development of Leninist categories in the post-war analysis of capitalism. This analysis is generalised for European capitalism under the generic term of "further-development" (Weiterentwicklung), employed to characterise those theoretical additions to Marxism which are evaluated as both compatible with Marxism and an extension of its essential theoretical premises. Stalin expresses these "further-developments" in the qualitatively new definition of "scientific socialism"⁽¹⁶³⁾, in the "Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution"⁽¹⁶⁴⁾. Leninism is thereby not reducible to the "application of Marxism simply on Russia, but on general relations"⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ of the world communist movement:

"Leninism is the theory and practice of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular"⁽¹⁶⁶⁾.

This analysis of world capitalism and world revolution "further-develops" the "fundamental theses of 'Kapital'"⁽¹⁶⁷⁾. Marx and Engels give in "Das Kapital" and other fundamental writings, an analysis of the foundation of capitalism. However, they live in the period of the rule of pre-monopoly capitalism and in the peaceful evolution of

capitalism and its 'peaceful' extension (Vorbereitung) over the whole earth"⁽¹⁶⁸⁾. Consequently, the analysis of Das Kapital can only "anticipate" the dissolution of the "old phase" through the "leaps and catastrophic kinds of development of capitalism" in imperialism and the laws of "new relations of development of capitalism"⁽¹⁶⁹⁾. Leninism represents the "new relations of development in the new phase of capitalism, transformed and 'further-developed' (weiterentwickelte) in imperialism"⁽¹⁷⁰⁾, and the authoritative interpretation of "Marxist theory in the new conditions of the struggle of the proletariat in the imperialist period ... applied, concretised and 'further-developed'"⁽¹⁷¹⁾. In this new phase of capitalism, Stalin formulates proletarian politics in the conditions of the historical "collapse" of capitalism and the "curve of capitalist evolution" on its "downward path"⁽¹⁷²⁾ and in its "last stage"⁽¹⁷³⁾.

However, Stalin's analysis of capitalism expresses a new quality and political function to the concept of "Socialism in One Country" under the laws of uneven development of capitalism⁽¹⁷⁴⁾. The epoch of imperialist wars and "collapse" of capitalism creates the objective historical conditions in world capitalism for socialist revolution through the "general weakening of the world front of capital"⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ and the destruction of the "links in the chain of world imperialism"⁽¹⁷⁶⁾. The consequent world historical function of the destruction of the "first link" in the imperialist chain through the Russian Revolution verifies not only the possibility of "Socialism in One Country", but its actuality as a historical reality⁽¹⁷⁷⁾. This also maintains the political evaluation of the development of world revolution and the new functions which the C.P.S.U. must assume in the world communist movement as the first socialist state.

However, with the victory of Stalin in internal power struggle of the C.P.S.U., the analysis sustains a political and tactical critique of the "Left Opposition" (Kamenov, Zinoviev and particularly Trotsky) regarding the possible reversibility of the laws of socialist construction in the Soviet Union through state-capitalism. The subsequent instrumentalisation of the Third International to the tactical imperatives of the C.P.S.U. under Stalin subordinates the world communist movement to the dictates of Soviet Realpolitik. This can be expressed here by the Comintern's acceptance of the theory of "Socialism in One Country".

For Lenin, this concept was developed in the imperialist war conjunction of developed European capitals, while for Stalin, it is taken as a post facto general theory of socialist construction. The subsequent disciplining and expulsion of communists from the Comintern⁽¹⁷⁸⁾, and the removal of any critique of the Soviet Union from affiliated sections of national Communist Parties under the "deviations" from the "general tactical line", expresses the Bolshevisation of Communist Parties⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ in the manner of their acceptance of the structure of the Comintern's tactical chain of command.

Two relevant arguments can be identified here in Stalin's presentation of Trotsky's opposition to socialist construction. The first is that "Socialism in One Country" is precluded for "all-times and periods of capitalism"⁽¹⁸⁰⁾. The second is that the theory of proletarian revolution is necessarily international in character in the imperialist epoch. This is opposed not only from a pragmatic defence of the "October Revolution" and the Realpolitik of socialist construction under N.E.P., but for our purposes, Lenin's law of uneven development⁽¹⁸¹⁾. Stalin argues that:

"the victory of socialism in individual countries is impossible only if the movement of bourgeois society is still on the upgrade ... (and) ... when the growth of capitalism as a whole was not accompanied by the process of decay ... when the law of uneven development did not exist and could not yet represent a powerful factor in the disintegration of capitalism ... in the period of monopoly capitalism"⁽¹⁸²⁾.

For Stalin, to oppose "Socialism in One Country" consequently fails to acknowledge three important factors in the imperialist epoch.

Firstly, that the law of uneven development is a process of combined economic and political relations which determine laws of movement of bourgeois society.

Secondly, pre-monopoly capitalism and monopoly capitalism are two different stages of capitalism, with the monopoly forming the "essence" and general character of imperialism.

Thirdly, in this epoch, the critique of "Socialism in One Country" through the concept of proletarian internationalism is a mechanical transcription of the theses of world revolution formulated in the epoch of pre-monopoly capitalism into monopoly capitalism. This also carries the connotation of approximating the "levelling" tendencies of Kautskian "ultra-imperialism" counter-posed to the catastrophic uneven development of the monopoly-form of capitals.

However, in distinction to Stalin's interpretation of Trotsky's opposition, we may note that the critique of proletarian internationalism was not derived from the pre-monopoly capitalist conception of capitalism, but rather the political expression of the laws of combined and uneven development of capitals. Consequently, we see that "internationalism is not an abstract principle, it constitutes the theoretical and political reflection of the international character of the economy, of the world development of production forces and the

world principle of class struggle"⁽¹⁸³⁾. Moreover, internationalism does not signify the simultaneity of international revolution but rather that the necessary form which revolution must assume is given by the class character and imperialist structure of world capitals. To misconstrue the critique in this manner constitutes the political character of Stalin's interpretation of Marx's Das Kapital and Lenin's theory of imperialism.

The modification to the concept of proletarian revolution now develops on the foundation of the historical-materialist relations of socialism in the Soviet Union and the strategic importance of the Soviet Union and the determination of Comintern tactics. In 1924, Stalin proclaims that the conditions in the Soviet Union are mature for socialism⁽¹⁸⁴⁾. While the October Revolution is initially dependent upon European support, the relation is progressively transformed: there now exists "favourable conditions not only for pushing on with the organising of the socialist economy, but also in turn, for giving support to the West-European workers and to the oppressed peoples of the East"⁽¹⁸⁵⁾. This transformation of the inner relations of the Soviet Union legitimates the Soviet conceptualisation of socialism as not being contingent upon the development of international socialism and the federation of national Communist Parties in the Comintern. Although "Socialism in One Country" does not profess to be a "self-sufficient entity", but rather a means for "hastening the victory of the proletariat in all countries"⁽¹⁸⁶⁾, recognising "centres" of world revolution⁽¹⁸⁷⁾, the Comintern factually accepts the Soviet Union as the principal axis of world revolution⁽¹⁸⁸⁾. This acceptance follows not only the obvious material and tactical superiority of C.P.S.U. over the other national

Communist Parties, and in turn, the ideological Weltanschauung of their Party members, but also the theoretical rationale of the law of uneven development in the "collapse"-conditions of the world capitalism. A national socialism is possible because the Russian Revolution is "not only the product of uneven development and progressive decay of imperialism; it is at the same time the beginning of, and the pre-condition for the world revolution"⁽¹⁸⁹⁾.

On these assumptions, the C.P.S.U. becomes the vanguard of world revolution and thereby the inspirational factor by which internal Party democracy of national Communist Parties accedes to "centralism" under the "Bolshevisation"-process of the social mechanisms of the mediation of theory and tactics. This establishes a "conspiratorial" organisational relation of an autonomous Party bureaucracy from the "spontaneous" forms of organisation and action of the labour movement. In this structure of a world confederation of Communist Parties, the representation of the historical interests of labour are abstracted from the relations of classes in bourgeois society. "Bolshevised" Communist Parties subsequently cease to represent a social movement, but assume an instrumental function in the bureaucratised Party apparatuses for the accomplishment of the command-chain of Soviet interests in the European labour movement.

The orientation of the Comintern is subsequently governed by the Soviet interest of national socialist construction. The resulting centralisation of economic and political power in the Soviet state accompanies the "Stalinisation" of the Party organisation and the dissolution of the "workers' Soviets". Rather than the realisation of the historical-materialist foundations of socialism, the necessity to stabilise the internal and external relations of the Soviet system and world capitalism govern the Comintern's formulation of the "United Front" strategy.

At the Fifth World Congress of the Comintern in 1924, the concept of "stabilisation" is advanced which contains three components. The first "stabilisation" refers to the internal relations of the U.S.S.R., and is a surrogate for the accomplishment of Soviet socialist construction under the national programme of the C.P.S.U. The second "temporary stabilisation" concerns the inner conditions of national monopoly capitalisms. While this period sustains the ascendancy of the bourgeoisie and reformists against the proletariat⁽¹⁹⁰⁾, the tendency to the formation of the plurality of European state capitalisms to transcend the inner crises of capitals is structurally delimited by the "collapse" of capitalism. As Stalin argues, this necessarily pre-empts a long-run stabilisation of capitalist systems, in that the "growth of capitalism does not cancel, but prepares the progressive decay of capitalism"⁽¹⁹¹⁾ in a contradictory, uneven expansion of social production powers which "inevitably leads to the aggravation of the contradictions of capitalism" through imperialism, national liberation movements in the colonies, inter-imperialist struggles and the struggle of capital and labour⁽¹⁹²⁾.

This period is defined as that of the Bolshevisation of Communist Parties⁽¹⁹³⁾ which prepares the organisational and ideological basis for mass revolutionary struggle, with the conjoint action of the expulsion of "ultra-left" Party members. Following the theory of the "miseration" of the proletarian masses as the economic basis of Communist Party tactics, Stalin argues that the "path of development of capitalism is the path of impoverishment of a semi-starvation existence for the vast majority of the working-people, while a small upper stratum of these working-people are bribed and pampered"⁽¹⁹⁴⁾. Nevertheless, the crisis of capitalism usurps the foundations of such manipulative strategies by the monopoly bourgeoisie and the reformist politics of the

social-democratic leadership of the labour movement. This essential nexus in the conditions of monopoly capitalism activates the process of the "United Front from below, combining the workers in a united front against capital"⁽¹⁹⁵⁾. This realises the Comintern's general tactic of the "Bolshevisation" of Social Democratic Parties,

"to transform them into genuine mass parties relying on the trade unions to rally the labouring elements among the non-proletarian classes, above all the peasantry, around the proletariat, and lastly, to educate the proletarians in the spirit of revolution and proletarian dictatorship"⁽¹⁹⁶⁾.

The third "relative stabilisation" refers to the relationship of both social systems.⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ This establishes the historical precedents of the subsequent theory of the politics of "peaceful co-existence", and represents another aspect of the "stabilisation" of the "system relations" of world capitalism and world socialism to accomplish the internal programme of the C.P.S.U. The tactical initiatives of forming alliances with, and creating divisions between imperialist states in the interests of Soviet foreign policy is expressed in these global relations⁽¹⁹⁸⁾.

Collectively, these relations modify the conditions of existence of world imperialism and the conditions in which proletarian revolution unfolds.

The "stabilisation of capitalism" and proletarian internationalism

The importance of the "collapse" is evident for the last two concepts of "stabilisations", and to this extent establishes an insufficient theoretical determination of the total capital constitution of classes and the economic mechanism of the crisis of capital. The "relative stabilisation of capitalism" is not examined from the general laws of capital but the imposition of the Leninist categories of monopoly capitalism on the class struggles of the

European proletariat under Stalin's analysis of imperialism. Although the law of uneven development dissolves the mode of action of economic laws in the cyclical movement of capitals, it nevertheless is conceived by Lenin under the priority of the monopoly-concept⁽¹⁹⁹⁾. Conversely, the Stalinist analysis of the "relative stabilisation" introduces a new concept into Marxism-Leninism which modifies the "law of uneven development" in the internal and external crisis of market disproportionalities. This owes its significance to principles primarily extraneous to the general concept of capital in the opposed world systems, and the translation of this contradiction into the Soviet Union's direction of the general tactical line of the Comintern⁽²⁰⁰⁾.

On the basis of these theoretical principles, the Comintern introduces the concept of "zig-zags"⁽²⁰¹⁾ into the materialist analysis of the laws of uneven development of capitals with which the politics of the Comintern's tactics direct the world proletarian revolution. However, in both the aforementioned cases, the underlying problem of the "United Front" strategy remains its foundation in the "collapse"-theory of capitals. Rather, the tactical significance of the system of stabilisations expresses the emergence of the contradiction between the C.P.S.U.'s defence of the specific form of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R with its ability to formulate the "genuine" interests of the Comintern and act as an international vanguard Party. The Comintern accordingly structures its interests to the requirements of the C.P.S.U., the national delegations of the world federation of Communist Parties to the national and world interests of Soviet Realpolitik.

However, as Lenin has anticipated the initiation of proletarian revolution in Europe and not Russia precisely because the material foundations of socialism were undeveloped compared with European

capitalism, the creation of "Socialism in One Country" was conditional upon international proletarian revolution. Moreover, although Lenin sustained the first "modification" to the Marxist theory of international revolution⁽²⁰²⁾, "Socialism in One Country" was conditional upon proletarian internationalism and world revolution⁽²⁰³⁾. Soviet socialism existed in an entrenched "capitalist encirclement" as a temporary phenomenon because of the imminence of the "collapse" of world capitals: "the result is a state of equilibrium which, although highly unstable and precarious, enables the Socialist Republic to exist - not for long of course - within the capitalist encirclement"⁽²⁰⁴⁾.

Conversely for Stalin, "Socialism in One Country" is conceptualised autonomously from the historical development of world revolution⁽²⁰⁵⁾, and as a "praxis-construct" for the critique of Trotsky and the legitimation of the C.P.S.U. in the Comintern.

3.2.2 The General Crisis of Capitalism

As world revolution is increasingly represented as being conditional upon the existence of the Soviet Union, this only goes to sustain the validity of the theory of imperialism with the additional significance of Soviet socialism for world capitalism. The Comintern interprets that "world history has entered a new phase of development - a phase of prolonged general crisis of the capitalist system"⁽²⁰⁶⁾ in which the "capitalist system is undergoing a process of collapse - a process without qualification"⁽²⁰⁷⁾. While the terminal character of capitalist systems have been examined under the concept of "dying capitalism", what is of qualitatively new importance in the theory and practice of the world communist movement is the presentation of the General Crisis of Capitalism through the category of an "alien body" in the structure of world capitalism. The "General Crisis" can no longer be interpreted

independently from the existence and development of the Soviet Union as a "new factor" whose "very existence is revolutionising the whole world"⁽²⁰⁸⁾. With the dominant role of the Soviet Union in the Comintern, the "General Crisis" is examined under the principal antagonistic relations of world capitalism, those of the "Land of Soviets and the countries of capitalism as a whole"⁽²⁰⁹⁾. This signifies that there is no longer a unified world capitalist system in existence but one constituted in two principal "camps" - the "camp of socialism" and the "camp of capitalism"⁽²¹⁰⁾.

The "system contradiction" is "not of the same order as the contradiction within capitalism"⁽²¹¹⁾ but is placed externally to individual national capitalist states. The function which the "Soviet System" fulfils in the destruction of the "first link" in the world imperialist chain by "its very existence demonstrates the decaying state of capitalism"⁽²¹²⁾. On this basis, the Comintern argues that capitalism is already a "dead capitalism" (gestorbender Kapitalismus)⁽²¹³⁾. As the Soviet Revolution realises the premises of Leninist theory, its existence presents a congruence between the interests of the Soviet Revolution and proletarian internationalism. The consequent inter-system struggle of socialist and capitalist centres for world domination is interpreted as the fundamental axis around which the struggle of world capitalism and world socialism revolves⁽²¹⁴⁾.

In these conditions of world system contradiction, the "Soviet System" sustains the crisis of world capitals.

Firstly, the general weakening of capitalist world markets precipitates the destabilisation of national, and international relations of capital on the world market through the inability to expand production powers. Capitalism unfolds through the:

"monstrous development of production powers, to the creation of the materialist foundation of socialism which forms the historical mission of capitalism, to the monopoly-degeneration of capitalism to its general crisis and finally to its collapse (Zusammenbruch) ..."(215).

The theory of the "General Crisis of Capitalism" does not abrogate the catastrophic concept of capitals but rather confirms the process of its historical occurrence.

Secondly, world capitalism is no longer a unified world economic and social system.

Thirdly, as the "problem of the market" is the "general problem of capitalism", the existence of the "Soviet System" ensures that the "peaceful way to the solution of the problems of the market remains closed to capitalism"(216). The historical connection of economy and political is subsequently expressed in the imminence of the collapse of capitalism and the inevitability of imperialist wars.

Consequently, the existence and defence of the national socialist soviet system establishes the guarantee of the objective historical course of world capitalism and the international proletarian revolution in the formalised relationships of the Comintern's analysis of the "General Crisis of Capitalism". However, from the standpoint of the critique of the theory and politics of the C.P.S.U. in the Communist International, Stalin's theory of "Socialism in One Country" exhibits the ideological function of giving credibility to the continuation of the Russian Revolution in terms which both extend and legitimate the developmental path of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R.(217) and its generalisation as a "model" for international communism. Nevertheless, in reality the consequence of the doctrine precludes the possibility of a genuine proletarian internationalism because of the exigences of national socialist construction. This demonstrates the incompatibility of a unique

"centre" within the world communist movement which performs the revolutionary vanguard functions in the interests of proletarian internationalism. Moreover, the combination of internal and external relations of the "General Crisis of Capitalism" attempts to "theorise" the primacy of the C.P.S.U. in the political structure of the world communist international.

3.3 Marxism and Social-Democracy

Under the monopoly-periodisation and transition of capitalism, Comintern theory establishes the characterisation of world capitalism and the conditions for the world-historical "collapse" of capitalism⁽²¹⁸⁾. Consequently, if capitalism could revert back to "free competition capitalism" of the epoch of classical capitalism of Marxism, then not only the theoretical variants of the Second International would be introduced into Bolshevik theory with its impact upon the derivation of class tactics, but also the raison d'être of the epoch of imperialism. Conversely, the "ultimate stage" concept of capitalism itself admits further consideration in that it bears two opposed ideological and theoretical functions within the "further-development" of Marxism. For monopoly capitalism, it legitimates both the "collapse" and revolutionary transition to socialism, and a historical critique of social-democratic praxis. For "organised capitalism", it legitimates the theoretical evaluation of the termination of the conditions of world revolution as an alternative to communist praxis in the European labour movement.

3.3.1 Organised-capitalism and state-socialism

After the First World War, the theory of "organised capitalism" presents the possibility of a qualitative extension of "transitional capitalism" to socialism without the Bolsheviks' conception of an

economic and political "collapse" of capitalist systems. As Comintern theorists argue, German social democratic theory interprets "organised capitalism" as a "transitional capitalism" and an "intermediate social system" between the "historical poles of the bourgeois democratic republic and the socialist republic"⁽²¹⁹⁾.

The "general-cartel"

The economic character of this concept, already implicit in the transformation of classical capitalism, is now examined by Hilferding through the extension of "finance-capitalism" in the direct binding of industrial and bank capital into a "social-capital" (gesellschaftliche Kapital)⁽²²⁰⁾. The concentration of production transforms the free competition of capitals into the monopoly-form of capital domination of total social production. This transformation of the unorganised, anarchical, unplanned structure of free competition capitalism⁽²²¹⁾ into the structure of organised-capitalism⁽²²²⁾, signifies the theoretical development and historical realisation of the theoretical principles of Das Finanzkapital in the "general cartel". They can be distinguished to the earlier capitalist epoch⁽²²³⁾ where the "general cartel is economically conceivable", but a "social and political impossibility" (Unmöglichkeit)⁽²²⁴⁾, and precluded by Lenin's ideological and political critique. The new concept of "finance-capital" effectively overcomes Lenin's principal economic criticisms.

The economic and political implications of "organised capitalism" are therefore evident in the historical realisation of the crisis-free potentiality of capitals established in the theory of the reproduction schemas. This appears as an anti-crisis capacity of trusts⁽²²⁵⁾ in a "general cartel" vis-a-vis "universal capital", and a tendency to be "accomplished without limit"⁽²²⁶⁾. The significance of this theory follows from the examination of capitalist crises in disproportionalities of production and the special importance attributed to appropriation—

relations. As Hilferding argues that the "cartel is the consciously regulated society", the contradiction of capital and labour appears as an "antagonism in distribution"⁽²²⁷⁾. Finance-capital creates the "last foundation of socialism"⁽²²⁸⁾ and the "formation of social control on production. It is however in antagonistic form"⁽²²⁹⁾, appropriated in the "hands of the oligarchy"⁽²³⁰⁾.

The transformed organisational structure of capitals develops through the "socialisation of labour processes"⁽²³¹⁾ and the socialisation of production⁽²³²⁾ which renders capitalist economic relations amenable to "conscious ordering and planning (bewusste Ordnung und Lenkung) in an "economic democracy (Wirtschaftsdemokratie)"⁽²³³⁾. They represent the theoretical and historical circumscription of the monopolisation-processes of the concentration and centralisation of capital, and the anarchical domination of capitals on bourgeois society through the substitution of the "epoch of individual private enterprises" with a "consciously ruled society"⁽²³⁴⁾. The character of this type of analysis is "logically and practically excluded"⁽²³⁵⁾ from the Marxist theory of the historical form of private capitalism and free competition capitalism.

Although the monopolies and the state dominate "organised capitalism", the "revisionist" character of these attributes of the capitalist social system inheres in the solution to the principal form of capitalist appropriation in the relations of production and consumption. This analysis envisages the "adaptation" of the capitalist economy⁽²³⁶⁾ to the material needs of social classes⁽²³⁷⁾, thereby implicitly rejecting the concepts of "immiseration" and "labour aristocracy"⁽²³⁸⁾ in a regulated system of total social planning. This equally implies a harmonisation of the contradiction of the relations and powers of production in that the "last antagonistic

form of the social powers of production" to which Marx refers, is transcended in an organised-capitalism. This appears as a "solution to the development of production powers", without a "destruction of the economic structure"⁽²³⁹⁾, and the historical limits to capitalist production relations in a new organisational structure of capitals and a historical stage of transition to socialism⁽²⁴⁰⁾.

The new mechanisms of capitalist regulation follow from the proportionalities of total social production in socialist planning techniques:

"organised capitalism signifies in actuality the substitution of the capitalist principle of free competition through the socialist principle of planning"⁽²⁴¹⁾.

Socialist planning is historically realised in the "convergence" theory of "transitional capitalism". This may be considered as a continuation of what Luxemburg had interpreted as Bernstein's "adaptation-theory of capitalism" (Anpassungstheorie des Kapitalismus)⁽²⁴²⁾ with the additional component of the state, which Renner interprets as a "lever to socialism". Consequently, the question of socialism is a subjective one of "consciousness". As Hilferding argues, the "last psychological objection against socialism" has been abolished by "capitalism itself"⁽²⁴³⁾. Where the theory of monopoly capitalism seeks the solution to the problem of class consciousness in the Party, the theory of organised capitalism looks to social-democracy.

However, for Lenin, the real form of the dissolution of the analytical "starting-point" (Ausgangspunkt) of free competition capitalism in monopoly capitalism also establishes the transference of the social regulation of individual producers through the market mechanism as "scattered capitalists are transformed into a collective capitalist"⁽²⁴⁴⁾. But unlike Hilferding, this does not create a

"state-socialist" planning, rather a state-capitalist despotic control of total social production by monopolies and the "tyranny of the cartels"⁽²⁴⁵⁾. This organisational structure of capitals cannot be abstracted from the political domination of the monopolies, and private property in the means of production. Consequently, once both theories accept the concepts of "general cartel" and "collective capital" on the basis of the transitional status of capitalism, the political relation must become the pre-eminent distinguishing factor.

Democratic state capitalism

The political impact of "organised capitalism" is examined from the legacy of state monopoly war capitalism that creates the economic and political crises in the institutional relations of bourgeois society. These are redressed in the expansion of bourgeois state mechanisms as a "counter-revolutionary" potential for the stabilisation of capitalist systems and the economic and political integration of the labour movement into bourgeois society. For Hilferding, this stabilisation of capitalism in distinction to Comintern theory is a refutation of the "collapse" and the "scientific socialism" of Marxism:

"after the war, Marxism has become an ideology just like the collapse (Zusammenbruch) as the facts have shown. The labour force (Arbeiderschaft) uses its position of power not to realise socialism but to improve their position, to extend social reform and political democracy"⁽²⁴⁶⁾.

For organised-capitalism, "social reforms" are examined on the foundation of a harmonised economic structure of capitalism and their political consequences for the orientation of the labour movement in that socialism not only enters bourgeois society through bourgeois states, but already exists in Keim-form⁽²⁴⁷⁾.

Consequently, the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution and class struggle is substituted for the accommodation of the theory and politics of the labour movement to the bourgeois state in the class praxis of the democratisation of economy and state. As

Varga argues:

"this theory has a great political significance. It forms the basis of the total Weltanschauung of today's reformism. The theory that the peaceful transition into socialism has already begun, the theory that today's state is no longer a class state of the bourgeoisie"(248).

This derivation of the political structure of capitalist society is conceptualised in terms that are commensurate with the organisational structure of capitalism in that the socialist principle of state-planning takes effect through the mechanisms of bourgeois state interventionism in the bourgeois-democratic republic.

"Organised capitalism" signifies a "conscious (bewusste) influence upon society" through a "conscious organisation of social influence through the state"(249).

As the "general cartel" makes a "democratically organised society" possible, its actualisation is accomplished through the newly created bourgeois-state mechanism for the solution of the contradiction of capitalism. Hilferding names this the "conscious social regulation (bewusste gesellschaftliche Regelung) of the economy by the few" (monopolies, trusts, cartels), and "economic democracy, the subordination of private economic interests under social interests"(250). This subordination of the interests of individual capitals under the "illusory" political form of representation of the totality of interests of the bourgeoisie is

perceived as a real social process of community interests in "state-socialism". State socialism becomes an instrument of "economic democracy" (Wirtschaftsdemokratie) and "democratic production politics" (251) in a "progressively organised economy through the concentration of capital", finally accomplished when the "producers" accept the "direction of socialised enterprises in the social interest" (252). Consequently, the theory of class struggle potentially loses its significance with the acceptance of the organisational capacities of "state socialism" under total social interests as effective guarantor of the real interests of labour movement. As social relations of production have been denuded of their capital-quality, the theory of "organised capitalism" is able to represent the transformation of economic relations under the subjective requirements of "educating consciousness", "psychological transformation" as a "necessary foundation for economic democracy" (253).

Moreover, as bourgeois state interventions are interpreted as socialist planning and characterised within the concept of "state-socialism" (254), German social-democracy re-appraises the Marxist evaluation of bourgeois states with a new state-theory (255) in which the European labour movement is to accept the liberal democratic theory of states. As Hilferding argues:

"in the political direction, the war ends with the extension and consolidation of democratic state-forms (demokratischen Staatsformen) in different countries" (256).

Consequently, social-democracy rejects the theory of the revolutionary transformation from capitalism to socialism and the class negation of bourgeois states (Staatsnegation) under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The corollary of this is the realisation of

socialism through democratic state-forms, and the integration of social classes into bourgeois society through their participation in the institutions and structures of bourgeois states. The democratic state-form is therefore the adequate political form for the representation of the political praxis of the European labour movement in Social Democratic Parties.

Hilferding implicitly rejects the Marxist-Leninist concept of states that separates the essence of states (state-types) from their state-form⁽²⁵⁷⁾ (state-form) and thereby the usurpation of the democratic state-form through the priority of the "state-types" under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. For social-democratic praxis, this precludes a democratic transformation of bourgeois society through the concept of modern states as "party-states", and the praxis of social-democratic parties in the character of the politics of its state-apparatuses. This is because of the "absolutisation" of the specific form of "undemocratic state" (undemokratischen Staat) with the Bolshevik commitment to the "abolition (Beseitigung) of this State-form"⁽²⁵⁸⁾. Organised capitalism now represents the bourgeois state as an "instrument" for the liberation of the labour movement both theoretically and historically from the experience of the labour movement; "labour considers the Republic as its work"⁽²⁵⁹⁾ and the "Party of the proletariat comes to identify with their state"⁽²⁶⁰⁾.

The principle of the "destruction" of the state is substituted with that of the "utilisation of states" under Hilferding's phrase of an "energetic statism". The participation of the working-class in these structures of the democratic state-form is a sufficient condition for the transformation of its class character. Thus, Kelsen argues that the "modern state is not a tool of the possessing

class ... fixed for all times" in its class function⁽²⁶¹⁾. As a "party-state", the bourgeois state makes possible the "participation of the masses" in state politics⁽²⁶²⁾, to govern both the politics of its apparatuses and the direction of the economy:

"more and more capitalist society succumbs to the growing influence of the working class, more and more the political principle of the working class lies in the utilisation of the state as means to the direction and control of the economy in the general interest"⁽²⁶³⁾.

Consequently, "class struggle" is defined through the mechanisms of the distribution of power in state party-politics, and a "party-struggle"⁽²⁶⁴⁾.

In this context, social-democratic theory rejects the "dogma of the destruction of states"⁽²⁶⁵⁾ and re-evaluates the conceptualisation of bourgeois states in a "new phase of Marxism with new tactics"⁽²⁶⁶⁾. Conversely, the "anarchistic standpoint" of Bolshevism, expresses the "catastrophic fiasko of Marxist state politics ... (which) ... has become for many, the acceleration of the crisis inside Marxist theory"⁽²⁶⁷⁾. The significance of these relations of economy and political in "organised capitalism" confronts the "collapse" with the realisation of socialist planning under a democratic state-form. Consequently, Hilferding rejects both the Comintern's expectation of the economic theory of the "collapse" (ökonomische Zusammenbruchstheorie) and its replacement with the political theory of the "collapse" (politische Zusammenbruchstheorie)⁽²⁶⁸⁾. For "organised capitalism", the "collapse" of capitalism cedes place both theoretically and historically to transitional forms of organised relations of economy and political in the "general cartel" and the state, and under the democratic control of existing planning apparatuses⁽²⁶⁹⁾.

"State-capitalist tendencies" and "class dictatorship"

The general political context of this analysis is criticised through the "counter-revolutionary" function of bourgeois parliamentary institutions in the "opportunistic" politics of Social Democratic Parties. This is interpreted by Comintern theoretician P. Lapinski as an "idealisation of simple bourgeois republican democracy"⁽²⁷⁰⁾, and by E. Varga as a reformist representation of bourgeois states "above classes"⁽²⁷¹⁾. While the relations of "state socialism" are not a unilateral repressive capital-power of state-capitalism because of the reality of economic and political concessions to the labour movement, bourgeois states remain an instrument of capitals and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie⁽²⁷²⁾ whose general socio-political functions serve the bourgeoisie in the exploitation of labour through capital. Rather, the primacy of the political concept of bourgeois states in Bolshevik analysis subordinates state-capitalist tendencies to the contradictory relations of both the dynamics of the revolutionary transition of capitals in the material foundations of socialism, and the world historical "collapse" of capitals as a necessary moment in the imperialist periodisation. Therefore, despite the importance of imperialist state interventionism in the Bolshevik theory of capitalism, state interventionism is repudiated either as a post-monopoly form or a post-crisis periodisation of the "collapse" of capitals through the structural constraints to "state-capitalist tendencies" under monopoly capitalism.

Rather, the Bolshevik theory of capitalism leads to the generalisation of the reactionary and of repressive political superstructures of bourgeois states⁽²⁷³⁾ in addition to the integrative functions of "social states" for the political resolution of both the

crisis -"shattering of the capitalist system"⁽²⁷⁴⁾, and the "maturing of revolutionary crises"⁽²⁷⁵⁾ inherent in "transitional capitalism" as an institutional expression of the reactive political capacities of bourgeois states.

Under these combined contradictory characteristics of the imperialist epoch which we have identified in the "collapse" and transition, Leontjew argues that state intervention responds to a "series of incisive structural displacements and transformations in the economic re-organisation of world capitals through the war"⁽²⁷⁶⁾. In monopoly capitalism, the social domination of capitals cannot be sustained from the general laws of classical capitalism⁽²⁷⁷⁾ but necessitates state interventionism within the ideological crises of imperialism to pacify proletarian revolt against capitalism⁽²⁷⁸⁾ under the concept of "welfare states"⁽²⁷⁹⁾, and to "mask" the activity of state functions against the proletariat in the interests of the bourgeoisie⁽²⁸⁰⁾. The acceptance of the theory of social-democracy in the labour movement is interpreted by the Comintern as a fundamental relation in the "relative stabilisation of capitalism"⁽²⁸¹⁾ and the "main channel of imperialist pacificism within the working-class"⁽²⁸²⁾.

The expansion of state functions in Western European capitalist societies expresses one form of the "counter-revolutionary" movement of the bourgeoisie, through both welfare provisions for labour⁽²⁸³⁾ and direct intervention in the capital-labour relation, as an attempt to construct a new system of mechanisms of labour regulation and class co-operation⁽²⁸⁴⁾. These new "mediational" functions of bourgeois states "co-opts" the entry of Social-Democratic Parties into the politics of class conciliation within the institutionalised framework of bourgeois Rechtsstaaten as

political mechanisms for the management of class struggle⁽²⁸⁵⁾.

The dissolution of the system of private property in the "decay period (Verfallsperiod) of capitalism"⁽²⁸⁶⁾ requires concessions to the proletariat with the creation of "social Rights" through the legitimation functions of states. Here, the organisation and systematisation of "bourgeois freedoms"⁽²⁸⁷⁾ functions for the "integration" of labour in the party-political representation of its interests in the bourgeois political system of power⁽²⁸⁸⁾.

Maintaining the political domination of "state capitalist tendencies", Comintern theoreticians reject the possibility that the expansion of "state socialist" functions can be conquered and transformed into a socialist state through the peaceful "parliamentary road"⁽²⁸⁹⁾ to socialism under the influence of political parties on bourgeois states, in democracy and co-alitions with the bourgeoisie⁽²⁹⁰⁾. In this respect, the state cannot possess two "different class contents", and therefore be transformed into a socialist state without its destruction under the dictatorship of the proletariat. As the Comintern's theory of "state-destruction" confronts the social-democratic theory of the "utilisation" of bourgeois party-states, there is no ambiguity over the ultimate political conception of states and the socio-political functions of bourgeois "social states". Therefore, despite the theoretical ambivalence revealed in the formulation of proletarian praxis in the Marxist-Leninist concept of state monopoly capitalism, the revolutionary political Weltanschauung is explicit in the Comintern's strategic programmatic demand of the "destruction" of bourgeois states. As Lapinski argues, the Marxist-Leninist concept of an "epoch of state monopoly capitalism", and repressive bureaucratic militaristic-police states⁽²⁹¹⁾ remains the "decisive organisation of capitals"⁽²⁹²⁾ for the repression and integration of the labour

movement into bourgeois society and states.

The importance of the concept of "state socialism" in the critique of capitalism expresses the introduction of legitimation crises into state-capitalist systems with its inability to function through the reproduction laws of total capitals without active ideological and political interventions of bourgeois states. The crisis of capitals in the imperialist epoch are therefore simultaneously ideological and political crises of the classical legitimation-processes of bourgeois society which necessitate the formation of state-capitalist agencies for the social-integration of the labour movement. In this respect, Comintern-theory has not neglected the "hegenonic state" functions, but rather stipulates the importance of the ideological functions of the praxis-relations of "organised-capitalism" and "state-socialism" in both the economy and political, and the organisational requirements of the "United Front" strategy in deference to the "superstructural cause" of the failure of European revolution.

"State-capitalist tendencies" and the "collapse" of capitalism

However, while Lenin and the Comintern stipulate the "illusory" nature of bourgeois democratic states, its significance as a real political form of bourgeois society which enters the class experience and consciousness of the labour movement is underestimated. Bourgeois-democracy is only "illusory" as a classless form of political domination in bourgeois society, but not as a real historical product of the ascendancy of bourgeois society against feudalism, and its extension in the unfolding class struggle within the structural limits of the reproduction of society. The spontaneity and fragmentation of the labour movement is through the reproduction of social classes in capitalist society under the general laws of the social domination of capital rather than the institutional-agencies and "corrupt" practices

of the social-democratic leadership of the labour movement. This further identifies democracy as the characterisation of the political system which has its class foundations in society rather than a "state-form". It is therefore the product of the social movement of classes, structured through the characteristic separation of the economy and political in capitalist systems.

The "dogmatic" quality of Comintern theory sustains the process of state-capitalist socialisations not only as anticipations of the "collapse" of world capital, but as Lenin signifies in the concept of imperialism, "a continuation of the development of imperialism, its highest stage - in a sense, a transition to socialism"⁽²⁹³⁾. However, with the "relative stabilisation" of European capitalism, the state-capitalist realisation of the socialisation of capitals leaves monopoly capitalism without an inner capital-critique of "organised capitalism" as we have suggested in the comparison of the concepts of the "general cartel" and the "collective capitalist".

Varga indirectly expresses the approximation of the "economic" components of the concepts of monopoly capitalism and organised capitalism when he argues that:

"the concept of organised capitalism is closely connected to the concept of state capitalism. The economic significance of the state is increasingly great. The foundation of this development is capital's imminent movement to the socialisation of production"⁽²⁹⁴⁾.

However, the utilisation of Leninist categories for the analysis of European capitalism is only given credence through the efficacy of the Stalinist theory of the "General Crisis of Capitalism". What is implied theoretically by monopoly capitalism, that capitalism is "no longer capitalism, rather a definite transition-stage to socialism",⁽²⁹⁵⁾

is denied in practice, that "this theory has naturally nothing in common with the Leninist understanding of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism"⁽²⁹⁶⁾. The "suppression" of the historical transitional quality of capitals under the political primacy of the monopoly "starting-point" - that the "monopoly creates all the effective foundations for the socialist system, however in order that these foundations are able to find their realisation, capitalism as such must be overthrown, destroyed"⁽²⁹⁷⁾ - constitutes the superstructural limitation to the creation of a "fourth epoch" in the history of capitals and its self - Aufhebung to socialism.

Rather, the concept of "state monopoly capitalism" has two principal functions. The first is the refutation of the revisionist social-democratic "further-development" of Marxism in the concepts of "organised capitalism" and "state socialism"⁽²⁹⁸⁾, and the "illusory" representations of the real development-tendencies of the economy and political⁽²⁹⁹⁾. As such, Leontjew states that "organised capitalism" represents the "cornerstone of present reformist ideology", and Varga, the social-democratic tradition of the Second International⁽³⁰⁰⁾; it cannot constitute a "concept of Marxism"⁽³⁰¹⁾. The second represents the actual interventionism of bourgeois states - as Lenin argues, "war-time socialism is in fact war-time state monopoly capitalism"⁽³⁰²⁾.

There is evidence to suggest that Lenin characterises state monopoly capitalism as a post-monopoly periodisation of capitalism:

"world capitalism, which in the 60's and 70's in the last century was an advanced and progressive force of free competition which at the beginning of the twentieth century grew into monopoly capitalism, that is, imperialism took a big step forward during the war, not only towards greater concentration of finance-capital, but a transformation into state-capitalism"⁽³⁰³⁾.

This is also expressed as an "era of development of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism"⁽³⁰⁴⁾. However, the analytical quality of this concept is established over its polemical import when Lenin argues:

"here we have what is most essential in the theoretical appraisal of the latest phase of capitalism, that is imperialism, viz., that capitalism becomes monopoly capitalism. The latter must be emphasised because of the erroneous bourgeois reformist assertion that monopoly capitalism or state monopoly capitalism is no longer capitalism, but can already be termed state socialism"⁽³⁰⁵⁾.

While Lenin has not rejected the concept and historical content of "state socialism" through the developed genetical forms of capitals, the evaluation of state monopoly capitalism as a "characteristic and co-essential" of imperialism, that "war capitalism" and "state monopoly capitalism" are synonymous⁽³⁰⁶⁾, sustains the refutation that "state monopoly capitalism" is a "state-socialism" and a "democratisation of capital"⁽³⁰⁷⁾.

However, while the Comintern reproduces Lenin's argument that "state monopoly capitalism" does not represent a qualitative transformation of monopoly capitalism, it can only "politically" reply to the inability to "realise" the historical transitional quality contained in Lenin's concept of "monopoly" in the post-war conditions of European capitalism. The absence of a theory of state monopoly capitalism in the Comintern is therefore the expression of the polemic against revisionism and the revolutionary proletarian theory of the "collapse". The examination of "state capitalist tendencies" are structurally determined by the prior conceptualisation of the periodisation of capitalism in which "Lenin repeatedly underlines the significance of the intensification of state capitalist tendencies

in the end-phase of the development of capitalism"⁽³⁰⁸⁾. Given the theorisation of the genetical development of capitals, full "state-capitalism" would represent the historical actuality of the foundation of socialism in a stabilised system of capitalism.

3.3.2 State-capitalism

While the Comintern's critique of "organised capitalism" is substantial, its cutting-edge remains primarily at the level of the political in deference to the common theoretical traits that constitute both "organised capitalism" and "monopoly capitalism". This is particularly evident with Bukharin's concept of state capitalism that demonstrates the transformation of these characteristics of monopoly capitalism into a general theory of state monopoly capitalism, a transformation implicit in "Marxism-Leninism" which designates the stabilisation of European capitalism not primarily through the ideological and legitimation-functions of bourgeois states, and the revisionist praxis of the labour movement, but a general theory of state-capitalist economies. This necessarily sustains the ambiguity over the theoretical-formation of Bolshevism and the political accomplishment of the transitional forms of capital. However, the point at issue here, is not that "organised-capitalism" and state-capitalism (in distinction to "state-capitalist tendencies" and Lenin's pre-war concept of state-capitalism and state monopoly capitalism) are identical theories, but that a principal Bolshevik theoretician develops the analysis of imperialism with analogous theoretical constructs.

The fundamental Comintern-critique of Bukharin's concept of state-capitalism is only issued in 1928 with the political renunciation of Bukharin's "Right deviation" and "theoretical deviation"⁽³⁰⁹⁾

under the new tactics of the "destabilisation period" of capitalism, and the reformation of "frontist" class strategies for the European labour movement at the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern.

Bukharin's analysis of state capitalism establishes both the equation of European state capitalism with "organised capitalism" - thereby contradicting the theoretical foundations of the Comintern's strategy, and the proximity of European state capitalism to the model of Soviet socialist construction - thereby implying that the Soviet system assumes characteristics analogous to the structure of imperialist state capitalism⁽³¹⁰⁾. This proximate form of "convergence" theory is derived from the theory-formation of capitals in a rigorous general capital analysis of the developed imperialist forms of the capitalist mode of production in state capitalism.

Bukharin's assessment of the crisis-characteristics of war-capitalism (1915-1920) evolve into a "normal form" of state capitalism. The development of "state capitalist tendencies" not only opposes the "collapse", but receives the general theoretical status of a "higher social formation" than that of "state war-capitalism" with the dissolution of the anarchy of capitals: in the narrow framework of individual state capitalist trusts, the first stage of the war leads to a stage of inner organisation of capitalist relations of production in the sense of planning and organisation of the competing parts of the system. It is not difficult to conceive and pursue the fundamental cause of this re-organisation. The nationalisation of economic functions leads to the abolition of the inner anarchy of production"⁽³¹¹⁾. The concomitant of this is that total social production in European national state capitalisms can be accomplished in a "rational plan" which abolishes general over-production crises through state-capitalist "calculation" of the means of production⁽³¹²⁾. In distinction from

"classical capitalism" and the definition of state capitalism as a product of the contradiction of private appropriation and the socialisation of production⁽³¹³⁾, the new "structure of modern capitalism is of such a kind that collective capitalist organisations emerge as the subject of the economy"⁽³¹⁴⁾, and executors of rationally planned capitalism in state-capitalist trusts.

These "state capitalist relations of production are logically and historically a continuation of finance-capitalist relations"⁽³¹⁵⁾ in a "new type of capitalist relations of production"⁽³¹⁶⁾, established in the theory of the "fusion" (Verschmelzung). As Bukharin argues, "under state capitalism, all separate organs fuse with the bourgeois state"⁽³¹⁷⁾ with the formation of "state capitalist relations of production as collective exploiter"⁽³¹⁸⁾. Compared to the terminal character of imperialism as a "period in which all the essential characteristics of capitalism are fully transcended through its development"⁽³¹⁹⁾, the capacities of state-capitalist relations of production "abolish the social connection of intermediate and small producers' in that all the means of production have been concentrated in the hands of the capitalist state. There matures from now on, state capitalism, the last conceivable form of capitalism"⁽³²⁰⁾.

For Bukharin, this "model" of state capitalism is an "ideal type" social formation distinct from the classical economy of Marx⁽³²¹⁾ which increasingly becomes a real-form⁽³²²⁾ of "organised state capitalism"⁽³²³⁾. The conscious inner-regulation of state capitalist economies is not the realisation of the complete Aufhebung of competition, but rather the intensification of the competition of national capitals on the world-market. As Bukharin contends, "the problem of markets, prices, competition and crises become

increasingly problems of world economy, in that they have been dissolved inside countries through organisation"; the competition of capitals functions primarily through the anarchical structure of world economy as a "blind irrational 'subjectless' system"⁽³²⁴⁾. State capitalism "in its full formation signifies ... the destruction of competition inside capitalist countries and a violent intensification of competition between capitalist states"⁽³²⁵⁾.

The subsequent issue of contention in the conceptualisation of "organised-capitalism" and "state-capitalism" as transitional forms of capitalism is not the periodisation of capitalism, but which periodisation and its signification for the historical development course of European capitalist metropolies. In this respect, both "organised-capitalism" and "state-capitalism" are conceived of as further stages of development of capitalism beyond the monopoly-form and in opposition to the "collapse" of capitals. While the theory of organised-capitalism "effaces the central point in the Leninist conception of imperialism, that monopoly capitalism is a decaying, dying capitalism"⁽³²⁶⁾ and the "final stage of development of the capitalist system ..., the threshold of world socialist revolution",⁽³²⁷⁾ it is equated with state-capitalism because capitalism is not impelled to the "collapse" from its internal contradictions and the constraints to the monopoly-formation of a total social planning construct⁽³²⁸⁾. As Borilin argues, in Bukharin's "state capitalist monopolism, as organised-capitalism, anarchy, crises and similar appearances disappear inside capitalist countries"⁽³²⁹⁾. This is interpreted as a "logical error" in the comparative evaluation of both concepts and the "logical consequence of (Bukharin's) old conception of the imperialist epoch"⁽³³⁰⁾. As Joelson states:

"the present stage of development of the monopoly has led from its anarchical, planless structure into a new phase, into the phase

of organised capitalism .. with planned economic regulation, with the abolition of competition and connected with it, the anarchy of production. Simultaneously, the development stage of capitalism is characterised by the strengthening of state capitalist tendencies. If one compares these tendencies of the present stage of Bukharin's representation of the last phase of capitalism, there is a noteworthy coincidence. In the one case as in the other, the character of the latest phase of capitalism is based upon the Aufhebung of competition and anarchy, upon the dissolution of unorganised capitalism through organised capitalism"⁽³³¹⁾.

Bukharin's concept of state-capitalism is consequently construed within the "theoretical conception of the organisation of capitalism in the framework of the national economy of individual capitalist countries"⁽³³²⁾, and in deference to this, the "collapse" is not connected to the totality of social production relations of the capitalist system⁽³³³⁾.

This formalistic concept of state-capitalism abstracts from the concrete "particularities" (Besonderheiten) of national capitalist economies, especially in respect of the dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie on the inner-conditions of national organised state capitalisms⁽³³⁴⁾. In this respect, the distinction between Bukharin's concept of state-capitalism and the Leninist concept of state monopoly capitalism is fundamental to the class and "crisis characteristics" of capitalist society.

As these "reformist" conclusions result from the inability of "state capitalism" to establish the inner-contradictions of capitalism and the critique of organised-capitalism except by the movement of national capitals on the anarchical world market, state capitalism is

distinguished from the social-democratic theory of Marxism only in relation to Kautsky's "ultra-imperialism" (Überimperialismus).

3.3.3 Ultra-imperialism

The theory of ultra-imperialism extends the "democratic-pacifist illusions of the masses"⁽³³⁵⁾ sustained by the social-democratic praxis of organised-capitalism in the period of the "relative stabilisation" onto the world-economy with analogous implications for the periodisation of world capitalism. This sanctions a new epoch of the expansion of capitals beyond national state boundaries in a peaceful transition to socialism⁽³³⁶⁾ through the anti-crisis relations of national capitals⁽³³⁷⁾. The consequent Aufhebung of the anarchy of capitals on world markets is through a planned organisation of the international direction of capitals in the world economy⁽³³⁸⁾ in contradiction to the law of uneven economic and political development⁽³³⁹⁾.

The Comintern interprets "ultra-imperialism" as a "social utopia of organised capitalism" in which imperialism expands the development of production powers beyond nation states into a world organisation of capitals of a "single world state capitalist trust"⁽³⁴⁰⁾. This social-democratic theory is rejected as another facet of the "imperialist politics of the world bourgeoisie"⁽³⁴¹⁾, and the pacificism and social-chauvinism of the leadership of the labour movement that permits the formation of a world alliance of nation states, and the class collaboration of national capitals in a supra-national world state of capitals⁽³⁴²⁾.

The concept of "ultra-imperialism" therefore contradicts both the classical theory of imperialism with its "ideology of the harmony of interests (Interessenharmonie) of trading nations of the world"⁽³⁴³⁾, and the Leninist concept of the termination of the world accumulation

of capital with the initiation of an epoch of proletarian revolutions. In contradistinction, Kautsky "detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, and makes imperialism a definite politics preferred by finance-capital"⁽³⁴⁴⁾, rather than the necessary political form of imperialist war-capitalism and the intensification of the "unevenness and contradictions inherent in world economy"⁽³⁴⁵⁾.

While Bukharin's concept of imperialist war-economy maintains that the "collapse (Zusammenbruch) of capitalism has begun"⁽³⁴⁶⁾, this is not connected to the inner-development of national state capitalisms, but to the existence of imperialism in the "system-competition" of the General Crisis of Capitalism⁽³⁴⁷⁾. Conversely, the Comintern "confirms the Leninist thesis, that the "collapse" (Zusammenbruch) of capitalism is dependent upon both the internal and external intensification of the contradictions of capitalist systems through the revolutionary struggles of Marxist-Leninists"⁽³⁴⁸⁾. In opposition to the "anti-Marxist theory" of "ultra-imperialism"⁽³⁴⁹⁾, the world expansion of national capitals cannot be harmonised through the law of uneven development of national capitals and the "system contradiction" of capitalism and socialism, but rather expresses the intensification of the contradiction between national state capitals in the structure of world economy and the compulsion of bourgeois societies to imperialist wars and world socialist revolution⁽³⁵⁰⁾.

The Bolshevik critique of capitalism

While Comintern theory has rejected both "organised-capitalism" and "state capitalism", it is important to establish the theoretical basis of the monopoly-capitalist critique when it is itself founded upon an analogous theoretical structure. The Second International problematic of capitals sustains both the subsequent derivation of the social-democratic concept of "organised capitalism" and the

communist concept of "monopoly capitalism". However, the status of "Bolshevik" theory has already been discussed in Lenin's modification of the theory of imperialism and the discussion of "organised capitalism", "ultra-imperialism" and "state-capitalism". We will now assess the status of the communist critique through the monopoly form of capitals.

The problem appears in the concept of imperialism as a "mixed-capitalism" and "mixed capitalism of free competition and monopoly"⁽³⁵¹⁾. This concept establishes the critique of the inner-relations of capitalism through the emphasis of the categories of free competition capitalism. However, this only brings to fruition the insufficient theoretical foundation of the analysis of capitals and a further revision to the theory of imperialism.

The mixed-form of imperialism consists in a combination of contradictory relations of monopoly capitalism-syndicates, cartels, trusts, etc., and pre-monopoly capitalism-exchange relations, the market, competition, the anarchy of capitals, etc.⁽³⁵²⁾. This militates against the theoretical and practical omnipotence of the "monopoly" in that the "assessment that imperialism transcends all the remains of the pre-monopoly epoch is categorically denied by Lenin"⁽³⁵³⁾. Further, the "mixed-form" of capitals approximates a "mixed-system" of the "social regulation of the process of production and distribution" - the socialist planning mechanism under state capitalist despotism, in contradiction to competition, markets and the anarchy of capitalist crises. As Joelson argues, imperialism becomes a "combination of antagonistic principles viz. competition and monopoly, this is the economic essence of imperialism and it is this that is making for the final crash, that is, social revolution"⁽³⁵⁴⁾.

For Lenin, monopoly capitalism in its "highest form does not cease to be a capitalism with all of its characteristics of anarchy in production, planlessness of market relations etc. To the contrary, the higher the scale (Stufenleiter) of capitalism, its accumulated contradictions must increasingly intensify and lead unavoidably to the collapse (Zusammenbruch) of the capitalist system"⁽³⁵⁵⁾. However, this characterisation of Lenin's concept of imperialism represents a significant change of emphasis in the analysis and critique of monopoly-capitalism.

Formerly, the monopoly was defined as the essence of imperialism in distinction to monopoly and competition. This can be seen where Lenin argues that competition belonged to the "old capitalism" and that the "old capitalism has had its day"⁽³⁵⁶⁾. Here, the non-monopoly capitals are progressively excluded from the social accumulation process of capital, especially with the concentration and centralisation of capitals, and the internationalisation of monopoly capitalist production with the competition of capitals on the world market. As monopoly capitalism approximates state capitalism, competition is tendentially eliminated from the analysis of capitals. This analysis informs Comintern theory in 1919⁽³⁵⁷⁾, and is maintained for the transformation of the spontaneity of capitalist development into the "process of decay and dying capitalism"⁽³⁵⁸⁾. However, with the emphasis on the "mixed-form", an ambiguity is introduced into the Bolshevik critique in that monopoly capitalism ceases to unilaterally characterise the total form of capitals. Thereby, the monopoly-periodisation of capitalism cannot exclusively establish the monopoly in its typical features as a "transition to a higher social order" of socialism⁽³⁵⁹⁾, and the characterisation of the "third epoch of capitals", that "capitalism as a whole is found to be on the downward line (abwärtsgehenden)"⁽³⁶⁰⁾.

As the Bolshevnik theory of the "collapse" is now derived from the relation of monopoly and the circulation sphere of competition, Lenin's critique of Kautsky - that the "characteristic feature of imperialism is not industrial but finance-capital"⁽³⁶¹⁾, that "imperialism is inseparably bound up with capitalism"⁽³⁶²⁾ and not a preferred politics of imperialism - cannot be so readily sustained.

Although the "mixed form"⁽³⁶³⁾ relations of imperialism are necessary for the Bolshevnik-critique, the primacy of the Leninist analysis of capitals still guarantees the "monopoly as the ruling factors of the epoch. Next to it remain all the essential characteristics of the pre-monopoly capitalist epoch: competition, anarchy of production"⁽³⁶⁴⁾. Subsequently, Borilin argues that the "root of imperialism lies in the monopolies, in the gigantic growth of the monopoly structure (Monopolgebilde) replacing the capitalism of free competition"⁽³⁶⁵⁾, and Varga, that monopoly capitalism is no longer an "unorganised capitalism"⁽³⁶⁶⁾. The rationale of the Bolshevnik monopoly-critique therefore necessitates the continued importance of competition, without establishing the laws of movement of a "mixed-form" of capitals. This lack of theoretical clarity can also be identified in the comparison of "monopoly capitalism" with the "general cartel" and "ultra-imperialism".

The economic distinction between the "general cartel" or organised capitalism and the "single collective capitalist"/"universal capitalist" of monopoly capitalism is made only quantitatively. While Joelson interprets the formation of a "universal cartel" and an "organised world capitalism ... (as) ... absolutely unmarxist"⁽³⁶⁷⁾, it yet remains economically "conceivable" though "socially and politically untenable"⁽³⁶⁸⁾.

Moreover, when Varga argues in the period of "relative stabilisation"

that the formation of international cartels and trusts diminishes the contradictions of national states on the world market⁽³⁶⁹⁾, this also functions as a concession to the theory of "ultra-imperialism". The theoretical problem in the Bolshevik critique here results from the direct binding of theory and history, of the "essence" and "appearance forms" of capitals in monopoly capitalism. This insufficient theoretical penetration of the laws of movement of the economic substructure of capitalism is expressed in the abstract formulation of the relation of theory and history. As Borilin argues,

it is "completely possible to solve the problem of the decay (Zerfalls) of capitalism from the standpoint of 'pure' theory, because with 'pure theory' one can prove with equal 'ease' both the collapse (Zusammenbruch) of capitalism as also its transformation into an ultra-imperialism or a unified world trust. 'Purely theoretically' it is after-all clear for example, that capitalism develops to a unified world-trust"⁽³⁷⁰⁾.

Both of these concepts can be compared in terms analogous to those of planning and anarchy, monopoly and competition in the proportionalities-disproportionalities of total social production established in Chapter 2, which establishes the limited character to Lenin's critique of capitals. Here we see that both these concepts fail to acknowledge that with the transition to the conscious rule of social relations through the "general cartel" or "universal capitalist", the logical status of the value determination of total social production is abandoned. Revolutionary monopoly capitalism presents the law of uneven development in the "codification" of the appearances of the crisis-cycle of capitals to demonstrate the "collapse" of capitalism, while the "revisionist" organised capitalism presents the expansion-cycle of capitals as a progressive control and regulation of capitalism, and an

abolition of capital-crises⁽³⁷¹⁾.

From their respective theoretical "starting points", both these theories express the surface-appearances of capitals in their cyclical movements, in abstractly determined "linear" processes of capital development. As the categories of "monopoly" and "competition" are mutually exclusive, neither theory is derived from the general laws of movement of the total structure of capitals, and in particular, the crisis-cycle of the over-accumulation of capitals is not expressed in the tendential fall in the general profit rate. The movement of capitals on the world market is still executed under the value-determined relations of competition, and therefore the general law-governed mechanism of capitals⁽³⁷²⁾. In both these concepts, social relations of production are denuded of their capital and class quality, and therefore, the specific character which distinguishes the capitalist from all other modes of production. As neither of these theories of "linear" capital development can theoretically preclude a rational total social subject of accumulation processes, then total social production can be characterised as a "collective capitalist" or a "general-cartel". In this context, Grossmann's critique of the "general cartel" is instructive for it shows that the "collapse (Zusammenbruch) is no longer economically derived, but becomes a political imperative ultimately based upon voluntarism"⁽³⁷³⁾.

The examination of the genesis of monopoly capitalism from the Second International theory leads to two opposed concepts of "transitional capitalism" primarily differentiated by the political evaluation of the interventionist functions of bourgeois states. This generates two models for the conceptualisation of the economic foundations of the transition from capitalism to socialism, in the political forms of transitional state monopoly capitalism or state-socialism. Important conclusions for the world communist movement

follow when the periodisation of the world historical transformation of capitals into imperialism can establish with equal theoretical ability both the Bolshevik theory of the "collapse" of capitals and the social-democratic theory of state-socialism. The subsequent ideological and polemical combat of both social-democratic and Bolshevik theoreticians appears in the structure of the Second International problematic of capitals. This prompts the consideration as to whether the "further-development" of Marxism in both social-democracy and "Marxism-Leninism" can adequately represent the development of capitals both in the "organisation" of capitals, and the "collapse" of capitals under the "primacy of the political" that abrogates the general theoretical form of the historical constitution of capitals. From the initial crisis-theory of disproportionalities in the reproduction schemas of the Second International problematic, the developed forms of capital in bourgeois society appear as both anticipation and actuality of socialist forms of production within the rubric of a "transitional capitalism". If Bolshevism cannot establish the definitive theoretical foundation for its political praxis in the theory of imperialism and European state capitalism, then it must remain susceptible to political voluntarism.

Neither "Marxist-Leninist" nor "social-democratic" theory examine bourgeois domination from the form of social reproduction processes contained in the unfolding of the general laws of the capitalist mode of production. Rather, relations of class domination are interpreted as particularised forms of the relations of power of the proletariat and bourgeoisie in the institutionalised relations of bourgeois state. Here, the relations of class struggle are consequently displaced from the laws of movement of bourgeois society and the internal relations

of mediation that connect the economy to the political⁽³⁷⁴⁾. If the Second International problematic can be interpreted as the theoretical foundation from which both social-democratic and communist theory develops, then Bolshevik politics are only distinguished by the ideological and political requirements that distinguish the Third from the Second International.

These theoretical structures represent the historical tendencies and appearances of the development forms of capitals in two objective structures:

A. Free competition capitalism, organised capitalism/social democratic praxis in the epoch of peaceful transition, socialism.

B. Free competition capitalism, monopoly capitalism/communist praxis in the epoch of imperialist wars and proletarian revolution, socialism.

The corollary of the monopoly-periodisation of transitional capitalism is expressed in the subordination of the analyse of capitals to the political praxis of the Comintern, and the subsequent examination of the revolutionary/counter-revolutionary direction of the labour movement. Insofar as both theories are characterised by the theoretical problematic of the Second International⁽³⁷⁵⁾, they equally articulate the "revolutionary" and "revisionist" political concepts of capital for the praxis of the labour movement. The contrast between "organised capitalism" and "monopoly capitalism" is therefore resolved primarily in the political relations of the Comintern's tactics for the European communist movement.

Lenin's examination of imperialism is governed as much by the general theory of monopoly-capitalism as the basis for the politics of the labour movement and the critique of social-democracy. The reception of Leninist-categories for the analysis of imperialism and

the state in the Third International sustains the periodised structure of the "collapse" of capitalism and the general tendencies this imposes upon the character of the political power of bourgeois states. Here, the bourgeois-democratic republic is transformed into an "imperialist republic", and all state-forms into dictatorships of the bourgeoisie. On the basis of the Comintern's analysis of the relations of economy and political, the problems which an analysis of fascism create for the "theory" of state monopoly capitalism will now be discussed⁽³⁷⁶⁾.

3.4 State monopoly capitalism and fascism

The Comintern's analysis of fascism is undertaken through the imperialist periodisation of capitalism and the analysis of the social relations of bourgeois society under the domination of the monopoly fraction of the total capitalist class. This is distinguished from "free competition capitalism", where the democratic form of social domination of the total bourgeoisie exists in the ascendent epoch of world capitalism, and the bourgeoisie is the historically progressive class⁽³⁷⁷⁾. Conversely, the epoch of monopoly capitalism completes the "civilising tendencies" (Zivilisierenden Tendenzen) contained in the simple concept of capitals (einfachen Begriff des Kapitals)⁽³⁷⁸⁾ which Marx examines in the epoch of industrial capitalism. With the dissolution of this progressive form of capitals in "finance-capitals", the historical perspective which confronts the European labour movement becomes that of the realisation of socialism or the maintenance of European capitalism in repressive forms of "state monopoly capitalism". This creates the expectation that the "normal" democratic forms of political power are confronted with two characteristic types of state-political superstructures on socialised and transitional economic substructures: those of the imperialist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie,

and those of socialist dictatorship of the proletariat. This excludes the "illusory" representation of existing forms of political power in "state socialism" for the conceptualisation of a world of state capitalisms.

However, some sections of the labour movement interpret these relationships in a different manner. On the one hand, Rühle interprets "Soviet socialism" as a Soviet state capitalism, and equates this with fascist state capitalism: there is an "inner congruence of the tendencies of German and Russian state capitalism and their structural, organisational dynamic and tactical identity"⁽³⁷⁹⁾. Conversely, Austro-Marxist Bauer interprets the "October Revolution" as a "bourgeois revolution" and therefore not as the beginning of the destruction of capitalism and the development of socialism. In distinction to the Comintern's analysis of the "General Crisis of Capitalism", Western Europe develops as a democratic state capitalism and a transition stage to socialism⁽³⁸⁰⁾.

Rather, for the Comintern, as monopoly capitalism initiates the historical "collapse" of capitals, the general tendency to "political reaction" confronts the epoch of proletarian revolution with the "counter-revolutionary" politics of fascism. Comintern theoretician Varga argues that the political form of imperialist state capitalism is expressed in the "undermining" (Unterhölung) of bourgeois democratic parliaments and the "unmasking" (Verhüllung) the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie:

"fascism is ... not the opposite of bourgeois dictatorship. It is simply the open form of the dictatorship of capitals whilst bourgeois 'democracy' is its concealed (verhüllte) form"⁽³⁸¹⁾.

Here, fascism appears in Leninist analysis as the priority of "state-types" over the "state-forms" in which the concept of monopoly capital is only accomplished under the actuality of fascist repression:

"parliamentary democracy is the ideology and the form of domination (Herrschaftsform) in ascendant capitalism where the bourgeoisie yet has the belief of being able to represent the interests of the majority of the population: the fascist state, the systematic terror in the interests of capitalists is the adequate form of government in the decline-period where the power of the bourgeoisie is acutely threatened"⁽³⁸²⁾.

This expresses the Comintern's analysis of a gradual transformation of bourgeois states into fascist states through the interventionism of "state capitalist tendencies".

Nevertheless, it does not explain how "state capitalist tendencies" are necessarily connected to the specific political form of fascism in the imperialist epoch. "Fascism" is conceived of as the necessary political form of development of imperialism under the structural determination of capitals and the negation of the contingency of the political forms of bourgeois states. For the Comintern, Lenin's concept of "state war monopoly capitalism" establishes the "model" for the general identification of fascism as a "form of domination of state monopoly capitalism"⁽³⁸³⁾ based upon the economic and political "fusion" (Verschmelzung) of the "leading circles" of industrial and bank/finance - capital with the state apparatus⁽³⁸⁴⁾.

This characterisation of the social functions and class content of "state monopoly capitalism" unfolds within the general political form of monopoly capitalism. Consequently, a theory or analysis of fascism is not necessary for the Comintern because the political form of bourgeois society has already been established in the dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie⁽³⁸⁵⁾. The examination of fascism is undertaken as a translation of the class character of imperialist economy,

the "primacy of the economy"⁽³⁸⁶⁾, on the political. The "fascist state becomes the state of the monopoly, its politics, the concentrated expression of economic relations, that is, the conditions and needs of monopoly power"⁽³⁸⁷⁾, and a "fusion-process between the fascist state apparatus and the monopoly"⁽³⁸⁸⁾. Therefore, the fascist character of the political power of bourgeois states functions as a necessary moment in the monopolised economic reproduction process of capitals for the maintenance of capitalist social relations. This is subsequently given a formal expression:

"the German war-economy must be examined and conceived as the special form of capitalist reproduction, as a specific stage of state monopoly capitalism, and finally, as the war-economy of a fascist regime"⁽³⁸⁹⁾.

Fascism represents the historically monopolised forms of capitalist reproduction processes compelled to approximate "their own concept" in the "fascisation" (Faschisierung) of the political superstructures of bourgeois society. Capital is accumulated through the systematic violence and terror of fascism analogous to the historical period of "original accumulation"⁽³⁹⁰⁾. Equally with the decadence of capitals, the "Nazis" are interpreted as the "auxiliaries of finance-capital"; the "repressive character of monopoly capitalism supported by the power of the state ... that is the economic formula of Nazism"⁽³⁹¹⁾. In the "third epoch of capitals" fascism is a direct agency of finance capital. Here, the characteristics of imperialism remain constant while the agencies of the political power of the monopoly capitalist class are transformed through the "instrumental" control of the political systems, rather than from the relations of social classes in bourgeois society. Consequently, the social and political significance of fascism is reduced when all economic and political systems are interpreted as instrumental functions-mechanisms of the social

reproduction of monopoly capitals. This assessment is of direct relevance for the Comintern's development of a concept of fascism and its function in the "United Front" strategy.

The Bolshevik concept of imperialism and politics in the Comintern leaves communist parties unable to examine the qualitative distinctions between bourgeois-democratic and fascist political power, and their consequent impact upon the European labour-movement. It leads to ambiguity over the evaluation of the political-tendencies within European metropolises which has its origin in the Comintern's assessment of the transformation of revolutionary international Marxism under the "revisionist" social-democratic leadership of the European labour movement and its contribution to the "counter-revolutionary" politics of the international bourgeoisie.

Here, the praxis of "organised-capitalism" in Social-Democratic Parties is interpreted as the principal factor in the dis-unity of the labour movement. The consequent combat against social-democratic "revisionism" in the "United Front" strategy becomes the last obstacle to a genuinely revolutionary labour movement for the destruction of capitalism⁽³⁹²⁾. This is the "tactical" requirement to transform the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. The principal aim of the ideological critique is therefore primarily one of the tactics of Social Democratic Parties.

The subsequent discrediting of the social-democratic leadership through their class collaboration with the bourgeoisie⁽³⁹³⁾ leaves the labour movement amenable to co-optation under the leadership of "Bolshevised" Communist Parties. The concept of fascism develops in the genesis of these relations of the Comintern's critique of social-democracy. On the one hand, the primacy of the "collapse" destroys the

credibility of the anti-crisis capacities of "organised capitalism" and dissipates the economic foundation of the "labour aristocracy", thereby levelling the divisions within the working-class. On the other, the organisational mechanisms of "Bolshevised" Communist Parties are the existing revolutionary instruments with which to unify the labour movement when the "collapse" destroys the ideological and superstructural hegemony of Social-Democratic Parties. This also precipitates a crisis in the ideology and politics of social-democracy with the "fascisation" of democratic republics.

As the "political" is examined under the "agents-theory" of the monopoly bourgeoisie, both social-democracy and fascism are political appearances of the same economic cause: the imperialist bourgeoisie. The Comintern now follows Lenin's "reduction" of all forms of political power in imperialist metropolises to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the direct correlation of all "state-forms, including the fascist state, to a principal "state-type". The analysis of fascism does not contradict the concept of imperialist state monopoly capitalism. Consequently, the "personal union" of the leaders of finance-capital, social-democracy and trade-unions with the imperialist state apparatus makes "social democracy" a complicit component in the "fascisation" of state-capitalist relations. As social-democracy and fascism are equally instruments of the politics of the monopoly bourgeoisie, they are not essentially different systems of political power but interchangeable forms of political domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

Here, the Comintern's concept of 'social-fascism' is an "ideological construct" with which to denounce the political and ideological capitulation of the labour leadership to the bourgeoisie. Consequently, the accentuation of the repressive state apparatus is only considered

under the politics of "Right-wing" Social Democratic Parties, while the defence of bourgeois-democracy is equivalent to that of the "counter-revolutionary" offensive of capital. This establishes the critique of social-democratic political praxis as a superstructural relationship in that the transformation of social-democracy into fascism is a movement confined to political superstructures, and not a social movement. (394)

The Comintern-critique of social-democracy rests on the theory that democracy is a "state-form". This rejects the separation of economy and political under the form of social interaction of bourgeois society with its corollary, that the bourgeoisie do not directly control the political apparatuses of state power (395). The class movement of bourgeois society that leads to the "fascisation" of bourgeois states through the penetration and domination of its institutional relations is subsequently absent from the Comintern's concept of fascism (396). Moreover, with the "equation" of social-democracy and fascism under the "collapse" of capitals, the socialist dictatorship of the proletariat is now confronted with the fascist dictatorship of monopoly capitals as a necessary transition-stage through which the "United Front" strategy of proletarian revolution must pass (397).

The concept of "social-fascism" is therefore both a theory and a tactical expedient in the critique of social-democratic "revisionism". It has two functions. Firstly it is a direct continuation of the Zimmerwald Left's critique of the social-democratic leadership of the labour movement. The limitations of this critique were seen to be confined to the superstructural relations of political parties and capitalist relations of distribution in the economy. It consequently formed a partial critique of capital independently from the totality

of social production relations, and the structuring of class relations through the social reproduction of capital. As a consequence, and this is its second function, it gives expression to the "dogma" and tactical expediency of the direct translation of the Comintern's "general tactical line" into the praxis of Communist Parties. In this respect, Stalin formulates the antecedents of the theory of "social-fascism" in the period of the "relative stabilisation of capitalism" from 1921 to 1928. Fascism and social-democracy are not opposed politics but "twin-brothers" (Zwilligsbruder)⁽³⁹⁸⁾; "social democracy is objectively the moderate wing of fascism - they are not antipodes, they are twins"⁽³⁹⁹⁾. The "relative stabilisation of capitalism" is interpreted by Stalin as a period of "fascisation"⁽⁴⁰⁰⁾ and identification of social-democratic and fascist politics; social-democratic "revisionism" (organised capitalism, ultra-imperialism) acts for a "strengthening of fascism with its moderate social-democratic wing pushed into the forefront"⁽⁴⁰¹⁾.

However, the "relative stabilisation of capitalism" and the "defensive" character of the "United Front" strategy were shown to coincide with the hegemony of the interests of the C.P.S.U. in the Comintern. We now see that this strategy does not qualitatively distinguish the social function and class content of fascism from social-democracy. Therefore, the rise of fascism does not require a new formulation of the class strategy of the European communist movement; to the extent that the "United Front" strategy does not effectively confront the rise of fascism, the Soviet-direction of the Comintern indirectly facilitates the "fascisation" of bourgeois society.

The Comintern's identification of the terminal crisis of European capitals with the end of the "stabilisation of capitalism"⁽⁴⁰²⁾ activates the "collapse" - conditions for the revolutionary unification of the

"proletarian masses" under "Bolshevised" Communist Parties⁽⁴⁰³⁾. As Stalin announces in 1927, the "era of the collapse of capitalism has begun"⁽⁴⁰⁴⁾ which shatters the stabilisation of capitalism⁽⁴⁰⁵⁾. This initiates the "third period" (1928-35) of the "direct offensive" of the European proletariat under the Comintern's theory and tactics⁽⁴⁰⁶⁾. Further we may note that the "destabilisation" of capitalism and the "left-turn" politics of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties coincides: (a) with Stalin's consolidation of the centrist offensive inside the C.P.S.U. against the "Left Opposition"⁽⁴⁰⁷⁾ and the "Right Deviationists"⁽⁴⁰⁸⁾ and (b) the mobilisation of European Communist Parties for the purge of "Right Deviationists" and the reassertion of the class theory of "social-fascism". This class "offensive" character to the "United Front" strategy may be considered in relation to "state capitalism" and the "General Crisis of Capitalism"⁽⁴⁰⁹⁾.

The Comintern characterises the expansion of European capitalism through "techniques and progressive rationalisations, the development of powerful cartels and trusts, and the growing tendency in the most important European countries to state capitalism"⁽⁴¹⁰⁾. But as Varga argues, the anti-crisis state interventionist functions in the economy⁽⁴¹¹⁾ represents a transition from monopoly capitalism to "state war monopoly capitalism ... as ... Lenin calls capitalism in the period of World Wars"⁽⁴¹²⁾. Thereby "state capitalist tendencies" are governed by the critique of "mixed-capitalism"⁽⁴¹³⁾, the inevitability of imperialist wars in the global conditions of the world chain of imperialist capitals and the "fascisation" of capitalist societies. Consequently, as the critique of Bukharin's state capitalism demonstrated, the "collapse" of capitalism is examined conjointly under both the world system relations of the "General Crisis of Capitalism" and the inner-contradictions of monopoly capitalism⁽⁴¹⁴⁾.

Nevertheless, there is evidence to believe that the Comintern has also given priority to the global conditions of capitalism in the formulation of class strategies: (a) because as the "market problem" is the "general problem of capitalism"⁽⁴¹⁵⁾, the contradictions of national state capitalist trusts on the world market not only express the inevitability of imperialist wars but also the impact of the contraction of world capitalist markets in the "system competition" - for "world domination" (Weltherrschaft) by the "world centres" (Weltzentrams) of capitalism and socialism⁽⁴¹⁶⁾ - on the inner capitalist contradiction of production and consumption⁽⁴¹⁷⁾ (b) the consolidation of Soviet interests in the Comintern promotes the interpretation that with the "capitalist encirclement" of the Soviet Union, German imperialism is preparing counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union⁽⁴¹⁸⁾. This sharpens the Soviet perception that state capitalist war construction is facilitated by both social-democratic pacificism, and the fascist suppression of the proletarian masses under the imperialist bourgeoisie as a means for strengthening the inner foundations of monopoly capitalism⁽⁴¹⁹⁾.

From these conjoint standpoints, the Comintern reformulates the Zimmerwald Left's strategy of the conversion of international imperialist wars into national class "civil wars" under the new structural relations of the "system competition" of world capitalism and world socialism. Thereupon, "Bolshevised" Communist Parties are to combat social-democracy in the combined spheres of economics and politics⁽⁴²⁰⁾, and establish a "united front of the workers of advanced countries and the labouring masses of the colonies in order to stave off the danger of war, or if war breaks out, to convert imperialist wars into civil war, smash fascism ... (and) ... overthrow capitalism"⁽⁴²¹⁾.

However, an important result of the Comintern's theory and tactics

leaves Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties unable to formulate an adequate political theory of fascism and class strategy for two principal reasons. Firstly, the theory of imperialism and "state capitalism" purports to determine the objective social conditions under which an "epoch" of international proletarian revolutions occur in the historical development of European capitalist societies. It thereby only gives a "mechanistic" analysis of the general laws of movement of bourgeois society and the national conditions in which the "fascisation" of society and state takes place. Secondly, the commitment to the Stalinist analysis of international proletarian revolution under the "system security" of Soviet socialism as the vanguard of world communism acts as a channel by which the national interests of the Soviet Union are translated into the international class tactics of "Bolshevised" Communist Parties. The effect is to emphasise the international relations of world capitalism and the Soviet Union in the politics of world communism, while discounting the potentiality for an institutionalisation of a fascist system of political power as a qualitatively distinct class system of state power from bourgeois-democratic form of the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie". As Stalin argues in 1928, social-democracy is the "main support of capitalism in the working-class and the chief enemy of communism"⁽⁴²²⁾.

Rather, in the theory of "social fascism" the precipitation of imperialist wars and the creation of a fascist dictatorship assume a "positive" function as an expression of the objective conditions of international proletarian revolution. This characterises the "Stalinist" interpretation of the "civil war" strategy under which the social emancipation of the proletarian masses follows from the destruction of fascism. Consequently, the Comintern's tactics express Soviet interests in the European class offensive against capital and its articulation in the critique of social democracy. As Thälmann argues,

"counter-revolutionary social democracy acts for the defence of capitalism in world wars, and in the revolutionary situation", the capitalist bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union⁽⁴²³⁾. As the "system contradiction" appears as the principal contradiction, the defence of the Soviet Union subsequently enters into the determination of the praxis of European Communist Parties in the strategy of "social-fascism". However, in the period of capitalist "destabilisation", the "social-fascism" thesis expresses an acute under-estimation of fascism, both to the labour movement and the whole of bourgeois society. Moreover, the "United Front" strategy is maintained despite the progressively authoritarian character of bourgeois states:

"imperialist states develop increasingly rigorous methods and means to suppress the revolutionary troupes of proletariats, especially Communist Parties ... These means of suppression ... act for the general intensification of class opposition and the intensification of all forms and methods and class struggle, the increasing use of fascist means of suppression on the side of the bourgeoisie"⁽⁴²⁴⁾.

The "United Front" strategy is composed of a "two front struggle" in which large-sections of the S.P.D. and D.K.P. struggle against fascism and social-democratic "revisionism"⁽⁴²⁵⁾. As the Comintern generalises fascism as the vanguard of international "counter-revolution", so Varga contends that the masses struggle not only for the destruction of the

"fascist form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie but also the power of the bourgeoisie in general. The fascist form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is the last historical form of the power of the bourgeoisie. A permanent return to the democratic form is impossible on account of the intense monopolistic character of capitalism, on account of the fact that in the period of the General Crisis, and especially through the end of the conditions of capitalist stabilisation, the intensification of class opposition and the

proximity of wars"⁽⁴²⁶⁾.

Fascist and proletarian revolution appear simultaneously as historical moments in the analytical representation of imperialist economy in the "third epoch of capitals". With the political interventionism of imperialist states in the epoch of "transitional capitalism", the precedent is created for the perception of the historical alternative of fascist state capitalism to socialism. The imperialist epoch is characterised as one of proletarian revolution, counter-posed to that of international counter-revolution, and the movement of bourgeois society under two principal types of class dictatorship⁽⁴²⁷⁾.

A particular problem which the analysis of fascism creates for the class character of states inheres in the connection of its political function to the class foundation of monopoly capitals. Here, the Comintern rejects the concept of the political form of fascism in the autonomy of state power from the total class of capital. Consequently, Thälheimer's application of Marx's concept of Bonapartism as a "form of open dictatorship of capitals"⁽⁴²⁸⁾ is rejected because it suggests a contradiction between political power and the social domination of total capital, the extreme autonomy of the fascist state from the bourgeoisie. Duly, the autonomy of the state from the bourgeoisie and proletariat appears as a classless power⁽⁴²⁹⁾. Conversely, in Marxist-Leninist theory, monopoly capital dominates both social functions in a unity of economic and political power which maintains its social domination through the "fascisation" of states. Hitler fascism is the marionette of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

However, the contentious nature of the social-fascism thesis⁽⁴³⁰⁾ here consists in the interpretation of fascism as a "particularised" form of "monopoly" politics and an expression of the "collapse" of capitals. It is thereby not accredited with any potential for systematic institutionalisation because it confirms, rather than

contradicts, the Comintern's evaluation that fascism is the last historical form of political power of the bourgeoisie and a transient form of bourgeois state. The subsequent identification of fascism and democracy in the "agents theory" of political systems leads to an inability to defend the democratic achievements of the labour movement from fascist incursions, and the formation of an anti-fascist alliance of Communist and Social-Democratic Parties in a period when the social "power" of the proletariat is being undermined⁽⁴³¹⁾. The generalisation of the "United Front" offensive in turn fails to distinguish between the national particularities of bourgeois society, between fascisms and between "left" and "right" social-democracies, but is sustained by a

"series of simple identifications: capitalism = fascism; economic crisis = political crisis; political crisis = revolutionary crisis; popular revolution as synonymous with proletarian revolution"⁽⁴³²⁾.

The impact of both "social-fascism" and the anti-communist critique of "organised capitalism" is expressed in the two opposed social-praxes which contribute to the organisational dis-unity of the European labour movement. On the one hand, the anti-communist critique of Social Democratic Parties is epitomised by the rejection of the Bolshevik theses on the economic and political "collapse" of capitalism. On the other, the "counter revolutionary" social democratic politics of class conciliation undermines the "natural" allegiance of the "proletarian masses" with communists. This even engenders the view that the "class treason of social-democratic leaders ... (is) ... thus the general cause of the victory of fascism in Germany"⁽⁴³³⁾.

The subsequent recognition by the Comintern, that fascism is a qualitatively different system of political power to that of bourgeois democratic state forms, and functions against Social Democratic and Communist Parties alike necessitates a revision of the strategy of

Comintern. The VII World Congress of the Comintern in 1935 advances a new general programmatic demand for a "broad anti-fascist popular front (Volksfront) on the foundation of a proletarian united front (Einheitsfront)" (434), although the concept of "social-fascism" is not explicitly rejected (435). However, this "re-evaluation" of fascism in European metropolies does not revoke the "United-Front" strategy nor the tactics of the Comintern (436), but rather combines them with the "popular front" strategy. Fascism is now

"not simply the replacement of one bourgeois government through another, but a dissolution of one state-form of class power of the bourgeoisie - bourgeois democracy - through another, through an open terroristic dictatorship ... (of the) ... most reactionary most imperialistic elements of finance-capitals" (437).

With this, a provisional analysis of the class character of fascism is made which designates the class character of the system of state monopoly capitalism through a fraction of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Fascism is both a "symptom of the weakness of the working-class and a result of the betrayal of the working-class by social-democracy", and also a "sign of the weakness of the bourgeoisie, a sign that the bourgeoisie is no longer able to rule by the old methods of parliamentarianism and bourgeois-democracy" (438).

From this mutual "class impotence", the social function of fascist political power is not the result of a social movement of class struggle but the control of political power by the petty-bourgeoisie in the Fascist Party, as a political surrogate for the monopoly bourgeoisie. While class relations are acknowledged, especially with the "immiseration" (Verelendung) of the broad masses of farmers and petty-bourgeoisie which form the social-basis for the rise of the fascist movement" (439), the principal perspective of the class character of

fascism is conferred by the imperialist bourgeoisie. Therefore, the imperialist bourgeoisie is interpreted as the politically dominant class power in which the "agents theory" of fascism construes the "fascisation" of bourgeois states.

However, with the modification of the "United-Front" strategy, it remains unclear as to whether the defeat of proletarian revolution is caused by social-democratic "revisionism" or the special conditions of fascism.

In the conditions of actual fascist dictatorship, the new conception of "alliance-politics" abandons the direct struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the destruction of bourgeois states. Consequently, the defence of the economic and political interests of the labour movement against fascism transforms the political perspective from that of the bourgeois-democratic/fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or socialist dictatorship of the proletariat to that of bourgeois democracy or fascism. Nevertheless, the defence of the democratic republic produces a tactical dilemma of forming an alliance of Communist Parties with the leadership of Social Democratic Parties after the denegation of social-democracy. Further, as the strategy combines the "United Front" and "Popular Front" features⁽⁴⁴⁰⁾, the "Bolshevised" structure of Communist Parties are maintained with Social-Democratic Parties. Therefore, while the "Popular Front" strategy attempts to "rectify" the error of social-fascism with the programmatic demand of the creation of a "new democratic republic"⁽⁴⁴¹⁾, the "United Front" strategy does not abandon the Comintern's prognostication on the "collapse" of capitalism of the imminence of proletarian revolution. Imperialist economy reaches its world historical termination in the monopoly periodisation of capitalism, in which the "fascisation"

of the instrumentalist relations of politics confirms the Comintern's theory of the world economic and political "collapse" of capitalism and the critique of Second International revisionism, even when this is brought into question by the "social-fascism" thesis.

In this Chapter we have examined Lenin's analysis of "state monopoly capitalism" and its subsequent interpretation and development in the inter-war period. The general conclusion to follow from this discussion is that the Comintern has not produced a theory of state monopoly capitalism, precisely because of its adherence to those principles associated with the very raison d'etre of the theory and politics of "Marxism-Leninism". As we have shown, these are formally expressed in the evaluation of "monopoly capitalism" as a crisis theory of capitalism from which the class strategies of the international communist movement are consequently formulated. Given these theoretical and political features of communist orthodoxy, a Marxist-Leninist theory of "state monopoly capitalism" proper is only to be sought after 1945.

CHAPTER 3REFERENCES

1. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 150. Lenin also speaks of the "objective conditions of this epoch - transitional from the consummation of Western European bourgeois and national revolutions to the beginning of socialist revolutions". See 'The Collapse of the Second International', p. 256.
2. V.I. Lenin, 'The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution', LSW, 2, (April 7, 1917), p. 62.
3. See V. Gerratana, 'Lénine critique de Staline', Dialectiques, 6 (Paris, 1974), 3-31 (p. 17).
4. V.I. Lenin, 'Under a False Flag', p. 46.
5. V.I. Lenin, 'The Diskussion on Self-Determination Summed-up', LCW, 22, (July, 1916), p. 326.
6. V.I. Lenin, 'The Tasks of the Proletariat', p. 62.
7. V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution (Peking, 1970), p. 100. First published in August-November, 1917.
8. By "economy and political" we understand the "economic substructure" and "political superstructure" of capitalist society. However, we distinguish "politics" - the subjective actions of individuals designated within the political - from the political - the objective relations of political superstructures.
9. V.I. Lenin, 'The Impending Catastrophy and How to Combat it', LCW, 2, (October, 1917), p. 269.
10. V.I. Lenin, 'A Caricature', p. 43 (emphasis added); 'Imperialism and the Split', p. 106.
11. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 106.
12. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 146.
13. V.I. Lenin, 'Resolution on the Current Situation', LCW, 24, (May 16, 1917), p. 309; 'Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination', LCW, 22 (January-February, 1916), p. 156.
14. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 5 (emphasis added).
15. V.I. Lenin, 'Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution', LSW, 1, (June-July, 1905). As a result, the theory and social content of proletarian dictatorship has no fundamental importance at this stage of Lenin's politics because the political forms of social emancipation in the transition to socialist society are based upon the bourgeois-democratic republic.

16. The transformation of the structure of world capitalist economy creates two important considerations for the reformulation of the international politics of proletarian revolution: (a) it precludes the expansion of the Russian economy on the world market, thereby creating an external limit to the expansion of production powers; (b) it necessitates the inter-imperialist conflicts on the world market, in which the domination of smaller nations by the major West European states is only a means of "artificially retarding the collapse of capitalism" (See: V.I. Lenin, 'The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed-up', /p. 342. Lenin also argues that "reforms" within nation states cannot bring a resolution to the "collapse". 'Proposals Submitted to the Central Committee of the RSDLP to the Second Socialist Conference', LCW, 23, (February-March, 1916), p. 170). In these objective conditions, a "stage" of bourgeois-democratic revolution is no longer possible.
17. V.I. Lenin, 'Position and Tactics of the Socialist International', LCW, 21, (November 1, 1914), p. 39.
18. V.I. Lenin, 'On the Slogan for a United States of Europe', p. 342. Although one should note that this concept is developed within a notion of proletarian international socialism.
19. V.I. Lenin, 'Letter to Inessa Armand', LCW, 35, (December, 1916). Conversely, both Bukharin and Osinskij contend that "state capitalism" is not a possible form of transition from capitalism to socialism but is associated exclusively with the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie". Therefore, they reject the "use" (Ausnutzung) of "state capitalism" in the interests of socialist construction under the politics of proletarian dictatorship. See I.D. Brin, 'Die Ausnutzung des Staatskapitalismus im Interesse des sozialistischen Aufbaus', in Die Entstehung des sozialistischen Weltwirtschaftssystem, Band, 1 (Berlin, 1967), pp. 397-420 (p. 399). First published in Moscow, 1966. Fundamentally, the significance of Bukharin's analysis compared with Lenin's is that the state is interpreted as an apparatus of the bourgeois class, and this contradicts the social-democratic tradition of Western Europe which Lenin's analysis reflects. See on this point H. Löwy, 'La théorie de la révolution chez Boukharine', in Histoire du Marxisme contemporaine, 5 (Paris, 1979), pp. 178-202 (p. 186).
20. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 267.
21. V.I. Lenin, 'Socialist Revolution', p. 157.
22. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 165 (emphasis added).
23. V.I. Lenin, 'Reply to P. Kievsky', LCW, 23, (August-September, 1916), pp. 24-5.
24. V.I. Lenin, 'The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination', LCW, 22, (April, 1916), p. 14.
25. V.I. Lenin, 'A Caricature', p. 51.
26. V.I. Lenin, 'Reply to P. Kievsky', p. 22. See also V. Gerratana, 'op. cit.', (p. 12).

27. V.I. Lenin, 'Letter to Inessa Armand', pp. 266-7 (emphasis added).
28. V.I. Lenin, 'Reply to P. Kievsky', p. 24.
29. V.I. Lenin, 'The Nascent Trend of Imperialist Economics', LCW, 23, (August-September, 1916), p. 13. Lenin is here polemicising against the programmatic demands which reject the Rights to political sovereignty, national self-determination and the opposition to the "minimum programme".
30. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', pp. 15-16.
31. V.I. Lenin, 'Socialist Revolution', p. 159.
32. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 157.
33. V.I. Lenin, 'Lenin to Bukharin', LCW, 35, (September, 1916), p. 231 (emphasis added).
34. V.I. Lenin, 'The Tasks of the Proletariat', p. 76. As Lenin also argues: "comrade Rykov says that there is no period of transition from capitalism to socialism. That is not so. It is a break with Marxism". 'Speech Winding-up the Debate on the Report on the Current Situation', LSW, 2, (April 24, 1917), p. 106.
35. See F. Engels, 'Einleitung zu Marx' Bürgerkrieg in Frankreich', MEW, 22, p. 119.
36. V.I. Lenin, 'Reply to P. Kievsky', p. 26 (emphasis added).
37. V.I. Lenin, 'On the Slogan', p. 155.
38. V.I. Lenin, 'The Youth International', LCW, 23, (December, 1916), p. 165 (emphasis added).
39. V.I. Lenin, 'Socialist Revolution', p. 157 (emphasis added).
40. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 159.
41. This proposition is of greater significance for early Twentieth Century European democracies.
42. V.I. Lenin, 'The Tasks of the Proletariat', p. 63.
43. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 62. While Lenin argues that the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is an "entirely different kind of power from the one that generally exists in the parliamentary bourgeois republics" ('The Dual Power', LSW, 2, (April 9, 1917), p. 48), we will subsequently examine the problems involved in this analysis.
44. This aspect of the relationship of society and state is first undertaken in Marx's "early writings" and later developed under the critique of political economy.

45. See P.K., for Lenin's evaluations of the "Commune", Leninismus, p. 180.
46. V.I. Lenin, 'The Tasks of the Proletariat', p. 62.
47. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 232.
48. Marx argues that the working-class cannot appropriate existing state institutions. See "Bürgerkrieg", p. 336. However, compare this with M. Löwy, La Théorie de la révolution chez le jeune Marx (Paris, 1970), pp. 176-7.
49. V.I. Lenin, 'Letter to Inessa Armand', LCW, 35, (February 3, 1917), p. 284.
50. V.I. Lenin, 'Reply to P. Kievsky', p. 25 (emphasis added).
51. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', (p. 25).
52. Moreover, we consider that the concept of a "labour aristocracy" cannot be generalised for the labour movement from a specific historical period.
53. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des Kapitalismus und des Sozialismus, (Berlin, 1977), p. 307.
54. See L. Trotsky and E. Varga, The International Situation. A Study of Capitalism in Collapse (London, 1921), p. 10; 'Le troisième Congrès de L'Internationale Communiste, Juin 1921' in Manifestes, pp. 85-149 (p. 86). The Comintern rejects a "new prolonged epoch of the re-establishment and aggrandizement of capitalism", (p. 85).
55. H. Weber, Marxisme et Conscience de Classe (Paris, 1975), pp. 246-7.
56. Lenin's arguments here are repeated in contemporary literature. See P. Hess, 'Aktuelle Lehren aus der Entstehungsgeschichte der Leninischen Imperialismustheorie', JWG, 4 (1974), 13-25 (p. 16).
57. V. Garrantana, 'op. cit.', (p. 18).
58. L. Basso, 'Attualita di Lenin: "Stato e Rivoluzione" cinquant'anni dopo', PS, 26 (1968), 34-46 (pp. 37-8).
59. V.I. Lenin, The State (Peking, 1970), p. 18.
60. V.I. Lenin; 'Letter to Armand', p. 289; 'Letter to Kollontai', LCW, 35, (February 17, 1917), p. 286.
61. Compare with S. Cohen, Bukharin and the Bolshevik Revolution (London, 1974), p. 40.
62. V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, p. 33.
63. V.I. Lenin, 'Letter to Kollontai', pp. 291-2.
64. V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, p. 126.
65. V.I. Lenin, Preface to Imperialism and World Economy (July 6, 1920).

66. V. Gerratana, 'op. cit.', (p. 10).
67. V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, p. 7.
68. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 41.
69. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 7.
70. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 7.
71. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 9.
72. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 11.
73. See S. Cohen, Bukharin and the Bolshevik Revolution, p. 42.
74. See V.I. Lenin, 'op. cit.', p. 19; 'Letters from Afar', LCW, 23, (March, 1917), p. 325.
75. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', pp. 50-1.
76. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 50 (emphasis added).
77. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 51.
78. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 51.
79. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 119.
80. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 119.
81. See V.I. Lenin, 'Socialism and War', LCW, 21, (July-August, 1915), p. 301.
82. V.I. Lenin, 'Programme Amendments to the Doctrinal, Political and other Sections of the Programme', LCW, 24, (April-May, 1917), p. 459.
83. V.I. Lenin, 'Speech in Favour of the Resolution on the Current Situation', LCW, 24, (April 28 - May 12, 1917), p. 306; 'Left-Wing Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality', LSW, 2, (May 5, 1918), p. 695.
84. V.I. Lenin, 'War and Revolution', LCW, 24, (May 14, 1917), p. 403. At this stage all references to "state capitalism", "state monopoly capitalism", and "state-capitalist tendencies" in the "Bolshevik" analysis of capitalist societies are synonymous.
85. Lenin also perceives the potential for social reforms which the new functions of state capitalism perform with the change from the world politics of imperialist wars to international peace. Here they function as a means by which the monopoly bourgeoisie retain state-power without a "revolutionary insurrection against the whole network of imperialist world relations". See V.I. Lenin, 'A Turn in World Politics', LCW, 23, (January 31, 1919), p. 267, 268.

86. V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, p. 120 (emphasis added). Examples of these apparatuses are the postal service, railways, big factories, large-scale commerce and banking. Moreover, the postal service is given as an example of a "socialist economic system".
87. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 59 (emphasis added).
88. V.I. Lenin, 'Theses for an Appeal to the International Socialist Committee and all Socialist Parties', LCW, 23, (January 7, 1917), p. 210.
89. See V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, pp. 80-1.
90. See E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung und der Theorie vom "organisierten Kapitalismus"', in Die Krise, pp. 11-41. First published in 1929; L. Leontjew, 'Der "organisierte Kapitalismus" und die "Wirtschaftsdemokratie"', UBM, 3 (1929), 660-687 (p. 676).
91. V.I. Lenin, 'op. cit.', pp. 119-20.
92. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 120.
93. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 116.
94. See: W. Tristram, 'Staat und Revolution', (p. 272); L. Libertine, 'Der neue Autoritarismus', IMD, 2 (1970), 16-32 (p. 21).
95. W.I. Lenin, 'Staat und Revolution', LS, 2, p. 81. Lenin also argues later against Kautsky: "while the preparatory work for the proletarian revolution, the formation and training of the proletarian reserve army were possible (and necessary) within the framework of the bourgeois-democratic state, now that we have reached the stage of "decisive battles", to confine the proletariat to this framework means betraying the cause of the proletariat, means being a renegade". 'The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky', LCW, 28, (October-November, 1918), pp. 261-2.
96. V.I. Lenin, 'The Proletarian Revolution', pp. 261-2.
- 96a. V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, p. 119.
97. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', pp. 83-4.
98. V.I. Lenin, 'Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution', LCW, 33 (October 14, 1921), p. 280.
99. V. Gerratana, 'op. cit.', (p. 12, 13).
100. This is also interpreted as "general theory". As Colletti has argued, Lenin's critique of bourgeois democracy remains "within the horizons of Rousseau's thought". L. Colletti, From Rousseau to Lenin (London, 1972), p. 186.
101. V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, p. 106 (emphasis added).
102. Compare with H. Gerstenberger, 'op. cit.', (p. 133n. 38).

103. V.I. Lenin, 'op. cit.', p. 44.
104. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 21 (emphasis added).
105. See C. Bettelheim, Les Luittes des Classes en U.S.S.R. 1917-23 (Paris, 1974), p. 422.
106. L. Colletti, 'Macht und Demokratie in der sozialistischen Gesellschaft', IMD, 2 (1970), 5-15 (p. 9). See also K. Kautsky, The Socialist Republic (New York, 1913), p. 7.
107. See U. Santamaria and A. Manville, 'Lenin and the Problem of Transition', Telos, 27 (Spring, 1976), 79-96.
108. See C. Claudin, Lénine et la révolution, pp. 86-8.
109. V.I. Lenin, 'Impending Catastrophy', p. 694.
110. V.I. Lenin, 'Can the Bolsheviks Retain State-power?', LSW, 2, pp. 408-9.
111. See V.I. Lenin, 'Bericht über das Parteiprogramm auf dem VII Parteitag der K.P.R.(B.)', LS, 2, (19 März, 1919), pp. 232-5.
112. V. Gerratana, 'op. cit.', (p. 25).
113. We consider that the "populist" character to Lenin's theory of the democratisation and utilisation of bourgeois state institutions contributes to the explanation of the absence of an analysis of the role of the vanguard Communist Party in state and revolution.
114. V.I. Lenin, 'Left-Wing Childishness', pp. 694-5 (emphasis added). For Lenin, Soviet Russia is to develop to socialism through the structures of state capitalism. As Mattick argues, "the accomplishment of a state-capitalist economy in Russia was therefore, according to Lenin's meaning, only the anticipation of the actual movement of capitals". P. Mattick, 'Die Unvermeidbarkeit', (pp. 33-4).
115. V.I. Lenin, 'Left-Wing Communism', p. 695.
116. P.K., Leninismus, p. 441.
117. V.I. Lenin, 'The Proletarian Revolution', p. 300; 'The Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat', LCW, 30, (October 30, 1919), p. 115. Therefore, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is not synonymous with the abolition of all classes but is itself a specific form of class struggle. ('ibid.', p. 115). Moreover, since it exists within the concept of a transitional period of "dying capitalism and nascent communism" ('ibid.', p. 107), it expresses the economic and political problems we have already identified in Lenin's concept of transition.

118. As Berger argues, such a "conception étatique de l'économie représente un véritable point aveugle chez Lénine".
C. Berger, 'Faut-il détruire l'État', Politique Aujourd'hui, 5 (Paris, 1971), 63-80; 6 (Paris, 1971), 63-81 (p. 77).
119. V.I. Lenin, 'Resolution on the Current Situation', p. 310.
120. K. Kautsky, The Road to Power (Chicago, 1909), pp. 27-8.
121. P. Mattick makes this point in 'Die Unvermeidbarkeit', (p. 35).
122. See H. Gerstenberger, 'Elemente', (p. 127). Compare this with L. Magri, 'L'État et la Révolution Aujourd'hui', LTM, 266 (1968), 388-430 (p. 398).
123. Consider here M. Wirth, Der Kapitalismustheorie in der D.D.R. (Frankfurt, 1973), p. 22.
124. V.I. Lenin, 'Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme', LCW, 24, (April-May, 1917), p. 464. However, this also has the connotation of a "social formation" with the combined characteristics of capitalism and socialism. See C. Glucksmann, 'Modo de Produccio, Formacion Economica de Lenin', Economica y Ciencias Sociales, 1-4 (Buenos Ayres, 1974), 79-96.
125. W.I. Lenin, 'Bericht über das Parteiprogramm', (p. 223).
126. A.K., Klassenkampf, Tradition, Sozialismus (Berlin, 1974), p. 424.
127. W.I. Lenin, 'Fünf Jahre russische Revolution und die Perspektiven der Weltrevolution. Bericht auf dem IV Kongress der Kommunistischen Internationale', LS, 2, (13 November, 1922), p. 382. See also D. Jordan, 'Der Imperialismus', (p. 232).
128. There are two standpoints to be considered here. On the one hand, Lenin suggests the necessity for an "economic" stage of transition to socialism in Russian when he argues that "economically", state capitalism is immeasurably superior to our economic system". 'Left-Wing Childishness', LCW, 27, (May 5, 1918), p. 339. Further: "petty-bourgeois capitalism prevails in Russia, and it is one and the same road that leads from it to both large-scale state capitalism and to socialism, through one and the same intermediary station called 'national accounting and control of production and distribution'", 'ibid.', p. 240. On the other, for the West, Lenin's analysis is directed to the stages in the political conditions of socialist revolution, expressed in the theory and tactics of the Second World Congress of the Third International.
129. 'Le deuxième Congrès de L'Internationale Communiste, Juillet, 1920', in Manifestes, Thèses et Résolutions de Quatre Premiers Congrès Mondiaux de L'Internationale Communiste 1919-23 (Paris, 1972), pp. 37-81 (pp. 38-41). First published by the Bibliotheque Communiste Libraire du Travail in 1934. The formation of the Third International is not simply a question of the revolutionary status of the ideology and politics of

129. (Continued)

vanguard Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties in Western Europe, but the legitimation of the Bolshevik Revolution for the political structure of proletarian internationalism, and therefore its defence from the "counter-revolutionary" social-democratic (and Menshevik) critique.

130. Lenin advances these tactics in 'Aus dem Buch: Der "Linke Radikalismus", die Kinderkrankheit im Kommunismus', LS, 2, (April-Mai, 1920).

131. 'Le deuxième Congrès', (p. 49).

132. The concept of "deviations" follows from the acceptance of a general tactical line in the Comintern and the adherence to it by Communist Parties under the "21 conditions".

133. The general propositions advanced by the Comintern under Lenin for the world communist movement oppose both the various forms of "council communism" and the "Luxemburghist Wing" of the German labour movement. The spontaneity of class praxis which they express contradicts the Marxist-Leninist concept of class organisation under "Bolshevised" Communist Parties.

134. 'Le premier Congrès de L'Internationale Communiste, Mars, 1919', in Manifestes, pp. 3-34 (p. 3).

135. 'Notice Historique', in Manifestes, pp. VII-XV (p. VIII).

136. V.I. Lenin, 'A Caricature', p. 60.

137. 'Le deuxième Congrès', (p. 18).

138. V.I. Lenin, 'The Military Programme', LSW, 1, (September, 1916), p. 770.

139. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 773.

140. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 775.

141. 'Le premier Congrès', (p. 3).

142. 'ibid.', (p. 3).

143. 'Historique Notice', (p. X).

144. 'Le quatrième Congrès de L'Internationale Communiste, Novembre, 1922', in Manifestes, pp. 115-210 (p. 157).

145. 'Le troisième Congrès', (pp. 86-93).

146. L. Leontjew, 'Der "organisierte Kapitalismus"', (p. 60). "Organised capitalism" is an influential theory developed in the German labour movement which establishes the possibility of transforming capitalism into socialism through the "democratisation" of the economic and political structures of bourgeois society. We are concerned with this analysis only to the extent by which it creates an alternative interpretation

146. (Continued)

of Marxist economic and political theory to that advanced by Marxism-Leninism. We will subsequently develop its significance for the theories of "monopoly capitalism" and "state monopoly capitalism".

147. O.K. Flechtheim, Le parti communiste allemand sous le république de Weimar (Paris, 1972), p. 105. First published in Offenbach, 1948.

148. The Sixth World Congress of the Communist International (London, 1928). This takes place July-September, 1928.

149. As Korsch notes, "Leninist theory is not theoretically capable of answering the practical needs of the international class struggle in the present period". K. Korsch, Marxism and Philosophy (London, 1972), pp. 132-3. First published in Leipzig, 1923.

150. Here, Lenin draws upon the traditional concept of the vanguard Party. See 'What is to be Done', LCW, 5, (March, 1902), pp. 421-2.

151. The proposition contained in this relationship is that "socialist class consciousness" is not spontaneously produced from within the labour movement ('ibid.', p. 383). Its renewed significance for Leninism appears in the theory and tactics of the proletariat after the October Revolution and the collapse of the Second International. Here Lenin argues that, "Bolshevism has created the ideological and tactical foundations of a Third International ..." ('The Proletarian Revolution', LCW, 28, pp. 272-3), and that "Bolshevism can serve as a model of tactics for all".

152. 'Historique Notice', (p. XIII).

153. W.I. Lenin, 'Aus dem Buch: Der "Linke Radikalismus"', pp. 330-339.

154. See P. Mattick, 'Otto Rühle und die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung', in Spontaneität und Organisation. Vier Versuch über praktische und theoretische Probleme der Arbeiterbewegung (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 7-39 (p. 20).

155. 'Die Dritte Internationale und ihre Platz in der Geschichte', LS, 2, (Mai, 1919), p. 296.

156. 'Le deuxième Congrès', (p. 20).

157. The 'United Front' strategy leads to two contrasting responses by sections of the European labour movement which both provide the premises for a critique of the Comintern's tactics for European Communist Parties. The first, expressed by Korsch, Pannekoek, Gorter and Bordiga for example, opposes the politics of a "revolutionary parliamentarianism" introduced at the Second Congress of the Third International. This is because where the bourgeois-democratic revolution is historically progressive against feudal society as in Russia, parliamentary action by the working class is a necessary preparatory stage in the conquest of political power. Conversely, in Western

157. (Continued)

Europe where the bourgeois-democratic revolution has been accomplished and is therefore no longer historically progressive, class struggles must be formulated in terms of immediate socialist revolution. Consequently, the Comintern's tactics of a "revolutionary parliamentarianism" are seen as failing to confront the fundamental problem of creating a revolutionary Communist Party independent of the ideology and politics of bourgeois parliamentary democracy. Its significance shows that the Comintern has not fully considered the impact of "parliamentary democracy" on the Western European socialist movement. Therefore, this is not simply a question of generalising the Bolshevik's politics and ideology for Russia to Western societies, but the Bolshevik's understanding of the relation between the bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolution. The second, characterised by Gramsci, develops the Comintern's tactics but interprets them as an alternative to the definitive model of Bolshevik politics. In contradistinction, this response directs the class struggles of the European communist movement to the terrain of political superstructures.

158. 'Le troisième Congrès', (pp. 160-1).
159. 'Le premier Congrès', (p. 18). The next three congresses of the Third International consider: "le générale décomposition du capitalisme", 'Le deuxième Congrès', (p. 54); that it is "incontestable qu'à l'époque où nous vivons, la courbe de la développement capitaliste est, d'une façon générale, descendante avec des mouvements passagers de relèvement, la courbe de la révolution est montante avec quelques fléchissements", 'Le troisième Congrès', (p. 93); that "l'écroulement du capitalisme est inévitable", 'Le quatrième Congrès', (p. 155).
160. For a discussion on Lenin's concept of the Party see H. Asseln, Darstellung und Kritik philosophischer und politischer-soziologischer Ansätze des "Projekt Klassenanalyse" (Köln, 1979).
161. See: R. Luxemburg, 'Zur Russische Revolution', in Rosa Luxemburg. Werke, 4 (Berlin, 1970), pp. 332-353, first published in 1922; A. Gramsci, 'Note sul Machiavelli', in Opere in Antonio Gramsci (Turino, 1947), pp. 3-7.
162. See H. Weber, 'Stalinismus. Zum Problem der Gewalt in der Stalin era', in Entstalinisierung. Der XX Parteitag der K.P.d.S.U. und seine Folgen, (Frankfurt, 1977), pp. 263-284. Herausgegeben von R. Crusius and M. Wilke.
163. Stalin's interpretation of "dialectical materialism" also militates against the philosophical variants of Marxist philosophy which have a "praxis"-connotation of "self-emancipation". See K. Korsch, Marxism and Philosophy; G. Lukacs, History and Class Consciousness (London, 1971). First published in 1922.
164. J. Stalin, 'Unterredung mit der ersten amerikanischen Arbeiter-Delegation', PL, 5a, (September, 1927), p. 10.
165. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 10.

166. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 10. See also E. Thälmann, 'Für den Sieg des Sozialismus in der Sowjetunion', in Über proletarianischen Internationalismus (Leipzig, 1976), pp. 42-55 (p. 47). First published in Dezember, 1926.
167. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 15.
168. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 15.
169. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 10.. See also E. Thälmann, 'op. cit.', (p. 46).
170. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 9.
171. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 15.
172. L. Trotsky und E. Varga, The International Situation, p. 20. See also J. Stalin, 'Political Report of the Central Committee to the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)', SCW, 12, (June 27, 1927).
173. L. Leontjew, 'Der "organisierte Kapitalismus"', (p. 675.
174. J. Stalin, 'Unterredung mit der ersten amerikanische Arbeiter-Delegation', PL, 5a, (9 September, 1927), pp. 10-11. As Stalin argues, "the service of Lenin, and consequently that which is new with Lenin, consists here in that he supports the fundamental theses of Kapital in a deeply grounded Marxist analysis of imperialism, ... and discloses the conditions of unavoidable decline (Unterganges). On the basis of this analysis stands the acknowledged principle of Lenin's that under the relations of imperialism, the victory of socialism is possible in one country".
175. J. Stalin, 'The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists', SCW, 6, (December 17, 1924), p. 416.
176. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 415.
177. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 415.
178. At this point, 'Marxism-Leninism' is characterised by the features of "Soviet Marxism" under Stalin and the formalisation of Leninism in the Third International.
179. See J. Stalin, 'Results of the Work', SCW, 7, (May 5, 1925), p. 102.
180. J. Stalin, 'The Seventh Enlarged Plenum of the E.E.C.I.', SCW, 9, (November 22 - December 16, 1926), 91.
181. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 91.
182. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 108.
183. L. Trotsky, 'La révolution permanente', cited in Trotsky Marxiste, D. Avenas, (Paris, 1971), p. 14.
184. J. Stalin, 'The October Revolution', p. 415.
185. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 392.

186. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 415.
187. J. Stalin, 'The Fourteenth Congress, C.P.S.U.', SCW, 7, (December, 1925), pp. 258-9.
188. J. Stalin, 'The International Character of the October Revolution', Leninism (London, 1940), p. 201. First published June 6-7, 1927.
189. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', (emphasis added).
190. See E. Varga, 'Die ersten zehn Jahre der Niedergangsperiode des Kapitalismus', in Die Krise, pp. 67-79 (p. 74).
191. J. Stalin, 'The Results of the Work of the Fourteenth Conference of the R.C.P.(B.)', SCW, 7, (May 9, 1924), p. 94.
192. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 96.
193. See O.K. Flechtheim, Le parti communiste, p. 153.
194. J. Stalin, 'op. cit.', pp. 96-7.
195. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 103.
196. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 102.
197. J. Stalin, 'Politischer Bericht des Z.K. auf dem 15 Parteitag der K.P.d.S.U.', PL, 5a, (Dezember, 1927), pp. 107-111. Here Stalin identifies the primacy of the "system contradiction". See also J. Stalin, 'Bericht auf der Leningrader Parteiarbeiterversammlung', PL, 5a, (vom 13 Juli, 1928), p. 210.
198. This forms the basis of the Comintern's interpretation of the "politics of peaceful co-existence" under Stalin and their subsequent formalisation in the theory of the "General Crisis of Capitalism". See J. Stalin, 'The Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)', SCW, 10, (December 2-19, 1927), p. 295.
199. Therefore in this regard, the "collapse" of capitalism is considered from the inner-contradictions of monopoly capitalism and their significance for class struggle.
200. Thälmann gives a striking example of how the acceptance of the concept of "relative stabilisation" can function for a critique of "ultra-deviations". See E. Thälmann, 'Niemand kann uns in Gegensatz zur Kommunistischen Internationale bringen', in Über proletarianischen, pp. 31-35 (pp. 32-3). However, on Thälmann's understanding of the "Bolshvisation" tactics of Communist Parties see M. Höfer, 'Ernst Thälmann und einige Fragen der Gewerkschaftspolitik der KPD in der Zeit der relativen Stabilisierung des Kapitalismus', WZFSUJ, 10 (1960-61), 175-179.
201. J. Stalin, 'The Results of the Work', p. 94.
202. See W. Leonard, Sowjet-ideologie heute (Frankfurt, 1962), p. 111, 137.

203. Lenin argues that "proletarian internationalism demands that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country be subordinated to the interests of that struggle on a world-wide scale". See: 'Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and Colonial Questions', LCW, 31, (June, 1920), p. 148; 'Better Fewer but Better', LCW, 33, (March 2, 1923).
204. V.I. Lenin, 'Third All-Russian Congress of the Communist International', LCW, 26, (June-July, 1921), p. 454.
205. See F. Claudin, La Crise du Mouvement Communiste I and II (Paris, 1972), Tome II, p. 701.
206. 'The Sixth World Congress', (September 1, 1928), p. 1754.
207. 'ibid.', (July 30, 1928), p. 1727. See also L. Trotsky, The First Five Years of the Comintern, 2, second edition, (New York, 1972), p. 80.
208. J. Stalin, 'The October Revolution', p. 415; N. Bucharin, Der Imperialismus, p. 117, 123.
209. J. Stalin, 'The Fourteenth Congress', p. 268.
210. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 294. Bukharin calls this the "cardinal further contradiction" in Der Imperialismus, p. 123.
211. J. Stalin, 'Political Report of the Central Committee of the XVI Congress C.P.S.U.(B.)', SCW, 12, (July 27, 1930), p. 262.
212. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 253.
213. E. Varga, 'Die ersten zehn Jahre', (p. 67).
214. J. Stalin, 'Fragen', (p. 48).
215. E. Varga, 'Die Krisentheorie', (p. 200).
216. J. Stalin, 'Politischer Bericht der Zentral Komitee. Auf dem 15 Parteitag der K.P.d.S.U.', PL, 5a, (3-7 Dezember, 1927), p. 99.
217. F. Claudin, Die Crise, Tome II, p. 701; P. Mattick, 'Anti-Bolshevism', Telos, 26 (1975-6), 57-69 (p. 66).
218. See also E. Thälmann, 'Die Krise des Kapitalismus', in Über proletarianischen (5 October, 1932), pp. 160-167 (p. 160).
219. P. Lapinski, 'Der "Sozialstaat". Etappen und Tendenzen seiner Entwicklung', UBM, 2 (1928), 377-418 (p. 382).
220. R. Hilferding, 'Probleme der Zeit', in Die Gesellschaft, 1 (1924), 1-17 (p. 7).
221. R. Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, p. 429.
222. L. Leontjew, 'Der "organisierte Kapitalismus"', (p. 667).
223. R. Hilferding, 'Probleme', (p. 3).

224. R. Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, p. 372.
225. E. Bernstein, Voraussetzungen, p. 70, 76.
226. R. Hilferding, 'Probleme', (p. 2).
227. R. Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, p. 295 (emphasis added). Also see E. Bernstein, Voraussetzungen, pp. 16-7.
228. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', p. 474.
229. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', p. 473.
230. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', p. 473.
231. R. Hilferding, 'Probleme', (p. 2).
232. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', (p. 2).
233. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', (pp. 2-5); Das Finanzkapital, p. 424. See also G. Pietranera, 'R. Hilferding und die ökonomische Theorie der Sozialdemokratie', IMD, 48 (1974), 5-72.
234. R. Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, p. 295.
235. K. Renner, Marxismus, Krieg und Internationale (Stuttgart, 1917), p. 19.
236. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 31).
237. R. Hilferding, cited in 'Zur Marx-Rezeption bei Hilferding - Die Bestimmung von Konkurrenz und Monopol im Finanzkapital', in Monopol und Staat, R. Schimkowsky, pp. 173-211 (pp. 279-80).
238. P. Merker, Sozialdemokratie und Gewerkschaften 1890-1920 (Berlin, 1949).
239. L. Leontjew, 'Der "organisierte Kapitalismus"', (p. 666).
240. W. Gottschalch, 'Développement et Crise du Capitalisme dans la Pensée de Rudolph Hilferding', in Histoire, pp. 11-47 (p. 37).
241. R. Hilferding, Die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie in der Republik. Parteitag zu Kiel, Mai 1927 (Bibliothek, Humbolt Universität, Berlin), p. 3.
242. See R. Luxemburg's assessment of Bernstein's theory, 'Sozialreform', (p. 338).
243. R. Hilferding, 'op. cit.', p. 5.
244. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 37 (emphasis added).
245. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 150.
246. R. Hilferding, 'Probleme', (p. 6).
247. While this proposition relates specifically to the theorists of "organised capitalism" and "state socialism", we have also considered its relevance for "monopoly capitalism".

248. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 26). See also P. Lapinski, 'op. cit.', (p. 283).
249. R. Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, p. 243.
250. R. Hilferding, 'Probleme', (p. 3).
251. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', (p. 7).
252. See: E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 37); 'Die grosse Krise und ihre politischen Folgen-Wirtschaft und Politik 1928-1934', in Die Krise, pp. 231-261 (pp. 234-5).
253. R. Hilferding, 'op. cit.', (p. 3).
254. On this concept see: H. Cunow, Die Marxsche Geschichte-Gesellschaft und Staatstheorie. Grundzüge der Marxschen Soziologie (Berlin, 1920-1), pp. 337-42; K. Kautsky, Das Erfurter Programm (Stuttgart, 1892), pp. 129-31.
255. R. Hilferding, 'Probleme', (p. 13).
256. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', (p. 12). See also V. Granow and M. Krätke, 'Thesen zur politischen Theorie im Austromarxismus', Eurokommunismus und marxistische Theorie der Politik, DA, 44, herausgegeben vom Arbeitskreis Westeuropäische Arbeiterbewegung (Berlin, 1979), pp. 103-122. Recognition is given to the 'Austromarxists' in the Comintern but this less as Marxist theorists than "revisionist" theorists of Second International social democracy. See E. Varga, 'Die Änderung in den Methoden der Diktatur der Bourgeoisie', in Die Krise, pp. 337-370 (pp. 349-51).
257. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', (p. 12).
258. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', (p. 12).
259. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', (p. 10).
260. H. Kelsen, 'Marx oder Lassalle. Wandlungen in der politischen Theorie des Marxismus', in Archiv, XI (1965), pp. 261-98 (p. 267). First published in Leipzig, 1925.
261. H. Kelsen, 'ibid.', (p. 267).
262. R. Hilferding, 'Probleme', (p. 12).
263. R. Hilferding, Die Aufgaben, p. 8.
264. R. Hilferding, 'ibid.', (pp. 8-11).
265. See H. Kelsen, 'op. cit.', (p. 291); 'Sozialismus und Staat. Eine Untersuchung der politischen Theorie des Marxismus', in Archiv, IX (1965), pp. 1-129 (pp. 30-33). First published in Leipzig, 1921.
266. H. Kelsen, 'ibid.', (p. 288).
267. H. Kelsen, 'ibid.', (p. 273).

268. R. Hilferding, 'op. cit.', p. 2.
269. See here H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations, p. 604.
270. P. Lapinski, 'Der "Sozialstaat"', (p. 382).
271. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 36).
272. E. Varga, 'ibid.', (p. 35). Formerly, Hilferding had called this the "dictatorship of capital magnates (Kapitalmagnaten)" in Das Finanzkapital, p. 477.
273. L. Leontjew, 'Der "organisierter Kapitalismus"', (p. 675).
274. P. Lapinski, 'op. cit.', (p. 679).
275. E. Varga, 'Die erfolglosen Versuche zur künstlichen Überwindung der Krisen', in Die Krise, pp. 278-289 (p. 288).
276. L. Leontjew, 'op. cit.', (p. 674).
277. This assumes that the social domination of capital in "free competition capitalism" was made effective by the operation of the market mechanism of private capitalism, while monopoly capitalism signifies the dissolution of this model of capital accumulation with the combination of economic and political relationships in the monopoly structure of capitalism.
278. Lapinski argues that this "monstrous growth of economic and "social" functions of states in the hands of social-democracy is the strongest arm for the demoralisation of the labouring-masses". 'Der "Sozialstaat"', (p. 388). See also L. Leontjew, 'op. cit.', (p. 679).
279. L. Leontjew, 'Der "organisierte Kapitalismus"', (p. 679).
280. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 37).
281. See J. Stalin, 'Plenum of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.)', SCW, 11, (July 4-12, 1928), p. 150.
282. J. Stalin, 'Results of the July Plenum of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.)', SCW, 11, (July 13, 1928), p. 209.
283. L. Leontjew, 'op. cit.', (p. 679).
284. P. Lapinski, 'Der "Sozialstaat"', (p. 386).
285. P. Lapinski, 'ibid.', (p. 389).
286. L. Leontjew, 'Der "organisierte Kapitalismus"', (p. 679).
287. See P. Lapinski for the recognition of the "legitimation" functions of states, 'op. cit.', (p. 389).
288. See: P. Lapinski, 'Der "Sozialstaat"', (p. 388); E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (pp. 37-8, 39).
289. P. Lapinski, 'ibid.', (pp. 382-3).

290. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 39).
291. P. Lapinski, 'op. cit.', (p. 393).
292. P. Lapinski, 'ibid.', (p. 389).
293. V.I. Lenin, 'Materials', p. 464, (emphasis added).
294. E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 34).
295. M. Joelson, 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus oder "organisierter Kapitalismus"', UBM, 3 (1929), 807-33 (p. 832).
296. M. Joelson, 'ibid.', (p. 832). Trotsky also gives expression to this with the distinction between state-capitalist and socialist socialisations: "wir Marxisten, entgegneten darauf, dass solange die Macht in den Händen der Bourgeoisie ist, die Sozialisierung keine Sozialisierung ist und nicht zum Sozialismus, sondern bloss zum Staatskapitalismus führt". L. Trotsky, Die neue Wirtschaftspolitik Sowjet russlands und die Perspektiven der Weltrevolution (Hamburg, 1922), p. 420.
297. M. Joelson, 'ibid.', (p. 832).
298. As Trotsky argues, the "term 'State capitalism' was thus put forward or at all events employed polemically by revolutionary Marxists against the reformists". The First Five Years of the Communist International, p. 245.
299. M. Joelson, 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus', (p. 832).
300. L. Leontjew, 'op. cit.', (p. 660).
301. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 26).
302. V.I. Lenin, 'Impending Catastrophy', LSW, 2, (p. 269). Also see N. Bukharin, Imperialism, p. 157.
303. V.I. Lenin, 'A Turn in World Politics', p. 267. See here also Lapinski, 'op. cit.', (p. 379).
304. V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, p. 80.
305. V. I. Lenin, 'ibid.', pp. 80-1 (middle emphasis added).
306. See E. Sereni, 'Fascismo, capitale finanziario e capitalismo monopolistico di Stato nelle analisi dei comunisti italiani', CM, 5 (Settembre-Ottobre, 1972), pp. 17-46 (p. 31).
307. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 55.
308. M. Joelson, 'op. cit.', (p. 824).
309. E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 26).
310. See N. Bukharin, 'Organised Mis-management in Modern Society', in Handbook of Socialist Thought, edited by I. Howe (London, 1972), pp. 394-403.

311. N. Bucharin, Ökonomik der Transformationsperiode, p. 31. See also N. Bukharin and E. Preobrazhensky, The ABC of Communism (London, 1970), p. 89. First published in 1918.
312. N. Bucharin, Der Imperialismus, p. 81.
313. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 34).
314. N. Bucharin, Ökonomik, p. 16 (emphasis added).
315. N. Bucharin, 'ibid.', pp. 34-5.
316. M. Joelson, 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus', (p. 812).
317. See N. Bukharin, Imperialism, p. 118; The ABC of Communism, p. 141, 146.
318. N. Bucharin, Ökonomik, p. 35.
319. M. Joelson, 'op. cit.', (p. 807).
320. N. Bukharin, cited in 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus', (p. 813), (emphasis added).
321. N. Bucharin, Der Imperialismus, p. 80.
322. N. Bucharin, 'ibid.', p. 84.
323. B. Borilin, 'Lenin über die Ökonomik der Transformationsperiode', UBM, 3 (1929), pp. 834-868 (p. 855).
324. M. Joelson, 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus', (p. 816).
325. N. Bukharin, cited in 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', E. Varga, (p. 39). Also see B. Borilin, 'op. cit.', (p. 857).
326. M. Joelson, 'op. cit.', (p. 832), (emphasis added).
327. The Sixth World Congress, p. 1753. Also see J. Stalin, '10 Jahre Sowjetmacht und die Internationale Arbeiterklasse', PL, 5a, (4 November, 1927), p. 76.
328. Compare with E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 39).
329. B. Borilin, 'Lenin über die Ökonomik', (p. 856, 851).
330. M. Joelson, 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus', (p. 813).
331. M. Joelson, 'ibid.', (p. 815).
332. M. Joelson, 'ibid.', (p. 807).
333. M. Joelson, 'ibid.', (p. 810). See also B. Borilin, 'op. cit.', (p. 857).
334. B. Borilin, 'ibid.', (p. 859). See also V.I. Lenin, 'Annotazioni di Lenin al libro Bucharin sull'economica del periodo di transizione', CM, 4-5 (luglio-ottobre, 1967).
335. E. Thälmann, 'Die Krise des Kapitalismus', (p. 161).

336. See: M. Joelson, 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus', (p. 818); E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 26).
337. M. Joelson, 'ibid.', (p. 819).
338. L. Leontjew, 'Der "organisierter Kapitalismus"', (pp. 668-9).
339. K. Kautsky, 'Ultra-imperialism', New Left Review, 59 (1970), 41-46 (p. 45). Moreover, "Überimperialismus" would be better translated as "neo" or "post"-imperialism.
340. The Sixth World Congress, p. 1750.
341. E. Thälmann, 'Zur anti-sowjetische Politik der rechten Führer der Sozialdemokratie', in Über proletarianischen, (2 März, 1927), pp. 56-65 (p. 60).
342. See V.I. Lenin, Imperialismus, p. 133; E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 40).
343. R. Luxemburg, 'Sozialreform', (p. 392).
344. V.I. Lenin, 'op. cit.', p. 107 (emphasis added).
345. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 113.
346. N. Bucharin, Der Imperialismus, p. 123.
347. E. Varga, 'Die ersten zehn Jahre', (p. 67).
348. V.M. Anders und J. Kuhles, 'Zur Frage des Verhältnisses von Revolution und imperialistischem Krieg in der Kommunistischen Internationale in den Jahren zwische den beiden Weltkrieg', WZKMUL, 1 (1975), 1-12 (p. 4).
349. A.K., Politische Ökonomie. Lehrbuch (Berlin, 1960), p. 365.
350. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 41); B. Borilin, 'Lenin über die Ökonomik', (p. 852).
351. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 43.
352. See: E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 40); V.I. Lenin, 'Materials', p. 459, 464.
353. M. Joelson, 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus', (p. 822).
354. See: V.I. Lenin, 'op. cit.', p. 464; M. Joelson, 'ibid.', (p. 823).
355. M. Joelson, 'ibid.', (p. 824), (emphasis added).
356. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 51.
357. C.A., 'Le premier Congrès', (p. 18, 19).
358. J. Stalin, 'The International Character', p. 201.
359. B. Borilin, 'op. cit.', (p. 841).

360. E. Varga, 'Die Perspektive der Entwicklung', in Die Krise, pp. 80-6 (p. 80). First published in 1924.
361. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 80.
362. V.I. Lenin, 'ibid.', p. 133.
363. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 15).
364. M. Joelson, 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus', (p. 815); K. Sauerland, Der dialektische Materialismus (Berlin, 1932), p. 215.
365. B. Borilin, 'Lenin über die Ökonomik', (p. 852).
366. E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 11).
367. M. Joelson, 'op. cit.', (p. 827).
368. See, V.I. Lenin, Preface to Imperialism and World Economy, pp. 12-14.
369. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 39).
370. B. Borilin, 'op. cit.', (p. 858). However, Marx has already established that "since value forms the foundation of capital, it also necessarily exists only through exchange against counter-value (Gegenwert) (and) necessarily repels (stösst) itself from itself. A universal capital (Universalkapital) without alien (fremde) capitals confronting it with which it exchanges - and from the present (jetzigen) standpoint is confronted with nothing other than wage-labour - is thus a non-thing (Unding). The repulsion of capitals from one another is already situated (liegt) in them as realised exchange-value". Grundrisse, p. 324.
371. E. Bernstein, Voraussetzungen, p. 76.
372. K. Busch, Die multinationalen, p. 264.
373. H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations, p. 56.
374. See E. Altvater, 'Die bürgerliche Hegemonie, die "Logik der ökonomischen Schwänge" und die Alternative der Arbeiterbewegung', Eurokommunismus, pp. 65-82 (pp. 69-70).
375. K. Korsch, 'Die materialistische Geschichtsauffassung. Ein Auseinandersetzung mit Karl Kautsky', in Archiv, XIV (1966), pp. 179-279 (pp. 256-8). First published in Leipzig, 1929.
376. However, it may be noted that there is no unanimity within the Comintern regarding the analysis of fascism. See B. Timmermann, Die Faschismus - Diskussion in der Kommunistischen Internationale, 1920-35, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Köln, 1977), pp. 187-8. Our concern is the conceptualisation of fascism from the premises of Marxism-Leninism which becomes the generally accepted analysis promoted by Soviet theorists.
377. E. Varga, 'Die Änderung in den Methoden', pp. 337-370 (p. 337).

378. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 317.
379. See: O. Rühle, 'Brauner und Roter Faschismus', in O. Rühle: Schriften (Hamburg, 1971) pp. 7-8 (p. 8). First published in 1939. This critique of a world plurality of "state capitalisms" anticipates the theory of "totalitarianism".
380. See E. Varga, 'op. cit.', p. 351. Also see: D. Albers, 'O. Bauer und das Konzept des "integralen Sozialismus"', Eurokommunismus, pp. 83-102; R. Hilferding, 'State capitalism or Totalitarian state economy', in A Handbook of Socialist Thought, pp. 511-517. First published in 1940.
381. E. Varga, 'Probleme der Monopolbildung', (p. 47).
382. E. Varga, 'Die ersten zehn Jahre', (pp. 77-8).
383. D. Eichholtz, Geschichte der deutschen Kriegswirtschaft 1935-45 (Berlin, 1969), p. 1.
384. D. Eichholtz, 'Monopol und Staat in Deutschland 1933-45', in Monopol und Staat 1933-45 (Berlin, 1973), pp. 33-59. See also A. Schröter, 'Die Bedeutung der institutionellen Verschmelzung von Staat und Monopolen für die Entwicklung des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', in Monopol und Staat in Deutschland 1917-1945 (Berlin, 1966), pp. 33-60.
385. B. Timmermann, 'op. cit.', p. 177.
386. E. Czichon, 'Der Primat der Industries im Kartell der nationalsozialistischen Macht', in DA, 3 (1968), pp. 168-192 (p. 217, 218).
387. D. Eichholtz, Geschichte der deutschen, p. 6.
388. W. Bleyer, 'Die Reichsgruppe Industrie - eine wirtschaftliche Kommandostelle des "totalen Krieges"', in Monopol und Staat 1917-1945, pp. 183-192 (p. 184).
389. D. Eichholtz, Geschichte der deutschen, p. 2.
390. In this regard, the "fascisation" of "state monopoly capitalism" is the most extreme formulation of the reproduction of imperialist war economies under the economic and political interventionist functions of capitalist states. In "Soviet Marxism" it tends to become the general, rather than the particular, form of capitalism.
391. C. Bettelheim, L'économie Allemande sous le Nazisme (Paris, 1971), p. 158. First published in 1945.
392. J. Stalin, 'The International Character', p. 204.
393. E. Varga, 'Die Änderung in den Methoden', (p. 340, 352).
394. See: E. Hennig, 'Zum Verhältnis von Industrie und Faschismus in Deutschland', in Texte zur Faschismusk Diskussion, 1, herausgegeben von R. Kühnl (Hamburg, 1974), pp. 140-175 (p. 50); Bürgerliche Gesellschaft und Faschismus in Deutschland. Ein Forschungsbericht (Frankfurt, 1977).

395. R. Opitz, 'Die faschistische Massenbewegung', in Texte zur Faschismuskritik, pp. 176-190 (p. 150).
396. See R. Miliband, 'Reply to Nicos Poulantzas', in Ideology in Social Science (London, 1972), pp. 252-262 (pp. 261-2).
397. See also N. Kadritze, 'Faschismus als gesellschaftliche Realität und als unrealistischer Kampfbegriff', Prokla, 8-9 (1973).
398. H. Weber, Die Wandlung des deutschen Kommunismus. Die Stalinisierung der K.P.D. in der Weimarer Republik (Frankfurt/Main, 1969), 2 Bände, Band 1, p. 242.
399. J. Stalin, 'Concerning the International Situation', SCW, 6, (September, 20, 1924), p. 294.
400. P. Merker, Sozialdemokratie, p. 276.
401. J. Stalin, 'op. cit.', p. 295.
402. J. Stalin, 'Politischer Bericht des Z.K. auf dem 15 Parteitag der K.P.d.S.U.', SL, 5a, (3-7 Dezember, 1927), p. 108.
403. E. Varga, 'Die Änderung in den Methoden', (p. 339).
404. J. Stalin, 'The International Character', p. 203.
405. J. Stalin, 'Über die Rechte Gefahr in der K.P.D. Rede in der Sitzung des Präsidium des E.K.K.I.', PL, 5a, (1-19 Dezember, 1928), p. 290.
406. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 293.
407. J. Stalin, 'Industrialisation of the Country and the Right Deviation in the C.P.S.U.(B.)', SCW, II, (November 19, 1928).
408. J. Stalin, 'Bukharin's Group and the Right Deviations in our Party', SCW, II, (February, 1929).
409. G. Caforio, 'Il dibattito al X Planum della Terza Internazionale sulla Sozialdemocrazia, il fascismo e il socialfascismo', CM, 4 (1965), pp. 117-142 (p. 137).
410. E. Thalmann, 'Kampf gegen die Gefahr einer imperialistischen Krieges', in Über proletarianischen, pp. 89-95 (p. 90).
411. E. Varga, 'Die Änderung in den Methoden', (p. 287).
412. E. Varga, 'ibid.', (pp. 287-8).
413. See L. Trotsky, The First Five Years, pp. 727-8.
414. Methodologically, this analysis attempts to combine the theory of capitals with the politics of class tactics.
415. J. Stalin, 'Die Ergebnisse des Juli-Plenum des Z.K. der K.P.d.S.U. Bericht auf der Leningrader Parteiarbeiterversammlung', PL, 5a (13 Juli, 1928), p. 206.

416. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 210.
417. This contradiction creates the "miseration" mechanism of capitalism. Its significance establishes the incapability of capitalist systems to supply the minimum reproduction requirements of the proletarian masses from which their revolutionary consciousness develops as a result. See also 'Le troisième Congrès', (p. 93).
418. See E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 345).
419. J. Stalin, 'Die Ergebnisse', pp. 208-9.
420. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 209.
421. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 209 (emphasis added).
422. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 210 (emphasis added). It appears to follow from this that the political reformism associated with the social-democratic theory of "organised capitalism" is thought to lead to fascism. The ambiguity of the Comintern's theory then appears as to whether fascism politically expresses the "collapse" of capitalism or a new "stage" of "regulated" capitalism.
423. E. Thälmann, 'Die Verteidigung des Sowjetunion - Sache des Proletariats der ganzen Welt', in Über proletarianischen (17 Juli, 1928), pp. 83-86 (p. 84).
424. 'The Sixth World Congress' cited in 'Die Änderung in den Methoden', E. Varga, (p. 338).
425. E. Varga, 'ibid.', (p. 339).
426. E. Varga, 'ibid.', (p. 368).
427. See G. Dimitroff, 'Arbeiterklasse gegen Faschismus', in Texte zur Faschismuskussion, pp. 57-68 (p. 58): "German fascism plays the role of the storm-troops of international counter-revolution, the general instigation of imperialist wars, the initiators of the crusade against the Soviet Union, the Great Fatherland of the workers of the whole world".
428. A. Thälheimer, 'Über den Faschismus', in Texte zur Faschismuskussion, pp. 14-29 (p. 21).
429. See E. Varga, 'Die Änderung in den Methoden', (p. 363, n.23).
430. This is witnessed by the "ultra-left" resolutions passed at the 12th Congress of the D.K.P. in 1929.
431. O.K. Flechtheim, Le parti communiste, p. 204.
432. G. Amendola, 'Insegnamenti del VII congresso dell'I.c. (rileggendo Dimitrov)', CM, 4 (1965), pp. 21-35 (p. 24).
433. J. Stalin, 'Results of the July Plenum', p. 213; P. Merker, Sozialdemokratie, p. 271.

434. G. Dimitroff, 'op. cit.', (p. 70).
435. H. Weber, Die Wandlung, p. 426.
436. While the theory of "social fascism" has subsequently been acknowledged as an error (See F. Firsov and K. Chirinia, Les traditions léninistes de la lutte pour la cohésion du mouvement ouvrier révolutionnaire et anti-impérialiste international', in Le léninisme et la transformation révolutionnaire du Monde (Moscou, 1971), pp. 89-188 (p. 150, 153)), it is not made explicit that the "Popular Front" strategy responds to both the new analysis of fascism and Soviet foreign policy. The latter point is witnessed by the Soviet Union's pact with Western capitalist social-democracies against fascism and their abandonment of the Stalin-Hitler non-aggression pact, while the former by the independent responses of national Communist Parties to fascism.
437. G. Dimitroff, 'op. cit.', (p. 58).
438. J. Stalin, 'Report to the Seventeenth Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)', SCW, 13, (26 January, 1934), pp. 299-300.
439. E. Varga, 'Die Änderung in den Methoden', (pp. 356-7), (emphasis added).
440. L. Magri, 'Il valore e il limite delle esperienze frontiste', CM, 4 (1965), 36-63 (p. 45).
441. 'Conference of the D.K.P., 1939' cited in 'Verfassung und Monopole-Aspekte zur antimonopolistischen diskussion in Westdeutschland 1945-1947', Jahrbuch des IMD, 1 (1978), 82-105 (p. 99). See also H. Timm, 'Das Aktionsprogramm der KPD vom II Juli 1945 - eine Anwendung der Lehren Lenins, sowie des VII. Weltkongresses der Kommunistischen Internationale der Brüsseler und Berner Konferenz der KPD', WZFSUJ, 4-5 (1958-9), 599-603.

CHAPTER 4THE TRANSFORMATION OF MONOPOLY CAPITALISM INTO STATEMONOPOLY CAPITALISM

In this Chapter we will investigate the post-war theory of capitalist society under "Stalinist orthodoxy" and the controversial issues occasioned by a new analysis of state monopoly capitalism in the initial phase of the "de-Stalinisation" of the world communist movement.

4.1 The Stalinist analysis of monopoly capitalism

The foregoing examination of monopoly capitalism, imperialism and the state established that the absence of a theory of "state monopoly capitalism" was the result of the Comintern's anticipation of the future historical course which European capitalism would follow. Economically, this expressed the "collapse" theory of capitals, and politically, the dictatorship of monopoly capitalism through the "fascisation" (Faschisierung) of "state capitalist tendencies" in the epoch of proletarian revolutions. Here, "state monopoly capitalism" is the "ultimate form" which imperialism takes before socialism. Moreover, it was shown that the global perspective of the Comintern's theory and tactics of the European labour movement played an indispensable part in the analysis of European capitalism through the combination of the theory of imperialism and "theory" of the "General Crisis of Capitalism". Subsequently, these two components of Comintern theory establish the theoretical and historical presuppositions from which "Stalinist orthodoxy" unfolds in the post-war analysis of Western European capitalist societies.

However, after 1945, Stalinist theory brings a series of "creative further-developments" (schopferische Weiterentwicklungen) to "Marxism-Leninism" which express the transformation in the relationship between

world capitalism and world socialism. These are presented under the new concept of the "Second Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism"⁽¹⁾ which establishes the theoretical and historical context of the global-collapse of capitalism⁽²⁾, and consequently, the structure of the world economy that delimits both the expansion of European imperialist metropolies and the systems of political power possible in capitalist societies. It thereby maintains the principal periodisations of capitalism and the features of the "third epoch of capitals"⁽³⁾. As Soviet theorist Tschepprakow states, the "new appearances" of "modern capitalism" (modernen Kapitalismus) do "not contradict the basic theses of Marxism-Leninism but much more confirm their renewed validity"⁽⁴⁾.

In these respects, the concept of "state monopoly capitalism" is most adequately expressed as the "highest form of capitalism, socialisation of production and the material preparation of socialism"⁽⁵⁾. State monopoly capitalism then retains its essentially "political" characterisation in a "transitional capitalism" (Übergangskapitalismus). Duly, Tschepprakow argues that the "development of state monopoly capitalism is the expression of the striving of the ruling-classes to stabilise the capitalist system. However, as a result of the dialectic of its development, they only accelerate the destruction (Sturz) of these systems"⁽⁶⁾. On this basis we will now examine the concept of "state monopoly capitalism" with reference to the "Stalinist" characterisation of capitalism, the general political form of bourgeois states, and class strategies.

4.1.1 The theory of "modern capitalism"

With the formation of a world socialist system after 1945, the connection of the "General Crisis of Capitalism" to Soviet Realpolitik receives a qualitatively new dimension in the "Stalinist" articulation of the history and prognosis on world capitalism.

The examination of the genetic development of capitals in the "Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist" analysis of Das Kapital ratifies both the Comintern's interpretation of the historical movement of European capitalism and the formation of the strategy and tactics of European Communist Parties. Consequently, the general concept and political form of monopoly capital functions under the mechanisms of "state monopoly war capitalism", as an appearance of the forms of dissolution of the capitalist mode of production and the terminal character of world historical accumulation processes. Since the global crisis of the inevitability of imperialist wars governs Stalin's analysis of world capitalism, the evaluation of the cause of fascism and its functions for bourgeois society remains fundamental to the post-war history and praxis of the European labour movement⁽⁷⁾.

The representation of the inner-dynamic of imperialist economies follows the genetical determination of value laws in the analysis of Das Kapital. This stipulates that the reproduction of capital through the mechanisms of free competition, the laws of surplus-value⁽⁸⁾ and the formation of a general profit rate - where "capitalism acts on its own laws"⁽⁹⁾ - is theoretically and historically valid only for pre-monopoly capitalism⁽¹⁰⁾. The destruction of this "model" of capital accumulation is manifest when the "state-capitalist war economy" appears to contradict Marx's general concept of capital. Stalin expresses the invalidation of this general "model" of capital accumulation with the formation of monopolies: average profit rates fall unilaterally through the rise in the organic composition of capital to a level which precludes further accumulation, with the corollary that "maximum profit" is both a necessary condition for the expanded reproduction⁽¹¹⁾ of capitals, and the capitalist's "aim" in the monopoly stage of

capitalism⁽¹²⁾. From the empirical determination of capital laws, monopoly capitalism represents a "modification of the law of value"⁽¹³⁾. As Stalin argues, the "law of value must be made more concrete and further-developed in adaptation to the conditions of monopoly capitalism"⁽¹⁴⁾.

The "concretisation" of the categories of capital accumulation theorises a new capitalist relation of domination and servitude in combined relations of imperialist economy and politics⁽¹⁵⁾. A "maximum profit" can only be accomplished through the extra-economic means of the "fascisation" of imperialist states and their "subordination" (Unterordnung) to the general reproduction requirements of monopoly capitalism. Consequently, the "open dictatorship" of fascism is only interpreted as the highest form of expression of the domination and control of the bourgeois state by the monopoly capitalist class⁽¹⁶⁾. This then characterises Lenin's concept of "state capitalism" (Staatskapitalismus), and the state-capitalist mechanism of the "subordination" of bourgeois states to monopoly capital in its national and international nexus in post-war European capitalism. In "direct connection with the fundamental economic laws of monopoly capitalism. The monopoly utilises the state apparatus to secure maximum profits for the capitalists through the extension of the ruination and immiseration (Verelendung)⁽¹⁷⁾ of the majority of the population through the enslaving and systematic plundering of the people of other countries, and through war and militarisation of the economy"⁽¹⁸⁾. The laws of uneven economic and political development of monopoly capitalism no longer functions through the "capital-mechanism", but by "brutal methods of exploitation"⁽¹⁹⁾, "enslavement and systematic plunder"⁽²⁰⁾, and the militarisation of national economies⁽²¹⁾ in the "Second Stage of the General Crisis"⁽²²⁾.

Imperialist wars, the crisis and "decay" of European state-capitalisms are analysed through the development of production powers on world capitalist markets⁽²³⁾ in the concept and contradiction of world capitalism and world socialism. This global process of world history conditions the existence and capacities of expansion of the world capitalist system, and undermines the reconstruction of European capitalism. The laws of uneven development of world capitals are consequently no longer factually coincident with the imperialist expansion of capitals on the world market. Three relationships can be identified here.

Firstly, the relative stability of markets is destroyed with the extrication of socialist Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, Asian and Chinese people's democracies (Volksdemokratien)⁽²⁴⁾ from the world capitalist system, and the dissolution of the total imperialist domination of world markets⁽²⁵⁾.

Secondly, the growth-potential of national capitals, the loss of control of world imperialism over raw material sources and world markets precludes the expansion of production powers⁽²⁶⁾, and directly contributes to the permanence of the world market crisis of capital.

Thirdly, the intensification of the laws of uneven development, transforms the relations of power (Macht) between imperialist competitors⁽²⁷⁾, and exacerbates the competition of monopoly capitals on the world market for the direct division of world markets through the militarisation of imperialist economies and the preparation of a Third World War⁽²⁸⁾.

The functioning of these fundamental laws acts as the "cause and roots of aggression, and ... (the) ... predatory politics of capitalist

states"⁽²⁹⁾. The concept of a world capitalist system of inter-imperialist relations is reproduced through these relations of "robber states", as the mechanism by which the international domination of world finance capital resorts to "robber methods of imperialist wars"⁽³⁰⁾.

Stalin formally acknowledges these phenomena under a "new stage" in the "General Crisis of Capitalism" at the XIX Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1952. The "two" stages of the "General Crisis" are however not "unconnected, independent crises, but stages in the General Crisis of the world system"⁽³¹⁾. Moreover, this is not only an "economic, but an all-embracing crisis, and thus also ... (a) ... political crisis of capitalist world systems"⁽³²⁾, premised upon the "increasing decay of the world capitalist system"⁽³³⁾.

However, the concept of a "Second Stage of the General Crisis" seeks to retrospectively maintain the continuity of Stalinist orthodoxy regarding the incapability of reconstructing European capitalism with the Comintern's theory of the "collapse" of capitals, now theorised as the "First Stage of the General Crisis". The new periodisation of capitalism assumes the "Stalinist" characterisation of revolution, transition and "collapse" appropriate to the post-war period. With the Soviet Union's initiation of the dissolution of the links in the imperialistic chain of world capitals, "the Great Socialist October Revolution introduces a new era into the history of humanity - the era of the collapse (Zusammenbruch) of capitalism and the triumph of communism over capitalism"⁽³⁴⁾. The transition of world capitalism inheres in the maintenance and augmentation of the socialist world system, after the European and Asian people's democracies "fall away" from the capitalist system⁽³⁵⁾. Consequently, after the integration of Eastern European "satellite states" into the

Soviet socialist world system and the consolidation of the economic and political structure of Soviet socialism, the concept of "capitalist encirclement" is replaced from Soviet Realpolitik. This now designates the dynamics of world historical forces outside of world capitalism in the ascendancy of world socialism in the relations of "system competition", and expresses the direction of Soviet foreign policy to the "super-power" struggle for "world domination" (Weltherrschaft) of the Soviet Union and the United States of America⁽³⁶⁾.

The Stalinist analysis of the world crisis of capitals sustains the Comintern's interpretation of the objective causes of fascism and the inevitability of imperialist World Wars. "State capitalist tendencies" therefore express the economic and political domination of capitalist society by the monopoly bourgeoisie. In the "collapse"-conditions of imperialism and the "General Crisis", the "fascisation" of bourgeois society characterises the form of the general reproduction requirements of capital, and the "state capitalist war-economy" completes the existing assumptions of "state monopoly capitalism".

4.1.2 The "subordination" of the state to the monopolies

The generalisation of this analysis of the imperialist war economy is not, however, upheld by all Soviet theorists. This is evident in the controversy between Stalin and Varga⁽³⁷⁾.

The significance of Varga's intervention points to the potential dilemma of examining the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory of the world communist movement through the "collapse"-conditions of world capital accumulation processes when the dissolution of Western European capitalist societies is not verified in post-war historical experience. Varga's "revision" of Stalinist orthodoxy concerns the possibility of the reconstruction of European capitalism and the stabilisation of

bourgeois parliamentary democratic "state-forms". We will discuss three issues here.

Firstly, for Varga, state interventionism permits a conjunctural stabilisation of Western European capitalism⁽³⁸⁾. The historical precedent of imperialist war-economies diminishes the anarchy of capitalist production compared to the "normal" peace-time conditions of capitalism. Analogously to Bukharin's concept of "state-capitalism", this suggests that the planning-mechanisms developed under the "state monopoly capitalist" war-economy can themselves become the "normal form" of capitalist reproduction processes. The significance of this proposition can be seen in contrast to Varga's own examination of the "fascisation" of "state capitalist tendencies" under the Comintern. Moreover, after 1945 Varga shows the capacity of capitalist systems to produce the means of subsistence of labour by emphasising the distinction which he has already made in the inter-war years, between the absolute and relative "miseration"⁽³⁹⁾. This opposes the orthodox critique of capitalism through the "miseration" of the proletariat and confronts the laws of monopoly capitalism with "counter-tendencies"⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Turning to the second of Varga's "revisions", he considers the proposition that the "imperialist state" is always unilaterally "subordinated" to the "imperialist bourgeoisie", "monopoly bourgeoisie" or the "finance-capitalists" to be a "simplification" that can lead to an absurdity (ad absurdum)⁽⁴¹⁾. Here, Varga argues that the finance-oligarchy, even in peace-time, does not "determine the total politics of the bourgeoisie, the total politics of states"⁽⁴²⁾. Consequently, Western European parliamentary democracies are not completely usurped by the "imperialist bourgeoisie"⁽⁴³⁾. Rather, the state is an organisation of the totality of the bourgeois class which permits the

"subordination of individual monopoly interests to the interests of the war"⁽⁴⁴⁾. This latter point would effectively contradict the Comintern's theory of fascism, and questions the plausibility of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the "subordination" of the state to the "monopolies"⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Varga's argument is contentious because the Comintern's analysis of fascism was interpreted as the last historical form of political power of bourgeois society in which the Soviet Union is accredited with the vanguard anti-fascist role, and the prospect of the restitution of European capitalism through bourgeois-democracy is rejected for the prognosis of the imminence of proletarian revolution and the critique of "revisionism" in the European labour movement. Conversely, the orthodox Stalinist evaluation of the state-monopoly relation stipulates the theoretical and substantive development of "state monopoly capitalism" through the "'subordination' (Unterordnung) of states under the monopoly"⁽⁴⁶⁾. At the XIXth. Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1952, Stalin explicitly rejects the "coalescence" (Zusammenwaschen) theory of monopolies and the state. This only "superficially and descriptively" examines the "process of merging of the monopolies with the state,... (and) ... does not reveal the economic import of this process" expressed in the unilateral subordination of the "state machine to the monopolies"⁽⁴⁷⁾ as an "instrument in the hands of the monopoly in order to accomplish its interests"⁽⁴⁸⁾. Consequently, the conceptualisation of the "economic power" and interventionist functions of bourgeois states is governed by the political form, instrumentally conferred upon it by the monopoly: "the demand for a 'conscious management' (bewussten Steuerung) under which we have understood the management of the economy and politics

through the monopoly, makes possible the free unfolding of all dictatorial or fascist methods ... this demand is not new and has already been raised with the full development of the highest stage (Stufe) of state monopoly capitalism, fascism"⁽⁴⁹⁾. The state-capitalist "subordination" mechanism is constructed by the European imperialist bourgeoisie as a "new form to utilise the state apparatus in its interests, the fascist form"⁽⁵⁰⁾.

The third point of dispute advanced by Varga suggests an alternative to Stalin's "derivation" of the "General Crisis" and therefore a different relation between monopoly capitalism and the "General Crisis". Here, Varga contends that the "First Stage of the General Crisis" exists before 1914 and with the "full unfolding of the monopoly stage of capitalism"⁽⁵¹⁾. The criticism this subsequently provokes is that the "General Crisis" is no longer principally identified through the features of the October Revolution, the division of the world into two opposed systems and the precipitation of imperialist wars⁽⁵²⁾. Therefore, Varga's concept of the "General Crisis" contradicts Stalin's analysis of the significance of the socialist world system, of which the Soviet Union is the hegemonic factor, on the global structure of world capitals and its direct connection with the contradictions of monopoly capitalism⁽⁵³⁾.

Considering the development of state monopoly capitalism, the French Communist Party theorist P. Boccara has noted that Varga has already discussed the role of state interventionism as a potential "solution" to the crisis of capitalism in the pre-war conditions under the concept of "state capitalist tendencies". However, Boccara also argues that Varga has not fully examined the significance of state interventions for the working-class with the possibility of a "democratic utilisation of the objective processes of state monopoly

capitalism"; Varga only acknowledges their significance for the bourgeoisie and advances the counter proposition of the "revolutionary collapse of capitalism"⁽⁵⁴⁾. Conversely, our discussion shows that such an analysis is a rational consequence of the Comintern's politics, and the theory of the "collapse" of capitals as a prelude to the revolutionary unification of the world communist movement and the destruction of fascism. In this respect, Boccara's suggested alternative to Varga's analysis of a "democratic utilisation" of state interventionist functions as objective components of "state monopoly capitalism" is precluded in Comintern theory⁽⁵⁵⁾. This is because the social connection which establishes the monopoly domination of political processes and the proximate nature of democratic and fascist state-forms, precludes this historical alternative within the political processes of Western European capitalist societies. Such is the background in which Varga's post-war propositions on monopoly capitalist systems are politically charged as alternatives to Stalinist orthodoxy and preparatory statements on the future course of the liberalisation of the communist theory of state monopoly capitalism.

Rather, the typical examination of the general theoretical character of imperialist economy and state results from the "historical" Kapital- analysis and its representation of the anatomy of the totality of capitalist production relations as the real form of capitalist society. This can be established through the concepts of monopoly capitalism and the "General Crisis".

In so far as the imperialist state functions under the politics of the monopoly bourgeoisie and enters into the relations of capital and labour, the state is imbricated in the appropriation mechanism of surplus value for the direct suppression and exploitation of labour by capital and the political state. The "particularities" of class

domination and the reproduction of social classes in capitalist society are not derived from the developed form of capital relations but the combination of monopoly capital and "state-force" (Staatsgewalt). Consequently, the representation of the relations of "domination and servitude" are rendered typical only for "classical capitalism", as the unification of the relations of economy and political under the monopoly-form function in a direct and "open" form of social domination⁽⁵⁶⁾. As Soviet theorists subsequently argue, "as capitalism stepped out of the pre-monopoly capitalist stage of monopoly capitalism, the qualitative transformation united (einiger) all sides of the economic base and superstructure"⁽⁵⁷⁾. With this, the form of political power and legitimation functions of the bourgeois state is structured by the manner in which the imperialist republic guarantees the economic form of reproduction as a pre-requisite of the structure of monopoly capitals⁽⁵⁸⁾, and follows the dissolution of the classical forms of the capitalist mode of production. The historical consummation of this general concept and political form of monopoly capitalism appears in the fascist system.

From our discussion it is clear why orthodox Marxist-Leninist theorists resist all attempts to relax the "subordination" theory and oppose the monopoly-domination of total social production with an "organised-capitalism" or a "planned-capitalism". With the creation of "Socialism in One Country" through destruction of the "first link" in the world chain of capitals, the transition from world capitalism to world socialism is initiated through the realisation of the "convergence theory" of social systems, of a totally planned socialised economy to the structural relation of the anarchical development of capitals in the "General Crisis"⁽⁵⁹⁾. Soviet socialism confronts national "state capitalisms" with the theoretical and historical forms of their own development, from the internal dissolution of the

capitalist mode of production and the initiation of a "transitional capitalism" to the socialised forms of world accumulation processes.

This follows the historical "stage-theory" of Das Kapital⁽⁶⁰⁾ which combines the genetical and logical forms of development of European capitalism from simple commodity production to "large-scale" capitalism in the periodisation of "simple commodity production", "general commodity production"/"free competition capitalism", and the dissolution of capitalist commodity production/"monopoly capitalism". The subsequent problems identified in Lenin's critique of capitalism and the transition from capitalism to socialism under state monopoly capitalism, developed through the general mode of capital relation in the reproduction schema, are reproduced in the Stalinist examination of the specificity of value laws⁽⁶¹⁾ in a socialist mode of production⁽⁶²⁾. As Stalin argues,

"Marx by no means considered that his theory of reproduction was valid only for the capitalist mode of production, he held that his theory of reproduction might be valid also for the socialist mode of production"⁽⁶³⁾.

Consequently, the general theoretical and historical form of the reproduction schema is interpreted as the analytical "starting-point" for the analysis of the production and distribution of the material means of subsistence for society in general.

The historically limited character of capitalist production is expressed in the contradictory development of social production powers with production relations. This creates the permanent disproportionality between total social production relations and the means of consumption which establishes the necessity of socialism when this contradiction enters the terminal stage of capitals⁽⁶⁴⁾. As a result of Marxist-Leninist analysis, the essential distinction between the critique of political

economy and the political economy of socialism can be identified through the reproduction schemas. The

"Marxist theory of the reproduction of total social capital as developed in Book 2 of Das Kapital, its capitalist shell (Hülle) removed (entkleidet) ... (is) ... the most important foundation of the socialist theory of reproduction and with it, socialist planning"⁽⁶⁵⁾.

As S.E.D. theorist D. Klein argues,

"Marx's teaching on the reproduction and circulation of total social capital is nothing other than the foundation for the theory of planned economy, and Book 2 of Kapital, the most important part for the teaching on the planned economy"⁽⁶⁶⁾.

While this establishes the distinction between capitalist anarchy and socialism, it equally establishes both their analytical and historical proximity through the pre-existing Keim structures of the state-capitalist mechanism of social management and state-socialist planning through "social property" in the means of production⁽⁶⁷⁾.

Consequently, the "model" of socialism is drawn principally from the capacity of socialist states to equilibrate total social reproduction through the superiority of socialist production epistemology over the totality of "unconscious" reproduction acts of the anarchical interaction of individual capitals in capitalist systems. However, Lenin's "starting-point" of the analysis of capitalism in "free competition capitalism" in the "pure-form" and "spontaneous blind action"⁽⁶⁸⁾ of the laws of capitals, accomplishes the proportionalities-disproportionalities of total production from the incapacity of individual capitals to determine the correct production proportionalities from the market relation and the "splintered" (zersplittert) and "separated" (zertrennt) production relations⁽⁶⁹⁾. The premises of this analysis are not contradicted when Stalin distributes the characteristics

of these economic laws in all commodity producing social systems corresponding to their historical stage of development: "the law of value is primarily a law of commodity production" and so it follows that "it existed before capitalism, and like commodity production will continue to exist after the overthrow of capitalism"⁽⁷⁰⁾. Consequently, the laws of value unfold through a series of historical modifications in the periodisations of general commodity production. Principally these are: the formation of a general profit rate in pre-monopoly capitalism; a "maximum profit" in monopoly capitalism⁽⁷¹⁾; and the final "modification" in socialism. This depicts the unfolding of the world history of social production relations through the laws of value from the inception of European capitalism in simple commodity production to commodity production in socialism⁽⁷²⁾. The final "modification" to the history of value laws in socialism submits them to "conscious utilisation" (bewusste Ausnutzung)⁽⁷³⁾ in a totally planned system of commodity production, permanent proportional expansion and realisation of consumption and cultural necessities⁽⁷⁴⁾.

The problem identified in Lenin's analysis of the value-form of capitalist commodity without money has its corollary in the examination of socialist production relations of commodities through the reproduction schemas⁽⁷⁵⁾.

Social reproduction in this form reduces value laws to abstract categories of means of accounting in "socialist planning". This cannot produce a solution to the anarchy of production in a "state capitalism" (Bukharin) or a rational socialist planning construct⁽⁷⁶⁾, but rather develops in Stalin's analysis as a "theoretical" expression of the "collectivisation" process of Soviet socialist construction. As Stalin argues, "our centralised socialist great industry develops according to the Marxist theory of expanded reproduction"⁽⁷⁷⁾.

Since monopoly capitalism already contains the undermining of general commodity production in a "transitional capitalism", its

continuation in the state-socialised planning mechanisms develops out of one aspect of the capitalist contradiction of private property in the means of production and the socialisation of production relations. However, in the reproduction schemas this abstracts from the relations of class domination and the specific form of capitalist production processes. In simple commodity production, the relations and means of production are privately appropriated. In pre-monopoly capitalism⁽⁷⁸⁾, the contradiction is between the socialisation of the means of production and private appropriation which is intensified in the "transitional" relations of monopoly capitalism. The economic content to the proletarian revolution is consequently to bring production and appropriation, the relations and powers of production into social "harmony" (Ubereinstimmung)⁽⁷⁹⁾ through "abolition of the private form of the appropriation of production relations, brought into complete harmony with the social character of production powers"⁽⁸⁰⁾.

However, in distinction to the Marxist-Leninist Kapital methodology, it was shown in Chapter 2 that the examination of the most elemental form of social relation in the double determination of social labour in the capitalist mode of production is a theoretical, and not historical representation⁽⁸¹⁾. The first "logical" stage in the general theory of the capitalist mode of production determines simple commodity circulation as an analytical "method"⁽⁸²⁾ and the most abstract representation of the movement of total capitalist production processes within the general concept of capital to depict the reconversion-process of surplus-value into capital. As the "simplest starting-point (Ausgangspunkt) of bourgeois society"⁽⁸³⁾ and the most general determination of commodity producing society⁽⁸⁴⁾, it establishes the continuity of capital accumulation processes as they appear in the exchange of commodity equivalents and the mystified forms of capitalist circulation relations⁽⁸⁵⁾. This is not an historical epoch of the

genesis of the laws of capitalism in simple commodity production⁽⁸⁶⁾ which is subject to subsequent modification in the general commodity production of "free competition capitalism" and dissolution under the monopoly-form. Nor does it express these laws through the transformation of the "collapse"-conditions of disproportionalities through the functional deployment of the reproduction schemas⁽⁸⁷⁾ under the "adaptation-tendencies" of a convergence-theory of social systems for a total social planning mechanism. One such comparability of both capitalist and socialist systems through the proportionalities-disproportionalities of total production is contained within the "formalised model" of reproduction processes and "planning mechanisms". Consequently, the "abstract dualism of planning : non-planning is the essential distinguishing criterion between communist and capitalist production"⁽⁸⁸⁾. In this context, the instrumentalist theory of the "subordination" of states follows the critique of the "revisionist" periodisation of "organised-capitalism" and explicitly rejects the "thesis that the state is in the position to subordinate the monopoly and to 'plan the economy in the interest of the workers (Werkstätigen)"⁽⁸⁹⁾ ... represented in the 'theory' of planned-capitalism (Plankapitalismus)"⁽⁹⁰⁾.

The significance of this discussion on the characterisation of post-war capitalism and the state will now be developed for the formulation of class strategies.

4.1.3 Class strategies in the "General Crisis of Capitalism"

Although the dissolution of the Comintern abandons the formal creation of a general tactical line for European Communist Parties, the C.P.S.U. still effectively legislates the strategy and tactics of the world communist movement⁽⁹¹⁾. In the world conditions of the "Second Stage of the General Crisis" and the "Cold-War" politics of non-co-operation between both world systems under the Cominform,

1947-56, the Soviet direction of the Cominform is defined both against the attempts to reconstruct European capitalism under the hegemony of the United States, and for the maintenance of the Eastern European "satellite" states within the "socialist world system". This strategy is contingent upon the identification of the domination of United States imperialism, both as the vanguard of world capitalism and European reconstruction and the new centre of imperialist aggression that confronts the world communist anti-fascist movement.

The global conditions of the "Second Stage of the General Crisis" consequently defines the world context for the formulation of an anti-imperialist "people's-revolutions" (Volksrevolutionen)⁽⁹²⁾ in which "peaceful countries" struggle for the defence of freedom and national sovereignty⁽⁹³⁾. The Cominform's "general tactical line" to European Communist Parties articulates an anti-imperialist strategy within the conditions of the national sovereignty of states, as a "destabilising" strategy with which to confront European capitalist integration⁽⁹⁴⁾. This consists of two aspects.

Firstly, the strategy of "non-compromise" of Communist Parties with national bourgeoisies in the period of the United States' reconstruction of European imperialist countries⁽⁹⁵⁾.

Secondly, once the reconstruction of Western Europe is increasingly consolidated, the new political orientation of Communist Parties given at the XIX Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1952 which defines the anti-imperialist strategy of "compromise" with the national bourgeoisie. This strategy is developed from the stand-point of the global interests of "system competition", and constitutes another platform in guiding Soviet Realpolitik in the orientation of the politics of European Communist Parties into non-revolutionary strategies. It shows one connection between Soviet communism and proletarian internationalism.

Here, the aim of "class strategies" is for the disorientation of imperialist war-aggression through the "common-interests" of the world's capitalist and socialist "people's democracies" (Volksdemokratien) - the democratic states of the Soviet Union, China, Europe and Asia⁽⁹⁶⁾ - for a "world-wide peacefront (weltweite Friedensfront)"⁽⁹⁷⁾. The struggle for "peace is maintained and established when the people take it in their hands"⁽⁹⁸⁾, while the priority given to this strategy is based in the formation of a "total world peace-movement (gesamte Weltfriedensbewegung)"⁽⁹⁹⁾. For Stalin, the "world peace-movement is not a socialist movement"⁽¹⁰⁰⁾, but a strategy for the mobilisation of the "masses" to support the world socialist movement in the struggle against imperialist wars: "the world peace-movement has the aim of hindering the present American threat of a World War"⁽¹⁰¹⁾.

That this global-strategy for the world communist movement is defined more under the perspective of the accomplishment of European reconstruction than the inevitability of its "collapse" is evident with the formal abandonment of socialist aims. As Stalin argues,

"the object of the present day peace-movement is to rouse the masses of the people to fight for the preservation of peace and for the prevention of another war. Consequently, the aim of the movement is not to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism - it confines itself to the democratic aim of preserving peace. In this respect, the present day peace-movement differs from the movement of the time of the First World War for the conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war since the latter movement went further and pursued socialist aims"⁽¹⁰²⁾.

However, Stalin does not explain why a socialist strategy has been abandoned in post-war international capitalism, despite its intimation in the Third Communist International's analysis of fascism and the

combination of the relations of "United Front" and "Popular Front" strategies. Moreover, as this is acknowledged to be only a temporary strategy because of the inevitability of imperialist wars⁽¹⁰³⁾, the relationship between "short-term" and "long-term" strategies remains undefined. Further, the tactical contingency of the conversion of peace-strategies into socialist strategies "if" imperialist wars occur⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ does not explain how the "peace-strategy" is converted into a socialist movement for the "destruction" of capitalism. Consequently, the overwhelming perspective of the strategy of the world communist movement in the conditions of world system relations is for a defence of democracy.

Soviet theory now ceases to define the inevitability of imperialist wars as a prelude to world-revolution because the priority of the preservation of the international status-quo⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. This "rationalises" the initiation of future imperialist wars for imperialist supremacy on the world market, not specifically against the Soviet Union⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ because imperialist wars against socialism are said to threaten the existence of capitalism⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. In this respect, the inter-imperialist struggles are of greater significance than the "system competition" of imperialism and socialism⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. However, Stalin's substitution of "peaceful-countries" for imperialist states in the post-war period has no theoretical basis in Lenin's theory of imperialism, but rather acts for the inner-division of the world imperialist front and potential inter-state alliances, within the Soviet Realpolitik and tactics for the world communist movement. It thereby constitutes another extraneous element in the determination of the "Popular Front" strategy for European Communist Parties. This expresses the abandonment of proletarian internationalism and the displacement of class struggle from the world accumulation process of capitals for

the maintenance of the international relations of "world domination" (Weltherrschaft) in the new world-historical contents of "system competition". This leads Tschepprakow to interpret the "General Crisis" as a "relatively long" period of co-existence of world systems, although premised upon the epoch of the "collapse" of world capitalism⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. Therefore, despite the categorical statements of the theory of the "Second Stage of the General Crisis", the actual defence of national freedom, security, and world peace secures the international economic and political conditions of world capitalism and world socialism as a constitutive component of the strategy of the world communist movement. Consequently, the insurrectionist politics of class strategies have no principal role in post-war communist strategies⁽¹¹⁰⁾.

The generalisation of national anti-imperialist strategies are to be considered within the more extensive geo-political conception of "Socialism in One Country". This follows as a corollary of the non-contingency of Soviet socialism upon European socialist revolution which already introduces the potential for an autonomous European revolution with the concept of a national centre of world revolution within the political structure of the world communist movement. Such potential is further concretised from the preparatory formation of anti-fascist "Popular Front" strategies in European imperialist metropolies. The subsequent Soviet dissolution of the Comintern in 1943 "formally" states the disengagement of the C.P.S.U. from the politics of the world communist movement and expresses in consequence the fact that European Communist Parties are politically mature for the autonomous formation of class strategies.

The preparatory formation of national anti-monopolist strategies for the construction of "Socialism in One Country", formally autonomous

from the C.P.S.U. as the vanguard of world revolution, leads the world communist movement into a "world polycentrism"⁽¹¹¹⁾. Consequently, the historical contingency of socialist construction in Western European metropolies does not necessarily follow a "general tactical line" from the C.P.S.U., nor contradict the dominance of "Marxism-Leninism" on European Communist Parties. Rather, the sequence of events in the history of the Comintern, from the Soviet declaration of "Socialism in One Country" to the "Popular Front" strategy culminating in a world polycentrism of national anti-monopolist strategies, expresses the "Stalinist" domination of the world communist movement as the basis of "Eurocommunism".

However, we have also argued that the defence of the democratic republic is a result not only of Soviet Realpolitik but also the expectation of the "fascisation" of bourgeois society. This is evident in the S.E.D.'s strategy for Germany after 1945, of the "creation of an anti-fascist, democratic regime of a parliamentary democratic republic with all Rights and freedoms for the people"⁽¹¹²⁾, and a "de-powering (Entmachtung) of monopoly capitals"⁽¹¹³⁾. More generally Communist Parties accept the necessity of the defensive strategy for the labour movement in Western capitalist societies as a result of the general proposition of the imperialist assault upon the democratic tradition and the "offensive of the monopoly ... against democracy"⁽¹¹⁴⁾. Although the post-war period sees the dissolution of European fascism, the monopoly-cause of the "fascisation" of bourgeois society is not removed. Therefore, the democratic anti-fascist "United Front" and "Popular Front" strategy of the 1930's is now converted into a democratic anti-monopolist strategy in the post-war epoch. However, this is formulated irrespectively of the characterisation of different political systems and without confronting the

presuppositions of the Comintern's analysis of either fascism, or the concentration of economic and political power in the monopolies.

The difficulty to emerge here in the theory of monopoly capitalism concerns the characterisation of the state and the formulation of class strategies. Although "Stalinism" does not revoke the "collapse" theory of European capitalism and therefore the "fascisation" of bourgeois-democratic states, the democratic republic must equally be a realisable political form of bourgeois states in order to confer credence upon the "Popular Front" strategy. This can be illustrated by reference to the concept of "social-fascism".

With the abandonment of the strategy of "social-fascism" two new propositions are advanced in Marxist-Leninist theory. Firstly, with the renunciation of the equation of fascist and democratic forms of political power, the epoch of imperialism is interpreted as "an extreme intensification of the class antagonism inherent in capitalism. Fascism is a counter-attack of the reactionary bourgeoisie against all progressive elements of society"⁽¹¹⁵⁾. As fascism is defined against the "progressive" elements of society, it is now also defined against social-democracy and so indirectly establishes the premises for a political alliance against the monopoly bourgeoisie. Moreover, secondly, it is thought to be "wrong to accept that the transition from bourgeois-democracy to fascism is dependent upon economic laws, approximating the transition from pre-monopoly capitalism to imperialism"⁽¹¹⁶⁾. Therefore, fascist forms of political power are not inevitable under the economic laws of uneven development of capitals, and the monopoly bourgeoisie can rule without the usurpation of bourgeois-democracy. However, in this event, it is unclear why revolutionary socialist strategies have been abandoned from the politics of the world communist movement when no fundamental change in the Marxist-Leninist examination of capitalism is involved.

Despite these considerations, the "tendency" to the "fascisation" of bourgeois society is not abrogated in imperialism. Further, the distinction between the "state-form" and "state-type" still remains ambiguously formulated in terms of the explanation of political power and the relation of fascism and social-democracy:

"fascism is a form of class-power of the bourgeoisie. Next to fascist dictatorship there are other forms of bourgeois states such as constitutional monarchy and the bourgeois-democratic republic. Both are characterised as bourgeois democracy. All three state-forms belong to capitalist state-types; their context is accordingly the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Fascism nevertheless represents an open unmasked dictatorship of the most reactionary circles of finance-capitals; the dictatorship is masked in bourgeois-democracy through bourgeois freedoms and above all parliamentarianism. So, the Weimar Republic becomes a bourgeois-democratic Republic in which, in spite of bourgeois freedoms and the existence of parliaments, the total economic and political power is placed in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Although the essence of bourgeois-democracy and fascism represents a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the working-class is not indifferent to which form the bourgeoisie uses its power; then in distinction to fascist dictatorship, bourgeois democracy preserves certain Rights and freedoms, which the proletariat can use in the interest of the struggle for freedom "(117).

Consequently, the "subordination"-relation of "state-forms" still guarantees the class character of "state-types"; the particular "state-form" of political power is only an instrumentally contingent form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Moreover, the variety of "state-forms", from fascist to democratic state capitalism are all political forms of the monopoly domination in a direct transmissions

mechanism of political power.

This conceptualisation of the relation of the "essence" of bourgeois states to their political "appearance-forms" follows the distinction of "state-types", "determined by the class which detains political power"⁽¹¹⁸⁾, from "state-forms", "defined by the mode of government"⁽¹¹⁹⁾. The specificity of the means of "utilisation" of this transformed structure of political power and the distinctions within the ruling-class is characteristic for the subsequent Marxist-Leninist theory of the state⁽¹²⁰⁾. However, with the designation of "state monopoly capitalism" as the "ultimate form" of imperialism, "state-forms" have a directly reactive function to the terminal crises of capital and follow the "agents-theory of state-forms" in that the "state has the task to preserve decaying capitalist society which is condemned by history to decline"⁽¹²¹⁾. Consequently, the "state-form (Staatsform) must adapt to the new economic content of 'decaying capitalism' of the epoch of the monopoly. Now begins the fascisation (Faschisierung) of states"⁽¹²²⁾.

Here, the theory shows the difficulty in treating bourgeois-democracy under the presuppositions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state. The distinction of "state-form" and "state-type" sustains the theoretical ambivalence over the forms of political power in bourgeois society identified in Hilferding's critique of the Bolshevik concept of bourgeois states. Nevertheless, the distinction of bourgeois-democratic from fascist state-forms acknowledges that the fascist "state-form" is not necessarily the last historical political "state-form" of bourgeois society and that the immediate post-war history of European state-capitalisms present the possibility of a political alternative to fascism, even if this is not given unequivocal expression in the "Marxist-Leninist" theory of the state.

However, the significance of the analysis of state monopoly capitalism after 1945 is to maintain the importance of the repressive character of "state-capitalist war economies" and the suppression of democratic republics after the dissolution of European fascism. This is because as the "subordination"-relation establishes the class character of bourgeois state-forms, democratic and imperialist republics are submitted to the same mechanisms of political instrumentalism: "in reality, fascism already establishes ... the expansion and profit interests of the monopoly enterprise through the mechanism of semi-state economic administration ... (and) ... also the transfer ... (of) ... state functions on to the monopoly capitalist instances"⁽¹²³⁾. Consequently, the "agents-theory" of fascism maintains its political function as another expression for the accomplishment of the reproduction of the economic interests of monopoly capitalism. Here, fascism is a "simple adaptation of the political system to the conditions of the system of economic power"⁽¹²⁴⁾.

The Stalinist analysis of monopoly capitalism establishes the general laws of capitalism through the monopoly domination of the total national economy and the "fascisation" of bourgeois states from the concerted conscious political action of the monopoly bourgeoisie. This expresses the imperialist war destruction of European capitalism without assessing the possibilities of a new cyclical phase of capital accumulation, but rather insists upon the non-reversibility of the imperialist "collapse" of capitals. Consequently, the formulation and generalisation of alliances in the Western European labour movement under the "imperialist republic" are not theoretically derived from an examination of the general laws of capitals and the political conditions of bourgeois societies, but follow the traditional analysis of the Comintern and post-war Soviet-directives of Communist Party theory.

4.2 The "liberalisation of the theory of state monopoly capitalism"

The importance of the XX Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1956⁽¹²⁵⁾ consists in the initiation of the "de-Stalinisation" period and the transformation of the political structure of the world communist movement. This establishes two relevant developments which contribute to the formation of the theory of state monopoly capitalism. The first of these developments occurs with the dissolution of the Cominform, and the relative independence of Western European Communist Parties from the tactical directives of the C.P.S.U. This occasions the critique of the "Stalin-cult"⁽¹²⁶⁾ but also implicitly extends the analysis of "de-Stalinisation" to the critique of the history of the Bolshevisation of Communist Parties in the Comintern⁽¹²⁷⁾. The second concerns the creation of a new political climate which permits the relaxation of "Stalinist orthodoxy" and facilitates the reconstruction of Marxist-Leninist theory⁽¹²⁸⁾. This is expressed in the critique of Stalin by the then General Secretary of the S.E.D., W. Ulbricht who contends that Stalin's works must not be interpreted with the "classics of Marxism"⁽¹²⁹⁾, while Soviet theoreticians acknowledge the "false theses" of Stalin⁽¹³⁰⁾.

The initial re-examination of Western European capitalism is undertaken in the relatively crisis-free period of the expansion of European capitals, epitomised by the German "economic miracle" (Wirtschaftswunder). This presents Marxist-Leninist theory with the challenge of examining the new developments of capitalism, which are typified by the extensive nature of capitalist state interventionism. However, it creates the problem of reconciling the empirical conditions in which the concrete functions of bourgeois states in capitalist reproduction processes promote the stability and frunctification of Western European capitalism in opposition to the Marxist-Leninist prognostication of the "collapse" of capitals.

The formation of a "theory" of state monopoly capitalism unfolds within the conflict that is generated over the theoretical and political character of post-war capitalist society, and the de-Stalinisation period which sanctions the liberalisation of theory. Subsequently, the transformation of the theory of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism represents the re-examination of the traditional Stalinist characterisation of the development of European capitalism in the schemata of the periodisation of capitalism, and the contribution of new theses on the functioning of contemporary capitalist systems.

The development of a theory of state monopoly capitalism takes place in the Soviet Union in 1955⁽¹³¹⁾, and especially in the D.D.R. in 1956⁽¹³²⁾. This establishes the general precedent in which a controversy develops regarding the theoretical and political issues occasioned by a theory of state monopoly capitalism, and its reception by "orthodox" theorists. The principal issues relate to the theoretical analysis and political prognosis on the historical movement of European capitalism and its consequences for the world communist movement.

4.2.1 State monopoly capitalism and the "collapse" of capitalism

The requirements of the examination of the "appearance-forms" of capitalism leads to a new level of general analysis and theoretical reflection of the processes of state monopoly capitalism. As Zieschang argues, "the role of state monopoly capitalism in the reproduction process, its relation to economic laws, the new economic processes which originate through it, the course of the fundamental economic process of capitalism under the new conditions, their actions on the contradiction of capitalism and other fundamental theoretical questions, is until now only insufficiently, or generally not investigated at all"⁽¹³³⁾.

With the new interventionist functions of the imperialist state in the reproduction process, Zieschang postulates that the development of "state monopoly capitalist relations of production signify that contemporary capitalism exhibits a new structure and new characteristics"⁽¹³⁴⁾.

This "higher form of capitalist relations of production gives giant capitals new possibilities" for expansion⁽¹³⁵⁾. The essential point is that state capitalist interventionism becomes a necessary condition for the expanded reproduction of capital accumulation processes. These new appearance forms and characteristics of state monopoly capitalism constitute objective categories in the reproduction of total social capital in that "the total conditions of contemporary expanded reproduction require state monopoly capitalism"⁽¹³⁶⁾.

For Zieschang, the explanation of the post-war stability and expansion of capitals in state monopoly capitalism develops as a result of the failure of the automaticity of the process of private capital formation in which the system of private monopoly capitalism cannot produce the necessary volume of capital to sustain an expanded reproduction of total capital in a new higher stage of capitalist socialisations. From the "historicised" analysis of Das Kapital, Zieschang argues that under the present historical concentration and centralisation tendencies of monopoly capitals, capitalist crises would precipitate a historical "collapse"⁽¹³⁷⁾ because "the economic and political difficulties of one monopoly endanger the total national economy and not one part of the capitalist social order"⁽¹³⁸⁾. The deferment of the historical "collapse" of capitals is thereby the result of the formation of state capitalist relations of production⁽¹³⁹⁾, and the new forms of capital which stand in an essentially opposed relation to the historical content of the "collapse" of capitals. The formation of state monopoly capitalist relations represent a new mechanism of "capital formation" through the development of socialised

forms of capital. This maintains the concentration and centralisation of capitals and circumvents the economic and political convulsions inherent in the failure of the laws of "free competition capitalism". The subsequent transformation of the laws of private monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism simultaneously undermines the mechanism of the action of economic laws of capitalism⁽¹⁴⁰⁾. In the new theory, the historical content of imperialism that led to the "collapse" of capitals leads capital to new further forms of development, and not directly to socialism as the next periodised structure in the history of capitalism.

Zieschang's analysis, however, does not represent the abandonment of the "collapse" but only one of its several forms of development, modification and historical realisation. Therefore, if Marxism-Leninism accepts the premises of the Leninist theory of capitals, the post-1945 development of capitalism in state monopoly capitalism expresses the "logic of the collapse" and not its renunciation. As a condition of the development of capitals, state monopoly capitalism becomes "nothing other than one such new form of imperialist relations of production. It is a necessary product of concentration and centralisation in imperialism and a requisite of present expanded reproduction"⁽¹⁴¹⁾. State interventions therefore are not only necessary for the reproduction of capital but raise the prospect of constituting a normal structure of capitalist relations of production for the stabilisation of capitalism. In distinction to the terroristic political form of imperialist states, contemporary state monopoly capitalism represents the formation of an integrated total social capital relation and an Aufhebung of the separation of economy and political in the anarchical structure of capitals for a socialised "fusion" (Verschmelzung) of economy and state.

Although these formulations have been discussed in Bukharin's concept of "state-capitalism", for orthodox Marxist-Leninist theory, they represent a transformation of the fundamental character of monopoly capitalism. The axis around which the subsequent debate unfolds is located in the apparent displacement of monopoly relations of production as the "starting-point" (Ausgangspunkt) for the analysis of state monopoly capitalism. This can be equally expressed in the relation of the historical "collapse" of capitalism in the "third epoch of capitals" with the continued existence of capitalism.

For Zieschang, the methodological and theoretical presuppositions of state monopoly capitalism lead to the suggestion of a new periodisation of capitalism in a "fourth epoch of capitals" which functions as a further compensatory law-mechanism to the anarchy of capitals, and a new historical content of capitals beyond the structural crisis-limits of imperialism. Conversely, for "orthodox" Marxist-Leninist theoreticians, the "mixed-form" precludes the realisation of the "higher form of social production" as a condition of the intractable crisis nature of capitalism. Monopoly capitalism is already an intermediate, transitional form of capitalism which contains the most comprehensive socialisation of production in the history of capitalism that drives monopoly production beyond its characteristic form in simultaneous relations of capitalist "collapse" and maturity for socialism.

In Zieschang's concept of state monopoly capitalism, the "higher form of capitalist relations of production" assume the theoretical status of a total social systems analysis as a necessary result of the "theoretical evaluation and generalisation of the role of present state monopoly capitalism"⁽¹⁴²⁾. As a direct consequence, we see that

this invests the imperialist state with the capacity to regulate the capitalist system beyond both the inner structural limits of the contradictions of the relations and powers of production in private capitalism with new social forms of capital, and the "subordination" mechanism of monopoly capitalism. The impact of such a theory and total social "system analysis" resides in two areas. Firstly, the specific monopoly class character to the structuring of the relations of economy and political, and secondly, the relations of political domination in state monopoly capitalism.

The formation of a total social analysis of capital opposes the "collapse" theory of capitals with not only the political power of states, but also the "economic" power of bourgeois states from state monopoly capitalist relations of production. Zieschang examines these relations of production from the socialisation of capitals:

"the basic Marxist-Leninist understanding of the unfolding socialisation of production in capitalism forms an important principle (Ansatzpunkt) for the solution of ... (the) ... fundamental questions of state monopoly capitalism"⁽¹⁴³⁾.

The new "appearance-forms" of capitalism operate through the extended socialisations of the capitalist reproduction process in that the "specific stages of the socialisation stipulate specific stages in the social organisation of labour, that is, specific stages of the development of relations of production"⁽¹⁴⁴⁾. Since the "development of production represents a permanent development of the relations and powers of production, the unity between the powers and relations of production inside a specific mode of production", create both the necessity and possibility of developing "new forms of capitalist relations of production"⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. Moreover, this "development of production powers in capitalism is simultaneously a process of the

concentration and centralisation of capitals"⁽¹⁴⁶⁾.

From the socialisation of production powers, Zieschang subsequently postulates "corresponding social forms of capitalist relations of production, that is, a permanent solution (ständig Lösung) of the conflicts between the powers of production and the relations of production inside capitalism"⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. However, this is not a "crisis-free" development of capitalism, because the "new forms of production signify ... new possibilities of development and profitability of the expansion of the powers of production of individual capital, but simultaneously higher stages of capitalist exploitation, of the unfolding of capitalist contradictions - the intensification of the conflict of production powers and production relations"⁽¹⁴⁸⁾.

In this "model" of the capitalist development of social wealth, the expansion of production powers is only possible through the creation of new forms of "capital-use" (Kapitalwendung) in social property and joint-stock capital raised on total social capital⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. This enables state monopoly capitalism to transcend the relations and limitations to the development of production powers and the concentration and centralisation of capitals contained in the structural relations of capitalist property in private capitalism. Consequently, the priority of "social property" facilitates the expansion of production powers to embrace the total social conditions of capital reproduction. Thereby state monopoly capitalism represents the interventionist functions of bourgeois states in capitalist social reproduction processes in its managerial capacities of capital movements by "capital-use". However, despite Zieschang's acceptance of the "collapse" postulate of capitalist systems, what is less evident in his analysis of capitalism are the contradictory relations of different forms of capitalist property. These are subsequently given a rather "formalistic" solution in the harmonisation

of production powers and production relations through the economic content of state-monopoly agencies of capital socialisation and treated through the category of state-property. The significance of this is, as Richter argues, that the "economic necessity for the bourgeoisie to use state property ... contradicts the economic foundation of the capitalist mode of production with private property in the means of production"⁽¹⁵⁰⁾. Consequently, the revolutionary quality to the Leninist analysis of socialisations in the historical structure of capitals which confronts the power and structure of private property,⁽¹⁵¹⁾ for Zieschang functions within the conceptualisation of a harmonisation of total social production. When state monopoly capitalism constitutes a new periodisation of capitalism, the social system of production that functioned under the "monopoly form" is replaced with the objectively determined social relation of monopoly and state.

The reception of Zieschang's theory of state monopoly capitalism is not only considered in its capacity as an initial "liberalisation" of Marxist-Leninist theory, but also the continual critique of "Right" social-democratic theories of the transition from capitalism to socialism through extensive state interventions. This contribution to the analysis of the objective theory and history of state monopoly capitalism initiates a debate over the correct characterisation of state monopoly capitalism.

For Richter, Zieschang's concept of state monopoly capitalism confuses the relations of economy and state, the political superstructures of monopoly capitalism with the economic substructure,⁽¹⁵²⁾ as it affords the capitalist state new economic capacities. This expresses a distinction between the concept of state monopoly capitalism and the historical content of imperialism, in that the partial measures of "state capitalist tendencies" within the circulation sphere are

converted into developed forms of state monopoly capitalism as a total social systems analysis which extends to a unified reproduction process of economy and state. Conversely, for Maier, the "state ... fulfils no direct functions in the reproduction process" and to this extent, the "relation of economy and state is not distinguished essentially from earlier social orders"⁽¹⁵³⁾. Consequently, the contradictory structure of total social production under the laws of monopoly capitalism realises "private monopoly capitalism" in state-property, not as the "social-use" of production powers, but under the direct political power of the monopoly bourgeoisie. In this respect, the accomplishment of the laws of monopoly capitalism are limited by the contradictions of commodity production and capital valuation,⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ while state monopoly capitalism "acts as a certain modification of the mode of action of surplus value laws, the laws of capitalist appropriation"⁽¹⁵⁵⁾.

Here, Maier argues that the "law-conditioned transformation of monopoly capitalism in the period of its general crisis only constitutes a state-monopoly (Staatsmonopol) in the sense of realising and extending the position of the monopoly with the help of the power of states"⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. This is also expressed by Soviet theorist Chmelnizkaja in the "mixing" of the relations of private and state monopoly as "forms and methods of the use of state-power through the monopoly"⁽¹⁵⁷⁾.

Maier further criticises Zieschang's analysis for failing to express the impact of the "Second Stage of the General Crisis" on the "increasing weakness (Labilität) of capitalist systems and the fundamental changes in the relations of power between capitalism and socialism"⁽¹⁵⁸⁾.

The problematical nature of Zieschang's concept of state monopoly capitalism as both a higher form of social production and a new stage of development of production powers inheres in the suggestion of its

proximity to "state-capitalism", "organised capital" and "ultra-imperialism"⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. Consequently, when Nehls argues that a "further-developed" stage of imperialism is "fundamentally false"⁽¹⁶⁰⁾, he is re-asserting the traditional Comintern evaluation of the historical course of European capitalism.

Although Zieschang's "solution" to the "stagnation" and "decay" of production powers is not permanent, it now appears as a theoretical construct within the new theses on the historical capacities of state monopoly capitalism and thereby opposes Lenin's concept of a "decaying capitalism". This is rejected in so far as it expresses a historical harmonisation of production powers with production relations without the revolutionary transformation of capitalist relations of production in socialism⁽¹⁶¹⁾. The theory of the "solution" to the contradiction of production powers can only be temporary and does not constitute a new stage of socialised production and "social-use" of capital⁽¹⁶²⁾. As Kratsch argues, Zieschang's "mechanistic" solution subsequently sustains the "essential error ... that the correlation between both production forces and relations is incorrectly represented and is treated under the complete exclusion of concrete historical conditions",⁽¹⁶³⁾ and therefore the imperialist content of state monopoly capitalism.

For Richter, to analyse capitalism beyond the structure of the private power of monopoly capital signifies that the limit to the relations of production is not given by the monopoly-form⁽¹⁶⁴⁾. This problem is expressed by Zieschang's failure to distinguish economic relations of production from their property-form, and therefore to distinguish the decisive social category which establishes the "contents" of capitalist production in the class nature of economic relations⁽¹⁶⁵⁾. This leads Zieschang to represent the apparent transcendence of private monopoly capital in socialised forms of

property, as a new "historical basis of property"⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ independently from monopoly relations of production. Nehls duly criticises the construction of "state monopoly capitalism" upon juridical property relations because it relieves the theory of the necessity to "consider under which specific contradiction of an historical epoch ... the further socialisation of production is accomplished"⁽¹⁶⁷⁾. Since this emphasises relations of appropriation instead of monopoly capitalist production⁽¹⁶⁸⁾, the concept of "state monopoly capitalism" can neither establish what determines relations of distribution⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ nor how the "property-forms" of distribution are connected⁽¹⁷⁰⁾. Rather, the traditional Marxist--Leninist interpretation of the general structure of capitalist state property is expressed as a relation of distribution⁽¹⁷¹⁾, that establishes a "shell which precludes the realisation of socialised production powers"⁽¹⁷²⁾. It is precisely the inability to expand social production powers and regenerate a "decaying" socio-economic system that produces the general political tendency to "imperialist republics". Zieschang himself accepts this basic premise, if in modified form under the "socialised" relations of state monopoly capitalism, when he contends that "capitalism must automatically collapse (Zusammenbruch) if state monopoly capitalism does not rescue it"⁽¹⁷³⁾. Nevertheless, this also suggests that the social-system constitutes the governing mechanism which maintains the existence and reproduction of capitals in distinction to the concept of "monopoly domination". Alternatively for Maier, "state monopoly capitalism" is the "present form of capitalism, the present form of monopolist relations of production"⁽¹⁷⁴⁾. However, it then remains unclear whether: (a) the state functions in class relations of the capitalist structure of production, in which case the implication of the concept approximate those of Zieschang's; or (b) if state interventionism is autonomous from the capital structure, how it is simultaneously a "form" of "monopolist relations of production".

The controversy which Zieschang's concept of an objective category of state monopoly capitalism creates engages "orthodox" Marxist-Leninist theorists on several issues.

Initially, the new concept and mechanism of social production relations of state monopoly capitalism appears to be independent from the monopoly structure of production relations⁽¹⁷⁵⁾. Conversely, in the "orthodox" analysis, state monopoly capitalism is the relation of domination and repression which the monopolist and finance-oligarchy must necessarily establish in the relations of economy and political.⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ It signifies that the monopoly dominates the most important relations of production and the centralisation of economic power is in the hands of the finance-oligarchy⁽¹⁷⁷⁾. State monopoly capitalism thereby constitutes the "highest form of finance-capitalist control of production and distribution, through the direct intervention and utilisation of state-power"⁽¹⁷⁸⁾. In the imperialist republic, the "state is ... an instrument of the dictatorship of the finance-oligarchy, and its politics are directed against the overwhelming majority of the population"⁽¹⁷⁹⁾. As a consequence, for Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy, Zieschang's concept of state monopoly capitalism does not express the process by which the monopoly bourgeoisie transforms bourgeois society into an "imperialist republic" as a higher form of monopoly repression with the tendency to the "fascisation" of states⁽¹⁸⁰⁾.

4.2.2 State monopoly capitalism and revisionism

The critique of Zieschang's concept of state monopoly capitalism is not only one of "political economy", of the relations of economy and state, but also relates to the total economic and political conception of capitalist society. From the traditional "stand-point"

of monopoly capitalism, the political conception of state monopoly capitalism as a total social systems analysis and a "fourth epoch of capitals" leads to the view that state monopoly capitalism approximates "organised capitalism". Nehls argues that "one such definition of state monopoly capitalism is false and can tendentially point to a revisionist conception"⁽¹⁸¹⁾. To deny that state-capitalist "subordination" mechanism is to "efface the class character of state capitalism"⁽¹⁸²⁾. This follows the "bourgeois economists and revisionists, who seek to exonerate capitalism, ... (and) ... interpret this process as a subordination of the monopoly under the state in the interests of the whole nation", and as a "transition to socialism"⁽¹⁸³⁾.

The question of "revisionism" raised against the new content of Zieschang's concept of state monopoly capitalism concerns a qualitatively new periodisation of capitalism: "with such a conception, Zieschang is able to come dubiously close to the points of view (Anschauungen) of revisionist and bourgeois theoreticians on a 'transformation' of capitalism into a 'new society' in which the 'old' alleged contradictions are solved or can become solved"⁽¹⁸⁴⁾. Conversely, as "state monopoly capitalism" is the material preparation of socialism⁽¹⁸⁵⁾, there can be no further stage in the centralisation of capitals; the "next stage becomes the expropriation of the monopoly through the direct producers" in socialism⁽¹⁸⁶⁾. Zieschang's concept is a "theoretical and political error"⁽¹⁸⁷⁾ because of its political evaluation of the historical content of imperialism which no longer demonstrates the revolutionary "collapse", decline and transition of capitalism but the potential abolition of the inner-"collapse" of capitalist systems in regulated,

organised state monopoly capitalism. As Richter argues,

"the economic use of states as the organisation of the domination of monopoly capitals is precisely state monopoly capitalism ... one such state is represented as an 'imperialist republic' and ... Lenin shows further, that it presents a way forward from monopoly capitalist society, the way to socialism"⁽¹⁸⁸⁾.

As a corollary to the instrumentalist conception of capitalist states, Zieschang's definition implies that the monopoly bourgeoisie have not already conquered the institutions of political power of the capitalist state and "subordinated" its apparatuses. State monopoly capitalism is a "dangerous thesis" because the objectively determined state-capitalist mechanism can function for qualitatively different purposes. As Behrens argues, the "difference between Zieschang and Right social-democracy consists accordingly (in that) Zieschang says the state regulates the economy in the interests of the monopoly, and the Right social-democrat says the state regulates the economy in the interests of society; between both conceptions no principle distinction exist"⁽¹⁸⁹⁾. Consequently, under the critique of "revisionism" this category of state monopoly capitalism brings a "false conception to scientific work"⁽¹⁹⁰⁾.

However, despite this critique, the "new theses" advanced by Zieschang on the relaxation of the "subordination" thesis have raised some qualitative distinctions within Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy. This itself reflects the progressive distancing of the concept of state monopoly capitalism from its traditional reception under Stalin. The subsequent re-examination of the Leninist theory of state monopoly capitalism and the re-assertion of the characteristics of monopoly capitalism constitutes a relaxation of theory compared with the generalisation of imperialist war capitalism. Thereupon, it is

recognised that the post-war development of state monopoly capitalism necessitates a new analysis of capitals, not wholly reducible to the categories of monopoly capitalism. However, such a re-direction of Marxist-Leninist theory is not readily accomplished given the political orientation of the Leninist concept of monopoly capitalism itself towards the examination of the crises and contradictions of capitalism rather than their "solution" in general theory.

This will be illustrated with the two principal responses to the relaxation of Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy in the 1950's.

The first of these regards Zieschang's concept of state monopoly capitalism, which tends to contradict the historical content of imperialism when it approximates a "state-capitalism" or an "organised-capitalism". Here, state monopoly capitalism examines the new developments of economic and political forms of power in a post-monopoly periodisation of capitalism⁽¹⁹¹⁾. The view which this expresses is that the analysis of Western European capitalism cannot be undertaken exclusively through the theory of imperialism. In deference to this, the historical absence of the "collapse" and proletarian revolution is now theoretically explained through the economic and political relations of state monopoly capitalism. This highlights the qualitatively new developments of state interventions and the derivation of capitalist states in which "state" production relations initiate a further "stage" of capitalism.

The second typifies state monopoly capitalism in the "third epoch of capitals" and therefore represents the theoretical and historical content of the monopoly, and the political consequences of the "collapse" of capitals. With the development of "state capitalist tendencies", there can be no "contradiction or distinction between imperialism and state monopoly capitalism"⁽¹⁹²⁾. As the historical

content of state monopoly capitalism is imperialism, it must be evaluated from this periodisation of capitalism⁽¹⁹³⁾. Nehls argues that the "monopoly produces with necessity, the tendency to state monopoly capitalism, that is, the subordination (Unterordnung) of the state under the power of the monopoly"⁽¹⁹⁴⁾. This class mechanism also circumscribes the process of the reform of state monopoly capitalism. As Chmelnizkaja argues, the "concept of reform is unacceptable for the characterisation of the process of state monopoly capitalism" which "already changes the forms and methods of the utilisation (Ausnutzung) of state power through the monopoly in harmony (Überstimmung) with its interests"⁽¹⁹⁵⁾.

However, what the debate also reveals is that the critique of Zieschang has introduced distinctions in the reception of the concept of state monopoly capitalism. Nehls characterises the interventionist functions of imperialist states through the political domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie. In this respect, the "decay and destruction of the whole capitalist system leads necessarily to the application of force and extra-economic force (Gewalt und ausserökonomischen Zwang) as typical means in addition to the economic methods of finance-capital"⁽¹⁹⁶⁾. Therefore, the interventionist functions of states have a wholly quantitative significance in the relation of monopoly and state. Post-war capitalist development unfolds through this structural relation:

"state monopoly capitalism represents the purely quantitative nature of the development of monopoly capitalist relations of production in so far as it is the expression and means of furthering and extending monopoly capitalist property. Nevertheless there is no doubt that there is no standstill in development and that the imminent laws of imperialism, just as the laws of concentration and centralisation,

exist as long as capitalism"(197).

Consequently, state monopoly capitalism under monopoly domination is unable to reconstitute capitalism from the laws of imperialism in a further "stage" of development of capitals through interventionist functions of states in total social reproduction processes.

The political import of this development of state monopoly capitalism signifies that "state monopoly capitalism is not a phase, but a tendency in monopoly capitals"(198). This is seen when Nehls contends that "under the historical conditions of capitalism in its imperialist stage, a qualitative transformation of the relations of production is only possible through their revolutionary transformation (Umgestaltung) into socialist relations of production"(199).

Conversely, while Maier equally rejects a new periodisation of capitalism, he recognises the insufficiency of the explanatory purchase of the "subordination" relation in contemporary capitalism when state monopoly capitalism represents an objective process: as the

"essence of state monopoly capitalism is defined as the subordination (Unterordnung) of states under the monopoly, all aspects of state monopoly capitalism are explained with the formula. This formula defines wholly correctly the class relation of economy and state in imperialism, however, they are not sufficient from the standpoint of political economy to evaluate the essential character of the development of state monopoly capitalism as objective law-bound processes (objektiven gesetzmässigkeit progresses) that brings to expression the characteristics of the capitalist order and the evident (augenscheinlich) historical necessity of socialist revolution"(200).

At the general theoretical level of analysis, the tendency to state monopoly capitalism admits modification at the level of concrete history:

"the task of the scientific examination of state monopoly capitalism arises, as Lenin argues, out of the economic essence of the historical conditions of imperialism. The tendency for monopolies to subordinate the state is specific, while the accomplishment of this tendency is a historical question, a tendency of maturity of the capitalist contradiction in imperialism"(201).

The correspondence of the general theoretical construct of state monopoly capitalism and its historical content of imperialist relations is only tendential and not manifest.

Tscheprakow however extends the problematic of the analysis of the objective character of state monopoly capitalism even further, and identifies a "new form of state monopoly capitalism"(202) after 1945 in which the "transformation of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism ... is a natural consequence of the action of the inner laws of capitalism"(203). This establishes that the "economic power" of state monopoly capitalism is not exclusively that of monopoly capital:

"the economic ruling class of capitalists also possess political power (Herrschaft). Besides this, one must not forget that force (Gewalt), that is, bourgeois state-force (Staatsgewalt) is also an economic power (Kraft). Its utilisation leads to the extension of state monopoly capitalism whereby the state-machine itself grows"(204).

However, neither Tscheprakow nor Maier perceive any contradiction in determining the class relations of capitalist states through the mechanism of monopoly domination while simultaneously developing state monopoly capitalism through the laws of political economy or the state as a "real total capitalist"(205).

In both these cases, a "modification" is acknowledged to the

concept and content of imperialism in that the general concept of state monopoly capitalism is introduced into the post-Stalinist theory as an embracing system of economic and political relations, of the co-ordination of the economic mechanism of monopoly capitalism with the political power of capitalist states. While Zieschang has established this connection in the laws of state monopoly capitalism, for Tschepprakow the connection is expressed through the instrumentalist concept of states: "the modern bourgeois state is a tool in the hands of a few circles of magnates of monopoly capitals"⁽²⁰⁶⁾.

However, the political "volontarism" identified in the Bolshevik critique of "organised capitalism" and "state capitalism" subsequently re-appears in the critique of the "revisionist" concept of state monopoly capitalism. This is expressed in the designation of an epoch of "collapse" of world accumulation processes of capital independently from proletarian internationalism and the historical constitution of political processes. In this respect, even Varga argues that the "capitalist order experiences its last stage of existence, the period of the collapse (Zusammenbruch) of the total social system"⁽²⁰⁷⁾. Consequently, when state monopoly capitalism is acknowledged as an objective process, the critique of Zieschang's or "revisionist" concepts of state monopoly capitalism is accordingly diminished. Since Marxist-Leninist and bourgeois-revisionist theories have identified essentially the same mechanisms in the objective representation of capitalism, the distinction between the concept of state monopoly capitalism, and the concept of contemporary capitalism as a "new form of society"⁽²⁰⁸⁾ or "state socialism"⁽²⁰⁹⁾ is not sharply formulated.

The critique of capitalism therefore does not specifically relate to the objective mechanisms of state monopoly capitalism, but

rather the political⁽²¹⁰⁾ and class conceptualisation of their functioning. This is expressed in the quantitative determination of bourgeois states, when Soviet theoretician Tschepprakow argues that the "mixing (Einmischung) of bourgeois states in the economy" cannot be separated from imperialism⁽²¹¹⁾: the "reformist theories on the essence of state monopoly capitalism separate the form, the mechanism of state capitalism from the class structure of society"⁽²¹²⁾.

The dilemma of interpreting a theory of state monopoly capitalism thereby consists in the new periodisation of capitalism and the analysis of post-war Western European capitalism without a capitulation of the total political conception of state monopoly capitalism into revisionism. This can be illustrated through Tschepprakow's evaluation of the development of capitals in state monopoly capitalism.

Tschepprakow opposes the "vulgarisation of Marxism" in bourgeois theory which attempts to refute the class divisions of capitalism through the empirical falsification of the absolute "miseration-hypothesis"⁽²¹³⁾, and the representation of state monopoly capitalism as a transition from capitalism to socialism⁽²¹⁴⁾. However, Tschepprakow acknowledges that the development of production powers does not lead to a "spontaneous transition from state monopoly capitalism to socialism" or an "automatic collapse of capitalism"⁽²¹⁵⁾. Rather, it is recognised as Varga argued earlier, that capitalism produces "counter-tendencies" to the laws of "absolute immiseration" (Verelendung) of the proletariat through the "relative immiseration" of the proletariat in the modified cyclical movement of capitals⁽²¹⁶⁾.

For Tschepprakow, this is not a refutation of class struggle, but its result which effectively prevents capitalists from permanently reducing the price of labour-power below its subsistence level of reproduction⁽²¹⁷⁾. Consequently, the level of intensity of labour

exploitation must be examined in the relevant phase of the capital cycle, and the impact of the law of uneven development in all stages of capitalism⁽²¹⁸⁾. Here, the general concept of "decaying capitalism" expresses the dialectics of development and class contradictions through Lenin's concept of technical progress (technics, automation, atomic energy, science)⁽²¹⁹⁾. In addition to these "economic" considerations, Tscheprow notes the transformed political position of the working-class in capitalism through the increase in the membership of trade unions and the strength of Communist Parties to secure a "series of social concessions"⁽²²⁰⁾. Moreover, the existence of world socialism places political constraints upon the action of monopoly capitalism⁽²²¹⁾.

Collectively, these factors do not refute Marxist-Leninist theory but are only explained by its categories. However, in Tscheprow's concept of state monopoly capitalism it now becomes unclear as to whether the relative "miseration" of the proletariat and the recognition that human needs are a "concrete-historical category" can establish a class critique of capitalism rather than facilitate the "integration" of the proletariat into capitalism through the reproduction of labour in the total social reproduction processes of capital. This also suggests an ideological problem for the critique of capitalism and the formation of a socialist class consciousness. For, while Communist Parties struggle against the "illusions" in the labour movement that capitalism can be reformed through the bourgeois state apparatus⁽²²²⁾, once the needs of labour are reproduced in the objective social relation of state monopoly capitalism, the critique of state monopoly capitalism assumes a subjective character.

A further problem that exists in Tscheprow's analysis is the attempt to combine the "Stalinist formula" of the "subordination"

theory of states in Western capitalist societies, which Varga criticised, with the democratic functions of political systems. Subsequently, Tscheprow advances contradictory statements on the Marxist-Leninist theory of bourgeois states. On the one hand, the "monopolies" subordinate the bourgeois state both politically and from the objective mechanism of state monopoly capitalism, while on the other, Tscheprow acknowledges that the bourgeoisie do not directly rule but can govern "only through political parties"⁽²²³⁾. Here, political parties not only represent "great capitals" but also part of the "petty-bourgeoisie" and the "proletariat" (Werkstätigen)⁽²²⁴⁾. This implies a much more complex process of political domination in bourgeois society than that admitted in the "Stalinist formula". However, if the "subordination" mechanism establishes the class domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie, then the distribution of political power in democratic parliamentary systems can only be "illusory". Conversely, if the political system is a genuine representation process of the interests of different classes, and a real distribution of political power, then it must be established how the monopoly bourgeoisie unremittingly dominate both state-power and the political system.

We will now consider the broader implications of a theory of state monopoly capitalism.

S.E.D. theorist Turley identifies the following problem of an analysis and critique of contemporary capitalist systems in the theory of state monopoly capitalism when he states that "without a thorough Marxist evaluation of the essence of state monopoly capitalism, and without an examination of its role, the many-sided problems of modern capitalism cannot be solved", and that a "further Marxist-Leninist elaboration of state monopoly capitalism is connected to (the) important theoretical task of the destruction of the anti-

Marxist opinions of the revisionists on modern capitalism"⁽²²⁵⁾.

However, although the implications of Zieschang's analysis are evident even in the critique of the concept of state monopoly capitalism, these initial relaxations of the subordination-thesis are contained within the logic of Lenin's concept of state monopoly capitalism. To this extent, the liberalisation-debate is structured with the relations of the "revisionist" concept of state monopoly capitalism and its counterpart in the "dogmatic" theory of monopoly capitalism. Tscheprow argues in consideration of the new analysis that "state monopoly capitalism - the unification and reflection of the power of the monopoly and the power of the bourgeois state, the direct subordination (Unterordnung) of the state apparatus under monopoly-capitalism - has directly further-developed (weiterentwickelt) these general characteristics on the basis of capitalism"⁽²²⁶⁾. This does not contradict the historical "essence" of imperialism and so demonstrates an inherent limitation to the process of the derivation of states. Similarly, Maier expresses state monopoly capitalism as the contradictory development of monopoly capitals:

"on the basis of the domination of monopoly capitals, the transformation of capitalism is extended further whereby the fundamental characteristics of imperialism are brought forward yet more strongly. State monopoly capitalism is the present form of capitalism, the present form of monopoly capitalist relations of production"⁽²²⁷⁾.

While there is a certain ambiguity here as to what constitutes an "objective mechanism of state capitalism" or a state monopoly capitalist form of production relations in the qualitative determination of states, "state capitalist tendencies" cannot transcend the contradictory movement of total social production, under monopoly

capitalism in a new periodisation of capitalism, nor aspire to the domination of total national economy. Consequently, state monopoly capitalism must be defined through Lenin's concept of the "collapse" of capitals in the terminal epoch of monopoly capitalism.

This analysis re-asserts the traditional features of the "third epoch of capitals". The "Leninist theory of imperialism proves that imperialism, as a dying (sterbender) capitalism, has no new possibilities of development"⁽²²⁸⁾. Therefore, despite the new development in the form of capitalism, state monopoly capitalism remains a "dying capitalism"⁽²²⁹⁾:

"state monopoly capitalism adds nothing new to the essence of imperialism but only intensifies the parasitical character. Therefore, it also does not establish a higher state of capitalist relations of production, but its economic essence is accordingly the highest possible form of control of social production and distribution in capitalism"⁽²³⁰⁾.

In monopoly capitalism, "the monopoly has become the ruling and determining appearance of the capitalist economy at the turn of the century, and with this, capitalism has entered into its last stage"⁽²³¹⁾. The continuity of these characteristics is maintained at the XXII Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1961, where imperialism is defined as

"decaying, dying capitalism, the eve (Vorabend) of socialist revolution. The capitalist world system in its totality is mature for the social revolution of the proletariat ... (which) ... makes unavoidable the collapse (Zusammenbruch) of capitalism and the transition to a higher type of socialised economy"⁽²³²⁾.

Consequently, the analysis of state monopoly capitalism in the mid-1950's responds to the premises of the Leninist analysis of capitals:

"the theoretical starting-point (Ausgangspunkt) which has the aim to represent the economic essence of state monopoly capitalism, to analyse the contemporary process in the capitalist economy, has the monopoly as the basis of imperialism. Of necessity, the monopoly produces the tendency to state monopoly capitalism - that is, the subordination of the state under the power of the monopoly"⁽²³³⁾.

In this period of post-Stalin liberalisation, the economic function of state monopoly capitalist planning instruments of imperialist states are defined politically through the process of the negation of democracy with the "fascisation" of inner-politics and as necessary moments in the war-preparation and defence of monopoly domination. As Klein argues, the "law-connection between the most aggressive imperialists, the tendency to war and state monopoly capitalism consist in that both appearances have their root (Wurzel) in a common basis in the monopoly"⁽²³⁴⁾. The impact of the "General Crisis" on imperialist states is through the acceptance of functions for the militarisation of the economy⁽²³⁵⁾ and the defence of the national and world capitalist order against the ascendent world socialist system⁽²³⁶⁾. This gives rise to the characterisation of the dynamics of imperialist economy in the formation of an integrated state monopoly capitalist "military-industrial-complex", a state-monopoly power structure of a "personnel and economic and political fusion of monopoly, state and military apparatus"⁽²³⁷⁾. Moreover, the apparatus does not function for the totality of the capitalist class, but only its most aggressive fraction, the monopoly bourgeoisie⁽²³⁸⁾. The exacerbation of the "market problem"⁽²³⁹⁾ through the constraints to the expansion of production powers under the intensification of the law of uneven development⁽²⁴⁰⁾ and military aggression⁽²⁴¹⁾ now appears in the modified mechanisms of capital reproduction. The development of state monopoly capitalist forms

of domination of capital⁽²⁴²⁾ from the momentum and inner-contradiction of production and market compels monopolies to "subordinate" state superstructures, and develop "new forms of the use of the state apparatus" for the express purpose of a "solution" (Lösung) to the market-problem⁽²⁴³⁾.

While state monopoly capitalism rejects the abolition of cyclical crises of capital through the politics of "crisis-free" development, economic laws express the modified appearance-forms and deviation from classical capital cycles⁽²⁴⁴⁾. However, in the periodisation of capitalism in the post-1945 "conditions of existence of capitals" (Existenzbedingungen des Kapitals), the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the inner laws of capitalism are modified (modifiziert) in the conditions of imperialism and the "General Crisis"⁽²⁴⁵⁾. Recognition is given here to the "possibility of the development of modern production powers of modern capitalism on the foundation of the general laws of capitalist reproduction"⁽²⁴⁶⁾, but is construed within the functions of militarisation for the dynamics of production powers and therefore the inseparability of imperialist wars, the destruction of production powers, the conquest of markets, and the law of uneven development⁽²⁴⁷⁾. This intensifies the "market-problem" and limits the "purchasing-power" of the masses while the expansion of production powers on the market is contained through the collapse of the colonial system and the rise of national liberation movements⁽²⁴⁸⁾.

The central importance to the question of the state is increasingly evident in all these variants as one of their unifying features. This follows in no small measure from the empirical orientation in Communist Party analysis to the interventist functions of states which interprets the cause of the restitution of the post-war prosperity cycle of capitals in the power of states⁽²⁴⁹⁾. It also

becomes increasingly clear that the actual historical formation of an objective social relation of state monopoly capitalism becomes less in question⁽²⁵⁰⁾ than the structural factors that compel capitalism to assume this form, the historical direction of the capitalist social system and the proximity to socialism⁽²⁵¹⁾. However, this concept for Western European capitalism must be distinguished from the generalisation of "state-capitalism" for China, South East Asia and the "Third World" as a necessary stage through which socialist revolution must pass in the transition to socialism⁽²⁵²⁾.

While the theoretical contribution of Zieschang is confronted with a primarily political concept of state monopoly capitalism, the "logic" of these debates indicates that "monopoly capitalism" is not synonymous with "state monopoly capitalism". Although the imperialist state can only partially and incompletely oppose the "collapse", it is acknowledged by S.E.D. theorist J.L. Schmidt that in the analysis of contemporary capitalism, "one cannot fully understand the development of capitalist countries without examining the essence and appearance-forms of state monopoly capitalism"⁽²⁵³⁾. However, for orthodox theorists such as Tscheprow, these "new appearances" of capitalism do not contradict, but rather confirm the pre-suppositions of Marxism-Leninism⁽²⁵⁴⁾. Here, it is acknowledged that the "state undertakes the attempt to regulate the capitalist economy"⁽²⁵⁵⁾ and the state is a "most essential lever (Hebel) in the mechanism of state monopoly capitalism in the control and regulation of the economy"⁽²⁵⁶⁾. However, state monopoly capitalism cannot realise a planned proportional development of the total national economy⁽²⁵⁷⁾.

Although the periodisation of capitalism extends the assumptions of the Third International into the genesis of state monopoly capitalism, the development of monopoly capitalism in the "de-Stalinisation"

phase does not conclude with a "pure-form" theory of state monopoly capitalism, but a series of partial and inconsistently formulated assumptions that reflect both theoretical revision and also practical concession to the realities of Western European capitalism. Here, the accusations of "revisionism" can no longer be sustained wholly against the concept of state monopoly capitalism because of the increasing general acceptance of its theoretical status. Rather, they relate more to the potential contained within a theory of state monopoly capitalism for a conflicting analysis of the relations of economy and political in capitalist society. Moreover, we may note that there does not appear to be a coherently formulated investigation of the politics of the communist movement with the theoretical development of state monopoly capitalism.

4.2.3 State monopoly capitalism and class strategies

The transformation of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism has led to the discussion of the objective status of the economic processes of monopoly and state. These constitute the materialist class conditions for the characterisation of political systems and the formulation of class strategies in Western European capitalism. Two responses are prominent in the formulation of the concept of alliances which governs class strategies⁽²⁵⁸⁾.

The first concerns the examination of state monopoly capitalism as the "ultimate form" of imperialism under the political features of the "fascisation" of society and state. This establishes the political conditions in the world communist movement for the formulation of class alliances: "the politics of Communist Parties for the formation of a unity of action (Aktionseinheit) and co-operation with all national and democratic powers is a politics of democratic unity"⁽²⁵⁹⁾ for the realisation of democratic Right⁽²⁶⁰⁾. One such concept of class

strategy is a direct legacy of the conceptualisation of the political power of bourgeois states under the "agents-theory" of fascism and the social domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie. Consequently, the structure of these relations and characterisation of the political system of Western European capitalist societies belong to the more general formulation of class strategies established under the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935.

The second response examines state monopoly capitalism through the objective social foundations of the new relations of class powers in developed capital countries, and the contradictory crisis-development of the "proletarianisation" of labour in the monopoly concentration and centralisation of capitals⁽²⁶¹⁾. The consequent polarity of class relations are structured around the "proletarianisation" of labour and monopoly capitals. This equally suggests that the generalisation of the "pure-form" of monopoly capitalism in the Comintern even for developed Western imperialist metropolies has not examined the contemporary structure of class relations from the historical stage of development of capitals. For an objective theory of state monopoly capitalism, the structure of monopoly capital establishes both the relation of a "handfull of monopolies with the whole nation, (which) prepares the ground for an anti-monopolist movement", and thereby the socio-economic basis for an alliance-formation of a "common action against the domination of monopoly capitals"⁽²⁶²⁾. Consequently, the objective structure of state monopoly capitalism creates the socio-class foundations of the general political form of class strategies in the combination of democratic and socialist movements for "freedom , democracy and social progress"⁽²⁶³⁾:

"Communist Parties stand for freedom, security and sovereignty of the people, for the political Rights of workers, and for raising (Hebung) the living-standards of the masses in the broadest front and struggle for the unity and solidarity (Geschlossenheit) of the working-class"(264).

The significance of the XX Congress of the C.P.S.U. creates the political conditions in the world communist movement in which a theory of state monopoly capitalism, and the re-examination of class strategies can take place(265). Marxist-Leninist theory now examines the transformation of imperialist state monopoly capitalism into democratic state capitalism under the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of national "people's democracies" (Volksdemokratien), and the transition to socialism in the "parliamentary form" (parlamentarische Form)(266). This consequently suggests a variety of political forms with the general laws of transition from capitalism to socialism in the world communist movement(267). As Chruschchev states, "under the present conditions, a peaceful transition in individual countries to socialism is possible without armed insurrection and without civil war"(268). This is premised upon the relaxation of the necessity of imperialist wars from the Leninist theory of imperialism. As Tscheprow argues, imperialist wars and revolutions do not follow "automatically and inevitably from over-production crises"(269). While Stalin formally abandoned the "insurrectionist politics" of the civil-war strategy in 1952, this did not articulate the objective conditions for the development of "Socialism in One Country", but expressed the necessity to defend democracy from the imminence of fascist incursions in the conditions of "system competition".

With these developments, a series of important considerations emerge for the formulation of the strategy and tactics of the European communist movement.

The dissolution of the Cominform and the general tactical line to national Communist Parties transforms the political structure of the world communist movement. This displaces the identification of the Soviet Union as the unique centre of world revolution to a "polycentric" characterisation of national socialist revolutions in the world communist movement⁽²⁷⁰⁾. The first "International Conference of Communist and Labour Parties" in 1957 since the VII World Congress of the Comintern in 1935 concludes with a "general line of unity" of Communist Parties, in which Communist Parties exercise control over theory and tactics in a relation of "close co-operation", but without a stringent Party-line with the Soviet Union. This permits Communist Parties to develop the theory and tactics from the history and experience of the national conditions in which "Popular Front" strategies are undertaken⁽²⁷¹⁾. As Togliatti argues, the "Soviet model cannot and must not any longer be obligatory"⁽²⁷²⁾.

The genesis of state monopoly capitalism thereby responds to the combination of two theories of capitalist society. The one is characterised by the theory of capitalism which becomes dominant in the history of the world communist movement under the Third International, while the other increasingly develops as the general theory of the world communist movement in the conditions of a world "polycentrism". However, while world "polycentrism" and "Socialism in One Country" represent the theory and practice of the European labour movement in the "de-Stalinisation" period, this analysis of Western European capitalism should not necessarily be interpreted as an "anti-Stalinist" movement because its conceptualisation realises a dimension of the dissolution of proletarian internationalism in the world communist movement already initiated by Stalin. In this regard, the theory of "state monopoly capitalism" reformulates the Euro-centric foundations of socialist

revolution in the geo-political conditions of the autonomy of Western European Communist Parties from the C.P.S.U.⁽²⁷³⁾. While this potentially extends beyond the general Soviet critique of the "Stalin-cult" to the critique of Stalinism in the political structure of the world communist movement⁽²⁷⁴⁾, the initial response of European Communist Parties is guarded, both in respect of the critique of Stalin, and their own historical role in the Comintern⁽²⁷⁵⁾.

The "de-Stalinisation period" suggests two schemas to the formulation of class strategies in Western European capitalist societies.

Class strategies and socialism

The first of these is that favoured by the Soviet Union and its "satellites", and responds to the theory and tactics of the Comintern.

The characterisation of class strategies can be examined through the propositions advanced on the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory of capitalist states and the political constitution of the transition from capitalism to socialism in bourgeois-democratic parliamentary state-forms. This political conceptualisation of strategies remains within the problematic of the combination of democratic and socialist revolutions in Western European capitalist societies.

Monopoly capitalism creates the objective conditions for the accomplishment of a "democratic popular revolution"⁽²⁷⁶⁾ from the new class contradiction of monopoly capitalism, the "monopolies and the greatest majority of the people"⁽²⁷⁷⁾. This proposition follows from the objective conditions of capitalism, and the thesis of the non-necessity of imperialist wars which cedes the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism: where possible "the proletariat ... (are) ... to conquer power by the parliamentary way"⁽²⁷⁸⁾. Consequently, the "conquering of power through the working-class conquest of a majority in parliaments can be a possible form of peaceful transition to socialism"⁽²⁷⁹⁾. With the stabilisation of European capitalism

this becomes the more probable form of communist strategy.

This expresses the "stage"-theory of revolution in labour tactics⁽²⁸⁰⁾ for the "binding of the democratic mass movement against imperialism and against the monopoly bourgeoisie, increasingly with the struggle for socialism"⁽²⁸¹⁾. The constitution of "social revolution" in this form is given by the Comintern's theory of the completion of the democratic revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and the "majority of the nation"⁽²⁸²⁾. As the transition from capitalism to socialism is designated through the parliamentary democratic state-form, the democratic essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat is in the alliance of the working-class, all workers and democratic powers⁽²⁸³⁾.

However, the aim of this stage of tactics of the democratic mass movement is defined against monopoly capitalism so as to isolate the general power of the reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie by the "de-powering" (Entmachtung) of the "agents of the great monopolies (Agenten der grossen Monopole)"⁽²⁸⁴⁾. Since this formulates a democratic movement against the dictatorship of the monopoly,⁽²⁸⁵⁾ and creates a new type of democracy in the interests of the "broad masses"⁽²⁸⁶⁾, it is not a socialist aim although it is narrowly bound with the socialist movement⁽²⁸⁷⁾. It thereby is not a critique of capitalism, a strategy against the total class of capital nor a rejection of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Consequently, the concept of revolution abandons the direct revolutionary transformation of state monopoly capitalism into socialism for intermediate and transitional forms of democratic state capitalist regimes between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the classical form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This "transition-stage" creates the favourable conditions for socialism⁽²⁸⁸⁾ through which the "people's revolution" (Volksrevolution) economically nationalises the great private banks, the trusts and concerns in social property of the means of production⁽²⁸⁹⁾, and politically destroys the political power of the dictatorship of the monopoly⁽²⁹⁰⁾. The subsequent transformation of the economic and political structures of monopoly capitalism through the democratic state-form establishes the anti-monopolist revolution as a "stable foundation for the transition to socialism"⁽²⁹¹⁾.

While the "utilisation" of parliamentary democracy can potentially transcend the ideological and organisational division of the European labour movement⁽²⁹²⁾, it is important to note that this is predicted by its functions in a revolutionary mass movement of the working-class and broad popular stratum of the population⁽²⁹³⁾. Although this appears to "beg the question" of the creation of a revolutionary movement, its postulation is an important proposition that qualifies communist utilisation of democratic state-forms from "Right-socialist" theories.

Several issues may be raised in this formulation of strategies in monopoly capitalism.

Firstly, "alliance-politics" encounter the problem of defining the transition to socialism through the political superstructures of bourgeois society on the basis of a transitional form of capitals. Consequently, the political forms of imperialist republic with the "fascisation" of state monopoly capitalism, and the political forms of the democratic republic with the democratisation of state monopoly capitalism, exists upon the same economic structure of monopoly capitalism. Therefore, the political forms of "state monopoly capitalism" are theorised independently from the "particularities" of capital.

Secondly, while it is argued that bourgeois-democracy is a form of class domination⁽²⁹⁴⁾, the full significance of this proposition is not developed because the critique of class society only extends to its monopoly-character. This is because anti-monopolist strategies do not establish a total critique of the political superstructures of bourgeois society but rather only the monopoly domination on the political. Therefore, Communist Party strategies raise no principal objection to the prospect of the accommodation of the European labour movement to the political superstructures of bourgeois society set free from monopoly domination.

Thirdly, the historical precedent of fascism establishes the rationale for the post-1945 alliance of political parties in a "block of anti-fascist democratic parties"⁽²⁹⁵⁾, against the economic and political omnipotence of the monopolies. However, when the rationale of this alliance is transformed from the defence of democracy against fascist repression to the organisation of a democratic transition to socialism, then the problem arises of establishing the necessity of the vanguard functions of Marxist-Leninist Parties and their role in bourgeois democracies.

This new quality to alliance-politics equally expresses the perspective of Communist Party-directed strategies in parliamentary democracies in distinction to the formation of revolutionary class consciousness from the "collapse" of capitals and the "fascisation" of bourgeois states.

Fourthly, Soviet theorists postulate no contradiction between defining the necessity of vanguard Party functions for the creation of revolutionary class consciousness⁽²⁹⁶⁾ and the political organisation of the labour movement in a democratic "stage" of anti-monopolist programmatic demands.

Fifthly, the communist critique of "Right" social-democratic leaders is no longer tenable when it is argued that the objective and subjective moments for the destruction of capitalism are mature⁽²⁹⁷⁾, and when Communist Parties themselves accept the "utilisation" of parliamentary democracies.

Sixthly, the relation of democratic and socialist revolution, the transformation of "popular revolution" into socialist revolution is defined directly out of the political constitution of "anti-monopolist" democratic solutions to imperialist crises. Therefore, the problem of Communist Party-directed, anti-monopolist strategies for the unification and general tactical line of Social-Democratic and Communist Parties remains undefined, and the combination of "United Front" and "Popular Front" strategies in the post-fascist conditions of Western European capitalism untheorised.

The problem of combining "United Front" and "Popular Front" strategies, reformism and revolution, democracy and socialism, spontaneity and organisation in the political relations of the labour movement in the "epoch of proletarian revolutions" have not been clearly answered. To this extent, the theorisation of a coherent strategy for the European communist movement responds to the imperatives that confronted Lenin's attempt to combine the Second and Third Internationals' programmatic demands in a unified world communist movement.

However, the dilemma of Communist Party tactics after the abandonment of the "social-fascism" -thesis and the defence of democracies concerns the proximity of the political praxis of Communist Parties to that of "Right" Socialist Parties.

Despite the analogous structure, the explanation of these tactics remains on a different political plane. It is accepted that the

general laws of monopoly capitalism preclude the regulation and development of capitalism in a "post-collapse" stage of production. However, on the supposition that monopoly domination usurps the political systems of Western European capitalist societies, Communist Parties now re-define the functions of parliamentary democracy in capitalist societies. Consequently, defensive anti-fascist strategies of the Comintern receive an anti-monopoly connotation in deference to their potential political "de-powering" of monopolies under the alliance of democratic and socialist powers. Paradoxically, the stabilisation of parliamentary democracies after European fascism has an anti-monopolist significance, while simultaneously remaining a "state-form" of monopoly power.

The Marxist-Leninist critique of revisionist politics no longer directly equates "revisionism" with social-democracy but, only social-democracy not delimited by the socialist critique, and thereby the necessity of transforming the democratic stage into the socialist stage of revolution.

Moreover, the issues raised here unfold within the "Cold War" phase (1945-61) of the "General Crisis", - where "state monopoly capitalism" develops as a "war of attrition" (Zermürbungskrieg) of inner "destabilisations" of capitalism. This is a "period of the further weakening of capitalist world systems and the growth of the power of democracy and socialism"⁽²⁹⁸⁾. The transformation of world power relations in "favour" (Gunst) of the anti-monopolist struggles of the world communist movement for peace and freedom⁽²⁹⁹⁾ are conditional upon the "politics of peaceful co-existence" and the world conditions of transition from capitalism to socialism in which the democratic forms of transition to socialism are constituted⁽³⁰⁰⁾. This establishes the significance of the socialist world system for class strategies

and acknowledges the re-evaluation of democracy when Soviet theorists identify the "growing organisational strength of the working class (which) ... places the bourgeoisie in fear of democracy"⁽³⁰¹⁾.

Further, the rapid expansion of Communist Party membership after the defeat of fascism and the legality of Communist Parties⁽³⁰²⁾ is increasingly acknowledged as having genuine influence of the democratic reform policies of governments and capitalist state interventions⁽³⁰³⁾ under democratic alliance-programmes as "concessions to the working-class"⁽³⁰⁴⁾.

Class strategies and republican democracy

The second schema of class strategies appears in the articulation of the Euro-centric foundations of "Socialism in One Country". The perspective involved here is less from the combination of "United Front" and "Popular Front" strategies than that of the transformation of the democratic into a socialist republic.

In 1956, Togliatti advances several propositions on the orientation of the Italian Communist Party to the "Italian way to socialism"⁽³⁰⁵⁾ which conceptualises the concrete struggle for democratic liberation in the theory and tactics of Western parliamentary democracies. This involves the reassertion of the "democratic struggle for the application of the Republican constitution in its political principles"⁽³⁰⁶⁾, and the examination of alliances within the transformed political relations of the world communist movement, of a "unity of action" of the communist movement and non-communist, socialist oriented movement (socialists, social-democrats) - the "progressive movement of the working-class"⁽³⁰⁷⁾. Consequently, Togliatti can postulate the relation of democracy and socialism through economic and political structural reforms of capitalism:

"we still believe that a democracy of the Western type is a limited and imperfect democracy which is false in many ways and needs to be developed and perfected through a series of economic and political reforms"(308).

Therefore, the emancipatory proletarian form of political power is constituted in bourgeois parliamentary democracies to "satisfy the peoples' requests and demands"(309).

Togliatti and the I.C.P. at the VIII Congress 27-29 September, 1956 show a greater receptivity to the possibilities of "liberalisation", and extend the theses on the relationship between democratic and socialist revolution further than both the Soviet/D.D.R. theorists and the French Communist Party. This is revealed in the interpretation of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory of class states to theory of the democratic "utilisation" of bourgeois states. Togliatti here makes the first explicit statement on the possibility of "destroying" bourgeois states under a plurality of political forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The principal consideration this introduces is the political constitution of the transition from capitalism to socialism in the democratic structures of existing bourgeois-parliamentary state-forms.

"First Marx and Engels and later Lenin stated, in developing this theory, that the bourgeois state apparatus could not be used in the building of a socialist society. This apparatus must be broken up and destroyed by the working class, and replaced by the apparatus of the proletarian state, that is, of the state directed by the working class itself. This was not the original position of Marx and Engels; it was the position which they arrived at after the experience of the Paris Commune and which was developed in particular by Lenin. Is this position still entirely valid today? Here is a subject for discussion. When in fact we state that it is possible to

proceed towards socialism not only through democracy but also by using parliamentary forms, it is evident that we are correcting something in this position, taking into consideration the changes that are still taking place in the world"⁽³¹⁰⁾.

We may also relate this characterisation of communist theory to the traditional formulation of "organised capitalism" and "state socialism", and the initial process of the accommodation of the European labour movement to bourgeois states.

Conversely, Garaudy's critical reception of the VIII Congress which expresses the F.C.P.'s position on the class constitution of bourgeois states and the socialist transition through parliamentary democratic states is in more orthodox terms. Garaudy consequently contends that "there is no contradiction between the utilisation of parliament for the passage to socialism and the Marxist thesis on the necessity to break the state machine of the bourgeoisie: it is simply a question of knowing if parliament can be utilised in order to effect (opérer) this transformation"⁽³¹¹⁾. Therefore, the utilisation of parliamentary democracies and the "destruction" of state are not incompatible propositions as Togliatti suggests, but rather "it is possible to utilise parliament in order to break other organs of the state apparatus"⁽³¹²⁾.

However, two important distinctions exist here in this formulation. The necessity to "destroy" the bourgeois state follows from the distinction of "state-forms" (bourgeois-democratic parliaments) from the character of "state-types" (capitalist states) in monopoly capitalism⁽³¹³⁾, and the fact that the consequent "utilisation" of bourgeois parliaments does not transform the class "essence" of states because, as Garaudy argues, there are no electoral laws with which to make parliaments more representative⁽³¹⁴⁾. Consequently, to "utilise parliaments in order to break other organs of the state apparatus"⁽³¹⁵⁾ is to "utilise" parliamentary institutions of the "constitutional

state" to "break" the other organs of the "repressive state". There is no proposition here of a transition to socialism through the mere act of utilising bourgeois states or the perfectability of the democratic republic.

Conversely, the F.C.P. is truer to the Marxist-Leninist concept of the Party and the Comintern's concept of the revolutionary utilisation of bourgeois-democratic parliamentary states as political counter-weights to the usurption of democratic republic through the "fascisation" of bourgeois states.

This brings into sharper relief the I.C.P.'s theorisation of a plurality of political parties to represent the working-class and to participate in the construction of "Socialism in One Country" with Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy. For the F.C.P. and Soviet theory, the strategy of the utilisation of bourgeois parliamentary democracies for socialist transition depends upon the preparatory mobilisation of the "masses" for revolutionary struggle, and is therefore conditional upon socialist presuppositions. This defines the terrain of class struggle in the "democratic revolution" as a subordinate moment to socialist movement. While this reply suggests an "inter-class" theory of the state when Garaudy expresses the necessity to "tear" (arracher) the state-machine away from the bourgeoisie⁽³¹⁶⁾, it yet sustains the important principle that parliamentary democracy is not a "transitional way" to socialism itself, but has only a "tactical" significance. It is therefore not the fundamental process in the political constitution of the "communist" movement. Such a distinction here separates the F.C.P. and the I.C.P. on the conceptualisation of the parliamentary transition to socialism and the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state.

However, the problem left unsolved here in addition to those already discussed, is that it is not explained how the communist

demand of the destruction of the "state-machine" is to be accomplished when "alliance-politics" are also comprised of democratic powers.

The distinction in the class theory of states is also important for the examination of imperialism. Here, Garaudy, opposes the "reform" of the structures of capitalism (Togliatti, Longo) through state interventions and nationalisations which promulgates the "illusions" that the capitalist economy can be "planned"⁽³¹⁷⁾. Garaudy perceives here a theory of the "state beyond classes" in these formulations which fails to acknowledge that nationalisations are "capitalist socialisations", and therefore economic instruments of the monopolies⁽³¹⁸⁾. Such "reforms of structure" contradict the critique of capitalism and the foundation of revolutionary class struggle. As Garaudy argues, "but how to stimulate (susciter) this 'revolutionary movement of the masses' if not in the struggle against capitalism which renders evident the law of absolute and relative pauperisation of the working-class and which makes the labourers (travailleurs) conscious (donne conscience) that this law will only be terminated with capitalism itself"⁽³¹⁹⁾. However, there is no argumentation as to how a "capital-negating" class consciousness is necessarily produced from the cyclical movement of capitals⁽³²⁰⁾, nor the mechanism of its creation. The inability of this concept to demarcate the structural limits to the reform of capitalism have already been established. It nonetheless remains the essential mechanism with which to generate a revolutionary class consciousness within which the "parliamentary strategy" is subordinated. However, as this strategy is conditional upon the "immiseration" of the working-class, the problem of connecting democratic and socialist movements is obscured in a prosperity phase of capitals with the dissolution of a revolutionary consciousness.

These preliminary developments of state monopoly capitalism and the formulation of political strategies are neither coherently nor comprehensively formulated as a combined economic and political analysis of Western capitalist societies. Rather, in the initial period of liberalisation of theory and tactics of Western European Communist Parties, both the weight of Marxist-Leninist tradition and the varying degrees of liberalisation constrain Communist Parties to theoretically examine the developments of a post-war prosperity cycle of capitals, and to construct a new socialist strategy in the political conditions in which Western European capitals are restituted.

Having investigated the first phase of "de-Stalinisation" and its effect on the strategy of the world communist movement, we will now introduce the issues involved in the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism. These principally concern the continued liberalisation of Marxist-Leninist theory from "Stalinism" and the consequent attempt to create a new general theory of capitalist social systems.

CHAPTER 4REFERENCES

1. H. Sander, 'Über den Charakter der ökonomischen Gesetze' in WZMLUHW, 10 (1952-3), 397-406 (p. 397). Also see W. Liebau, 'Über die Bedeutung der Arbeit Stalins' Ökonomische Probleme des Sozialismus in der U.d.S.S.R.' in WZMLUHW, 7 (1952-3), 299-316 (p. 305).
2. As F. Claudin argues, the consolidation of the Soviet socialist system not only reinforces the domination of Soviet orthodoxy, but also "supplies it with a new ideological and political justification in monolithism and Stalinist dogmatism". La Crise du mouvement communiste. II, p. 368.
3. For example, Italian Communist Party theorist E. Sereni accepts the characterisation of the Leninist theory of imperialism as the "epoch of ... dying (morente) capitalism and proletarian revolution". 'Politica e ideologia nella Resistenza: un' introduzione inedita del gennaio-marzo 1945 ai Principi del leninismo', CM, 2-3 (1972), 207-261 (p. 219).
4. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige Fragen des modernen Kapitalismus', Die Press der Sowjetunion, I (1956), 421-428 (p. 421).
5. A.K., Politische Ökonomie (Moskau, 1959).
6. V. Tschepprakow, 'op. cit.', (p. 424).
7. Dimitroff's definition of fascism is characteristic of Soviet-Marxism and enters the D.D.R. literature after 1945. See B. Bernhard, R. Relche and I. Werth, 'Die Faschismus-Theorie der D.D.R.', D.A., 33 (1965), 35-48.
8. H. Sander, 'op. cit.', (p. 404).
9. G. Geissler, 'Das ökonomische Grundgesetz des modernen Kapitalismus', WZMLUHW, 7 (1952-3), 323-326, p. 234.
10. H. Sander, 'Über den Charakter', p. 404. Also see R. Creussol, 'Les Profits' EP, 5-6 (1954), 163-180 (p. 168. P. Figurnow, 'M. Rosental "Fragen der Dialektik im 'Kapital'"', SW, 10 (1956), 1306-1317, (p. 1310).
11. J. Stalin, The Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. (Peking, 1972) p. 38 (May 22, 1952); R. Creussol 'op. cit.', (p. 173); H. Borchert, 'Über die Besonderheiten der ökonomischen Gesetze', WZMLUHW, 7 (1952-3), 347-350 (p. 348).
12. O. Beuer, 'Ökonomische Probleme des Sozialismus in der U.d.S.S.R.', WZMLUHW, 1 (1954-5), 67-72 (p. 68).
13. H. Sander, 'op. cit.', (p. 404).
14. J. Stalin, 'op. cit.', (pp. 38-9), (emphasis added).

15. In fascism, this is the "unmasked (unverhüllten) terroristic counter-attack (Gegenangriff)", and establishes the basis for later theoretical developments. B. Porschnjew, 'Über gewisse Tendenzen in der deutschen Geschichte', Sowjetliteratur, 1-3 (1947), 97-126 (p. 97).
16. G. Geissler, 'Die Unterordnung des Staatsapparatus unter die Monopole', WZMLUHW, 7 (1952-3), 339-41 (p. 325).
17. K. Langendorf, 'Die Bedeutung der Marxschen Wertlehre für den Aufbau des Sozialismus in der D.D.R.' WZFSUJ, 1 (1952-3), 27-33 (p. 30). Here, the "immiseration" thesis is explained from "over-production crises".
18. W. Liebau, 'Die Funktionen der sowjetischen Finanzwirtschaft und ihre Besonderheiten gegenüber der Finanzwirtschaft der kapitalistischen Staaten' WZMLUHW, 3 (1953-4), 567-587 (p. 580).
19. G. Geissler, 'op. cit.', (p. 341); B. Porschnjew, 'op. cit.', (p. 97).
20. J. Stalin, The Economic Problems, p. 39.
21. H. Borchert, 'op. cit.', (p. 348); R. Gutermuth, 'Über die Widersprüche zwischen den Ländern des imperialistischen Lagers und die Unvermeidlichkeit von Kriegen zwischen diesen Ländern', WZLUHW, 7 (1952-3), 327-333.
22. G. Geissler, 'Das ökonomische Grundgesetz', (p. 324).
23. G. Fraas, 'Zur Entwicklung des Weltmarkts', WZMLUHW, 7 (1952-3), 343-346 (p. 343).
24. J. Stalin, 'op. cit.', p. 30.
25. W. Liebau, 'Über die Bedeutung', (p. 305).
26. W. Liebau, 'ibid.', (p. 305).
27. R. Gutermuth, 'op. cit.', (p. 327).
28. G. Geissler, 'Die Unterordnung', (p. 340).
29. O. Beuer, 'op. cit.', (p. 68).
30. P. Fedossejew, 'Quellen und Charakter der Kriege', Sowjetliteratur, 3-4 (1946), 118-131 (pp. 124-5); G. Fraas, 'Zur Entwicklung', (p. 343).
31. J. Stalin, 'op. cit.', (p. 58), (emphasis added).
32. E. Langelüdecke, 'Die Besonderheiten des deutschen Imperialismus', WZMLUHW, 5 (1956), 903-918 (p. 905).
33. J. Stalin, 'op. cit.', p. 58. However, the argument that Lenin supplies the "scientific analysis of capitalist economic laws in imperialist capitalism ... under the conditions of the General Crisis of Capitalism" is a retrospective interpretation. See H. Matern, 'Die Bedeutung der Werke von K. Marx und F. Engels für den gegenwärtigen Kampf der deutschen Arbeiterklasse', Einheit, 3 (1957), 274-293.

34. W. Brjunin, 'Die Grosse Sozialistische Oktoberrevolution in Russland und die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung in den Jahren 1917-1918,' WZMLUHW, 6 (1954-5), 715-727 (p. 715).
35. See J. Stalin, 'op. cit.', p. 30.
36. See W. Petrowsky, 'Zur Entwicklung der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus' Prokla, 1 (1974), 129-176, (p. 132).
37. See E. Varga, 'Veränderungen in der kapitalistischen Wirtschaft im Gefolge des Zweiten Weltkrieges', in Die Krise, pp. 416-425.
38. W. Petrowsky, 'op. cit', (p. 133).
39. E. Varga, 'Die grosse Krise', in Die Krise, p. 234-297.
40. E. Varga, 'Veränderungen in der kapitalistischen', (p. 420).
41. E. Varga, 'ibid.', (p. 417).
42. E. Varga, 'ibid.', (pp. 417-8).
43. This point is made by R. Nordahl, "Stalinist Ideology: the Case of the Stalinist Interpretation of monopoly capitalist politics', Soviet Studies, 26 (1974), 239-259.
44. E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 419).
45. E. Varga, 'ibid.', (p. 419).
46. G. Geissler, 'Die Unterordnung', (p. 339).
47. J. Stalin, The Economic Problems, p. 43.
48. G. Geissler, 'op. cit.', (p. 339).
49. H. Riedel, 'Zur Kritik der sogenannten Theorie der "sozialen Marktwirtschaft', WZMLUHW, 3 (1955), 353-359 (pp. 353-4).
50. I. Leshnew, 'Die deutsche Kapitalmagnaten', Internationale Literatur. Deutschen Blätter, 10 (1945), 73-90 (p. 77).
51. E. Varga, 'op. cit.', (p. 425).
52. E. Varga, 'ibid.', (pp. 424-5).
53. The significance of this concept of contradiction first identified in Chapter 3 will be more fully examined in Chapter 5.
54. P. Boccara, 'Apercu sur la question du capitalisme monopoliste d'État', EP, (Janvier-Mai, 1966), 5-17 (p. 8), (Julliet, 1965). In this regard, the development of the theory of state monopoly capitalism by the theorists of Western European Communist Parties is relatively autonomous from the history and politics associated with the theory under the Comintern.

55. Boccara argues that "during the Great Depression in the 1930's the Nazi economy of Hitlerian Germany and the economy of the United States inaugurated by the 'New Deal' of Roosevelt constitute two particularly eloquent examples of state monopoly capitalism", 'ibid', p. 7. We will examine the "objective" status of state monopoly capitalism subsequently. However, here compare with J. Chmelnizkaja, 'Grundzüge des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus in Westdeutschland', SW, 4 (1959), 415-431 (p. 430).
56. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus-Leninismus (Berlin, 1960), p. 523. First published in Moscow, 1960.
57. A.K., Grundlagen der marxistischen Philosophie (Berlin, 1966), p. 290. First published in Moscow, 1959.
58. As Soviet theoreticians argue, "'free competition' corresponds to bourgeois democracy, liberal ideologies, pacification, national sovereignty, etc. while monopoly capitalism strives for national and international domination through foreign conquest, nationalism, chauvism, corruption and the general transformation of democracy into political reaction". See A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 453.
59. See P. Figurnow, 'M. Rosental. Fragen der Dialektik', (pp. 1309-10).
60. O. Beuer, 'Über die Bedeutung des Lehrbuchs "Politische Ökonomie" für Wirtschaftstheorie und Praxis', WZMLUHW, 3 (1955), 343-351 (p. 345).
61. O. Beuer, 'Ökonomische Probleme', (p. 67).
62. O. Beuer, 'Über die Bedeutung', (p. 348).
63. J. Stalin, The Economic Problems, p. 24; P. Figurnow, 'op. cit.', (p. 1309).
64. O. Beuer, 'Ökonomische Probleme', (p. 67).
65. See F.W. Mussler, 'Die Sowjetischen Erfahrungen beim Aufbau des Sozialismus-Kommunismus und die Politischen Ökonomie', Einheit, 8 (1957), 992-1013 (p. 995); F. Volkerung. 'Über die Grundthesen der Marxschen Reproduktions-theorie', WZMLUHW, 7 (1952-3), 351-354. However, compare with H. Rössler, 'Der II Band "Kapitals" und seiner Bedeutung für die Politische Ökonomie des Sozialismus', WZMLUHW, 6 (1952-3), 235-243. This latter text states the significance of Volume I of Kapital for Volume II more clearly.
66. D. Klein, cited in 'Der II Band "Kapitals"', H. Rössler, (p. 233).
67. O. Beuer, 'Über die Bedeutung', (p. 310).
68. K. Langendorf, 'Die Bedeutung', (p. 28).
69. V. Tschepprakow, 'Die bürgerlichen Ökonomen und der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus', SW, 3 (1956), 275-289 (p. 286).
70. J. Stalin, The Economic Problems, pp. 37-8, emphasis added. Also see H-D Kühne, 'Die Warenproduktion im Kapitalismus und im Sozialismus', WZMLUHW, 10 (1952-3), 407-414 (p. 407).

71. H. Sander, 'Über den Charakter', (p. 404).
72. H. Sander, 'ibid.', (p. 405); W. Liebau, 'Über die Bedeutung', (p. 311).
73. H. Sander, 'ibid.', (p. 401); W. Liebau, 'ibid.', (p. 308).
74. H. Borchert, 'Über die Besonderheiten', (p. 348).
75. The reproduction schema has no independent existence or significance as an historical relationship outside the capitalist mode of production, or as an historically equilibrated total production through the analytical categories of capital.
76. For this application see H. Franck and A. Schiener, 'Die objektiven Grundlage der Planung und Leitung der sozialistischen Wirtschaft', Einheit, 12 (1957), 1324-1333 (p. 1324). Also see R. Horst, 'Stalin's Hinweise und Konkretisierung der Bedingungen unter deren sich in der Sowjetunion der Übergang vom Sozialismus zum Kommunismus vollzieht', WZMLUHW, 7 (1952-3).
77. J. Stalin, cited in F. Völkerung, 'Über die Grundthesen', (p. 353).
78. Compare with H-D. Kühne, 'op. cit.', (pp. 410-11).
79. I. Stern, 'K. Marx über die historischen Grundmässigkeiten und des handeln der Menschen', WZMLUHW, 1 (1953-4), 1-16 (p. 15).
80. I. Stern, 'ibid.', (p. 15).
81. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 567, 569, 571.
82. K. Marx, Grundrisse, (Frankfurt, 1953), p. 902.
83. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 907.
84. See T. Blanke, Funktionswandel des Streits im Spätkapitalismus (Frankfurt, 1972), pp. 110-1.
85. v. H-D Kittsteiner, '"Logisch" und "historisch"', (p. 42); K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 904.
86. Compare with I. Rubin, Essays on Marx's Theory of Value (New York, 1972). First published in 1928.
87. For the examination of "reproduction" in contemporary communist theory see A.D. Magaline, Lutte des classes et dévalorisation du travail (Paris, 1975), p. 59.
88. Engels follows this problematic of "anarchy-planning" which is influential on subsequent communist theory. See Anti-During, MEW, 20, pp. 252-3; see also W. Petrowsky, 'Zur Entwicklung', p. 140.
89. G. Geissler, 'Die Unterordnung', (p. 339).

90. G. Geissler, 'ibid.', (p. 339).
91. See F. Fejtö, L'ère de Stalin, 1945-53 (Paris, 1969), p. 351. Also see H. Weber, Post-face, Le Parti communiste allemande, (1972); P.T. Mania, De Lénine au panzer - communisme (Paris, 1971).
92. R. Gutermuth, 'Über die Widersprüche', (p. 332).
93. F. Fejto, 'op. cit.', pp. 190-1.
94. See L. Marcou, Le Kominform (Paris, 1977).
95. R. Gutermuth, 'op. cit.', (p. 332).
96. D. Klohr, 'Die Ziele der gegenwärtigen Friedensbewegung', WZMLUHW, 7 (1952-3), 335-337 (p. 335).
97. R. Gutermuth, 'op. cit.', (p. 332).
98. J. Stalin, Die Neue Welt, 6, 1951.
99. O. Klohr, 'op. cit.', (p. 335).
100. O. Klohr, 'ibid.', (p. 336).
101. O. Klohr, 'ibid.', (p. 335); J. Stalin, The Economic Problems, pp. 32-4.
102. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 36 (Emphasis added).
103. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 37.
104. O. Klohr, 'Die Ziele', (p. 336).
105. See B. Rabehl, 'Le S.D.S. et la stratégie de l'action directe en Europe occidentale', Partisans, 51 (1970), 29-50 (p. 34). Also see W. Petrowsky, 'Zur Entwicklung', P. 131, 132.
106. R. Gutermuth, 'Über die Widersprüche', (p. 332).
107. J. Stalin, The Economic Problems, p. 34.
108. J. Stalin, 'ibid.', p. 35.
109. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 421).
110. The general perspective of alliance-politics from 1921 onwards are essentially defensive in character with the exception of the period 1928-35.
111. See F. Marek, 'Der XX Parteitag der K.P.d.S.U. und die Kommunistischen Parteien Westeuropas' in R. Medwedew, 'et al', Der XX Parteitag der K.P.d.S.U. und seine Folgen (Frankfurt, 1977). However, these initiatives pre-date the XX Congress of the C.P.S.U. and have their origins in the Comintern. Moreover, the concept of "Socialism in One Country" does not contradict the theory of the "General Crisis".

111. (Continued)

As Rosental argues, the law of uneven economic and political development in imperialism has "not only another form, but produces other results than in pre-monopoly capitalism. Lenin has elaborated a new foundation (abgerundete) for a theory of socialist revolution, the theory of the victory of socialism in one country". P. Figurnow, 'op. cit.', pp. 1309-10.

112. A.K., 'Grundsätze und Ziel der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands', 1946, in Die sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands 1946-71 (Bremen, 1971), pp. 48-9. See also G. Alexandrow, 'Über Sowjetdemokratie', Sowjetliteratur, 1-3 (1947), 85-96.
113. W-D Schmidt, 'Verfassung und Monopole', (p. 100).
114. W. Petrowsky, 'Zur Entwicklung', (p. 166).
115. B. Porschnjew, 'op. cit.', (p. 97).
116. H. Naumann, 'Einige Probleme des VII Weltkongresses der Kommunistischen Internationale', WZFSUJ, 4-5 (1955-6), 605-614 (p. 609). Naumann is here referring to fascism in Germany. However, this interpretation conflicts with our evaluation of Comintern theory.
117. H. Naumann, 'ibid.', (p. 608).
118. This characterisation is subsequently developed by Soviet theorists. See V. Kelle and M. Kovalzon, Le materialisme historique, (Moscou, 1972), p. 244.
119. V. Kelle and M. Kovalzon, 'ibid.', p. 245.
120. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, See also W. Ulbricht, Das Programm des Sozialismus. Aus dem Referat des Genossen. VI Parteitag der S.E.D. (Berlin, 1966).
121. R. Garaudy, Die Freiheit als philosophie und historische Kategorie (Berlin, 1959), p. 307. First published in Paris, 1955. See also A.K., Grundlagen der marxistischen, pp. 454-5. The concern here is not the Marxist-Leninist analysis of fascism, but rather the effect of the periodisation of capitalism on the general theoretical representation of the political forms of power in state monopoly capitalism.
122. R. Garaudy, 'ibid.', p. 376.
123. W-D. Schmidt, 'Verfassung und Monopole', (p. 87).
124. B. Bernhard 'et. al.', 'Die Faschismus', (p. 36). See B. Porschnjew, 'op. cit.', (p. 97).
125. See here 'N. Chruschtschows "Geheimrede" vom 25 Februar, 1956', in 'Der XX Parteitag', pp. 487-537.
126. However, as the presentation of the issues raised in Marxist-Leninist theory show, the "problems" of communist theory cannot be reduced to a critique of the "Stalin-cult".

127. The XX. Congress is not, however, equally received by all Communist Parties. For example, compare P. Togliatti, "9 Domande sull Stalinismo". Nuovi Argomenti, 20, (June 16, 1956) and the F.C.P., 'Statement of the Political Bureau of the F.C.P., L'Humanité' (June 18, 1956), both in The Anti-Stalin Campaign and International Communism (New York, 1956).
128. W. Petrowsky, 'Zur Entwicklung', (p. 142).
129. W. Ulbricht, Neues Deutschland (Berlin, 1956), p. 71.
130. A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 275.
131. This first example is I. Kusminow, Der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus cited in 'Diskussion zum Thema staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus', O. Kratsch, WW, 7 (1959), 106-116 (p. 111). However, this example of a "relaxation" does not advance beyond earlier formulations, see P. Boccara, 'Définition de la question du capitalisme monopoliste d'État', cited in Conference Internationale sur "Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État", (Mai 26-29, 1966), 5-22.
132. Particularly important here is the essay by K. Zieschang, 'Zu einigen theoretischen Problemen des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus' WW, 5 (1956), 690-705. See here also, M. Wirth, Die Kapitalismustheorie in der D.D.R. (Frankfurt, 1972).
133. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 690).
134. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 693).
135. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 693).
136. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 694).
137. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 694).
138. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 693), (emphasis added).
139. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 700).
140. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 693).
141. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 693). However, compare this with a later essay, 'Ursachen und Wesen des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', WW, 2 (1973), 235-244.
142. H-J Richter, 'Zu den Ansichten Kurt Zieschang's über den staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', WW, 2 (1958), 270-281 (p. 277).
143. K. Zieschang, 'Zu einigen', (p. 692), (emphasis added).
144. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 691).
145. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 691), (emphasis added).
146. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 691).
147. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 691), (emphasis added). However, Zieschang should not be interpreted as meaning a "crisis-free" capitalism in the traditional sense of an "organised capitalism".

148. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 692).
149. K. Zieschang, 'ibid.', (p. 691).
150. H-J. Richter, 'op. cit.', (p. 277).
151. K. Zieschang, 'op. cit.', (pp. 690-1).
152. H-J. Richter 'Zu den Ansichten', (p. 277).
153. L. Maier, 'Zum Problem des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', WW, 2 (1958), 243-259 (p. 252).
154. K. Nehls, 'Zum Problem des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', WW, 2 (1958), 258-269.
155. L. Maier, 'op. cit.', (p. 248), (emphasis added). See also, A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 258.
156. L. Maier, 'ibid.', (p. 246).
157. J. Chmelnizkaja, 'Grundzüge', Also see V. Tschepprakow, 'Die bürgerlichen', (p. 273).
158. L. Maier. 'Zum Problem', (p. 243).
159. These concepts are also expressed as bourgeois ideologies. See V. Tschepprakow, 'Die Leninische Theorie von der Ungleichmässigen Entwicklung des Kapitalismus und die Zuspitzung der imperialistischen gegensätze in der Nachkriegsperiode', SW, 4,(1956), 915-936 (p. 916).
160. K. Nehls, 'Zum problem', (p. 264).
161. H-J. Richter, 'op. cit.', (p. 272).
162. H-J. Richter, 'ibid.', (pp. 277-8).
163. O. Kratsch, 'Diskussion zum Thema', (p. 107).
164. H-J. Richter, 'Zu den Ansichten', (p. 274).
165. H-J. Richter, 'ibid.', (p. 271).
166. K. Zieschang, 'Zu einigen', (p.703).
167. K. Nehls, 'op. cit.', (p. 260).
168. However, we have argued that Marxist-Leninist theory has not presented these relationships adequately.
169. This point has been established earlier by Joelson in the "Bukharin-Hilferding" debate.
170. H-J. Richter, 'Zu den Ansichten', (p. 271).
171. J. Chmelnizkaja, 'Grundzüge', (p. 416).

172. K. Nehls, 'Zum Problem', (p. 265).
173. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 266).
174. L. Maier, 'Zu Problem', (p. 244); J. Chmelnizkaja, 'op. cit.', (p. 415). While Lenin advances this point against Kautsky, it was delivered upon the basis of the theory of monopoly capitalism.
175. See O. Kratsch, 'op. cit.', (p. 109).
176. K. Nehls, 'Zum Probleme', (p. 263).
177. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 263).
178. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 263).
179. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 263).
180. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 269).
181. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 258); O. Kratsch, 'Diskussion zum Thema', (p. 113)
182. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 296.
183. A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 282, (emphasis added). However, this is less a critique of the ideology of the "nation" than the class interests maintained by the mechanism.
184. L. Maier, 'Zum Problem', (p. 244); A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 320.
185. V. Tschepprakow, 'Die bürgerlichen', (p. 289); 'Einige', (p. 424).
186. H-J. Richter, 'Zu den Ansichten', (p. 271).
187. L. Maier, 'op. cit.', (p. 244).
188. H-J. Richter, 'op. cit.', (p. 277).
189. F. Behrens, cited in 'Diskussion zum Thema', O. Kratsch, (p. 108).
190. K. Nehls, 'Zum Problem', (p. 258).
191. V. Tschepprakow; 'Die bürgerlichen', (p. 273). Tschepprakow here also defines state monopoly capitalism as a "stage of the developement of monopoly capitalism" within the Lenin-problematic.
192. H-J. Richter, 'Zu den Ansichten', (p. 277).
193. O. Kratsch, 'op. cit.', (p. 111).
194. K. Nehls, 'op. cit.', (p. 260).
195. J. Chmelnizkaja, 'Grundzüge', (p. 430-1).
196. K. Nehls, 'Zum Problem', (p. 258).

197. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 264), (emphasis added); A.K., Politische Ökonomie, (p. 375).
198. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 258).
199. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 267).
200. L. Maier, 'Zum Problem', (p. 244), (emphasis added).
201. K. Nehls, 'op. cit.', (p. 258).
202. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 423).
203. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 422).
204. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 422).
205. L. Maier, 'Zum Problem', (p. 252).
206. V. Tschepprakow, 'Die bürgerlichen', (p. 277).
207. E. Varga, 'Staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus und seine Schwäche', in Die Krise, 426-437 (p. 428). First published in 1947.
208. V. Tschepprakow, 'op. cit.', (p. 283).
209. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, pp. 520-1; V. Tschepprakow, 'Die bürgerlichen', (p. 286).
210. Consequently, Tschepprakow refers to the "bourgeois exponents" of state monopoly capitalism. 'ibid.', (p. 288).
211. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 423).
212. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 421).
213. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 427).
214. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 427).
215. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 426).
216. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 427); A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 140.
217. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 427).
218. V. Tschepprakow, 'Die Leninische', (p. 916).
219. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 426, 428).
220. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 427).
221. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 427).
222. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 428).

223. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 422).
224. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 422).
225. H. Turley, cited in Diskussion zum Thema, O. Kratsch, (p. 109).
226. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 421).
227. L. Maier, 'Zum Problem', (p. 245).
228. K. Nehls, 'ibid.', (p. 258). Nehls also argues that with the "further intensification of imperialist contradictions and the increasing hopelessness of capitalist systems, the tendency to state monopoly capitalism must become strengthened. It is however, not an expression of the new possibilities of the development of capitalism, nor does it represent a new stage of capitalism, rather it is the expression of the increasing decay and destruction of capitalist systems". 'ibid.', (p. 264).
229. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 245).
230. K. Nehls, 'Zum Problem', (p. 263). For Nehls, the "growth of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism brings to the out-moded (überlebten) system not an escape but signifies only the conclusion to the materialist preparation of a socialist social order".
231. L. Maier, 'Zum Problem', (p. 245); A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 242.
232. A.K., 'XXII Kongress K.P.d.S.U.' in Kommunismus ohne Zukunft (Stuttgart, 1961). Hereausgegeben und erläutert, G. Wagenlehner.
233. K. Nehls, 'op. cit.', (p. 258).
234. D. Klein, 'Schlussfolgerung aus der Untersuchung der aggressivsten Monopologruppen in Westdeutschland', Einheit, 16 (1961), 1046-1058 (p. 1056, 1057).
235. V. Tschepprakow, 'Die bürgerlichen', (p. 278). Any proposition less than this leads to the "conception of a crisis-free unfolding of capitalism ... (which) ... serves now the apologists of militarism and state monopoly capitalism, which is the highest form of the power of suppression (Unterordnungsherrschaft) of the monopoly". See L. Mendelson, 'Die Wirtschaftskrisen des gegenwärtigen Kapitalismus', Einheit, 14 (1959), 1686-1700 (p. 1686).
236. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des Kapitalismus und des Sozialismus, p. 323.
237. L. Maier, 'Lenins Imperialismus-Theorie und der gegenwärtige staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', Einheit, 9-10 (1969), 1245-1257 (p. 1248). A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 354. The characterisation of state monopoly capitalism through armaments continues to be a principal feature represented in state monopoly capitalism. See V.H. Handke and K. Wimmer, 'Betrieb und staatsmonopolistischer Kapitalismus', JWG, 2-3 (1964), 390-418 (p. 290, pp. 416-8).

238. D. Klein, 'op. cit.', (p. 105).
239. Tschepprakow examines the "Leninist theory of imperialism" in the post-war period from the "market" and laws of uneven economic development. See 'Die Leninische', (p. 915, 916, 921).
240. A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 316.
241. V. Tschepprakow, 'op. cit.', (p. 936); A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 319).
242. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, (p. 307).
243. J.L. Schmidt, 'Zur Problematik des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg', Einheit, 6 (1957), 715-726 (p. 717).
244. A.K., 'op. cit.', p. 302.
245. L. Mendelson, 'Die Wirtschaftskrisen des gegenwärtigen Kapitalismus', (p. 1686).
246. L. Mendelson, 'ibid.', (p. 1695), (emphasis added).
247. L. Mendelson, 'ibid.', (p. 1695).
248. L. Mendelson, 'ibid.', (p. 1700, 1696); V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 423).
249. See C. Deutschmann, 'Die Weltwirtschaftskrise als Problem des marxistischen Krisentheorie', in Krisen und Krisentheorien (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 157-188.
250. L. Maier, 'op. cit.', (p. 243); J. Chmelnizkaja, 'Grundzüge', (p. 415).
251. See A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 375. The concept of "mixed-economy" here refers to capitalism and socialism.
252. See V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 426; A.K., 'ibid.', p. 314, 485. The concept here relates to "underdeveloped countries" (schwachenentwickelten).
253. J.L. Schmidt, 'Zur Problematik', (p. 715).
254. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 421).
255. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 327.
256. V. Tschepprakow, 'Die bürgerlichen', (p. 279).
257. See V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 426).
258. These relate to the precedents of the "alliance-politics" of the Comintern.
259. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 440.
260. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 528, 511, 542).

261. We may note here three factors: automation and technical innovations lead to the expulsion of "hand-labour" (Handarbeit) from the production process; the monopoly capitalisation of agriculture; divisions in the bourgeoisie oppose the monopoly fraction of capitals through the ruination of the middle bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie. V. Tschepprakow, 'op. cit.', (p. 428); A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus-Leninismus, pp. 558-9.
262. L. Mendelson, 'op. cit.', (p. 1700); A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 440, 558.
263. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 428).
264. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 428); A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 418.
265. However, as the political formulation precedes the capital analysis, theory is not "free" from political commitment.
266. As Sonntag argues, "die Formen und das Tempo des Überganges zum Sozialismus sind im wesentlichen von der Stärke des Sozialismus überhaupt, von seinem internationalen Gewicht abhängig. Durch die Existenz der Sowjetunion und die Verschärfung der allgemeinen Krise des Kapitalismus wurde z.B. die Diktatur des Proletariats in der Form der Volksdemokratie möglich und notwendig, die auf Grund der nationalen Besonderheiten der einzelnen Länder wiederum dieser oder jene Eigenart hat. Auf dem XX Parteitag der K.P.d.S.U. wurde festgestellt, dass die Formen des Überganges von Kapitalismus zum Sozialismus noch vielfältiger werden und dass auch die parlamentarische Form möglich ist". See H. Sonntag, 'Über die Wechselbeziehungen zwischen den allgemeinen Gestezmässigkeiten der Übergangsperiode vom Kapitalismus zum Sozialismus und den ökonomischen Gesetzen des Sozialismus', WZFSU, 8, (1958-9) 291-301 (p. 292).
267. See N. Chruschtschew, 'XX^e Congrès du Parti Communiste de L'Union Sovietique', Cahiers du Communisme, (Mars, 1956), 11-484 (p. 44).
268. N. Chruschtschew's 'Geheimrede', 'XX^e Congrès', (p. 46).
269. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 426); P. Togliatti, 'Report to the Central Committee of the I.C.P.' (June 24, 1956), in the Anti-Stalin Campaign, (p. 207); M. Thorez, 'Quelques questions capitales posees au XX Congrès du Parti Communiste de l'Union Sovietique', Cahiers du Communisme, 4 (Avril, 1956), 373-394 (p. 378).
270. P. Togliatti, '9 Domande sullo Stalinismo', p. 200, 106, 138.
271. P. Togliatti, 'ibid.', (p. 106).
272. P. Togliatti, 'ibid.', (p. 138).
273. See J. Agostinho, '"Eurcommunismo" e Marxismo', Seara Nova, 1593 (1978), 18-21. Nevertheless, the significance of a general theory of state monopoly capitalism resides in the potential it offers to Communist Party theorists for an analysis of capitalism independent of the theory and politics of Soviet proletarian internationalism. Zieschang's investigation has this significance.

274. However, Togliatti gives no basic critique of the Soviet Union as a socialist society, 'Report', (p. 207) but only vanguard Communist Parties 'ibid.', (p. 212).
275. The reception of the critique of Stalin is not universal amongst Communist Parties. For example, the F.C.P. is more cautious than the I.C.P.
276. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 560. See also K. Hager, 'Eine Enzyklopädie unserer Zeit', Einheit, 15 (1960), 1138-1155.
277. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 558).
278. A.K., 'ibid.', (pp. 582-3).
279. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 582); See also N. Chruschtchev, 'XX^e Congrès', (pp. 46-7).
280. Although the non-necessity of "democratic stages" is acknowledged if not developed as the principal argument. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 556.
281. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 581).
282. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 582).
283. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 565).
284. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 565, 556).
285. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 557, 558).
286. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 558).
287. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 556).
288. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 567).
289. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 604).
290. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 559).
291. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 565).
292. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 419); see also N. Chruschchev's argument that "La conquête d'une solide majorité parlementaire s'appuyant sur le mouvement révolutionnaire de masse du prolétariat et des travailleurs créerait", 'op. cit.', (p. 47).
293. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 583).
294. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 520).
295. H. Weber, 'Die sozialistische Einheitspartei', pp. 48-9.
296. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 566.

297. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 421). However, not only can this not be generalised, but it contradicts the concept of anti-monopolist strategies.
298. G. Reintanz, 'Die amerikanische Integration Europas nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg', WZMLUHW, 4 (1955), 293-342 (p. 332).
299. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, (p. 581).
300. A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 310.
301. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 490.
302. See F. Claudin, La Crise, 11, p. 362.
303. See W. Petrowsky, Zur Entwicklung, (p. 133).
304. I. Sokolov, 'Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État' in Conférence, II, (p. 20).
305. See P. Togliatti, 'Report', L. Barca lists five significant points from the XXth Congress, C.P.S.U.: (i) the crisis of democratic centralism; (ii) the new role of parliaments; (iii) the reform of state structures; (iv) democratic programmes; (v) a new theory of capitalist development. See L. Barca, 'Per lo sviluppo dell'analisi teorica sul capitalismo monopolistico di stato' CM, (1966), 52-78 (pp. 62-4).
306. P. Togliatti, 'ibid.', (p. 239).
307. P. Togliatti, 'ibid.', (p. 216).
308. P. Togliatti, '9 Domande', (p. 106), (emphasis added).
309. P. Togliatti, 'Report', (p. 248). The "utilisation" of bourgeois states is accepted by the X Congress of the I.C.P.. See L. Barca, 'op. cit.', (p. 61).
310. P. Togliatti, 'ibid.', (p. 234).
311. R. Garaudy, 'A Propos de la "voie Italienne vers le socialisme"', Cahiers du Communisme, 1 (1957), 33-55 (p. 42); see also R. Garaudy, 'A Propos du Rôle du Parlement', Cahiers du Communisme, 5 (1956), 539-562 (p. 557, 559).
312. R. Garaudy, 'ibid.', (p. 43), (emphasis added).
313. See R. Garaudy, Die Freiheit als philosophische und historische Kategorie, pp. 307-8, p. 376.
314. R. Garaudy, "A Propos du la "voie Italienne"', (p. 43).
315. R. Garaudy, 'ibid.', (p. 43).
316. R. Garaudy, 'ibid.', (p. 43).

317. R. Garaudy, 'ibid.', (p. 47). Moreover, the "parliamentary way" to socialism does not abandon class struggle as does "reformism". See 'Une reunion du comité central du P.C.F. consacrée au XX^e Congrès du P.C.U.S.', Cahiers du Communisme, (Mars, 1956), 477-484 (p. 481).
318. R. Garaudy, 'ibid.', (p. 45).
319. R. Garaudy, 'ibid.', (pp. 48-9). See also M. Thorez, 'Noch einmal die Verelendung', Einheit, 12 (1957), 850-871; R. Gutermuth, 'Die Krise des französisch Kapitalismus', WZMLUHW, 2 (1954). Here, Gutermuth speaks of the "growth of state monopoly capitalism and the fascisation of public life", 'ibid.', (p. 273).
320. V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 427).

CHAPTER 5THE CONTEMPORARY THEORY OF STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

In this Chapter the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism will be examined as the general theory of the principal Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties for the materialist analysis of Western European capitalist systems. It is a consequence of the post-Stalin debate which establishes the official status of state monopoly capitalism as the theory of the international communist movement. We may identify and elaborate the development of its fundamental categories in the monopolies, the state and the formalisation of a theory of the "General Crisis of Capitalism".

5.1 The "fusion" theory of the state

The formulation of a general theory of state monopoly capitalism is only undertaken after the initial "de-Stalinisation" of the political structure of world communism as the theoretical basis upon which the new revolutionary politics of the Western European Communist Parties are articulated. In this historical context we will consider the explanations advanced by Communist Party theorists as to why a theory of state monopoly capitalism had not been developed before the mid-1960's.

Firstly, it is argued that the ideological conflicts which existed between the Comintern and other sections of the European labour movement were continued in the post-war period. On this basis, a theory of state monopoly capitalism was precluded as a result of the ideological struggle against revisionism⁽¹⁾. The implication here is that the premises of state monopoly capitalism were already formed but not elaborated because of the potential theoretical support they could offer to other sections of the labour movement opposed to the

official theory and politics of the Communist International.

Secondly, the domination of Stalinist orthodoxy on the European communist movement constrained the theoretical continuation of Lenin's analysis of state monopoly capitalism. The potential for an anti-Stalinist critique in the new construction of a theory of state monopoly capitalism can be elicited from the arguments of S.E.D. theorists who claim that "already before, but especially after the Second World War there is a slowing down of the dogmatic distortion of Marxist theory with the elaboration and further-development of the problem of state monopoly capitalism"⁽²⁾. Also in this respect, Boccara contends that Stalin concentrates on the "negative" aspects of the "General Crisis of Capitalism"; the categories he employs at the XIX Congress of the C.P.S.U. of "actual capitalism", "monopoly capitalism" and "subordination" do not comprehend the most "original characteristics" and "structural changes" of state monopoly capitalism⁽³⁾. Boccara consequently states that "there is not yet a true theory generally admitted"⁽⁴⁾; existing formulas only constitute the "first tentative generalisation of known phenomena" rather than a presentation of the "necessary laws of their appearance and development, of their new diverse movements"⁽⁵⁾. Similarly, S.E.D. theorist H. Heininger contends that Stalin's examination of the economic laws of "modern capitalism" under the militarisation of national economies as a prerequisite for expanded reproduction through monopoly maximum profits, is an "inadmissible simplification in the representation of the complicated connection and exchange between the economy and political of imperialism"⁽⁶⁾. Moreover, Varga continues the critique of Stalin by arguing that his concept of "monopoly capitalism" fails to examine the "counter-tendencies" to the laws of monopoly capitalism and therefore to anticipate the stabilisation and expansion of capitalism in the post-war period⁽⁷⁾.

The consequent rejection of "Stalinist dogma" and the formal acceptance of a general theory of state monopoly capitalism is advanced as a "solution" to the historical analysis of the new features of capitalism and the politics of the communist movement. The subsequent theory and practice of Western European Communist Parties develops as a "non-sectarian" examination of capitalism based upon the theoretical presuppositions of Lenin's concept of state monopoly capitalism. This is distinguished both from Stalin's dogmatic transcription of the categories of the "collapse" theory of capitals into post-war European capitalism and the capitulation of Marxism-Leninism into "revisionism". Consequently, the problematic in which the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism is formulated seeks to reconstitute the theory of Lenin, rather than totally reconstruct the Marxist analysis of capitals. The theory of state monopoly capitalism is thereby concerned to establish the continuity between Marx and Lenin⁽⁸⁾ in the theoretical reconstruction of Marxism-Leninism through the "creative" (schöpferische) "further-development" (Weiterentwicklung) of Marxism with Leninism⁽⁹⁾.

However, in distinction to the contemporary theorists of state monopoly capitalism, we have identified the "collapse" theory of capitals in Lenin's analysis of monopoly capitalism; this is the principal reason why Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not rigorously advance a general theory of state monopoly capitalism, but rather were engaged in the critique of Bukharin's and Bauer's concepts of state capitalism. Moreover, the debate on state monopoly capitalism in the mid-1950's discussed in Chapter 4 establishes that the acceptance of such theoretical developments are only relatively recent in the history of this communist theory. Such is the importance of Zieschang's liberalisation of the

theory of state monopoly capitalism with the recognition that the concept and social content of Western European capitalism cannot be adequately explained through the orthodox theory of monopoly capitalism.

By the mid-1960's, the principal focus of attention of this development resides in the examination of a new periodisation of capitalism, the re-examination of the relationships of monopoly and state, and the significance of state interventionism for the stabilisation of capitalism. The new quality of the concept of state monopoly capitalism is expressed by Soviet theorist I. Sokolow when he argues that state monopoly capitalism constitutes a "certain rupture" with the period of theoretical development 1945-1965⁽¹⁰⁾. The debate on state monopoly capitalism now no longer concentrates upon whether "state monopoly capitalism is merely a general theory or exists as the accomplishment of the objective transformations of the total system of imperialism"⁽¹¹⁾ because of the acceptance of a new "stage" of capitalism. Although there is no "pure concept" of state monopoly capitalism, its acceptance as a social-theoretical category is sufficient to introduce a further periodisation of capitalism⁽¹²⁾. Communist Party theorists now interpret state monopoly capitalism as the "highest and last stage of imperialism"⁽¹³⁾. This is the "most recent form, the most modern of capitalist relations of production, a new stage in the development of monopoly capitalism"⁽¹⁴⁾, and the maturity of socialism⁽¹⁵⁾.

With the acceptance of a new "stage" of capitalism, the importance of the state is emphasised in contrast to the "subordination" relation which identifies "monopoly capitalism" as the fundamental component of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of capitalism⁽¹⁶⁾. This however introduces the problem experienced in Zieschang's analysis of

distinguishing the contemporary concept of state monopoly capitalism from "state capitalism" and "organised capitalism", and thereby the revisionist theories of capitalism. The resolution to this problem is advanced by according a completely different social content to the concept of "revisionism". The "revisionism" that formerly referred to the articulation of a new "stage" in the development of capitalism beyond Lenin's analysis of the "third epoch of capitals" now only refers to the social-democratic interpretation of this concept. Marxism-Leninism does not preclude the possibility of theoretical "further-developments" but rather only the "revisionist" orientation of a "non-scientifically motivated abandonment of previously acquired theoretical precedents"⁽¹⁷⁾.

The basis upon which the transformation of the general determination of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism takes place is through the relationships of "monopoly" and "state". On the suppositions of the theory of state monopoly capitalism, the principal mechanism which sustains the new "stage" of capitalism is the "fusion" (Verschmelzung) of the monopoly and state in a "unified apparatus of the power of the monopoly and the power of the state"⁽¹⁸⁾.

The re-examination of the state-monopoly relation is considered initially through the analysis of the concepts of "personal-union" and the "subordination". While the "personal-union" thesis is "only one among many essential appearances of imperialism", the "fusion" signifies "not simply the subordination of states under the monopoly. Rather, it is a question of the direct intervention (Einbeziehung) of states in the monopolistic production process"⁽¹⁹⁾. Here, the new forms of capitalist state interventionism are considered the principal distinguishing feature of contemporary state monopoly capitalism⁽²⁰⁾.

The superiority of the "fusion" distinguishes between the general determination of capitals from the political domination of the monopolies on the agencies of the state and the objective causes of state interventionism in the reproduction processes of capital. As the economic power of the monopoly bourgeoisie is an insufficient condition to maintain its own reproduction in contemporary capitalism, the economic forms of state interventionism are necessary for the continued existence of the monopolisation process of capitals. This establishes a new economic content to the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the state-monopoly relation which extends the reproduction of monopoly capitals beyond the structure of private capitalism⁽²¹⁾.

The theory of state monopoly capitalism is increasingly characterised by the maintenance of the structure of private capitalism through the reproduction of total social production processes as a remedial mechanism to the crisis of capitals⁽²²⁾. Despite this, since the capitalist system is only reproduced through the "fusion", it must be shown how bourgeois states are incorporated into the objective laws of the reproduction of total social capitals. In order to undertake the examination of these developments, the theory of the "fusion" must be distinguished from the theory of the "subordination".

The analysis of the interventionist functions of states in post-Stalinist theory is undertaken with the concept of the "relative autonomy" of bourgeois states and the relaxation of the rigorous theoretical constraints to the examination of the state under the "subordination mechanism". Formerly, the theory of the "subordination" had not comprehensively investigated the economic power of the state, the conflictual interests between individual monopolies, nor the .

relation of the "many capitals" to the state. This was because the capacity of monopoly capital to generate coherent interest-demands in relation to the state, the economic and political mechanism by which they were mediated in the state apparatus, and the functional capacity of the state to respond, were presupposed in the direct state-monopoly mechanism⁽²³⁾. Conversely, the "fusion" attempts to redress this with new propositions on the state.

Since the state is not only a political instrument of monopoly domination but also possesses a certain "relative autonomy" as an economic power in total social reproduction processes, the relationships of monopoly and state may prove to be more complicated than those traditional representations in the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the class character of the state. The subsequent issues regarding the mechanism of monopolies and the state involve: (i) the structural determination and boundaries to state-economic planning praxis; (ii) the relationship between economy and political in the periodisation of contemporary capitalism; (iii) the potentiality for the reform of capitalism and the initiation of socialist principles through the capitalist state.

As we saw in Chapter 4, Varga had already suggested the relaxation of the "subordination" thesis in the immediate post-war period, only to be opposed by Stalin. However, in the post-Stalin era Varga is able to return to these themes as a contribution to the contemporary discussion on state monopoly capitalism. During the mid-1960's he argues against the "holders of the unilateral subordination of the state to the monopoly capitalist ... (as) ... the expression of the dogmatic conception of actual capitalism"⁽²⁴⁾. Varga further criticises the "dogmatists'" refusal to acknowledge

that state monopoly capitalism is a new phenomenon and their erroneous contention that "all state activity in economic life ... (and) ... the politics of the bourgeoisie have always been that of the intervention (l'ingérence) of the state in the economy"⁽²⁵⁾. Conversely, he also criticises the "revisionists" for whom state interventionism modifies the nature of capitalism; here the "state acquires a role more and more independent from private capital and situates itself beyond capital"⁽²⁶⁾. Both these positions represent two extremes, each emphasising a different aspect of the state-monopoly relation at the expense of the other. The solution which Varga duly advances to these two extremes is based upon their synthesis in the new concept of "conjunction"⁽²⁷⁾.

Moreover, Varga also contends that because the bourgeoisie is not a "monolithic block", the view that in "monopoly capitalist countries there exists a centre which represents its interests and gives directives to the apparatus of the state which must compulsorily execute them" cannot be sustained⁽²⁸⁾. Contradictions may exist between "monopolies" and state because the "state represents the common interests of monopoly capital which can be in contradiction with the interests of certain monopolies or monopolist groups"⁽²⁹⁾.

Analogously, a similar discussion is conducted within the French Communist Party. H. Joudain argues that the new phase of state monopoly capitalism establishes the "conjunctural" relations of monopolies and state:

"by the conjunction of the power of the bourgeois state and monopoly capital, state monopoly capitalism expresses a new force (force nouvelle) which introduces certain modifications in capitalist relations of production and in the development of the antagonism between the accrued socialisation of production and the capitalist

appropriation of the product"⁽³⁰⁾.

We may note here the insistence on the contradiction between socialisation and appropriation in distinction to the contradictory form of social production relations, and that the "relatively autonomous" power of bourgeois state contributes a new quality to state monopoly capitalism.

The theorists of the French Communist Party identify the "growing interdependence between monopolies and the state"⁽³¹⁾ as a "contradictory unity"⁽³²⁾. It is important to emphasise here the contradictory nature of this relationship with which state monopoly capitalism expresses both "continuity" and "rupture" with the "simple monopolism" that preceded it⁽³³⁾. State monopoly capitalism expresses "continuity" in so far as it

"reinforces the hegemony of the monopolies on society and therefore also on the state apparatus. This reinforcement is the double consequence of the growing accumulation of capital and of the increasingly social character to the crisis of expanding (en oeuvre) production powers in capitalist countries. Interventions appear increasingly direct with the general law of capitalist accumulation"⁽³⁴⁾. Conversely, state monopoly capitalism expresses "rupture" in so far as the state, "although more directly under the control of the monopolies, sees its role accentuated, for such is the objective need and interest of the great groups of monopolists"⁽³⁵⁾. This creates the possibility of a conflict of interests within the bourgeoisie, and of the state "entering into contradiction with the monopolies"⁽³⁶⁾.

These theorists subsequently argue that there is "neither fusion nor separation but narrow interaction" between monopolies and state⁽³⁷⁾. The reason for this is that the "fusion" sanctions the interpretation that "the monopolies have disappeared, ... that capitalism has changed

its nature, that the state has become a passive instrument that one cannot distinguish in principle from the monopolies"⁽³⁸⁾. In contrast, the proposition that the state and monopolies are not "organically connected in the present epoch ... (has) ... led to the under-estimation of the role of the state", and not to "see the nature of the contradictions of contemporary capitalism in its last phase (dernière phase)"⁽³⁹⁾.

Further, H. Claude formulates the critique of the "subordination" with the concept of the relative autonomy of the political superstructures of the state. The "subordination" of the state to the monopolies effaces the distinctions "between economic base and superstructures" and thereby the "means of resolution of the conflicts in capitalism"⁽⁴⁰⁾. These "conflicts reflect the composition of governments and ... the politics of states which conserve a relative autonomy; the latter can be brought to exercise against particular monopoly interests when they strike at the general interests of the class of finance-oligarchy"⁽⁴¹⁾.

While the propositions of the preceding discussion do not contradict the Marxist-Leninist class theory of the state, it is also recognised that if the monopoly bourgeoisie are to persistently maintain their interests in the state, then the state must develop ideological functions⁽⁴²⁾. These ideological functions of states become particularly important once it is acknowledged that the "monopolies" do not directly "subordinate" the state, even though the state extends the domination of monopolies to the totality of society⁽⁴³⁾. The new relationships between class and state that emerge with the concepts of "fusion", "conjunction" and "relative autonomy" suggest that the "imperialist state" is not purely an apparatus of political repression but also "possesses" economic power and performs ideological functions

by which the system of political power is legitimated. However, on the presuppositions of the monopoly domination of bourgeois society, it remains unclear under which ruling form of ideology the state functions when it enters into contradiction with the monopolies, and more importantly, by which mechanism either the state or the "monopolies" can produce an integrating ideology for the whole of class society. Moreover, it is not explained how the capitalist state has become "relatively autonomous" from the class domination of the "monopolies", nor the mechanism which establishes the class character of the state when it "contradicts" the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

It may be noted that this discussion does not exhaust the contributions to the theory of state monopoly capitalism within the Marxist-Leninist tradition, although it is the most important and the most representative analysis of the relations of monopoly and state. Against the liberalisation and "de-Stalinisation" of the world communist movement initiated at the XX Congress of the C.P.S.U., the Stalinist concept of state monopoly capitalism is maintained in opposition to what is interpreted as "modern revisionism"⁽⁴⁴⁾.

Moreover, Stalin's analysis still finds adherence with contemporary theorists of state monopoly capitalism. As Jalée argues, disregard for the institutional permanence of the state-monopoly relation which emphasises the contradictions between monopolies and state rather than their stabilisations does not establish the ascendancy of the "monopoly" as the "essential" condition⁽⁴⁵⁾. The superiority of the "subordination" relation

"puts the accent on the fundamental identity of objectives of monopoly capital and state, ... (while) ... that of conjuncture permits the excessive importance of disagreements which can arise between the

politics of the state and the interests not of monopoly capital in its ensemble, but with a branch of this monopoly capital"⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Conversely, the respective concepts of the "fusion" and "conjunction" in this discussion express the attempt to overcome the limitations of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state. However, despite the objective status afforded to the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism, the economic and class character of the state has hitherto only been "mechanistically" unified with the political concept of the state. The difficulty which this analysis poses for the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism concerns the "derivation" (Ableitung) of the state from the economic substructure⁽⁴⁷⁾. This follows the precedents of Bukharin's and Zieschang's analyses which suggest a contradiction between the classical Marxist-Leninist theoretical "starting-point" for the derivation of states from class domination of the monopolies compared with the general laws of the capitalist mode of production.

While the Marxist-Leninist concept of state monopoly capitalism has no systematic expression⁽⁴⁸⁾, all attempts to establish its objective theoretical status respond to the perceived contradiction between the historical relations of capitalist societies and the Marxist general concept of capital. The general criterion which the contemporary theorists of state monopoly capitalism advance for the reconciliation of the theoretical and historical relations of capitalism is based upon the derivation of the state from the socialisation of monopoly capitalism. As Katzenstein argues, "monopoly and state monopoly capitalism are produced (hervorbringt) as adaptation-forms of capitalist relations of production to the social character of the production process"⁽⁴⁹⁾. On this basis, the new qualities which state

monopoly capitalism typifies concern the structural transformation of the reproduction processes of national capitalist economies in the combined relations of economy and political.

The presuppositions of state monopoly capitalism are no longer established under the direct political mechanism of monopoly domination but through their theoretical status as an integrated total social systems mechanism. In the new "stage" of capitalism, this functions both economically and politically as an anti-"collapse" mechanism of capitals. However, it introduces a series of problems and perspectives into the contemporary derivation of the state which contrast to Lenin's concept of state monopoly capitalism.

The systematic interventionism of the capitalist state forms a permanent component in the reproduction of total social capitals beyond the general functions for the maintenance of the conditions of private capital accumulation. In turn, this promotes a change of emphasis in the concept of state monopoly capitalism away from the objective historical limits of social reproduction processes in the "collapse" of capitals to the stabilisation of capitalism and the realisation of the materialist foundations of socialism. Here, the transitional quality of capitalism is extended through the contradiction of private property in the means of production and their socialisation with a new stage in the socialisation of capitalism⁽⁵⁰⁾. While these "socialisations" are structurally limited by the class relations of private property capitalism, they are increasingly undermined with the creation of new forms of social property. These facilitate the expansion of production powers beyond the automaticity of the laws of private capitalism in "new forms of capitalist contradictions"⁽⁵¹⁾. The contradiction between the monopolies and state now becomes the principal example of the new contradiction of capitalist systems.

The new class contradiction of capitalism is established through the double perspective of state interventionism in capitalist reproduction processes as an organisational form of monopoly capitals against the "collapse" of private capitalism⁽⁵²⁾, while simultaneously extending the inner-tendencies to the negation of capitalism in the Leninist model of transitional capitalism⁽⁵³⁾. Monopoly capitalism itself creates the presuppositions of the historical contradictory character of the structural imperatives of imperialist state interventionism in total social reproduction processes for the maintenance of capitalist systems and the continuation of the class domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie. This is articulated through the conceptualisation of the classical foundations of the capitalist mode of production which establishes the class relations of private property capitalism in the formal model of the spontaneity of real market connections as the general regulator of production and distribution⁽⁵⁴⁾. The historical negation of these economic foundations of the capitalist mode of production are actualised not only in the monopoly, but extended with the creation of state monopoly capitalism⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Unless the theoretical and historical limits to the formation of state monopoly capitalism are assessed in the contradiction of private property in the means of production and their socialisation, then the objective process of total social economic reproduction appears as a controlled system of capitalist exploitation. However for Lenin, the "unified mechanism" was not a principal component of a general theory of the objective laws of capital but the expression of both the "moribund" character of capitalism and the materialist foundations of socialism upon which the revolutionary politics of world proletarian revolution were determined. Conversely, the re-deployment of Lenin's

concept of state monopoly capitalism in the politics of Western European Communist Parties seeks to legitimate the new theoretical analysis of the historical dissolution of the anarchy of capitals through state-capitalist planning mechanisms⁽⁵⁶⁾. But even in this conceptualisation, the logic of the historical "collapse" of capitalism is not obviated but assumes a modified form⁽⁵⁷⁾.

The subsequent analysis of the continued existence and stabilisation of capitalism in the "adaptation-forms" of capitalist relations of production expresses the new examination of capitalism through the dissolution of the formal politics of Stalinism in the European communist movement. However, whether the theory of state monopoly capitalism can adequately perform the necessary explanatory functions for contemporary capitalism depends both upon its status as general theory and the prior prognosis on the historical development of capitalism upon which it depends.

From the foregoing discussion we can identify several relevant issues for the examination of the class character of capitalist states.

Firstly, while state monopoly capitalism precludes a complete realisation of the socialisation tendencies of capital because of the presuppositions of Leninist analysis which designates the state as a class instrument of the monopoly bourgeoisie, it equally expresses a "socialisation process which can no longer be maintained with the power of private monopolist means"⁽⁵⁸⁾. This signifies that private property is not necessarily the dominant form of property in the combined property-forms of state monopoly capitalism. On the assumptions of a "transitional capitalism", they suggest an ambivalent character to the class relations of state monopoly capitalism with the proposition that the "monopoly bourgeoisie must today strengthen their system with such means and methods whose form contradicts its private

capitalist basis and aims"⁽⁵⁹⁾.

Secondly, although it is stated that "Marxist-Leninist theory has proven that in class society the economically ruling class converts its power in to political power to accomplish their interests in society"⁽⁶⁰⁾, it remains unclear how this "inseparable connection between economic and political relations of power" is established on the foundation of contradictory property relations⁽⁶¹⁾.

Moreover, when the new contradiction of monopoly and state tends to replace the contradiction of private property and socialisation, a number of considerations are suggested.

The principal class contradiction of capitalism is not located in production relations of capital and labour but appears in the total social reproduction processes⁽⁶²⁾. Consequently, the contradiction of capitalism is transformed from the materialist relations of the economic structure of bourgeois society to the partial capital concept of monopoly and the political superstructures of states.

When state monopoly capitalism constitutes a "unified mechanism" of economy and state, and an objective condition for the continued total social reproduction of capitals, the class character of states cannot be unambiguously established through the absolute economic and political power of the monopoly relations of domination. The particular problem here concerns the contradiction between the different levels of conceptual analysis of the "unified-mechanism" which refers to the relationship of economy and state and the "fusion" which refers to monopoly and state. The basis of the class character of states in the "fusion" is not equivalent to the objective anti-"collapse" mechanism of state monopoly capitalism developed at the level of total social production processes.

Although state monopoly capitalism has attempted to resolve the principal economic and political problems sustained by the concept of the "subordination", emphasising the concept of the "relative autonomy" of states, this has not established the inner class-connection of states from the specific form-determined relations of economy and political.

Rather, the principal class relationships between the monopolies and the state we have identified are of three types, although they are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

The first considers the unification of the monopolies with the state through the "personal union" of finance-capitalists, their representatives in social institutions and the functionaries of bourgeois state apparatuses⁽⁶³⁾. This is a "subjectivisation" of the state-monopoly mechanisms that govern the social processes which mediate class domination through economic and political systems of power⁽⁶⁴⁾. In these respects, the "personal-union" is the "crassest appearance-form of monopolies"⁽⁶⁵⁾ which establishes the class character of states in the subjective particularities of institutional relations and permanent fusion of socio-state networks⁽⁶⁶⁾.

The second type follows the developed concept of state monopoly capitalism; while the "personal-union" gains further in significance in state monopoly capitalism, it is nevertheless only one of many essential appearances of imperialism today"⁽⁶⁷⁾. This recognises that these relations do not represent a theoretical analysis of the objective structures of state and social institutions, but only interprets their class character through the politics of state apparatuses rather than the structures of monopoly capital. Conversely, the explanation of state monopoly capitalism as a form

of imperialism receives the status of an objective relation from the monopoly periodisation of capitalism⁽⁶⁸⁾. The transformation of capitalist relations of production under the monopoly-form also invalidates the classical concept of bourgeois states as the representative of the "common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie"⁽⁶⁹⁾. Subsequently, the political domination of the monopolies assumes the form of a "dictatorship" in which the "bourgeois state is no longer an instrument of the total capitalist class, but the finance-oligarchy used exclusively in its interests"⁽⁷⁰⁾. This instrumentalist conception of bourgeois states also connects the class power of the monopolies to the "state-type": "monopoly capitals use the bourgeois state independently of its respective form as an instrument of its domination. It uses the most different of methods right up to the open fascist dictatorship"⁽⁷¹⁾.

Finally, although the "subordination" is criticised under the "fusion", the class character of bourgeois states is only conclusively maintained from the primacy of monopoly domination on the totality of economic and political functions of states. So, despite the derivation of states as an objective factor in the monopoly socialisation of capital, the theory still imparts an "instrumentalist" character.

In this theoretical context, the concept of the "relative autonomy" of states appears as an antagonistic principle to the process of its class determination and the monopoly foundations of capitalism. As these are not examined from the totality of the social relations of capitalist commodity production, the inner-connection of the economy and political ceases to be adequately established under the monopoly. Subsequently, the interventionist state functions appear as "counter-tendencies" and contradictory principles to the general laws

of monopoly capitalism. The specific problem to emerge from this discussion is a theoretical representation of the objective relations of the economy and political which distinguishes the laws of capitals from their fetishised "surface-appearances".

However, the analysis of the objective structure of state monopoly capitalism also supplies the theoretical conditions for the post-Stalinist evaluation of class strategies. Both "anti-monopolist strategies" and the theory of "state-utilisation" introduced into communist politics by Togliatti are augmented with the new material contents of the objective social processes of state monopoly capitalism⁽⁷²⁾. The possibility of utilising these forms and processes is a political consequence of rejecting the Stalinist theory of "all power to the monopolies"⁽⁷³⁾ and the examination of the objective state-capitalist mechanisms⁽⁷⁴⁾. As Varga states,

"those economists who refer to the total power of monopolies in the spirit of the Stalinist formula of the 'total and definitive subordination' of the modern bourgeois state to the monopolies, deny ... the possibility ... to constitute an anti-monopolist popular front, the possibility to limit or suppress the power of monopolies before the collapse of the capitalist régime in the political action of the masses"⁽⁷⁵⁾.

While the modified theory of the "collapse" of capitalism is continued in the post-war period, the genesis of state monopoly capitalism creates new political options for the European communist movement in the materialist contents of capital socialisations.

We will now examine the principal features of the monopoly form of capital introduced by the new concept of state monopoly capitalism.

5.2 The monopoly form of capital

If the "monopoly" is to be the central category in the critique of political economy⁽⁷⁶⁾ then it must be systematically derived from the general laws of capital accumulation⁽⁷⁷⁾. We will therefore examine the connection between the value analysis of capital and the Marxist-Leninist theory of monopoly capitalism.

5.2.1 Competition and capital

The monopoly now emphasises the expansion of capitalism in opposition to its terminal character, and constitutes a "stage of the development of capitalist relations of production ... (and) ... a qualitatively new category"⁽⁷⁸⁾. This monopoly structure to the expanded reproduction of total social capital "undermines" and transforms the classical foundations of capitalism⁽⁷⁹⁾, its "social relations of production, exchange and distribution"⁽⁸⁰⁾. However, in our discussion on Lenin's theory of imperialism it was shown that the monopoly concept actually contradicted the law of value and created the materialist foundations which initiated a "transitional capitalism". Conversely, if the analysis of the monopoly does not abolish the general laws of capital⁽⁸¹⁾, then it must be subjected to the structural constraints of capital accumulation⁽⁸²⁾. On this basis, the "monopoly" must establish the new quality of capital in its general theoretical derivation from the capitalist mode of production⁽⁸³⁾. Moreover, as the monopoly domination of production branches and market relations appears in the historical negation of free competition, the theoretical forms of this historical process of dissolution unfolds in the opposition of competition and monopoly as a theoretical category in the contradictions of capital⁽⁸⁴⁾. Consequently, the "reactionary" adaptation of production powers to the monopoly form of production relations becomes a "necessary form of capital relations"⁽⁸⁵⁾.

Rather, the initial discussion of the Bolshevik's concept of "mixed capitalism" showed that the contradiction of competition and monopoly was defined through circulation relations and therefore could not constitute the dynamics of real accumulation processes. In this form, the development of capitalism is represented in a "contentless" abstraction analogous to the analysis of social reproduction schemas in which the quantitative extension of the monopoly concept was shown to have equal significance for the periodisation of capitalism through the concepts of "state capitalism" and "organised capitalism". The theoretical proximity of these opposed "models" of capitalism creates a "crisis" in contemporary Marxist-Leninist theory with the prospect of a qualitative transformation of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism. However, the theoretical development of Lenin's concept of monopoly capitalism and the retention of its validity as a social critique of capitalism is proposed with the distinction in the capital methodology between the general laws of capitalism from their "modes of accomplishment"⁽⁸⁶⁾.

S.E.D. theorists Heiningen and Hess argue that competition and monopoly relate to the "modes of accomplishment" of capitals rather than the laws themselves: "both are only different, necessary appearance forms whereby ... economic laws in different stages of the development of the capitalist mode of production are realised"⁽⁸⁷⁾. This suggests either that the periodisation of capitalism is not based upon circulation, and therefore competition and monopoly are not the fundamental relationships, or conversely that it refers to a combination of production and circulation relations. Following the "stage" theory of capitalism, free competition is the most adequate "mode of accomplishment" of the laws of capitalism while the typical features of Marxist-Leninist theory are

expressed by Braunsdorf and Löffler in that "monopoly competition is the necessary accomplishment-form of the immanent law of capitals in their period of decline" (Niedergangsperiode)⁽⁸⁸⁾, and by Lemnitz in that finance-capital "dictates the conditions of competitive struggle"⁽⁸⁹⁾.

However, this is not a satisfactory resolution to the problem of the monopoly analysis on two counts. Firstly, if the monopoly-problematic is only concerned with "modes of accomplishment", then the historical development of Lenin's theory of monopoly capitalism in the Comintern cannot be understood. Heininger and Hess themselves discount this view with their interpretation of the "new category" of monopoly competition as a "new stage" of capitalism⁽⁹⁰⁾. The difficulties associated with the concept of competition are consequently maintained because the "modes of accomplishment" are interpreted as the "starting-point" for the analysis of capitals and therefore the basis upon which the "stage" theory develops. Secondly, if the "stage" theory not only relates to circulation but also production relations then it must be explained how the monopoly is a fundamental category of political economy which simultaneously contradicts the logic of capitals. Here Hess argues that "capitalism no longer functions on its own mechanisms. The system no longer develops on its own foundations, according to its own logic (eigenen Logik), it must accept a foreign element which announces its dissolution"⁽⁹¹⁾.

On this basis, the monopoly transforms the economic laws of capital accumulation⁽⁹²⁾ and continues the historical prognosis on the dissolution of capitalism, even though it is unclear whether this is occasioned by the "mode of accomplishment" which contradicts the general laws of capital or the complementary nature of the "mode of accomplishment" with the laws of monopoly capitalism. Marxism-Leninism

is now confronted with the problem of attempting to maintain the validity of the general laws of capitalism while characterising the forms of their dissolution in the monopoly "stage"-theory of capitalism initiated by Lenin's social critique.

The significance of these propositions for the laws of capitalism are related to the examination of the category of profit when the monopoly form is said to constitute the determining relation of capitals. In pre-monopoly pure capitalism, the formation of a general profit rate is the automatic regulator of total social production and the distribution of social labour⁽⁹³⁾ in the categories of capital mediation - production price, average price, average profit rate, extra-profit etc.⁽⁹⁴⁾. Conversely, in monopoly capitalism, these are replaced by monopoly price, monopoly profit, permanent extra-profit, and the mediation of total social reproduction processes with the extra-economic mechanisms of the political power of bourgeois states. Although the derivation of the monopoly in these general theoretical relations of capital attempts to avoid the reductionism of the Leninist analysis of capitals in surface-movements of monopoly competition, the proposition advanced is that the laws of value and the historical formation of a general profit rate⁽⁹⁵⁾ are circumvented when the free competition of capitals are transformed under monopoly production conditions.

This parallels Hilferding's theory of the formation of a two sector average profit rate directly from the transformation of competition in the sphere of the cartellisation of production and its retention in the other⁽⁹⁶⁾. In contemporary monopoly capitalism, the new executor of economic laws is by the "economic and extra-economic power (Macht) and force (Gewalt) of the monopoly"⁽⁹⁷⁾. It opposes the "unhindered⁽⁹⁸⁾ action of the price and profit mechanism"⁽⁹⁹⁾, which interprets the

primacy of market relations as constitutive for the mechanism of the capitalist mode of production⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. Since the laws of state monopoly capitalism no longer act according to their "own logic", capitalism is "maintained (erhält) only by means of political force (Gewalt)"⁽¹⁰¹⁾. Capital is historically compelled to correspond to its own concept under the "compulsion" (Zwang) and domination of the monopolies and the state⁽¹⁰²⁾. This indicates another important aspect of the interventionist functions of capitalist states by which "dying capitalism" is only maintained through economic and political state power⁽¹⁰³⁾.

These means of "artificially hindering ... the accomplishment of the laws of profit" are the basis for a "permanent deviation from average profit"⁽¹⁰⁴⁾, the termination of the equalisation tendencies of capitals, and the proportional distribution of total social labour⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. This is equally expressed in the themes of Lenin's analysis which underpins the theory of state monopoly capitalism. As Soviet theorists contend, "Lenin defines the monopoly as the direct opposite to free competition and emphasises thereby the line of separation between the spontaneous formation of proportionality which exists in the epoch of free competition, and the undermining of this spontaneous mechanism of proportionality in the monopoly stage"⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. The monopoly modification to the fundamental processes of capital accumulation and surplus-value appropriation establishes an extension to the "exploitation fields" (Ausbeutungsfeldes) of labour in individual production branches. This is interpreted as a "secondary exploitation" by the economic and political domination of monopolies and state in the reproduction process of capitals, the distribution and appropriation of profit⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. As S.E.D. theorist Jahn argues, in "state monopoly capitalism, the character of capital has accomplished (vollendung) a

total social relation of exploitation"⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. The "exploitation-field" of the monopolies is extended on total social production in the form of a "tribute" (Tribut)⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. It creates the opportunity for another source of additional profit⁽¹¹⁰⁾ through the monopoly appropriation of the surplus-value of non-monopoly capitals, a part of the surplus product of small commodity producers and the impact of monopoly pricing on non-monopoly classes⁽¹¹¹⁾.

Thus, the accumulation of private capital through "monopoly profits" and the regulation of total social production is accomplished in the new capitalist "price-profit-mechanism" of distribution⁽¹¹²⁾.

The regulation of capitalist systems in this manner establishes the primacy of distribution relations on the formation of a general profit rate through the division of the total profit mass under economic and political power. It is expressed as a qualitatively new stage in monopolistic distribution⁽¹¹³⁾.

However, the price-profit mechanism is necessarily concerned with distribution rather than production because as Marx states, "competition between capitals can only exchange the relation wherein they participate in total profit, but cannot alter the relation between total profit and total wages"⁽¹¹⁴⁾. This point can also be made through Grossman's value analysis: "the total quantity of the originally produced surplus values are not changed through the distribution of surplus value in the state, banks, industries etc."⁽¹¹⁵⁾.

The issues which we will develop in the theory of state monopoly capitalism follow from the fact that economically determined competition is not the exclusive executor of the laws of movement of total social capital. Once the representation of the relationship between total social value and total profit, economic laws and their "modes of

accomplishment" cease to be expressed in the formation of a general profit rate, then the capitalist mode of production cannot be examined as a unified system of total production and circulation. With the dissolution of the automaticity of the process of private capital formation, the reproduction mechanism of total social production is construed through the combined unity of the monopoly domination of economic and political processes. Thus, the theory of monopoly capitalism has not established the connection between the economic laws of the different stages of capitalism with their "modes of accomplishment" on the basis of the "logic of capital".

However, the theory has also emphasised the transformation of capital accumulation under the concentration tendencies of production in contrast to distribution. We will now discuss these in the contemporary analysis of the monopoly.

5.2.2 The concentration and centralisation of capital

Marxist-Leninist theorists argue that the "concentration of production and capitals is ... the historical and logical starting-point for the origin (Entstehung) of modern monopolies"⁽¹¹⁶⁾ and the formation of state monopoly capitalism⁽¹¹⁷⁾. While the "starting-point" for the monopoly-concept is Book 23 and 24 of Kapital Volume 1⁽¹¹⁸⁾, this only concerns the "generally valid form" of the laws of movement of capital and therefore only the first tendency of monopoly capitalism through the concentration and centralisation of capital⁽¹¹⁹⁾.

Accordingly, Soviet theorist Oelssner argues that the Leninist theory of imperialism has "scientifically proven the emergence of modern monopolies out of (aus der) free competition" as a "new stage of development of production powers" and the "decisive character of the epoch"⁽¹²⁰⁾. Although "concentration is the starting-point for the transition to imperialism"⁽¹²¹⁾, as Hess contends, this remains

within the continuity and unity of the laws of capitalism and imperialism through the monopoly in the critique of political economy: "Lenin's analysis established the inner-connection (inneren Zusammenhang) of both general phases of capitalist development and secured the unity and completion of the Marxist theory and critique of capitalism"⁽¹²²⁾.

For Hess, this is established through the features which we have identified in Lenin's theory of monopoly capitalism:

"in the framework of his theory of imperialism, Lenin has formulated the monopoly as a development-form (Entwicklungsform) of capital-relations on the basis of concentration and centralisation, ... (and) ... finance-capital as a new capital-category as a result of the formation of monopolies and the fusion of monopolistic industrial and bank-capital"⁽¹²³⁾.

To this process of the concentration and centralisation of capitals are added the juristic power of states in the accumulation process, and the expansion and concentration of capital beyond national boundaries⁽¹²⁴⁾. As S.E.D. theorists contend, the "new quality of monopolisation is above all characterised by the realisation of monopolies with the assistance, and under the participation of states on the basis of the fusion of the power of the monopoly with the power of states"⁽¹²⁵⁾.

The significance of the Marxist-Leninist methodological analysis of Das Kapital for Klein interprets Marx's examination of the general laws of the capitalist mode of production as a "prognosis" on the "future movement of society" from the theory of capitalist accumulation⁽¹²⁶⁾. The consequent historical intensification of the concentration and centralisation of capitals in either the dissolution of competition in

"organised capitalism" or "monopoly capitalism" obviates the regulation of bourgeois society on the theoretical and historical basis of capitalist commodity production and generates the historical relations of a "planned" economy.

This section has considered the monopoly with respect to competition and concentration. We will now examine the monopoly domination on the socialisation processes of capital and its significance for the concept of state monopoly capitalism.

5.2.3 The socialisation of capital

The concentration and centralisation of capital increases the command of individual capital over total social production through the extension of socialisation-functions for the reproduction of the general conditions of capital accumulation and the mobility of capitals. While Marxist-Leninist theorists have acknowledged the expansion of production powers in monopoly capitalism they remained within the structure of "decaying capitalism". However, with the formation of a new stage of capitalism, the more extensive socialisation⁽¹²⁷⁾ of capitalist reproduction processes beyond the structure of private monopoly capitalism stimulates the analysis of the expansion of production powers in the dialectic of "decay" and "development". Paradoxically, although "decay" is a "general historical tendency of the development of imperialism"⁽¹²⁸⁾, it does not signify a complete stagnation and retardation of production powers even in the last historical stage of capitalism⁽¹²⁹⁾.

Since there is no "automatic stagnation of production powers"⁽¹³⁰⁾, nor constraint to "technical innovation" by the monopolies, Marxist-Leninist theorists now formulate a "restrictive solution and intensification of the capitalist contradiction of monopoly capitalist relations of production and production powers"⁽¹³¹⁾. Monopolies are

compelled to sustain monopoly profits through the expansion of production for unbounded growth and the saturation of markets with excess commodities⁽¹³²⁾. The contradictory expansion and retardation of the social development of production powers in "decaying capitalism" is achieved through the extra-economic interventionism of states under the "fusion" and the "scientific-technical-revolution"⁽¹³³⁾.

This category is derived from the double determination of internal and external relations of monopoly capitalism and the "General Crisis of Capitalism".

Internally, scientific-technical innovation revolutionises the development of production powers through the accomplishment and renewal of the material production conditions⁽¹³⁴⁾ in conjunction with state functions for the reproduction of total social capital⁽¹³⁵⁾. S.E.D. theorist A. Lemnitz expresses the "scientific-technical-revolution" as a permanent transformation in the technical composition of capital. Although, this is interpreted as a "method" and thereby a conscious activity of the monopoly bourgeoisie for augmenting profits⁽¹³⁶⁾ rather than a consequence of the reproduction requirements of total social capital from the fall in the general profit rate. With the transition from free competition capitalism to monopoly capitalism, science is transformed into a directly productive power within the capitalist form of material-technical conditions as a general instrument for raising the social production powers of labour⁽¹³⁷⁾. Consequently, the typical contents of the "scientific-technical-revolution" reflect: the contradictory transformation of the capitalist reproduction process through the qualitative transformation of labour processes (division of labour, means of labour); the general dependence of material reproduction upon science and technics as

directly productive powers, for the extended socialisation of production⁽¹³⁸⁾; and the intellectual-qualification functions of labour in the production process (autonomisation, cybernetics)⁽¹³⁹⁾.

Externally, Marxism-Leninism translates the superiority of world socialism on world capitalism in "system-competition" onto the concrete relations of state monopolistic processes. These are characterised through the adoption of state capitalist planning techniques⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ and "adaptation (Anpassung) processes⁽¹⁴¹⁾ for the expansion of production powers⁽¹⁴²⁾ in new methods of exploitation⁽¹⁴³⁾. The specific "form-transformations"(Formwandlungen) of capitalist systems in the mutual determinations of state monopoly capitalism and "General Crisis of Capitalism" express the dialectical process of the limitation of monopoly capitalism in "system-competition" and the "new stage in the social character of production powers"⁽¹⁴⁴⁾.

This now suggests a primacy of the politics of "system maintenance" on the dynamics of capitalism through manipulative strategies of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The expansion of capitalist production processes under the "scientific-technical revolution" in the Third Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ function for the containment of class struggle⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ and the security and regulation of total social systems⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. State monopoly capitalism now maintains the concept of a "dying capitalism" less through the absolute inability to expand production powers than the relative incapacity to utilise them in the world conditions of state capitalist systems⁽¹⁴⁸⁾.

As the expansion of production powers are not constrained by the inner limits of capitalist relations of production, the criterion of the superiority of socialist over world capitalist systems is in the comparative expansion of production powers in the "Second"⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ and "Third Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism"⁽¹⁵⁰⁾. There are two

issues to be considered here.

Firstly, the formation of a socialist from a capitalist mode of production is examined through the quantitative level of "modern production powers" as an "independent category"⁽¹⁵¹⁾ in the comparative success of competing world systems⁽¹⁵²⁾. The concept of "scientific-technical-revolution" defines the criterion of the inter-system comparability and materialist realisation of social labour processes in the genetical connection of capitalist and socialist systems. Analogous to the examination of production powers, the "scientific-technical-revolution" becomes a class neutral and independent process characteristic of both socio-economic systems. In capitalist systems, the monopoly "usurps" this process⁽¹⁵³⁾ and deploys it for the maintenance of the interests of capitals in contradistinction to its complete realisation in the superiority of socialist planning mechanisms⁽¹⁵⁴⁾.

Secondly, the realisation of the "scientific-technical-revolution" becomes an organisational instrument of class struggle; as S.E.D. theorists argue, the proletariat attempt to "master the scientific-revolution"⁽¹⁵⁵⁾.

However, this examination of the development of production powers has contrasting features to those identified under Lenin's concept. In particular, it marks a "concession" to the expansion and "stabilisation" of capitalist systems in contemporary monopoly capitalism rather than their "decay".

The developed forms of social property in which the expansion of production powers unfold are subsequently interpreted as real historical forms of the dissolution of capital-logic and the transition of the capitalist mode of production in the new mechanisms of exploitation and socialised production. This analysis does not originate in Lenin's

concept of monopoly capitalism but the theories of Bernstein and Hilferding. It arises from the genesis and periodisation of the transformation of pre-monopoly capitals in the separation of capital functions and property⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. In the historical process of monopoly concentration and centralisation of capitals, the necessary functions for "profit production"⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ and the reproduction of total social production generate new social property relations in contrast to private property in the means of production. This is accomplished in a stage of the separation of the functions and property of capital⁽¹⁵⁸⁾, in a new category of capital⁽¹⁵⁹⁾: these are the collective forms of capitalist property in "joint-stock capital", "finance-capital" and "state property".

While Lenin examines the finance-oligarchy and the concept of "rentier states" from the separation of loan capital and industrial capital, of entrepreneurs from rentiers in the crises of imperialist economy⁽¹⁶⁰⁾, the primacy of the objectification of capitalist socialisation processes express the social domination of the monopoly form of capitals as the foundation for the analysis of finance-capital⁽¹⁶¹⁾. This is the most extreme form of the subordination of the production-sphere of capital to its most abstract form of money-capital⁽¹⁶²⁾ and a "further anonymisation (Anonymisierung) of the relations of capital"⁽¹⁶³⁾.

However, the economic relations of production developed from the capital contradiction of property and socialisation emphasises the juridical forms of social appropriation in which the "intensification of the fundamental contradiction of the capitalist mode of production becomes visible"⁽¹⁶⁴⁾. The new forms of capitalist production relations are based upon "social-capital" (gesellschaftlichen Kapital) in a "new exploitation field"⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ and "new economic mechanism of exploitation"⁽¹⁶⁶⁾.

It facilitates a redistribution of surplus-value in the interests of monopoly capital through the "foreign element" of political "power" (Macht) and "force" (Gewalt) in capitalist reproduction processes⁽¹⁶⁷⁾. With the dissolution of free competition capitalism⁽¹⁶⁸⁾, the collective forms of capitalist property in the socialisation process of capitals appear to function as relatively autonomous movements of capital and negating forms of the capitalist mode of production in the transition of capitalism.

The class content of the negation of capitalism exists in the formation of contradictory property relations as qualitatively new appearance-forms of the capitalist contradiction through the combination of private capitalist property with collective capitalist property⁽¹⁶⁹⁾. On the basis of the Marxist-Leninist capital methodology, the contradictions within the property forms of inter-capitalist class relations are interpreted as the "co-existence of old and new forms of property"⁽¹⁷⁰⁾ which contradict the "foundations of the capitalist mode of production"⁽¹⁷¹⁾. Private property and social property constitute the new class foundations of state monopoly capitalism⁽¹⁷²⁾ in an "embracing state property in the means of production" and the "completion of monopoly power in the state-monopoly"⁽¹⁷³⁾.

The process of the functional separation of capital and property transforms private capitalist property into a parasitical ownership of socialised production processes by the finance-aristocracy; finance-capital becomes the "economic foundation of the power of a small group of the capitalist exploiting class"⁽¹⁷⁴⁾. Following both the precedents established by Hilferding and Lenin, socialisations of production are increasingly usurped by the command of a parasitical "finance-oligarchy", a small circle of finance-capitalists and the "personal-union"⁽¹⁷⁵⁾. This is because the "adaptation of political

institutions to the economic process of development ... leads to the personal union of monopolies and state apparatus"⁽¹⁷⁶⁾, which assumes control of the central mechanism of direction of total social production in the "unified mechanism" (einheitlichen Mechanismus). Thus, with the transition to imperialism, the "changes in the relations of economy and political places the subjective moment more into the foreground"⁽¹⁷⁷⁾ in the conscious control of the price-profit mechanism⁽¹⁷⁸⁾.

This presentation of the category of finance-capital accentuates the "subjective" moment in the separation of capital and property functions with the principles of the combination of property relations in distinction to the general economic laws of the capitalist mode of production. Moreover, it is especially evident when the contradiction of private and public within the total relations of capitalist property is interpreted as the negation of the capitalist system. As Marxist-Leninist theory follows the historicised analysis of Das Kapital, the references to the "Aufhebung of capitals as private property inside the framework of the capitalist mode of production"⁽¹⁷⁹⁾, the "Aufhebung of the capitalist mode of production itself"⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ are interpreted as the self-Aufhebung of the capitalist mode of production supporting the concept of a "declining" (Niedergangs) and "dying capitalism"⁽¹⁸¹⁾. Equally, the new "forms" into which capital must move beyond its own inner limit⁽¹⁸²⁾ constitutes capitalism in "general form changes" (hauptsächlichen Formwandlungen) by which the "finance-aristocrats" (Finanzaristokraten) and state interventions are founded upon the "development of collective capitalist enterprises in the juristic form of joint-stock societies"⁽¹⁸³⁾. These "general form changes" again signify that the capitalist system no longer functions on its "own foundations, according to its own logic; it must accept 'foreign

elements' which announce its dissolution (Auflösung)"⁽¹⁸⁴⁾. With the dissolution of the market economy, this also appears in the "non-capitalist" methods of state interventions within national capitalist systems⁽¹⁸⁵⁾. The appearances of capitalist reproduction processes are interpreted as historical factors in the dissolution of the laws of private capitalism on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist Kapital methodology and the historical periodisation of free competition capitalism.

The manner by which state monopoly capitalism represents the destruction of capital-logic is equally the methodological and theoretical "starting-point" for the examination of economy and political, and the process of state interventions in capitalist reproduction processes. We will now discuss these themes in total social reproduction processes.

5.3 The imperialist state in the reproduction process of capital

The central propositions in the theory of state monopoly capitalism concerning the relations of monopoly and state, state and society are examined through the periodisation of capitalism and the structural impositions of imperialism on the functions of capitalist states. One such general theory of state interventions follows the methodological and theoretical presuppositions of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of capitalism in the relation of individual capitals to the "unknown market"⁽¹⁸⁶⁾. It situates the analysis of state monopoly capitalism beyond the "pure form" capital-logic of free competition capitalism and the automaticity of the reproduction of total social production in new forms of socialisation. To this extent, it is concerned with the legitimation of the theory of state monopoly capitalism in distinction to the issues involved in its formation in the first phase of the "de-Stalinisation" of the world communist movement.

With the formation of a theory of state monopoly capitalism, the assessment of the general character, structures and functions of imperialist states in the total social reproduction processes of capital receives new consideration. This necessarily follows from the continued existence of capitalism after the prognosis of the world historical "collapse" of capitals. However, the revolutionary perspective of Marxism-Leninism now constitutes state monopoly capitalism as the "last phase of imperialism". Zieschang contends that the state is the "only and last instrument which exists at the disposal of imperialism"⁽¹⁸⁷⁾. This concept is examined through the political direction of the monopoly bourgeoisie⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ over the functions of state monopoly systems for the "preservation of the system" (Systemsicherung) under the "primacy of the political" (Primat der Politik)⁽¹⁸⁹⁾.

Since the laws of social development are the principal foundation for the analysis of imperialist states, with the dissolution of free competition capitalism the characterisation of the "scientific analysis" of imperialist states⁽¹⁹⁰⁾ can only be accomplished on the basis of the general theoretical structure of state monopoly capitalism. Thus, the derivation of the interventionist functions of states in capitalist reproduction processes follow the theory of the periodisation of capitalism⁽¹⁹¹⁾.

5.3.1 Economy and political

S.E.D. theorists argue that under the economic mechanism of "free competition capitalism", the general functions of bourgeois state interventions are politically constrained to secure the "conditions of free competition against all extra-economic limits to the free development of capitals"⁽¹⁹²⁾, and the general valuational conditions

of production without permanent state interventions in the direct production process⁽¹⁹³⁾. This is taken as the ideological natural form of self-reproduction of capitalist production relations through the general commodity exchanges on private capitalist market relations and the liberal theory of bourgeois states. Conversely, in the conditions of state monopoly capitalism, the historical adaptation-processes of capitalist systems necessitate a "qualitatively new stage of political functions of suppression of the capitalist state" for the accomplishment of its general functions with "economic and political power against the economic limits of capitalist development"⁽¹⁹⁴⁾. Here, the dissolution of the private capitalist commodity exchanges in bourgeois property relations in monopoly capitalism leads to the "undermining" (Untergrabung) of the characteristic separation of economic and political relations of capitalist society⁽¹⁹⁵⁾.

This takes the form of a unity of economy and political in the monopoly periodisation⁽¹⁹⁶⁾. The monopoly form of capital is the "key to understand the inner-connection of imperialist economy and politics"⁽¹⁹⁷⁾. It is the "fundamental social relation of imperialism, ... the typical relation of production for this phase of capitalism ... (and) ... the fundamental relation of political domination (Herrschaft)"⁽¹⁹⁸⁾. Only in state monopoly capitalism does it appear as a "higher stage of the unity of economy and political"⁽¹⁹⁹⁾. Under the conditions of state monopoly capitalism, the realisation of the monopolisation tendencies are accomplished through the transfer of economic functions to imperialist states as the general political instrument of monopoly capitals and the unified economic and political mechanism which constitutes the essential structure for the preservation of capitalism under the long-run "collapse" tendencies of capitals.

The constitution of the "primacy of the political" in state monopoly capitalism is the new process of the monopoly transformation of the political from the economic structure of capitalist production relations. This form of social relations in the monopolies and state⁽²⁰⁰⁾ shows that the "specific characteristic of the economic activity of states is directly bound with its political function"⁽²⁰¹⁾. State interventionism is interpreted as a "politisation of the economy" in that capitalist relations "simultaneously" possess the quality of political relations⁽²⁰²⁾. Moreover, the "primacy of the political" on the economy is established not only by the inner-relations of the "fusion"⁽²⁰³⁾ but also the external relations of the "system competition"⁽²⁰⁴⁾.

Since the new periodisation of capitalism is based upon the unity of economy and political⁽²⁰⁵⁾, Marxist-Leninist theorists maintain Lenin's critique of Kautsky, that the "separation of economy from the political, and thereby of economic and political power ... is ... today a characteristic method of falsifying the essence of imperialism"⁽²⁰⁶⁾. The proposition can also be distinguished from the political interventions of states in relations of distribution from the conceptualisation of states as components of economic laws. The consequent general theoretical representation of state monopoly capitalism as a combined unity of economy and political expresses the regulation of the total capitalist system as a social imperative as well as a "strategy" of capital management. This is established by the "permanent fusion (Verschmelzung) of the power of the monopoly with the power of states into an embracing objective mechanism for the conditions of existence (Existenzbedingungen) of imperialism"⁽²⁰⁷⁾. These quantitative extensions of interventionist functions of states into a qualitatively new total social systems analysis represents the concept and content of bourgeois states as a

tential and "real total capitalist" (wirklichkeit Gesamtkapitalist)⁽²⁰⁸⁾ as opposed to an "ideal total capitalist" (idealle Gesamtkapitalist)⁽²⁰⁹⁾.

The transcendence of the structural limits of individual capital valuation is through the centralisation of economic and political functions of imperialist states for the accumulation of total social capital and the reproduction of the general conditions of capitalist production⁽²¹⁰⁾. This is a new mode of socio-economic interaction which constitutes a "functions-mechanism of the total capitalist exploitation processes" (Funktionsmechanismus des gesamten kapitalistischen Ausbedeutungsprozesses)⁽²¹¹⁾.

It is precisely in the formulation of the relation of states to the totality of bourgeois society in the "adaptation-processes" (Anpassungsprozesses) of state monopoly capitalism where the qualitative nature of the system-determination of state functions are theorised for the "interests of the system" (interessi di sistema)⁽²¹²⁾. However, such a concept enters into contradiction with the class connections of monopoly-power and the state because Marxism-Leninism derives the state from the monopoly, and state interventionist functions from the standpoint of the interest-representation of the monopoly bourgeoisie. What Hufschmid has termed the "continuity of capitalist class systems"⁽²¹³⁾ is conceived through the political character of state functions which preserve the integrity of the class system of monopoly economic and political power. Nevertheless, the development of total social production powers under monopoly domination not only establishes contradictions in the relation of the monopoly and the state through the "aim-means-conflict" (Ziel-Mitteln Konflikt)⁽²¹⁴⁾ of capitalism but also contraposes the logic of "systems-interests" to those of monopoly capitals. We will now discuss the issues which the opposition creates

for the theory of state monopoly capitalism.

While Marxist-Leninist theory has always been able to explain the "subsistence" of competition in the "mixed-economy"⁽²¹⁵⁾, the political system remains for S.E.D. theorists the concentrated expression of imperialist economy⁽²¹⁶⁾ because the "competition of monopolies in their totality characterises the political system of domination of state monopoly capitalism"⁽²¹⁷⁾. However, this concept is also modified by contemporary theorists who argue that the political instrument of states may also discipline the total interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie. Hess contends that on the one hand, "state monopoly capitalism from the stand-point of the action of the competition and anarchy in imperialism is only an instrument of competitive struggle (Instrument des Konkurrenzkampfes) that is utilised by the strongest monopolies against their competitors"⁽²¹⁸⁾. While on the other, the political instrument of domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie can "represent the common interests of monopoly capitalism, which can be in contradiction with the interests of certain monopolies or monopoly groups"⁽²¹⁹⁾. This latter characterisation of the state is difficult to conceive on the suppositions of state monopoly capitalism because the anarchical struggle of monopolies does not suggest either a conscious political process with a social regulatory capacity which organises the collective interests of the monopoly class. In so far as this is possible, then the examination of the class character of the state through monopoly domination contradicts the political functions for the organisation of the monopoly capitalist class.

The political conclusion to be drawn is that if the monopolies are in a continuous competitive struggle to subordinate the state, then the state cannot be permanently dominated by any one section of

the monopoly bourgeoisie⁽²²⁰⁾. The theory must then explain how either a new fraction of the monopoly bourgeoisie, and only the monopoly bourgeoisie, comes to dominate the political processes of the state, or how the state discriminates between competing interest demands. In this state-class concept, the competitive struggle of monopolies for the domination of the state approximates the general concept of states in the pluralist theory of the inter-class interest representation in the state system.

The problem is further complicated when Hess contends that the imperialist state not only represents the "common interests" of the monopoly bourgeoisie but also the long-run "collective interests of the domination of total finance capital" (den kollektiven Herrschaftsinteressen des Gesamtfinanzkapital) in relation to the individual interests of monopolies⁽²²¹⁾. The difficulty this creates is to establish how the "long-run" disciplining of the monopoly capitalist class interests can be maintained while displacing the "individual interests of the monopolies (die Einzelinteressen der Monopole)"⁽²²²⁾. Hess supplies the explanation through the "limited autonomy" (Selbständigkeit) of the state from the interest conflicts of monopoly capitals⁽²²³⁾. But as we have already argued, this cannot be unambiguously maintained on the premises of Marxism-Leninism; rather, it functions more as a "surrogate" for an explanation.

Another feature of this analysis is expressed by Klein when he contends that state-monopoly systems function for the "objective survival of the total system" (objektiv überlebten Gesamtsystems)⁽²²⁴⁾. Here a contradiction is suggested between the interests of the monopoly capitalist class with those represented in the political instruments of states necessary for the security of the total social system. In turn,

Hess has also advanced a similar argument when he reports that the "economic and political measures of the regulation of states are ... able to violate (verletzen) the entire short-run interests of monopoly capitals in favour of the long-run interests of systems, or also the interests of one monopoly group in favour of another (national or international)"⁽²²⁵⁾.

Further, in the global conditions of "system competition", the imperatives of the "existence of the domination of monopoly capitalism"⁽²²⁶⁾ are structured in the contradictory relationships of the totality of interests of the imperialist system against socialism⁽²²⁷⁾. Thus, the problematic of the profitability of monopoly capitals exists in the conjunctural relations of the political compulsion to maintain the general system security of capitalism with economic, ideological and political methods of state monopoly integration⁽²²⁸⁾. On this basis, the characterisation of the political functions of imperialist states are expressed in the unity and contradiction of the "fusion" of the economy and political. Although the socialist world system intensifies the inter-imperialist struggle⁽²²⁹⁾ and thereby the divisions within the monopoly bourgeoisie, it also impels the forces of unification beyond those of dissolution for the preservation of the integrity of the social system against world socialism⁽²³⁰⁾.

Moreover, we can identify in these aspects of contemporary state monopoly capitalism the anticipation of anti-monopolist interests in the performance of the functions necessary for capitalist adaptation-systems. In addition, when capitalist states function against the short-run profit interests of the monopoly capitalist class, then the "aim-means-conflict" of state monopoly capitalism produces an ideological dilemma in formulating the principles under which the total

capitalist system operates. The ambiguities of this process result primarily from the identification of the "autonomy" of bourgeois states from the domination of monopolies on the total economic and political systems. To a certain extent however, the problem is obscured when Hess appears to equate total social system interests with those of total monopoly capitals⁽²³¹⁾.

Further contradictions on the conceptualisation of the state emerge when Hess remarks that the "state is not a simple, direct and passive instrument of the ruling class", while simultaneously advancing the proposition that the "state is the political instrument of power (Macht) of monopoly capitals", and the "politics of states are the same as the strategy of finance-capitals"⁽²³²⁾.

In summation we suggest that if the state-monopoly relation is expressed in the contradictory unification of monopoly and state power in the interests of monopoly capitals and the total social system, then the contradictions of these respective aims must be reproduced in the interventionist functions of states. Since state monopoly capitalism has not established the inner-mechanism which represents the economic interests of capital through bourgeois states except in the instrumentalist attribution of the utilisation of states, the "aim-means-conflict" of state monopoly capitalism appears to efface the class premises and political character of capitalist states. This in turn expresses an even greater difficulty of examining state monopoly capitalism through the monopoly or state-monopoly connection because the class character of states is stipulated through the fetishised surface relations of bourgeois society. These problems are imposed upon the issues raised on the conceptualisation of the class character of the state: that the class character of the state is determined by its functions; that the long-run interests of the monopoly capitalist

class can be identified and converted into state politics; and that objective "system-interests" exist independently from those of the total monopoly capitalist class.

From the foregoing discussion in this Chapter, the analysis of economic laws of state monopoly capitalism will be examined along with their significance for the functions of interventionist states.

5.3.2 Capital laws and state-planning

With the rise of a prosperity phase of capitals in Western Europe, Marxist-Leninist theorists advance new theses on the capacities of bourgeois states to regulate capitalist economies. The point of concern here is their conceptualisation from the characterisation of economic laws from the monopoly problematic of capitals.

S.E.D. theorist A. Lemnitz follows the Marxist-Leninist methodology on the relations of theory and history to establish the "abstract-theoretical and concrete-historical analysis of the laws of the epoch of imperialism", and the "long-run tendencies that are abstracted from the accidents of historical development"⁽²³³⁾. In this respect, the theoretical formation of "free competition capitalism" constitutes the essential dynamic and generalised model of capitalist economic processes in the spontaneity of market mechanisms⁽²³⁴⁾, while the spontaneity of capitalism is qualitatively transformed under the monopoly forms of capitalist contradictions in a "negative modification of the accomplishment of economic laws"⁽²³⁵⁾. It prompts two contrasting responses in Marxist-Leninist theory.

The first of these is advanced by Soviet theorist Rosental and can be classified as an example of "capital logic". This interprets Lenin's theory of imperialism as a "direct continuation" of Marx⁽²³⁶⁾ while also arguing that the "methodology of capital is the starting-point" for the analysis of the "appearances" of capital⁽²³⁷⁾. In a

manner similar to Lemnitz, Rosental establishes the methodological distinction between "capital logic", the "most abstract form, free from historical development tendencies"⁽²³⁸⁾. The subsequent representation of the relations of theory and history in Das Kapital constitutes the "logical" as the historical divested of the "accidental" (Zerfälligkeiten) to express the essential laws of capital⁽²³⁹⁾. From these principles, Rosental considers that according to Marx "the concept of law and inner-connections are ... in general identical. A law is nothing other than the expression of the inner, the essential connection and the reciprocal dependence of appearances"⁽²⁴⁰⁾. Without establishing the methodology of capitals, the "critics of Marx see in the development of the capitalism of free competition to 'planned economy' under the conditions of state monopoly capitalism, the proof that the method and logic of capitals is obsolete"⁽²⁴¹⁾.

However, Rosental does not seek to contest the concept of state monopoly capitalism but seeks to interpret it on the basis of "capital-logic". In addition, the analysis does not consider the problem of connecting theory to history when it is argued that "logic" is the "ideal model of the objective world"⁽²⁴²⁾. This suggests that capital-logic is the "model" of the real historical development of capitalism.

Conversely, the second response favoured by Lemnitz can be classified under the monopoly-concept. The analytical derivation of the monopoly form of capitals establishes its "logic, structure and method ... (as) ... a continuation (Fortsetzung) of the analysis, which Karl Marx determines in 'Kapital'. Marx chooses the commodity as the starting-point (Ausgangspunkt) for the scientific analysis of free competition capitalism: with Lenin, the monopoly generally has this role"⁽²⁴³⁾. This formal substitution of the commodity with the

monopoly equally expresses the limitations to the commodity analysis of total social production relations in monopoly capitalism.

In both these examinations of the general laws of capitalism in capital-logic and the monopoly-concept, the "antinomies" of competition and monopoly, anarchy and planning are prominent features of state monopoly capitalism. Moreover, the primacy of the monopoly on the capital movements creates the mechanism which establishes the laws of socialism from the manner in which the laws of capitalism are "undermined" (untergräbt) and "transcended" (aufgehoben) in a centrally planned direction of total social production. The "unified-mechanism" of "fused" (verschmelzt) power of monopoly and state develops in contradiction to the spontaneity of capitals⁽²⁴⁴⁾ through systematic state interventionism for the "survival" of capitalist systems⁽²⁴⁵⁾. The consequent transformation of the structure of economy and state is a "permanent and indispensable component of this system and state capitalist planning"⁽²⁴⁶⁾, and introduces the problematic of state-planning into the contradictions of competition and monopoly⁽²⁴⁷⁾. On the basis of the dissolution of the laws of capitalist commodity production, the structure of the spontaneity of capitals enters into contradiction with the state-monopoly planning mechanism and the new Marxist-Leninist proposition of the "use" of economic laws.

The developed planning mechanisms of state monopoly capitalism submit the general laws of total economic processes to a "conscious utilisation" by the imperialist state⁽²⁴⁸⁾. State capitalist planning demonstrates that the spontaneity of production and exchange in the mode of action of economic laws is replaced with a system of total social regulation of capitalist production processes⁽²⁴⁹⁾. The development of this process in the theory of state monopoly capitalism however can neither be complete - equivalent to the abolition of the general laws of the capitalist mode of production - nor independent of

the contradictory structure in which the regulation of social production by the spontaneous and anarchical action of value laws in capitalist crises is confronted with the economic praxis of state monopolist planning and programming⁽²⁵⁰⁾ as a "growing consciousness" (waschender Bewusstheit) in the total structure of economic laws. Even where the spontaneity of capitalist commodity production is not eliminated and the "fusion" mechanism is not so conclusively maintained⁽²⁵¹⁾, they remain the predominant components in the new forms of capitalist contradictions in the antinomies of anarchy and planning⁽²⁵²⁾, competition and monopoly, value laws and state monopoly regulation⁽²⁵³⁾.

Nevertheless, despite these propositions on the "use" of economic laws, they are not unanimously supported by all state monopoly capitalist theorists on several important points.

While E. Albrecht seeks to emphasise the spontaneity of capitalist production processes through the antinomies of monopoly capitalism, the distinction remains quantitative:

"under the conditions of state monopoly capitalism, consciousness is subordinated to spontaneity, it is only temporary and partial against spontaneity ... (and) ... is integrated into spontaneity"⁽²⁵⁴⁾.

Conversely, H. Scheler designates the spontaneous mode of action of objective economic laws as the mode in which the general and essential connection of total social production processes is made. The conscious acts of production agents within capitalist exchange processes produces the unconscious spontaneity of total social development: "under the spontaneity of the social process, Marxist-Leninists understand the unconsciousness (Unbewusstheit) of the conscious activity of men"⁽²⁵⁵⁾.

Since the action of individual laws are moments of total social systems, the imperialist bourgeoisie can only "understand" (erkennen)

the social nature of production "inside the capital relation"⁽²⁵⁶⁾. Rather, the structural relation of anarchy and state monopoly planning exists within total social production relations. State monopoly system-planning does not transcend the spontaneous mode of action of economic laws, but rather expresses the "new appearance forms of spontaneity"⁽²⁵⁷⁾. The concept of the "conscious use" of economic laws in the dialectic of planning and anarchy is to be construed within the framework of total social relations and not as a growing consciousness within total national economy⁽²⁵⁸⁾. On such a basis, some S.E.D. theorists have not established a qualitative distinction between the realisation of total social planning mechanisms through the use of laws in capitalism and socialism⁽²⁵⁹⁾.

There are two characteristic propositions to be advanced here on the laws of capitalism.

Firstly, the real historical tendency in capitalist systems is that the spontaneous action of economic laws are "limited" by the "conscious utilisation"(bewusste Ausnutzung) of the economic laws of capitalism in the regulatory activity of monopoly and state⁽²⁶⁰⁾. Thus, the unity of total social economic processes still cannot be founded on the logic of capitals, especially with the effect of "system-competition" on the inner adaptation-processes of capitalist systems to the general reproduction requirements of capital⁽²⁶¹⁾.

Secondly, not all concepts of capitalist planning promote the regulatory power of the state-monopoly mechanism to the extent examined so far. Here, Soviet theorists emphasise the creation of national planning instruments of bourgeois states under the "scientific-technical-revolution" and "system-competition": the

"objective logic of the development of modern production powers in the scientific-technical-revolution and the logic of the development

of state monopoly capitalism, which is accomplished under the conditions of competition of both opposed systems, demands the transition to a new, higher form of state regulation of production, distribution, exchange and consumption, to economic programming and forecasting (Prognostizierung) on the total national scale (gesamtstaatlichen Mass-stab)" (262).

In both these examples, capitalist systems reveal that the social reproduction process of capitals are no longer examined under the dictates of the valuation of total social capitals, but the theoretical generalisation of the planning-anarchy contradiction of state monopoly capitalism. These relations are posed from the stand-point of the total system-perception of the monopoly bourgeoisie, and thereby the representation of the "blind action" of value laws in the surface-relations of state-society, the bureaucratisation of state apparatuses and social relations of class power. This suggests an examination of the historical laws of development of capitalist societies through the institutionalised relations of economy and state rather than the capital foundations of society and class struggle.

The emphasis upon the monopolist and state-planning of capitalist systems in contemporary Marxist-Leninist theory is considered from the conditions of the long-period of post-war economic and political stability of Western Europe. This leads to the characterisation of capitalism through those features identified in "organised capitalism" and Engels' examination of trusts: "in trusts, freedom of competition changes into its very opposite - into monopoly; and the production without any definite plan of capitalist society capitulates to the production upon a definite plan of invading socialist society" (263). State-capitalist planning in total social reproduction processes becomes a formal planning principle analogous to socialist economy

derived from the Engelsian-Leninist problematic. The superiority of a rational socialist planning of the total social system of production is derived from the traditional analysis of capitalist disproportionalities, the anarchy of capitalism from Marx's reproduction schemas⁽²⁶⁴⁾. It also establishes state monopoly capitalism as the "model" of transition from capitalism to socialism in which under "system-competition", capitalist systems attempt to "borrow socialist methods of state economic direction"⁽²⁶⁵⁾.

Here, extensive state interventions in developed state monopoly capitalism receives a double characterisation in the performance of functions for the social reproduction of capital and the anticipation of real socialist production relations. Since the distinction between capitalist and socialist planning resides in the extent to which the "conscious use" of economic laws has been attained, the contradiction of capitalism can appear in the control of the state monopolist planning mechanism for the interests of the monopolies against the interests of the people"⁽²⁶⁶⁾. Nevertheless, this does not establish the Marxist-Leninist theory of state monopoly capitalism as a "class knowledge" of capitalist systems. Analogously, S.E.D. theorists interpret a planned political economy of socialism from the "state-use" of the capital categories of the capitalist mode of production (money, price, profit, etc.)⁽²⁶⁷⁾ in which general economic processes are only given in their "capital-form"⁽²⁶⁸⁾.

This designates the "negation of capitalism" in a series of logical contradictions in capitalist and socialist systems of "non-capitalist commodity production"⁽²⁶⁹⁾, "commodity production without capitalists"⁽²⁷⁰⁾.

A distinction can be made here between contemporary S.E.D. and Soviet theorists. The former argue that the transition-period from

capitalism to communism "is not a short-run transition-phase in the development of society but a relatively independent socio-economic formation in the historical epoch of transition from capitalism to communism on a world-scale"⁽²⁷¹⁾ in which its laws and categories function as the unconditional foundation of socialism. Conversely, the latter argue that socialism is the "first phase of new communist modes of production". Therefore, without this consideration, socialist states (in the Soviet dominated socialist world system) are not necessarily articulated within the general laws of transformation to communism⁽²⁷²⁾. Nevertheless, such a distinction is not readily evident in Soviet analysis because: (a) the historical transition to communism in Russia through "state-capitalism" necessitated a phase of socialist construction in distinction to the classical Marxist model of the transition to communism and (b) Soviet theorists advance a stage-theory of socialist transition through "state monopoly capitalism" in Western Europe.

In this discussion on economic laws, the monopoly-form contradicts the general concept of capital with the development of the total social structure in the combined economic and political relations of state monopoly capitalism. Here, the domination of total national economies under the political direction of state-planning apparatuses is opposed to the inner-organisation of capitalist society under the laws of value. Thereby the economic laws of monopoly capitalism function in contradiction to the general foundations of capital, and receive their significance for the planning-potential of socialist production relations. Nevertheless, this new character to economic laws in state monopoly capitalism stands against the intimations of Marx who contested the connection between the labour theory of value and a "socialist system"⁽²⁷³⁾.

The general theory of capital and its significance for the European communist movement concerns the "application" and concretisation of Leninist categories through the new mechanisms of the expanded reproduction of capitals by which the state-concept assumes the central relation in the analysis of state monopoly capitalism. The conceptualisation of the concrete functions of state interventions in the general laws of capitalist reproduction processes will now be examined.

State interventionism and the devaluation of capital

State interventionist economic praxis develops in the structural crisis of capitalism⁽²⁷⁴⁾. It responds to the social problems of capital accumulation - identified by the F.C.P. in the tendential fall in the general profit-rate from the greater increase in the mass of capital than the accumulated mass of total value⁽²⁷⁵⁾. This creates the difficulty contemporary capitalist systems exhibit of expanding total capital accumulation at existing average rates of profit without interventionist states as "real total capitalists" and regulators of social movements of capital.

Following the discussion on the "fusion" concept, the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism defines imperialist states as "economic powers". However, it must be shown how, as Lemnitz argues, the "imperialist state develops to a real independent economic power to which the monopoly bourgeoisie increasingly transfer economic tasks"⁽²⁷⁶⁾, and how the interventionist concept of imperialist states in the reproduction process of capitals can contribute to the solution of this problem by circumventing the essential laws of capital.

We will develop these issues through the two principal functions of imperialist states in the general theory of over-accumulation and devaluation of capital with particular reference to the theorists of the F.C.P. and the S.E.D.. The first involves the new modes of capitalist adaptation-processes for the structural devaluation of the sectorial

over-accumulation of capital through state-monopolisation functions, and the creation of new accumulation processes. The second concerns the state's contribution to the accumulation and profitability of private monopoly capitals in the facilitation of the circumvention of the fall in the general profit rate⁽²⁷⁷⁾. This extends the sphere of monopoly capital valuation to the level of total social capital by the economic and political activity of the state⁽²⁷⁸⁾.

The theory of the over-accumulation and devaluation of capital parallels the genetical determination of capitals in the periodisation of capitalism⁽²⁷⁹⁾. Schematically, this can be represented under the chronological categorisation of the tendency to the over-accumulation of capital and its significance for the relationship of capital and the state.

The first period is that of "free competition capitalism", the initiation of a period of the over-accumulation of capital with the formation of monopoly capital and the devaluation of non-monopoly capital⁽²⁸⁰⁾. The second period (1895-1914) is of the full formation of monopoly capitalism. This is the "simple monopoly stage" of capital exports⁽²⁸¹⁾ which Lenin examines, where state interventionist functions in the economic reproduction process only give the possibility of the dissolution of the general over-accumulation of capital. The third period (1914-1944) is characterised by the systematic tendency to the general over-accumulation of capital and the collapse of the valuation of private capitalism under the "profit-price-mechanism"⁽²⁸²⁾. These are given provisional solutions by the structural devaluations of capital under state interventionism in the capitalist reproduction processes⁽²⁸³⁾. The fourth period (1945-1969) is that of the "epoch of state monopoly capitalism" and the creation of "social capital" through the instruments of state to create permanent forms of the

devaluation of capital due to the "growing and permanent over-accumulation of capital"⁽²⁸⁴⁾. Finally, the period from 1969 onwards is characterised by the permanent over-accumulation of capital in the last stage of capitalism before socialism. Only in this periodisation does state monopoly capitalism develop as a general theory of capital accumulation and the structural devaluation of capital⁽²⁸⁵⁾. Here, the institutional "fusion" of economic and political power is an objectively determined response to the accumulation crisis of capitalism⁽²⁸⁶⁾.

Since state interventionist functions are determined by the permanent crises of capital accumulation, the mechanism of capitalist reproduction processes are constructed through the over-accumulation and devaluation of capital. The theory also purports to transform the "profit-price-mechanism" to oppose the fall in the general profit rate through the domination of the monopoly and state⁽²⁸⁷⁾. Moreover, the investigation of the mechanism of contemporary state monopoly capitalism⁽²⁸⁸⁾ is also examined by S.E.D. theorists through the external features of the socialist world system in the "Third Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism" on "state functions for the devaluation of capital"⁽²⁸⁹⁾. On this basis, the modified conditions of the structural form of capitalist reproduction processes no longer fully responds to the cyclical movement of capitals⁽²⁹⁰⁾ but are characterised by a permanent crisis under the "scientific-technical-revolution" and "system competition"⁽²⁹¹⁾.

The general theory of "over-accumulation and devaluation" of capital advances beyond the distribution mechanisms of monopoly and state because of the state's capacity as a "real total capitalist" and an "autonomous" economic power from monopoly capital. Here, the imperialist state not only enters into relation with the

conditions of the appropriation of profit for "monopolies" and the realisation of private capital, but is also considered as a fraction of total social capital. Consequently, the dissolution of the laws of an average profit-rate formation are not limited to the "profit-price mechanism" of distribution, but the laws of value⁽²⁹²⁾.

Boccaro advances this proposition with the development of the continuity of the analysis of Marx and Lenin through the political distinction between "revisionism" and "revision":

"revisionism is a non-scientific attitude which rejects the old acquisitions of science. Revision is the same movement as science which ceaselessly by-passes the old acquisitions and relativises them by integrating them in a new richer conception"⁽²⁹³⁾.

Subsequently, Marx is said to revise Ricardo, and "Lenin, as other Marxists at the same time, begins to revise Das Kapital in Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism, and pose the question of its revision and its development". However, we have argued that the distance between Marx and Ricardo is a qualitative one which Lenin had not adequately assessed. The vitiation of such distinctions permits Boccaro to methodologically approach the theoretical question of the continuity and compatibility of Marx's general concept of capital with Lenin's theory of imperialism and the contemporary concept of state monopoly capitalism.

The genetical determination of capitals follows from the distinction of the "general concept of capital" from its "modes of accomplishment". As Boccaro argues, Marx has given the "analysis of capital in general (capital en général) or the formes of capital, reserving for a later work the analysis ... of the movement of concrete total reality"⁽²⁹⁴⁾. The "continuity" and "completion" of the analysis

of "capital in general" in the theory of over-accumulation/devaluation of capital develops "beyond the plan of Das Kapital for the analysis of capital in general ... to the movement of total concrete reality"⁽²⁹⁵⁾. This connects Volumes I and II of Das Kapital and completes the analysis of the law of tendential fall in the general profit rate. For Boccara, the concretisation of the general theory of capital accumulation is developed in the circulation relations: the "relation between devaluation and over-accumulation is posed at the concrete level or to speak as Marx, at the phenomenal level of competition"⁽²⁹⁶⁾.

In addition, it is considered that with the permanent over-accumulation of capital the mechanism of social reproduction of capital is not established through the connection of the average social organic composition of capitals and total profit mass. As a result, the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism follows Zieschang's earlier analysis of the mechanisms of reproduction⁽²⁹⁷⁾ as a "necessary and antagonistic solution to over-accumulation in the limits of the tendency of the falling rate of profit"⁽²⁹⁸⁾.

"Over-accumulation" is defined as the excess of capital accumulated in relation to the mass of total social surplus value or attainable profit for the valuation of capital⁽²⁹⁹⁾. When additional quantities of capital do not correspond to additional profit⁽³⁰⁰⁾, the over-accumulation of capital is absolute and thereby has equal significance for the devaluation of total social capital. To examine the forms in which the over-accumulation of capital develops, it is first necessary to consider the relation of individual to total social capital: "individual capitals are elements of total social capital and their particular profits, elements of global profit, or total social value"⁽³⁰¹⁾. On this basis, the devaluation of the permanent over-accumulation of capital is derived from Marx's examination of the

internal contradictions of the law of the falling rate of profit (Das Kapital Volume III Chapter XV part 3) and developed with the general theory of state interventionism in the accumulation processes taking responsibility for the permanent excess of capital⁽³⁰²⁾. The analysis is not interpreted as contradicting the fall in the general profit rate because the "analysis of over-accumulation and the devaluation of capital shows that the counter-tendencies cannot prevent the law from manifesting itself"⁽³⁰³⁾.

The proposition here is that the state capitalist devaluation of the over-accumulation of capital supports the monopoly domination of total social production through state functions in the valuation and competitive conditions of capitalist economies⁽³⁰⁴⁾. Nevertheless, these "structural devaluations" do not signify that "state mobilised capital" is a completely independent capital⁽³⁰⁵⁾. Although they ensure the favourable valuation of monopoly capital they simultaneously bring state monopoly capitalism into question as an "antagonistic solution" within the fall in the general profit rate⁽³⁰⁶⁾.

The theory of over-accumulation/devaluation provides three "antagonistic solutions":

- (i) An additional increment of total social capital receives zero profit and is therefore "put to sleep" (mis-en-sommeil) as capital because it does not function as capital.
- (ii) An increment of total capital is valued at a reduced rate, as a "partial destruction" of capital, and an inferior rate to that of the rest of total capital on which the general profit-rate is formed. Considered under this division is the "non-use" of monopoly capacity as a "further form of permanent non-cyclical capital devaluation", the "monopoly is nothing other than a necessary developed new devaluation-form of capitals in favour of the expanded valuation of capitals"⁽³⁰⁷⁾.

(iii) An increment of total capital is valuated at a negative rate (a "negative profit") where a fraction of accumulated capital is totally destroyed"⁽³⁰⁸⁾.

Here we can identify the principal forms of capital devaluation in monopoly capital, state controlled public enterprises and capitalist production financed by state expenditures⁽³⁰⁹⁾. These facilitate the devaluation of capital because the state is "relatively autonomous from its own capital valuation"⁽³¹⁰⁾. The state does not "claim" its share of total surplus value nor establish an average profit rate. This enables "monopolies" to be "freed" of excess capital (capitals with high organic compositions) through the modification of the value composition of capital advanced and the conditions of capital realisation so that the mass of value returning to them remains constant or increases⁽³¹¹⁾.

The new class significance of this analysis for Communist Parties inheres in the mechanism by which the total social product is produced. Nevertheless, the difficulty which confronts a general theory of state monopoly capitalism concerns the formulation of the inner dynamics of capitalist systems when the laws of value no longer fully operate. Since the over-accumulation of capital is permanent in the periodisation of state monopoly capitalism, structural state capital devaluations are qualitatively new compared with the insufficiency of the methods of capital devaluations in "classical capitalism"⁽³¹²⁾. This assumes concrete expression in the state-monopoly mechanism of total capital reproduction as a dissolution of the efficacy of the categories of capital logic and the cyclical laws of movement of capitals.

Rather, the constraints to the general laws of state monopoly capitalism are to be derived from the double value determination of capitalist commodity production. Since the "production process is only a production process for capital in so far as it maintains value in the production process"⁽³¹³⁾, the valuational requirements of total

capital accumulation processes must remain socially dominant. If the state does not constitute a component of the economic substructure and the general laws of movement of capital, the theory of over-accumulation/devaluation is concerned primarily with the realisation-processes of total capital accumulation and thereby does not transform the laws of value. Here, it is equally questionable to constitute bourgeois states as the subject of total social circulation processes without acknowledging the adaptation-processes of money - circulation to the general laws of capital accumulation. This leads to the misconstrual of states as both the cause of prosperity and crisis in the respective stages of the cyclical movement of capitals.

Conversely, if the state functions through the laws of capital as an objective condition of total social reproduction processes, then the contradictions of capital and labour are reproduced through the social property of "state" relations of production, and are given political expression in the decision-making nexus of state planning apparatuses. Then the theory of over-accumulation/devaluation does not supply the rationale for a capital planning competence of bourgeois states. Moreover, it should not be represented as a reproduction of the contradiction of capital and labour in the state apparatus, for this would only express the functional limitations of the state through its lack of planning competence in the sector of state organised capitals. Rather, the juridical control of real individual surplus value producing capitals in state property relations sustains the same capital contradictions of the total social reproduction movements of capital crises and the fall in the general profit rate. The problem which confronts the theory of over-accumulation/devaluation is how the new mechanism of capital

reproduction connects individual to total social capital and how the state can transform the relations of capital over-accumulation.

This expresses the problems involved in both the methodological and theoretical relations of the Kapital-analysis which attempts to re-construct the laws of movement of bourgeois society in a unity of general theory and empirical relations of "concrete total reality". Subsequently, the representation of the counter-tendencies to the fall in the general profit rate (in Das Kapital Volume III Chapter 15) are interpreted as historical tendencies and therefore as empirical oppositions to the contradictory development of the capitalist mode of production and the "pure-form" representation of its laws in the formation of a general profit rate⁽³¹⁴⁾. The logical structure of capitals are now transformed in the theory of state monopoly capitalism as both logical and historical "completion" of the general theory of capital and representation of the historical course of capital accumulation. Nevertheless, the contradictions of the theory are evident when it attempts to maintain the general validity of the laws of capitalism while simultaneously expressing their dissolution in the historical forms of "monopolies", "joint-stock-capital" and "state-capital".

5.4 State monopoly capitalism and the General Crisis of Capitalism

We have shown that in the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism, the analysis of the general laws of movement of bourgeois society cannot be confined to the inner-relations of national capitalist economies without the examination of the competition of capitals on the world market in the global conditions of the "General Crisis of Capitalism". However, while the inter-connection of the inner laws of capital and the global conditions of world capitalism have been

discussed under the concept of the "General Crisis", these have principally been from the stand-point of Soviet Realpolitik in the conditions of world imperialism and "capitalist encirclement", and the post-Stalinist liberalisations of theory without explicit consideration of the inner-relations of state monopoly capitalism and the formalisation of the relations of "system-competition". As the latter constitute the most developed of the four principal propositions advanced on the relationship of state monopoly capitalism and the "General Crisis of Capitalism", these must command the focus of attention for the completion of the theory of state monopoly capitalism.

Despite this, the absence of any unanimity in their formulation expresses important distinctions regarding the principal historical contents of the concepts of state monopoly capitalism and the "General Crisis". It is a consequence of the different interpretations of the stage-theory of capitalism, and the connection of the new processes of state monopoly capitalism to the earlier "appearance-forms" and tendencies of capitals.

The first proposition suggests that "state capitalist tendencies" are unrelated to the "General Crisis". The principal advocate of this proposition is Soviet theorist Dragilew who argues that the "General Crisis" exerts no qualitative influence on the formation of "state capitalist tendencies". While the "General Crisis" is a "powerful stimulator" to state monopoly processes⁽³¹⁵⁾, they are formed before the revolutionary process of the division of the world capitalist system" in the "total imperialist stage of capitalism and not only in the epoch of its General Crisis"⁽³¹⁶⁾. The corollary of this is that the "General Crisis" is "relatively autonomous" from state monopoly capitalism as "two different processes"⁽³¹⁷⁾. Dragilew's interpretation approximates that of Varga's, first given in opposition to "Stalinist orthodoxy".

Since the "growth of the state monopoly process is a fundamental law of imperialist capitalism", it develops in relation to the "self-limit" of capital in the "characteristic structural-form (Strukturform) of the rule of finance-capitals"⁽³¹⁸⁾. State interventionist functions express a progressive accumulation of partial measures for the valuation of the general social conditions of production.

The general feature of this concept evaluates state-capitalist anti-crisis measures from the initiation of the First World War and the laws of uneven economic and political development of capitalism⁽³¹⁹⁾. With the relative stabilisation of capitalism, after 1945, the dismantling of "state monopoly war capitalism" permits selective "reprivatisations" of capitals under the traditional concept of the dominance of "private" sectors of capitalist societies⁽³²⁰⁾.

In the second proposition, state monopoly capitalism is a tendency which unfolds in the "General Crisis" from 1914. As Heiningen states, the "totality of economic and political conditions of capitalism in its General Crisis which are introduced with the First World War and the October Revolution forms the foundation for the furtherance of the process of transition to state monopoly capitalism"⁽³²¹⁾. Historically, this is the principal relationship by which the Comintern theorists "further-develop" Lenin's concept of imperialism. Here the global conditions of capitalism contribute to the elaboration of state monopoly war capitalism in which the world market functions of imperialist states and the "fascisation" of state capitalist tendencies are constructed⁽³²²⁾. In the epoch of imperialist wars and proletarian revolutions, state monopoly capitalism assumes the militaristic and fascist forms under the domination of the imperialist bourgeoisie: "this development leads to the most barbaric form of state monopoly capitalism, to fascism, to war and destruction. Fascist power becomes state monopoly war capitalism under the conditions of struggle between imperialism and

socialism at that time"⁽³²³⁾. Here, the general and permanent world economic crises of capitalism are the product of both monopoly forms of capital accumulation and the impact of the "system contradiction" on the "inner conditions of capitalism"⁽³²⁴⁾. However, after 1945 these features are formalised under the laws of the "General Crisis" on the reproduction conditions of capitals in their "internal and external" (inneren und ausseren) "economic connections" (Wirtschaftbeziehungen)⁽³²⁵⁾. This interpretation shows that the "necessity to intensify the tendency to state monopoly capitalism is a consequence of the conditions of capitalism in its General Crisis, particularly in its Second Stage"⁽³²⁶⁾.

In both these propositions, "state capitalist tendencies" represent a "partial strengthening of capitalism" rather than an "objective transformation of imperialist systems into a qualitatively new stage in the development" of imperialism⁽³²⁷⁾, although they do not respond entirely to the same principal processes.

In the third proposition, the development of a new stage and theory of state monopoly capitalism exists relatively independently from the "General Crisis". The primacy of the concept of state monopoly capitalism over the "General Crisis" is advanced by some Soviet theorists and Western European Communist Parties especially with their growing autonomy from the jurisdiction of the C.P.S.U. This emphasises the internal structural features of capitalism rather than the global analysis of world capitalism which rests upon the historical and political functions of the Soviet Union and the socialist world system⁽³²⁸⁾.

Bregel contends that state monopoly capitalism is a "new historical stage" of capitalism which expresses the formation of the "fusion" of monopoly and state. It is therefore not a "permanent attribute of imperialism" but its "highest historical stage"⁽³²⁹⁾. Although "system-competition" is acknowledged, it does not form a fundamental component

of the analysis of state monopoly capitalism⁽³³⁰⁾.

The fourth proposition is the most comprehensive theoretical development of the "stage" theory of state monopoly capitalism and is formulated conjointly with the "Third Stage of the General Crisis"⁽³³¹⁾, and dates state monopoly capitalism from the mid-1960's.

State monopoly capitalism is an "adaptation-process" of "imperialism in its new conditions of existence (Existenzbedingungen)"⁽³³²⁾ with the impact of "system-competition" on the "logic of the characteristic development (Eigenentwicklung) of capitalist systems"⁽³³³⁾. It is the "product and expression of this adaptation-process"⁽³³⁴⁾ in the "epoch of world wide transition from capitalism to socialism ... (as the) ... characteristic movement form of dead (sterben) capitalism"⁽³³⁵⁾. The socialist world system constitutes a "fundamental structural aspect of the inner developmental logic of capitalist relations of exploitation"⁽³³⁶⁾.

The forms and functions of state monopoly capitalism respond to the new laws of world development which threaten the existence of the monopoly system of domination⁽³³⁷⁾. The interventionist functions of states in the total economic reproduction of capitalism are the "natural form of existence of this social formation"⁽³³⁸⁾ and the permanent institutional unification of state and monopoly in the "unified-mechanism"⁽³³⁹⁾. They express the "system conflict" as well as the "specifics of the capitalist mode of production"⁽³⁴⁰⁾, which leads to the "acceleration of the coalescence (Zusammenwachsen) of monopoly and state into a system of state monopoly capitalism"⁽³⁴¹⁾. The concrete form of interventionist state functions in the reproduction of national capitals "embrace all phases of reproduction, of production and consumption, of the financing of production processes for the realisation of surplus values for the monopoly bourgeoisie"⁽³⁴²⁾.

Moreover, in the general security of the capitalist system of exploitation, the "functions of imperialist states are activated above all in the struggle against socialism"⁽³⁴³⁾.

As the fourth proposition is the most theoretically developed concept of state monopoly capitalism, we will now discuss its significance for the laws and contradiction of capitalism.

Considering the laws of capitalist development we have shown that in the "General Crisis" the socialist world system is presented as the "decisive power" in the laws of world development⁽³⁴⁴⁾. As Soviet theorist Kusminow states, "the general law of the period of the General Crisis of Capitalism is the weakening power of capitalism and the consolidation (Festigung) of the power of socialism and the ever greater unfolding of its possibilities and superiority"⁽³⁴⁵⁾. This leads to the importance of the "social laws of rising socialism" (aufsteigenden Sozialismus) on the inner laws of the capitalist mode of production of two principal types.

Firstly, it has been established that the "transition from pre-monopoly capitalism to imperialism signifies that the capitalist mode of production has formed complex qualitatively new laws" and a "qualitatively new kind (Art) of capital, finance-capital"⁽³⁴⁶⁾. While Soviet theorist Dragilew also derives the laws of the "General Crisis" from the "immanent contradiction between the relations and powers of production"⁽³⁴⁷⁾, they must be distinguished from the laws of the capitalist mode of production⁽³⁴⁸⁾ in order to establish their impact on the inner-laws. This suggests that the laws of the "General Crisis" are relatively autonomous from the inner-collapse laws of capitalism, while the "General Crisis" is itself subjected to a periodisation through the theoretical stages of the permanent crisis of capitalist systems⁽³⁴⁹⁾.

Secondly, the impact of these laws upon the cyclical movement of capitals are conceived primarily through the objective transformation of the external production and realisation conditions of the laws of accomplishment of capitalism (sales markets, raw materials, capital markets, capital export, territorial division, and the collapse of the colonial system)⁽³⁵⁰⁾. As S.E.D. theorists state, the "development of victorious socialism since the Great Socialist October Revolution has decisively transformed the conditions of existence (Existenzsituation) of capitalism and the objective conditions of its reproduction"⁽³⁵¹⁾. On this basis, the "General Crisis" modifies the "laws of accumulation, the laws of concentration of capital, the laws of competition, the laws of uneven economic and political development of capitals, etc."⁽³⁵²⁾. Here, world socialism is implicated in the genesis of state monopoly capitalism and the "reactive-forms" of capital to the transformed conditions of the valuation and monopolisation processes of capitals because socialism abrogates the circulation moment (M-C) of the first moment of capital valuation-processes beyond national production conditions⁽³⁵³⁾. Braunsdorf and Löffler also argue that "state monopoly capitalism develops in the epoch of world wide transition from capitalism to socialism to characterise the movement of dying capitalism"⁽³⁵⁴⁾.

Considering the contradictions of capitalism, we have shown how the theory of state monopoly capitalism expresses them in the double-form of inner adaptation-laws of capitalism and their "further-development" in the global conditions of world capitals.

In the periodisation of free competition capitalism, the principal contradiction of capitalism is analysed as the contradiction between private property in the means of production and their socialisation, and an "inner-contradiction"⁽³⁵⁵⁾ of a "closed system" of capitalism⁽³⁵⁶⁾.

However, as Soviet theorists contend, the "analysis of today's imperialism cannot ... be limited to the inner-contradiction"⁽³⁵⁷⁾ of capitalism, but must consider its relationship to the "external contradiction"⁽³⁵⁸⁾.

This establishes the class connection and contradiction of capitalism to the global conditions of system relations. On the one hand, the "contradiction between capitalism and socialism on the world scale is casually bound with the contradiction between capital and labour. Both contradictions have the same class content ..."⁽³⁵⁹⁾. On the other, the "contradiction between monopoly capitalism and the working-class inside capitalist society has ... become 'further developed' to the general contradiction of our time, the contradiction of capitalism and socialism on a world-scale"⁽³⁶⁰⁾. A further means here for identifying the class character of the "General Crisis" are the politics of peaceful co-existence as a "specific form of class struggle in the international arena"⁽³⁶¹⁾.

In general, these contradictions of world capitalism are interpreted as entering into the valuational conditions of capitals: "since the beginning of the General Crisis and especially since its Third Stage, the further development of the capitalist contradiction can no longer be determined from the inner-valuation conditions of capitals, but is equally determined by a growing influence of socialism upon imperialism"⁽³⁶²⁾. The mutual determination of these contradictions of capitalism raises the problem of which contradiction has primacy.

Although the Third International has emphasised the "inner" contradiction of capitalism, especially with the critique of the "stabilising" capacities of "organised capitalism" and "state capitalism" in the epoch of world proletarian revolution, in the 1960's Varga contends that under Stalin the "external contradiction" received primacy over the "inner-contradiction" in the epoch of "transition from capitalism to

socialism"⁽³⁶³⁾. The implication of this statement emphasises the global relations of "system-competition" and the examination of the "General Crisis" through the world historical significance of Soviet socialism as the determining factor in world economy and politics. Nevertheless, even when the "inner contradiction" of capitalism is given primacy, the "external contradiction" of capitalism still modifies the inner-relations of economy and political in bourgeois society. Marxist-Leninist theorists must therefore establish the theoretical status of the "external contradiction" and its relationship to the capitalist mode of production. We will examine this problem through the debate which takes place on the derivation of the "General Crisis". Two principal considerations can be identified here.

The first examines the "General Crisis" under the primacy of "external factors". Here, the "General Crisis" is derived from imperialist wars and the October Revolution from which the "collapse" character of imperialist war capitalism and Soviet socialism in the world structure of capitalism arises⁽³⁶⁴⁾.

The second examines the "General Crisis" under the primacy of the internal features of monopoly capitalism. Here the epoch of imperialism initiates the "General Crisis" as a historical process extended upon the totality of the monopoly periodisation of capitalism, and is governed by the laws of uneven development of capitalist anarchy⁽³⁶⁵⁾. This concept is interpreted as an "organic part" of the theory and history of imperialism and a "new stage" of monopoly capitalism⁽³⁶⁶⁾.

However, both these derivations reveal problems in the formulation of the concept the "General Crisis".

When the concept of the "General Crisis" contains the "general contradiction" of capitalism and the global characteristics of "system competition"⁽³⁶⁷⁾, the socialist world system exists within

the general world crisis of capitalist systems⁽³⁶⁸⁾. The incoherence which this produces results from the theorisation of Soviet socialism on the basis of the historical dissolution of the total structure of world capitalism. The attempted resolution of this contradiction is undertaken in the new concept of the "modern epoch".

In distinction to the hitherto characterisation of the "General Crisis", Soviet theorist Bregel argues the importance of distinguishing between the "present historical epoch and the General Crisis of Capitalism. The first concept is all-embracing (umfassender) and contains the transition of human society from capitalism to socialism while the second relates to capitalism and signifies its inner-destruction and revolutionary abolition"⁽³⁶⁹⁾.

Although Bregel has provided an answer to the problem expressed in Dragilew's analysis, the concept of the "General Crisis of Capitalism" is not without difficulty when it relates exclusively to the second derivation. The periodisations of capitalism are now super-imposed upon those of the "General Crisis" because this is a special period in the development of the inner structural transformations of capitalism. Bregel defines it as the "last phase inside the last stage of capitalism"; state monopoly capitalism develops "inside the total epoch of monopoly, decaying and dying capitalism ... (as) ... a specific stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism"⁽³⁷⁰⁾. On this basis, the "General Crisis" is conceived under the Marxist-Leninist examination of the laws of monopoly capitalism and the qualitative transformation it occasions is expressed in the "moribund" character of capitalism, in which socialist systems do not function as an historical content of the "General Crisis". Conversely, the "modern epoch" embodies the total relations of the world system and therefore the "system-competition" of world capitalism and world socialism⁽³⁷¹⁾.

However, in so far as the concept of the "General Crisis" excludes the "general contradiction", it stands in clear opposition to the historical analyses of Marxism-Leninism. Further, when the "modern epoch" is said to represent a world system, it ceases to have a rigorous theoretical status because its defining criteria are not specified according to any social formation. On the one hand, it contradicts the rationale of "system-competition" which expresses contrasting capitalist and socialist systems. Yet on the other, the concept embodies the "general contradiction" and relates to two qualitatively distinct world systems.

The problem to both Marxist-Leninist interpretations is the inability to distinguish the "appearance-forms" of capitalism in relation to qualitatively different systems of laws and their distribution in the respective "stages" of the "General Crisis of Capitalism".

This is evident with Dragilew's contention that the "General Crisis" has a series of "particularities" (Besonderheiten) which are present throughout its whole course of development but not reducible to its particular phases. The "entrance of the General Crisis does not signify that the essence of capitalism changes", that it has "attained a new quality. It remains in all its features, the same after, as before monopoly capitalism. Its socio-economic nature has not changed, but its position in the world: it is no longer the only world system, it stands against the socialist system"⁽³⁷²⁾.

However, this proposition contradicts the Marxist-Leninist concept of monopoly capitalism because as Bregel argues, if monopoly capitalism is not a qualitative transformation of capitalism then what constitutes the foundations of the imperialist epoch⁽³⁷³⁾. Moreover, the "General Crisis" ceases to be identified with the dissolution of the weakest

link in the imperialist world chain through Soviet socialism and its significance for the various stages of its development⁽³⁷⁴⁾.

The methodological problems that follow from the theory of the "General Crisis" show that either "appearance-forms" are governed by the laws of the periodisation of capitalism in which case there can be only one process of laws. Or, that these are two relatively autonomous processes of laws and periodisations in which case the criteria must be adduced to distinguish the features of the respective laws. From these two contrasting methodological stand-points, the conclusion to be drawn is that these are "abstract" processes which distribute the "appearances" of capitalism into different "stages"⁽³⁷⁵⁾. In effect, this has led to the problem of examining the inter-connection of these systems of laws in Marxism-Leninism⁽³⁷⁶⁾. The impact of these movements on the formation of state monopoly capitalism is consequently shown to be less theoretically grounded in the dialectical methodology of the abstract-concrete movement of capital categories than through the generalisation of the "features" of capitalism⁽³⁷⁷⁾.

The methodological premises of state monopoly capitalism unite the theory and history relationship of the general laws of social development in the logic of capital with their empirical determinations. State monopoly capitalism is interpreted as the theoretical form of the historical content of the real development of capitals, of the "collapse" of capitalism and its transformation from a purely internal process into one of mutual determination with the global conditions of existence of world capitalism.

Moreover, the formal theory of the "General Crisis" should be distinguished from the political presuppositions of its construction. While the Russian revolution confirms the historical creation of "Socialism in One Country" as the destruction of capitalism and a

world historical alternative to capitalism, for Lenin the historical "collapse" of inner capital relations of bourgeois society were completed in the politics of international proletarian revolution. Soviet Marxism in particular reformulates these premises of Leninism when it conceptualises an epoch of the world historical decline of capitalism in the laws of the "General Crisis of Capitalism". Stalin's continuation of this analysis under the Comintern substitutes the world historical functions of proletarian international revolution, and is subsequently formalised in the general theory of "Socialism in One Country" in the laws of world capitalism, and the articulation of the impact of the "General Crisis" on inner conditions of capitalism through the formation of state monopoly capitalism and the "scientific-technical-revolution". This equally impels state monopoly capitalism to socialism through the necessity to adopt "socialist" planning techniques to expand materialist socialisations and the organisation of total social production as a compensatory mechanism to the "collapse"-induced tendencies from the successive restrictions to the realisation conditions of world capitalism.

The debate on these aspects of the nature of state monopoly capitalism is nevertheless structured within the theoretical constructs of Marxism-Leninism by which the analysis of the historical forms of capitalism are delimited by the theory of the "collapse" of capitals. On this basis, the Marxist-Leninist theory of the world communist movement attempts to harmonise the historical prognosis on capitalism with its continued existence in state monopoly capitalism. However, as the relations of "system-competition" have no necessary class character and transform the general laws of development of bourgeois society in the epoch of imperialism, they augment the traditional Marxist analysis of capitals and class struggle with the global politics

of the "system-competition" of international capitalist and socialist social systems. For many Marxist-Leninist theorists, this is expressed in the unification of the theory and politics of Communist Parties, and thereby their analyses of: the general laws of development of Western European capitalist societies; the historical relations of social classes; and the political form of class strategies.

Having considered the principal themes involved in the formation of a general theory of state monopoly capitalism, we will now develop their significance for the examination of the class politics of Western European Communist Parties. This expresses the inter-relation of theory and politics by which class strategies are derived from the theory of the historical socio-economic system of "state monopoly capitalism".

CHAPTER 5REFERENCES

1. See: L. Maier, 'Imperialismus-Theorie und der gegenwärtige staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus', Einheit, 9-10 (1969), 1245-1257 (p. 1247); P. Hess, 'Aktuelle Lehren aus der Entstehungsgeschichte der Leninischen Imperialismustheorie', JWG, 4 (1974), 13-25 (p. 13); E. Sereni, 'Fascismo, capitale finanziario', (p. 42); J.C. Dufour, 'Lénine et l'économie politique' EP, 189 (1970), 63-79 (p. 79).
2. Barca argues that economic theory unilaterally emphasises the features of crisis and decay (imputridimento) of monopoly capitalism, consequently rejecting the growth capabilities of capital. 'Per lo sviluppo', (p. 54, 56). See also S.L. Wygodski, 'Probleme des gegenwärtige Imperialismus im neuen Programm der K.P.d.S.U.' SW, 5 (1963), 449-476 (p. 4); P. Boccara, 'Introduction a la question du capitalisme monopoliste d'État' EP, 138 (1966), 5-22 (p. 11); A.K., 'Imperialismus heute - der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus in Westdeutschland. (Thesen)', (p. 102); S. Tjulpanow, 'Der historische Platz des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', SW, 10 (1973), 1105-1115.
3. P. Boccara, 'Apercu', (p. 7). However, by the "General Crisis of Capitalism" Boccara understands the crisis of monopoly capitalism.
4. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', (pp. 6-7).
5. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', (p. 9, 11).
6. H. Heininger, 'Zur Rolle der Rüstung im staatsmonopolistischen System', in Zur Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus (Berlin, 1967) pp. 85-154 (p. 94).
7. E. Varga, Essais sur l'économie politique du capitalisme (Moscou, 1967) p. 62. S.E.D. theorists argue that the "definition of monopoly capitalism as dying capitalism does not signify a theory of the automatic collapse (Zusammenbruch)" of capitalism but that the destruction of capitalism is a product of the revolutionary action of the working-class. See Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff und Monopol (Berlin, 1976), p. 120.
8. P. Hess, 'Methodologische und theoretische Probleme der Imperialismusforschung', WW, 22 (1974), 187-206 (p. 192); P. Boccara, Études sur le capitalisme monopoliste d'État. Sa crise et son issue. (Paris, 1974). As Soviet theorist E. Pletnew states, the "whole path of development of modern imperialism is shown correctly by the Leninist analysis of the monopoly stage of capitalism and its contradictions". 'Die Leninische Lehre vom Monopolkapitalismus und die heutigen imperialistischen Widersprüche', SW, 3-4 (1970), 349-362 (p. 358). See also A.K., Politischen Ökonomie des heutigen Monopolkapitalismus, p. 10. These propositions are also maintained by S.E.D. theorists with regard to Lenin's analysis of imperialism and the economic activity of imperialist states in state monopoly capitalism. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD (Berlin, 1967), p. 244.

9. A.K., 'Der Marxismus-Leninismus kein Dogma sondern Ableitung zum Handeln', Einheit, 9 (1960), 1317-1333 (p. 1319); A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 243; H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität der Leninischen Imperialismuskritik (Berlin, 1970), p. 13.
10. J.L. Schmidt, 'Über einige Merkmale des Dogmatismus', Einheit, 16 (1961), 1109-1112 (p. 1110), (emphasis added).
11. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 102); see also S. Tjulpanow, 'op. cit.', (p. 1111).
12. C. Quin, M. Decaillet and M. Bormann, 'Der staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', in Der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus (Frankfurt, 1973), pp. 72-82 (pp. 73-4); L. Barca, 'Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État', EP, 26-29 (1966), 13-16 (p. 13) Tome II; I. Sokolov, 'Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État dans le cadre de la crise générale du capitalisme', 'ibid.', 17-24 (p. 18).
13. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 105); S. Tjulpanow, 'Der historische', (p. 1107).
14. See: V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État, pp. 431-2; P. Boccara, 'Apercu', (p. 14).
15. A.K., Allgemeine Krise des Kapitalismus (Berlin, 1976), p. 23.
16. P. Hess, 'Der Kapitalismus und das Problem des gesellschaftlichen Fortschritts', WW, 6 (1967), 993-1008 (p. 993, p. 1002); E. Varga, 'Die staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus und seine Schwäche', in Die Krise, pp. 426-438 (p. 426).
17. L. Barca, 'Per lo sviluppo', (p. 56).
18. See: W. Ulbricht, Das Programm des Sozialismus (Berlin, 1966); A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD p. 239; S. Tjulpanow, 'op. cit.', (p. 1103); L. Barca, 'ibid.', (p. 57); F. Muhri, 'Sobre a contradicao principal do capitalismo moderno', Seara Nova, 1553 (1975), 26-31 (p. 27).
19. K. Heuer, 'Die Verschärfung des Grundwiderspruchs des Kapitalismus im Imperialismus von Heute und die Menschfeindlichkeit des spätkapitalistischen Gesamtsystems', WZHUB, 5 (1970), 523-532 (p. 526).
20. See for example, L. Maier, 'Lenin's Imperialismus-Theorie'; A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 129; P. Boccara, 'Apercu', (p. 14). Also, the XXIV Party Conference of the CPSU accepts the economic interventionist role of states as a new condition in capitalism. See W.M. Martynow, 'Grundprobleme der politischen Ökonomie des modernen Kapitalismus', in Der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus, pp. 97-120.
21. V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État, p. 119. See also: A.K., 'ibid.', p. 242, 243; A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 104); S. Wygodski, 'Die ökonomische Grundlage der Krise des Weltkapitalismus', SW, 2 (1969), 113-126 (p. 13-14).

22. P. Boccara, 'Introduction de la question du capitalisme monopoliste d'État', (p. 12,13). Compare with H. Nussbaum, 'Zur Diskussion um den historischen Platz des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus in der neuen marxistisch - leninistischen Literatur', JWG, 1 (1976), 69-93.
23. For an evaluation of the relations of monopoly and state, see U. Jaeggi, Kapital und Arbeit in der Bundesrepublik (Frankfurt, 1973), p. 126.
24. E. Varga, Essais sur l'économie politique du capitalisme, p. 5. See also H. Jourdain, 'Capitalisme monopoliste d'État, démocratie et socialisme', EP, 143-144 (1966), 201-229 (p. 202). However, a more fundamental argument for the absence of a theory of state interventions is the periodisation of capitalism.
25. E. Varga, Essais, p. 5.
26. See the 'Introduction' to Essais, p. 5.
27. E. Varga, 'ibid.', p. 58. This only contradicts the "fusion" when this is interpreted to mean the "subordination".
28. E. Varga, Essais, p. 59. See also L. Barca, 'Per lo sviluppo', (p. 57).
29. E. Varga, 'ibid.', p. 261. Varga's argument is contradictory here, suggesting both the concept of the "conjunction", and of state monopoly capitalism, that its "existence and development are rooted (wurzeln) in the positions of the power of the monopoly", 'ibid.', p. 114.
30. H. Jourdain, 'Capitalisme monopoliste d'État, problèmes actuels et solutions démocratiques', EP, 136 (1965), 9-45 (p. 43). See also 'Die Krise ist nicht nur eine ökonomische Krise. Gespräche mit Nicos Poulantzas', IMD, 15 (1974), 18-38.
31. C.A., Traité Marxiste d'Économie. Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État, 1 (Paris, 1971) p. 9.
32. C.A., 'ibid.', p. 24.
33. C.A., 'ibid.', p. 24.
34. C.A., 'ibid.', pp. 24-5.
35. C.A., 'ibid.', p. 25.
36. C.A., 'ibid.', p. 25.
37. C.A., 'ibid.', p. 25 (emphasis added).
38. C.A., 'ibid.', p. 25.
39. C.A., 'ibid.', p. 26. See also E. Bregel, 'Die ökonomische Theorie von Marx und Lenin und der gegenwärtige Kapitalismus', SW, 4 (1969), 424-429 (p. 426).

40. H. Claude, 'Capitalisme monopoliste d'État et concentration', EP, 143-4 (1966), 49-69 (p. 51).
41. H. Claude, 'ibid.', p. 51.
42. We have already considered the ideological functions of states in the Bolshevik critique of "organised capitalism", although they are examined under Lenin's political concept of state monopoly capitalism.
43. The concept of state monopoly capitalism is also expressed as an "organic totality". See C.A., Traité, p. 9.
44. The People's Party of China and to a much lesser degree, the Labour Party of Albania are considered here. See C.A., Marxisme-Léninisme et révisionisme face à la crise économique. Cahiers Yenan (Paris, 1976); C.A., Oppose Modern Revisionism and uphold Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the International Communist Movement (Tirana, 1964).
45. P. Jalée, L'imperialisme en 1970 (Paris, 1969), p. 154, 145.
46. P. Jalée, 'ibid.', p. 146.
47. This is considered in A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 184.
48. See for example H. Handke, K. Lehmann, B. Puchert, 'Einige Fragen des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus in neueren sowjetischen Publikationen', JWG, IV (1976), 127-146; H. Handke and R. Winmer, 'Betrieb und staatsmonopolistischer Kapitalismus. Gedanken über die Bedeutung des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus für die Betriebsgeschichtsschreibung', JWG, 2-3 (1964), 390-418.
49. R. Katzenstein, 'Zum Problem einer marxistischen "Staatsableitung"', BDIP, 4 (1975), 426-438. However, this is also a contradictory process: "the fundamental cause and momentum of the development of state monopoly capitalism results from the intensification of the fundamental contradiction of capitalism, the contradiction between the social character of capitalist production and the private appropriation of its results". See A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 184. Also, C.A., Traité, pp. 22-3; A.K., Allgemeine Krise des Kapitalismus, pp. 26-7; A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen Monopolkapitalismus, p. 39.
50. S. Tjulpanow, 'Der historische', (p. 1103); V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, p. 11. Hess argues that "der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus ist eine Stufe der Entwicklung der kapitalistischen Vergesellschaftung, auf der Reproduktionsprozess durch die Entwicklung der Produktivkräfte, des materiellen Reichtums immer komplizierter wird und der gesamtgesellschaftlichen Leitung unabdingbar bedarf". 'Kapitalistisches Wachstum zwischen Gleichgewicht und Ungleichgewicht', WW, 5 (1969), 736-753 (p. 746).
51. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 103). However, here the theory of "transitional capitalism" does not examine the "materialisation" of class relations of production in a form-determined system of capitalist production powers whose "socialisation" is a continuous process under the contradictory character of the general laws of surplus value production.

52. See V. Tschepnikov, Le capitalisme, p. 15. Tschepnikov expresses this as to "save the capitalist regime and at the same time ... (to) ... increase the surplus profits of the imperialist bourgeoisie", p. 88. S.E.D. theorists speak here of "new sources of profit". A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 103.).
53. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 105); J. Borko, 'Methodologische Fragen der Analyse des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', SW, 10 (1973), 1089-1104 (p. 1103). Borko describes the Twentieth Century capitalism as "developing and accumulating elements of a new higher socio-economic order inside this formation" (pp. 1102-3).
54. J. Borko, 'ibid.', (p. 1093).
55. This has led S.E.D. theorists to argue that in "state monopoly capitalism, the inner-decay process of the economic basis of capitalism which already began with the formation of private monopolies has come to full expression today. The decay of the capitalist system consists in above all else that with the state regulation of the economy there develops the opposed (entgegenstehendes) principle to the private capitalist mode of economy whereby the capitalists have become a fully superfluous (überflüssige) figure in the total directing-mechanism (Lenkungsmechanismus) of the economy". A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 103).
56. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 104); J. Borko, 'op. cit.', (p. 1094).
57. Marxist-Leninist theory characterises capitalism through the forms of its "survival" in the total epoch of its "collapse". See L. Maier 'Dialektik der Anpassung', Einheit, 4 (1972), 514-524; L. Maier, 'Lenin's Imperialismus-Theorie', (p. 1255); R. Gündel, H. Heinninger, P. Hess, K. Zieschang, Zur Theorie, p. 322.
58. D. Klein, Labilität des heutigen Imperialismus und Kampf der Arbeiterklasse (Berlin, 1976), p. 23
59. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 105).
60. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 179.
61. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 179.
62. Compare with C.A., Marxisme-Leninisme, p. 70, 79.
63. See A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 106); V. Tschepnikov, Le capitalisme, p. 124.
64. See V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 149: "the finance oligarchy ... throws a close network of dependence relationships over all the economic and political institutions of present day society without exception - such is the most striking feature of the monopoly". Also, A. Lemnitz, Der historische Platz des Imperialismus, (Berlin, 1977), p. 34. This conceptualisation of the monopoly bourgeoisie's class domination (a) equates the objective structure of total socio-economic production relations with the institutional command structure of capitalist enterprises and (b) interprets the political system as an auxiliary institutional nexus of their socio-economic class power.

65. A.K., Der Imperialismus der B.R.D., p. 172.
66. H. Jourdain, 'Capitalisme monopoliste d'État. Démocratie et et Socialisme', EP, 26-29 (1966), 201-229 (p. 217).
67. K. Heuer, 'op. cit.', (p. 526), (emphasis added).
68. G. Geissler, 'Die Unterordnung', (p. 340) argues that the "possibility of the subordination of the state apparatus is created with the transition from pre-monopoly capitalism to imperialism"; K. Nehls, 'Zum Problem', (p. 260).
69. K. Marx/F. Engels 'Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei', MEW, 4 p. 464.
70. V. Tschepprakow, 'Die bürgerlichen', (p. 277); A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus-Leninismus, p. 524.
71. W. Ulbricht, Das Programm, p. 32 (emphasis added).
72. P. Boccara, Études, p. 26, 31.
73. E. Varga, Essais, p. 52.
74. P. Boccara, 'Apercu', (p. 12).
75. P. Boccara, 'op. cit.', p. 55.
76. V. Kruse and H. Scharping, 'Zum Monopolbegriff', WZUR, XVII (1969), 41-46 (p. 46); J. Huffschnid, 'Begründung und Bedeutung des Monopolbegriffs in der marxistischen politischen Ökonomie', DA, 6 (1975), 4-92.
77. This derivation of the general theoretical determination of monopoly capital avoids the examination of capital in the surface-movements of economy, and connects the monopoly category to production in the debate on the monopoly and capital concepts. Moreover, in drawing attention to problem-areas in the theory of state monopoly capitalism we do not wish to imply that this literature is not an important contribution to the analysis of capitalism.
78. H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 3 2. See also P. Hess, 'Methodologische', (p. 193).
79. F. Oelssner, 'Zur geschichtlichen Rolle und zum Begriff des Monopols', MD, 3 (1971), 3-22.
80. A. Lemnitz, Die historische, p. 11.
81. See G. Krause, 'Zur Kritik einer Variante bürgerliche Monopoltheorie', SP, 14-15 (1971), 57-101.
82. The generality of these propositions extend to the "New Left" analysis. See P. Baran and P. Sweezy, Monopoly Capital, (Suffolk, 1966). For a Marxist-Leninist critique see J. Kuczynski, 'Das verschwundene Monopol-Kein staatsmonopolistischer Kapitalismus?', JWG, 1 (1978), 369-376. More generally see M. Salvati and P. Santi,

82. Continued ...
 'Critiche "orthodosse" a "Il capitale monopolistico": Sovrappiù o plusvalore?', PS, 34 (1968), 1113-1126; C. Daneo, 'Osservazioni sullo schema teorico de "Il capitale monopolistico" di Baran e Sweezy', PS, 30 (1968), 533-542; P. Mattick, 'Marxismus oder Monopolkapitalismus', in Kritik der Neomarxisten (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 106-131.
83. F. Oelssner, 'op. cit.', (p. 68); A.K., Politische Ökonomie des Kapitalismus, p. 270. Moreover, as Lemnitz argues, "das ökonomisch Grundlegende des Übergangs des Kapitalismus zum Imperialismus ist die Absölung der freien Konkurrenz durch das Monopol. Das Monopol selbst ist ein weiterentwickeltes, reaktionäres kapitalistisches Produktionsverhältnis. Es löst die freie Konkurrenz ab und verwandelt sie in die monopolistische Konkurrenz". Der historische, p. 5.
84. For example see D. Klein, 'Über den Widerspruch zwischen Produktivkräften und Produktionsverhältnissen im gegenwärtigen Imperialismus', Einheit, 7 (1967), 890-902 (p. 508). Soviet theorist F. Oelssner examines the unfolding contradiction of competition and monopoly: "die Klassiker des Marxismus-Leninismus haben das Monopol stets in seinen Wechselverhältnis, aber das Monopol negiert wiederum die Konkurrenz, es ist auch geschichtlich betrachtet die negation der negation". 'Zur geschichtlichen', (p. 4).
85. See R. Katzenstein, 'Zum Problem', (p. 431).
86. The discussion here relates primarily to S.E.D. and Soviet literature. The FCP contribution will be examined subsequently. Further, the distinction and debate over the capital or monopoly concept is fundamental to the characterisation of contemporary capitalism. For example, see G. Krause, Monopoltheorie (Frankfurt, 1976); P. Hess, 'Wider der imperialistischen Ökonomismus Die Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus und ihre Kritik', Facit, 35 (1974), 5-21; Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff und Monopol (Berlin, 1976).
87. H. Heiningen and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 34 (emphasis added); I. Reisin, 'Zur Diskussion neuerer Probleme der Imperialismus-Analyse', SP, 19 (1972), 1-27 (p. 70).
88. Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 123.
89. A. Lemnitz, 'op. cit.', (p. 10).
90. H. Heiningen and P. Hess, 'op. cit.', p. 32 (emphasis added). This new quality of monopolisation is also expressed in the "fusion" relation of monopoly and state power for the realisation of monopolist production powers. See A.K., Der Imperialismus der B.R.D., p. 131.
91. P. Hess, 'Der Kapitalismus', (p. 998).

92. See A. Lemnitz, 'Lage Bewusstseinsentwicklung und Kampf der Arbeiterklasse in Westdeutschland', WW, 8 (1967), 1260-1291 (p. 1265).
93. P. Hess, 'Der Kapitalismus', (p. 1005); A. Lemnitz, 'Lage Bewusstseinsentwicklung', (p. 1273).
94. P. Hess, 'Ökonomische Grundlagen für Differenzierungsprozesse in der Monopolbourgeoisie', WW, 20 (1972), 390-406 (p. 392).
95. K-H. Heise, 'Zur Entfaltung der Widerspruch des Gesetzes vom tendenziellen Fall der Profitrate unter staatsmonopolistischen Bedingungen. Thesen', WW, 21 (1973), 865-877 (p. 869).
96. See R. Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, pp. 239-40.
97. H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 34; A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 127; D. Klein, 'Über den Widerspruch', (pp. 508-9).
98. H. Heininger and P. Hess, 'ibid.', p. 76; P. Hess, 'Ökonomische Grundlagen', (p. 392.)
99. P. Hess, 'Der Kapitalismus', (p. 997).
100. For example, compare with D. Klein, 'Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Programmierung im staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', Einheit, 8 (1964), 102-115. (p. 111).
101. H. Heininger and P. Hess, 'op. cit.', p. 80 (emphasis added); R. Gündel, 'Zur Wirkung der staatsmonopolistischen Regulierung auf den kapitalistischen Konkurrenzmechanismus' in Zur Theorie, p. 323; Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 126.
102. P. Hess, 'Wider den imperialistischen', (pp. 12-3).
103. See P. Hess, 'Der Kapitalismus', (p. 1003).
104. P. Hess, 'Monopol, Rationalität und gleichgewichtiges Wachstum', MD, 3 (1971), 52-71 (p. 61), (emphasis added); Braunsdorf and Löffler, 'op. cit.', p. 124, 125.
105. Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, pp. 129-31.
106. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 135.
107. R. Katzenstein, 'Zur Frage des Monopols, des Monopolprofits und der Durchsetzung des Wertgesetzes im Monopolkapitalismus', DA-S, 6 (1975). 93-128 (p. 12).
108. See W. Jahn, 'Haupttendenzen der Verfälschung der Marxschen Mehrwerttheorie', Einheit, 7 (1967), 880-889 (p. 882). However, Jahn also argues that the laws of surplus value remain the general laws of the capitalist mode of production without considering this proposition in the theory of state monopoly capitalism.
109. Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 127; P. Hess, 'Der Kapitalismus', (p. 997).

110. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 105).
111. Braunsdorf and Löffler, 'op. cit.', p. 127, 149, 173.
112. K. Zieschang, 'Ursachen und Wesen', (p. 242, 244).
113. R. Gundel, 'Zur Wirkung', (p. 321).
114. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 452.
115. See H. Grossman, 'Die Änderung', (p. 319).
116. F. Oelssner, 'Zur geschichtlichen', (p. 9).
117. P. Hess, 'Wider den imperialistischen', (p. 9).
118. F. Oelssner, 'ibid.', (p. 9).
119. See for example, S. Kahn, 'Lenins Analyse des Imperialismus - ein schärfe Waffe gegen die Bonner Kriegspolitik', Einheit, 15 (1960), 40-50 (p. 41).
120. F. Oelssner, 'op. cit.', (p. 6, 7).
121. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 280.
122. P. Hess, 'Methodologische', (pp. 193-4), first emphasis added).
123. P. Hess, 'ibid.', (p. 193).
124. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 130, 131.
125. A.K., 'ibid.', (p. 131).
126. D. Klein, 'Über die inneren Widersprüche des modernen Imperialismus', WW, 6 (1967), (p. 951).
127. H. Fritsch and G. Stier, Der wissenschaftliche Arbeitsprozess, (Berlin, 1978), p. 123.
128. W. Ulbricht, Das Programm des Sozialismus, p. 327.
129. A.K., 'Programm der Kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion (Entwurf)', Einheit, 16 (1961), 1-91 (p. 16).
130. A.K., Allgemeine Krise, p. 41.
131. D. Klein, 'Über den Widerspruch', (p. 891).
132. M. Dragilew, 'Allgemeine Krise und staatsmonopolistischer Kapitalismus', SW, 12 (1971), 1292-1309 (p. 1298).
133. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 101).
134. G. Maurischat, 'Die wissenschaft-technische Revolution und die Perspektiv Entwicklung in Westdeutschland', Einheit, 7 (1967), 903-912 (p. 911); P. Bourtayre, 'Capitalisme, Socialisme et Révolution scientifique et technique', EP, 188-189 (1970).

135. R. Gündel, 'Zur Wirkung', (p. 326).
136. A. Lemnitz, 'Lage, Bewusstseinsentwicklung', (p. 1273).
137. H. Fritsch and G. Stier, 'op. cit.', (p. 123).
138. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 247, 249.
139. A.D. Magaline, Lutte de classes, p. 25.
140. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (pp. 103-4).
141. See L. Breshnew, Unser Kurs:Frieden und Sozialismus, (Moskau, 1975), p. 17.
142. H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 95.
143. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p.125: "one can define contemporary state monopoly capitalism as imperialism under the struggle of both social systems in the world, under the specific influence of socialism and the action of the 'scientific-technical-revolution". E. Pletnew, 'Die Leninische', (p. 350).
144. L. Maier, 'Lenins Imperialismus-Theorie', (p. 1247).
145. A.K., Allgemeine Krise, p. 53; A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 96.
146. L. Breshnew, Unser Kurs, p. 17; A.K., Politische Ökonomie des Kapitalismus, p. 348.
147. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (pp. 103-4).
148. S.L. Wygodski, 'Probleme des gegenwärtigen', (p. 463).
149. I. Kusminow, 'Die neue Etappe im Wettbewerb der zwei Systeme', Einheit, 9 (1960), 1-5.
150. A. Arsumanjan, 'Die neue Etappe der Allgemeine Krise des Kapitalismus', SW, 15 (1961), 935-955.
151. G. Kohlmeier, 'Neue Aufgaben für die Erforschung der kapitalistischen Wirtschaft', Einheit, 8 (1963), 58-71 (p. 59).
152. See A.D. Magaline, Lutte de classes, pp. 63-4.
153. A. Arsumanjan, 'op. cit.', (p. 949).
154. This concept follows from the "convergence" of social systems identified in the monopoly-problematic.
155. K. Heuer, 'Des Marxismus-Leninismus über die Haupttriebkkräfte des wissenschaft-technischen Fortschritts im Imperialismus von heute', WZHU, 4 (1968), 517-527 (p. 518); A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 92.

156. H. Sonntag, 'Die Klassiker des Marxismus-Leninismus zur Trennung von Kapitaleigentum und Kapitalfunktion', WZFSUJ, 1 (1970), 111-119 (p. 113); H. Sonntag, 'Eigentum als ökonomische Kategorie und die Kapitalverfügung', WZFSUJ, 2 (1974), 309-317.
157. P. Hess, 'Methodologische', (p. 198).
158. H. Sonntag, 'Die Klassiker', (p. 115, 113).
159. P. Hess and K. Zieschang, 'Das Finanzkapital - Der Zusammenhang zwischen Kapitalverwertung und Kapitalmacht im heutigen Kapitalismus', WW, 11 (1972), 1673-1690 (p. 1682).
160. V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 69.
161. P. Hess and K. Zieschang, 'op. cit.', (p. 1682).
162. See P. Sonntag, 'Die Klassiker', (p. 114).
163. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 172.
164. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 243 (emphasis added).
165. H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 27.
166. V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, p. 3, 11.
167. P. Hess, 'Methodologische', (p. 193).
168. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 243.
169. For example, see J. Borko, 'Methodologische', (p. 1100).
170. J. Borko, 'ibid.', (p. 1099).
171. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 102 (emphasis added).
172. See J. Tjulpanow, 'Der historische Platz', (p. 1110).
173. A. Lemnitz, 'Die westdeutsche Bundesrepublik - ein Staat der Monopole', Einheit, 2 (1964), 87-98 (p. 92). As Hess argues, "State monopoly capitalism is the necessary and unavoidable development of private monopolies in the framework of the capitalist mode of production; a development of capitalist relations of production which contradicts their inner-nature". P. Hess, 'Der Kapitalismus', (p. 1000).
174. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 172.
175. H. Sonntag, 'Die Klassiker', (p. 111, 116).
176. V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, p. 124.
177. H. Sonntag, 'Die Klassiker', (p. 116).
178. P. Hess, 'Wider den imperialistischen', (p. 11).

179. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 291; see also N. Badaloni, Pour le communisme (Paris, 1976).
180. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 454.
181. F. Oelssner, 'Zur geschichtlichen', (p. 6).
182. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 544.
183. L. Maier, 'Zum Problem', (p. 245).
184. H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 44.
185. H. Jung, 'Die privatmonopolistische Entwicklungsvariante des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus der BRD; Voraussetzungen, Inhalt, Perspektiven', IMSF, 1 (1978), 9-57.
186. See for example, A. Lemnitz, Der historische Platz des Imperialismus.
187. K. Zieschang, 'Ursachen', (p. 235); A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 242.
188. A.K., 'ibid.', pp. 92-113.
189. A. Lemnitz, 'Die westdeutsche', (p. 92); A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 104.
190. For example, consider P. Herzog, 'Die Funktion des Staats in der gegenwärtigen kapitalistischen Gesellschaft', MD, 1 (1974), 3-29; A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 244.
191. A.K., Imperialismus der BRD, pp. 242-3; A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, pp. 387-394.
192. H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 49.
193. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 242.
194. H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 50; see also H. Delorme, 'Le capitalisme', (p. 58).
195. P. Hess, 'Ökonomische', (p. 401).
196. A. Lemnitz, Die historische, p. 15, 34. However, see also R. Hilferding, Das Finanzkapital, p. 429.
197. L. Maier, 'Lenin's Imperialismus-Theorie', (p. 1247).
198. C. Schirmeister, 'Zum Monopol als Herrschaftsverhältnis-aktuelle Aspekte der Leninische Analyse', MD, 7 (1971), 112-128 (p. 113).
199. See: K. Zieschang, 'Zum ökonomischen Inhalt und der Rolle der Staatsfinanzen im westdeutschen staatsmonopolistischen System', in Zur Theorie, pp. 17-84 (p. 50); L. Maier, 'Zu einigen methodologischen und konzeptionellen Fragen der Imperialismus Analyse', in Der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus, pp. 23-38 (p. 24).

200. L. Maier, 'ibid.', (p. 24); P. Hess, 'Das Kapitalismus', (p. 999, 1002).
201. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 101.
202. K. Zieschang, 'op. cit.', (p. 50).
203. A.K., 'op. cit.', (p. 92).
204. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute' (p. 103): A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 92, 96.
205. As we have argued, it is the unity of monopoly and state which establishes the new "stage" of capitalism.
206. A.K., Imperialismus der BRD, p. 128 (emphasis added).
207. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 96.
208. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 246.
209. See F. Engels, 'Anti-During', MEW, 20, p. 260.
210. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 246; E. Varga, Essais, p. 58.
211. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 48.
212. See L. Barca, 'Per lo sviluppo', (p. 61).
213. See J. Huffscheid, Die Politik des Kapitals (Frankfurt, 1975) p. 4.
214. P. Hess and K. Zieschang, 'Das Finanzkapital', (p. 1675).
215. See E. Varga, Essais, pp. 58-9.
216. M. Schmidt, 'Zur Entwicklung des imperialistischen Herrschaftssystems', MD, 17 (1974), 45-60 (p. 47).
217. K-H. Röder, Klassenkampf and "Staatsreform" in Westdeutschland (Berlin, 1968), p. 1274 (emphasis added).
218. K. Nehls, 'Zum Problem', p. 260; E. Varga, 'Problem der Monopolbildung'.
219. E. Varga, Essais, p. 61 (emphasis added); V. Tschepnikov, Le capitalisme, p. 120; A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 247; P. Hess, 'Ökonomische Grundlagen', p. 397.
220. See R. Miliband, 'Poulantzas and the Capitalist State', New Left Review, 82 (1973), 83-92 (p. 85).
221. D. Klein, 'Methodologische Probleme der Behandlung des internationalen Klassenkampfes zwischen Sozialismus und Imperialismus', WW, 2 (1974) 208-235 (p. 230).
222. D. Klein, 'ibid.', (p. 230).

223. P. Hess, 'Der Kapitalismus', (p. 1003) ; L. Maier, 'Zu einigen Fragen', (p. 32).
224. D. Klein, 'Methodologische Probleme', (p. 229).
225. P. Hess, 'op. cit.', (p. 1003); P. Hess, 'Ökonomische Grundlagen', (p. 397).
226. H. Riedel, 'Die Beziehungen zwischen dem staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus im nationalen und internationalen Rahmen', WZMLUHW,†(1965), 1-7 (p. 1).
227. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p 92; A.K., Politische Ökonomie des Kapitalismus, p. 345.
228. P. Markowski, 'Die strategische Konzeption des Imperialismus in der Gegenwart und die Strategie und Taktik der Kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien in antiimperialistischen Kampf', Einheit, 9-10 (1969), 1233-1243 (p. 1227, 1234).
229. P. Hess, 'Ökonomische Grundlagen', (p. 391).
230. H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 51.
231. P. Hess and K. Zieschang, 'Das Finanzkapital', (p. 1685).
232. P. Hess, 'Ökonomische Grundlagen', (p. 402); P. Hess, 'Der Kapitalismus', (pp. 1003-4).
233. A. Milejowski, 'Die Leninische Theorie und die neuen Erscheinungen in der kapitalistischen Wirtschaft', PFS, 13 (1970), 759-768 (p. 760).
234. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 242, 245.
235. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 423); P. Hess 'et. al.', Zur Theorie, (p. 11, 16).
236. See P. Figurnow, 'M. Rosental Fragen der Dialektik im "Kapital"', (p. 1306).
237. See E. Drechsel, H. Reichardt, W. Willkommen, 'Bericht vom Plenum der Konferenz. Die Aktuelle Bedeutung das "Kapitals" vom Karl Marx für die politische Ökonomie des Sozialismus', WW, 8(9 September, 1967), (p. 1413), (emphasis added).
238. E. Drechsel 'et. al.', 'ibid.', (p. 1414).
239. P. Figurnow, 'op. cit.', (p. 1314).
240. P. Figurnow, 'ibid.', (p. 1307).
241. E. Drechsel, 'op. cit.', (p. 1413).
242. E. Drechsel, 'ibid.', (p. 1411). Conversely, we have identified the theoretical object of Marx's Das Kapital as the capitalist mode of production rather than an historical capitalism.

243. A. Milejkowski, 'Die Leninische Theorie', (p. 760). See also E. Albrecht, 'Staatsmonopolistische Regulierung und bewusste Ausnutzung ökonomischer Gesetze', DZP, 14 (1966), 946-962 (p. 952).
244. P. Hess, 'Monopol, Rationalität', (p. 60).
245. K. Zieschang, 'Ursachen und Wesen', (p. 240).
246. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 102).
247. See D. Klein, 'Über den Widerspruch', (p. 508).
248. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 112); E. Albrecht, 'op. cit.', (p. 948).
249. See A.K., 'ibid.', (pp. 416-7).
250. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 63; A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 106, 112).
251. K. Zieschang, 'Ursachen und Wesen', (p. 40).
252. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, pp. 323-30.
253. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (pp. 331-2). See also P. Hess 'et. al.', Zur Theorie; O. Reinhold, 'Die Entwicklung des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus in Westdeutschland', Einheit, 15 (1960), 890-905.
254. E. Albrecht, 'Staatsmonopolistische Regulierung', (p. 949). M. Wirth examines this debate in Kapitalismustheorie in der DDR. However, despite the importance of Wirth's general appraisal of DDR theory, a fundamental critique of the theory of state monopoly capitalism is not given. Compare with 'Zur Kritik der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus'.
255. H. Scheler, 'Zu einem Problem der philosophischen Imperialismus-Analyse', DZP, 14 (1966), 687-708 (p. 692).
256. H. Scheler, 'ibid.', (p. 693) and (p. 695), (emphasis added).
257. H. Scheler, 'ibid.', (p. 699).
258. H. Scheler, 'ibid.', (p. 702).
259. H. Scheler, 'ibid.', (p. 701).
260. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 417). See also P. Butterwege, 'Market, Plan and Profit'. Zur politischen Ökonomie der Investitionslenkung', IMSF, 1 (1978) 58-105 (p. 63); A. Lemnitz, 'Lage, Bewusstseinsentwicklung', (pp. 1273-4).
261. See D. Klein, 'Über den Widerspruch', (p. 505); A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 96.
262. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 464.

263. F. Engels, 'Socialism, Utopian and Scientific' in Karl Marx and F. Engels SW, 1 (1968), 375-401 (p. 384). For this emphasis in the theory of state monopoly capitalism see V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, p. 311; E. Varga, Essais, p. 38; P. Boccara, Études, pp. 23-5.
264. See R. Schmiede, Grundprobleme der Marx'schen Akkumulations- und Krisentheorie (Frankfurt, 1973), p. 205.
265. D. Klein, Labilität, p. 12.
266. See V.G. Stiehler, 'Die Marxsche Analyse der Widersprüche des Kapitalismus im "Kapital" und der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus', DZP, 15 (1967), 952-967.
267. O. Reinhold, 'Die aktuelle Bedeutung des "Kapitals" von Karl Marx für die politische Ökonomie des Sozialismus', WW, 6 (1967), (pp. 808-809).
268. See W. Ulbricht, Die Bedeutung des Werkes "Das Kapital" von Karl Marx für die Schaffung des entwickelten gesellschaftlichen Systems des Sozialismus in der DDR und den Kampf gegen das staatsmonopolistische Herrschaftssystem in Westdeutschland (Berlin, 1970), p. 9.
269. A. Lemnitz, Der historische, p. 9.
270. Franck and Schiener, 'Die objective Grundlage', (p. 1327).
271. W. Ulbricht, 'op. cit.', (pp. 67-8).
272. See H.U. Foerderreuther, 'Sozialistische Warenproduktion - Warenproduktion im Sozialismus', Mehrwert, 4 (1973), 103-120.
273. K. Marx, 'Marginal Notes on Adolph Wagner's Lehrbuch der politischen Ökonomie', Theoretical Practice, 5 (1970), 40-65 (p. 42).
274. O. Reinhold, Die Wirtschaftskrisen (Berlin, 1974), p. 8.
275. C.A., Traité, p. 29.
276. A. Lemnitz, 'Die westdeutsche Bundesrepublik', (p. 91).
277. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 108); A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 101; C.A., Traité, p. 46, 49, 56.
278. K-H. Heise, 'Zur Entfaltung', (p. 872).
279. P. Boccara, Études, p. 21, 22.
280. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', pp. 52-3.
281. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', p. 53.
282. A.K., Strukturveränderungen und staatsmonopolistisches Finanzsystem, p. 27.
283. P. Boccara, 'op. cit.', p. 310.

284. K-H. Heise, 'Zur Entfaltung der Widersprüche des Gesetzes vom tendenziellen Fall der Profitrate unter staatsmonopolistischen Bedingungen (Thesen), WW, 12 (1972), 864-877 (p. 869). As Braunsdorf argues, 'State interventions create "long-run structural disproportions", Kapitalbegriff, p. 100.
285. P. Boccara, Études, p. 21, 22.
286. K-H. Heise, 'Gesetze', (p. 368); K-H. Heise, 'Zur Entfaltung', (p. 865).
287. A.K., Strukturveränderungen, p. 18.
288. P. Boccara, 'op. cit.', pp. 213/4.
289. K-H. Heise, 'Zur Entfaltung', (p. 868, 873).
290. K-H. Heise, 'ibid.', (p. 869); O. Reinhold, Die Wirtschaftskrisen, p. 55; A.K. Strukturveränderungen, p. 25, 28.
291. O. Reinhold, 'ibid.', (pp. 56-7, 66).
292. See P. Boccara, 'Apercu', (p. 13): "the fundamental theoretical axis of the analysis of state monopoly capitalism is constituted by the Marxist theory of over-accumulation and the devaluation of capital developed on the foundation of the theory of surplus value and of capital".
293. P. Boccara, Études, (p. 293).
294. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', (p. 304, 37).
295. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', (p. 304).
296. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', (p. 52), (emphasis added).
297. K. Zieschang, 'Ursachen und Wesen', (p. 243).
298. P. Boccara, Études, p. 298.
299. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', p. 42.
300. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', p. 42.
301. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', p. 42.
302. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', p. 296.
303. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', p. 299.
304. K-H. Heise, 'Zur Entfaltung', (p. 868); A.K. Politische Ökonomie des Kapitalismus, p. 347.
305. P. Hess and K. Zieschang, 'Das Finanzkapital', (p. 1687).

306. P. Boccara, Études, p. 296; K-H. Heise 'Zur Entfaltung', (p. 868).
307. Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 133.
308. P. Boccara, 'op. cit.', pp. 43-4, 298.
309. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', p. 312.
310. P. Hess and K. Zieschang, 'Das Finanzkapital', (p. 1686). Although the state is examined from the dominant property relations, these are confused with the relations of production and the concept of the "autonomy" of "state capital". This is evident when it is argued that economic state functions and "state capital" do not produce value or surplus-value. 'ibid.', (p. 1686).
311. P. Boccara, Études, p. 47.
312. P. Boccara, 'ibid.', p. 132.
313. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 220.
314. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 184. As Marx argues, "in der Theorie wird vorausgesetzt, dass die Gesetze der kapitalistischen Produktionsweise sich rein entwickeln. In der Wirklichkeit besteht immer nur Annäherung".
315. M. Dragilew, 'Allgemeine Krise', (p. 1298, 1296).
316. M. Dragilew, 'ibid.', (p. 1296, 1298).
317. M. Dragilew, 'ibid.', (p. 1298, 1308).
318. M. Dragilew, 'ibid.', (p. 1307, 1292).
319. M. Dragilew, 'ibid.', (p. 1304).
320. This point is made by A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p. 101).
321. H. Heininger, 'Zur Rolle der Rustung im staatsmonopolistischen System ' in Zur Theorie, (p. 99).
322. See for example K. Nehls, 'Zum Problem', (p. 268).
323. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, pp. 93-4.
324. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 104, 108.
325. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, pp. 13-16, p. 40, 876, 879.
326. K. Nehls, 'Zum Problem', (p. 259, 267); V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 421).
327. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 94.
328. See P. Hess, 'Zum staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', SP, 14-15 (1971) 211-214. However, compare with H. Delorme, 'Le capitalisme', (p. 62).

329. E. Bregel, 'Zu einigen strittigen Problemen der Theorie der Allgemeinen Krise des Kapitalismus', SW, 3 (1972), 297-310 (p. 307).
330. K. Zieschang, 'Zu einigen', (p. 690).
331. A.K., Allgemeine Krise, p. 49, 54; V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, pp. 15-18; O. Reinhold, 'Die Widersprüche', (p. 875).
332. L. Maier, 'Dialektik der Anpassung', (p. 515).
333. L. Maier, 'Zu einigen methodologischen und konzeptionellen Fragen der Imperialismus - Analyse' in Der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus (Frankfurt, 1973) pp. 23-37 (p. 26).
334. L. Maier, 'ibid.', (p. 28).
335. Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 145.
336. Braunsdorf and Löffler, 'ibid.', p. 165.
337. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 247.
338. S. Tjulpanow, 'Der historische', (p. 1102).
339. J. Borko, 'Methodologische', (p. 1102).
340. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 241.
341. E. Pletnew, 'Die Leninische', (p. 350).
342. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 253.
343. However, compare with D. Tomaszewski, 'Das Leninische Prinzip der friedlichen Ko-existenz und der Klassenkampf', Einheit, 10 (1970); T. Timoféev and V. Grouchiantz, 'La conception léniniste du processus révolutionnaire mondial et faillite de ses "critiques"' in Le Leninisme, 58-88 (p. 75).
344. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, pp. 106-7.
345. I. Kusminow, 'Die neue Etappe', (p. 2).
346. M. Dragilew, 'Allgemeine Krise', (p. 1307, 1303); Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 150.
347. M. Dragilew, 'ibid.', (p. 1295).
348. As Dragilew argues, "theoretical analysis demands not only that the characteristic tendencies of the individual stages of the General Crisis of Capitalism are distinguished from the fundamental laws of capitalism, but also that the particular laws of the General Crisis are to be specified - just as the laws of the imperialist stage of capitalism must be distinguished from the fundamental laws of the capitalist mode of production", 'ibid.', (p. 1295).
349. A.K., Allgemeine Krise, pp. 22-3: "only if one proceeds from the Marxist-Leninist methodology of a global analysis of the decisive social economic process, and thereby consider the world as a whole, can one correctly situate (vorgenommen) the periodisation (Periodisierung) of the stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism". See

349. (Continued)
also A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, pp. 23-4.
350. Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, pp. 152-3. For example, the internationalisation of capital is derived from the law of uneven development, private property and competition of capitals. See also A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 299.
351. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 247.
352. See: D. Klein, 'Methodologische Probleme', (p. 232); A.K., Allgemeine Krise, p. 43.
353. Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 148, 153. However, as circulation is the "conceptless form of capital" (K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 405) it does not contain the fundamental laws, and therefore dynamics of capital accumulation.
354. Braunsdorf and Löffler, 'ibid.', p. 153.
355. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 872. See also Allgemeine, pp. 40-45.
356. K. Heuer, 'Die Verschärfung', (p. 523).
357. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 872.
358. See: A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 25; E. Pletnew, 'Die Leninische Lehre', (p. 349); D. Klein, 'Die weitere Verschärfung der allgemeinen Krise des Kapitalismus', WW, 2 (1976), 1761-1778 (p. 1761).
359. See K. Heuer, 'op. cit.', (p. 523); E. Pletnew, 'ibid.', (p. 349).
360. H. Heininger and P. Hess, 'Die Aktualität', p. 46.
361. D. Tomaschewski, 'op. cit.', (p. 1348). See also S. Titarenko, 'Das Leninische Prinzip der friedlichen Koexistenz und der ideologische Kampf', Deutsche Aussenpolitik, 6 (1960), 594-602 (p. 598).
362. See D. Klein, Labilität, p. 11.
363. E. Varga, Essais, p. 83. However, as Soviet theorists still argue that the "system contradiction" is the "cardinal problem" (Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, pp. 650-1), the structural relations of world capitalist development are not examined under the general laws of historical materialism.
364. See: E. Bregel, 'Zu einigen', (p. 300); A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 459.
365. See: E. Varga, 'Veränderungen', (p. 425); Essais, p. 49.
366. See: A. Heinze, P. Hoffmann and H. Richter, 'S.I. Tjulpanow-herausragender Gelehrter der politischen Ökonomie der Arbeiterklasse', WZKMUL, 4 (1976), 321-338 (p. 332); G. Fraas, 'Zur Entwicklung', (p. 344).

367. M. Dragilew, 'Allgemeine Krise', (p. 1293); A.K., Allgemeine Krise, p. 46.
368. M. Dragilew, 'ibid.', (pp. 1293-4).
369. E. Bregel, 'Zu einigen', (pp. 309-10).
370. E. Bregel, 'ibid.', (p. 301, 310). However, this suggests at least five periodisations in the Twentieth Century: monopoly capitalism, state monopoly capitalism and the three stages of the "General Crisis".
371. S.L. Wygodski, 'Probleme des gegenwärtigen', (p. 457).
372. M. Dragilew, 'Allgemeine Krise', (p. 1305).
373. See E. Bregel, 'Zu einigen', (p. 298).
374. E. Bregel, 'ibid.', (p. 298, 299). The problem caused by the insufficiency of defining criteria is illustrated with references to some contrasting features of state monopoly capitalism. See S.L. Wygodski, 'Probleme', (p. 5); M. Dragilew, 'op. cit.', (p. 1296); E. Bregel, 'op. cit.', (p. 303); A. Arsumanjan, 'Die neue Etappe der Allgemeine Krise des Kapitalismus', SW, 15 (1961), 935-955 (p. 936).
375. A.K., Allgemeine Krise, pp. 46-8.
376. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 247. Here it is argued that "all causes today act simultaneously".
377. See R. Winkel, 'Grundzüge', (p. 57).

CHAPTER 6CLASS STRATEGIES AND STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

The general theory of state monopoly capitalism is the constitutive theory of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties for the examination of Western European capitalist societies and the formation of anti-monopolist strategies in the European communist movement⁽¹⁾. As a unity of economic and political relations, state monopoly capitalism creates the economic and political form of the transition from capitalism to socialism through the objective laws and tendencies of capitalist "adaptation" systems upon which the scientific foundation of the strategy and tactics of Communist Parties are formulated⁽²⁾. These strategies are defined on the presuppositions of a plurality of national socialist struggles within the political structure of world communism and the combination of democratic and socialist stages of revolution.

In this Chapter we will examine the principal economic and political features of contemporary state monopoly capitalism. It is not however a general analysis of Communist Party strategies, but an evaluation of the specific form of anti-monopolist strategies from the standpoint of class relations in state monopoly capitalism. Given the autonomy of Western European Communist Parties, it is not possible to present a theory of anti-monopolist strategies defined in all the diverse geopolitical configurations of Western European capitalist systems, but rather only the typical theoretical components of such a strategy derived from the general problematic of the relations of economy and political. Therefore we will only consider the themes of the theory of state monopoly capitalism and the class tactics of Communist Parties which possess a representative character.

6.1 State monopoly capitalism and anti-monopolist strategies: (a) economics

The foregoing Marxist-Leninist examination of state monopoly capitalism contains the theoretical and historical presuppositions of the reproduction-forms of class domination in bourgeois society. Since they are located within the economic and political reproduction relations of capitalist systems, Communist Parties derive their critical anti-capitalist theory and tactics from the governing social relations of the total reproduction processes of state monopoly capitalism.

This advances the important new proposition for contemporary Communist Party theory that anti-monopolist strategies are not politically contingent, but are conceived within the objective "stage" of capitalist development as general programmatic requirements of the European labour movement in an "anti-monopolist phase of transition to socialism"⁽³⁾. However, because state monopoly capitalism is also determined from the combination of internal and external relations of "system competition", the formation of class strategies respond to the objective monopoly form of capitals in the international relations of world capitalism and world socialism⁽⁴⁾. In these conditions, the principal relations of class domination exist in the "adaptation -problematic" (Anpassungsproblematik)⁽⁵⁾ of state capitalist systems by which the world socialist system influences world capitalism⁽⁶⁾ and creates both the favourable conditions for the anti-imperialist strategy and tactics of the world communist movement in the struggle against "state monopoly capitalism"⁽⁷⁾.

The structure of these relationships develops from the "inner vulnerability of imperialist systems of domination" with the ascendancy of world-socialism⁽⁸⁾. On the one hand, the politics of the imperialist bourgeoisie must respond to the new "strategic situation"⁽⁹⁾ of the ensuing inner class contradictions within their national capital

formations and by adopting foreign policies which secure the perpetuation of international capitalism. This is achieved conjointly with the Soviet Union's "stabilisation" of the international status-quo - conceived primarily from the Soviet and Western "spheres of influence" - under the "system competition" of world capitalism and world socialism. However, it produces complications and contradictions in the representation-process of the class interests of the bourgeoisie in the capitalist state which directs the inner structure of class domination to the global requirements of the long-run interests of capitalist adaptation-systems⁽¹⁰⁾. On the other, the revolutionary political structure of "proletarian internationalism" promotes the politics of "peaceful co-existence" whereby the transitional epoch from world capitalism to world socialism is formulated as a "compulsorily long period of existence of the opposed systems in the world arena"⁽¹¹⁾. Here the contemporary interpretation of Lenin's proletarian internationalism rejects the definition of imperialism as the inevitability of an "epoch of wars and revolutions"⁽¹²⁾ for the "peaceful co-existence of socialism and capitalism ... (as) ... an objective necessity for the development of human society"⁽¹³⁾. This creates the world structure upon which "proletarian internationalism" articulates the national strategies of Western European Communist Parties for the creation of "Socialism in One Country"⁽¹⁴⁾.

The external relations of "system competition" developed initially under the Stalinist politics of the world communist movement now comprise a component part of the anti-monopolist strategies. Moreover, the abandonment of direct revolutionary strategies first formulated under the anti-fascist alliance politics of the Third International in which the world proletariat constitute the principal revolutionary class and the subject

of social transformation, are now conceptualised on the basis of the general Marxist-Leninist theory of the communist movement. Since this expresses the belief that the "revolutionary" programmatic demands of the Western European communist movement cannot be immediately realised in the developed centres of capital accumulation, the principal conceptualisation of alliance-strategies is not formulated for a direct destruction of the total capitalist system but only the specificity of the monopoly-form of domination on total social reproduction processes⁽¹⁵⁾. Anti-monopolist strategies are therefore defined for the limitation and abolition of the economic and political power of the monopolies on the principal production branches of capitalism and the capitalist state.

In the political framework of anti-monopolist strategies, Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties encounter the problem of defining anti-monopolist structural reforms in an intermediate stage of transition to socialism through the utilisation and transformation of existing institutional forms of capitalist systems in which the monopoly form of domination has been interpreted as the primary socio-economic relationship and governing dynamic of capitalist economies. The analysis subsequently defines the "unified-mechanism" of state monopoly capitalism as the central component of state-monopolist planning apparatuses which can be utilised against the monopolies for the management of capitalism - as elaborated in the theory of over-accumulation/devaluation of capital - and the realisation of the materialist foundations of socialism. Thus, the theoretical examination of state monopoly capitalism not only expresses the new reproduction conditions of total social capital but also sustains a political and ideological significance for the communist movement with the following components.

Firstly, the "great capitals" are to be repelled from their positions of economic and political domination⁽¹⁶⁾. This aspect of anti-monopolist strategies has already been formulated in the Comintern as the "struggle against the domination (Herrschaft) of the monopoly, against the dictatorship of finance-capitalism and the trusts"⁽¹⁷⁾. However, the contemporary analysis of monopoly domination and class states differs with respect to the distinction between state monopoly capitalism and the Bolshevik's concept of state capitalism because the post-collapse stage of capitalism signifies the introduction of interventionist functions of capitalist states into the transitional social relations of capitalism. Thereby, anti-monopolist alliances are now to "exclude" the monopolies from the new structure of state monopoly capitalism and appropriate the "unified-mechanism" as a revolutionary instrument for the dissolution of the class domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie and capitalist anarchy. This concept of a transitional society duly represents the realisation of anti-monopolist programmatic demands in an additional stage of transition from capitalism to socialism.

Secondly, state monopoly capitalism establishes new forms of class contradictions in which the interventionist functions of state apparatuses define the relation of alliance-formations to the unified relations of economy and political. The state becomes an "object" of inter-class appropriation as the anti-monopolist alliances "tear-away" (entreissen) the state from the monopolies and "subordinate it to the interests of the people" (Interessen des Volkes unterzuordnen)⁽¹⁸⁾. This is the political corollary of the "fusion"-thesis which promotes the anti-monopolist aim to "democratise the state-apparatus"⁽¹⁹⁾ in a "transitional stage to socialist planning"⁽²⁰⁾. As Boccara contends, "if" the democratic and revolutionary movement can "take control of the state, it can utilise it in the service of the people, and also construct

a new society in the revolutionary passage to socialism by the peaceful-way"⁽²¹⁾.

With the "politics of peaceful co-existence", the realisation of anti-monopolist strategies establish a democratic transition to socialism under a historical stage of anti-monopolist alliances from the "new relations between economics and politics"⁽²²⁾, and the "primacy of the political"⁽²³⁾. This also interprets the democratic stage of transition from the premises of monopoly domination. Here K-H. Roder argues that it is necessary to reconstruct democracy "through the abolition of monopoly power and the attainment of democracy as the power of the people, to create the conditions in which the rising possibilities of the scientific-technical-revolution and modern industrial development for social progress can be used in the interest of the working-class and other classes and stratum"⁽²⁴⁾.

Moreover, as we have shown that the class nature of capitalist states is potentially conceived under subjective relations of comparative class politics, the state apparatus can be "subordinated" by classes other than the monopoly bourgeoisie in alternative "instrumentalist" relations of class politics. This is expressed when SED theorist Lemnitz argues that the:

"capitalist state is ... today not only an integrated part of the capitalist social reproduction process, an organ of the preservation and security of the interests of finance-capitals in particular and the capitalist class in general, but is equally also an object of struggle between classes, especially between the working-class and finance-capital"⁽²⁵⁾.

On the basis of the subjectivisation of the objective economic laws under capitalist state interventionism in total social reproduction processes,

the inter-class theory of state monopoly capitalism provides the rationale for the aforementioned conceptualisation of the capitalist state in the materialist foundations of social transition and the realisable historical interests of the working-classes.

Thirdly, the economic programmatic demands of anti-monopolist alliances are defined in the conditions which French Communist Party theorists term a "democratic state capitalism", a "stage of advanced democracy" (l'étape de la démocratie avancée)⁽²⁶⁾, and SED theorists as a "progressive democracy"⁽²⁷⁾. Further, Belgian Communist Party theorist J. Moins interprets this "democracy" as an intermediary stage between bourgeois and socialist democracy⁽²⁸⁾, while SED theorist O. Reinhold envisages a long-period of democratic alternatives and parliamentary reforms by which the monopolies are "repressed"⁽²⁹⁾. Similarly, Italian Communist Party theorist L. Barca following Togliatti's initiative, argues that it is with the "revolutionary democratic utilisation of the objective processes of state monopoly capitalism that we have founded our strategy of reforms of structure"⁽³⁰⁾.

The general proposition contained within these strategies is that the structural transformation of the social reproduction processes of capitalist systems, in which the means of subsistence are produced, in the sense of reform rather than revolution, can be converted into a democratic "anti-monopolist state"⁽³¹⁾. Consequently, total social state capitalist property in the means of production is to redistribute the general product of labour "for the proportional expansion of social production powers" through the "utilisation" of capital categories - the "scientific-technical-revolution", production, wage-politics, investment, money-markets, rates of exchange, credit institutions, nationalisations - under a total social planning mechanism⁽³²⁾.

6.1.1 State monopoly capitalism

The fundamental economic component of the materialist socialisation processes are developed through the social forms of property in the means of production. This permits the creation of a distinct form of economic property from that of the capitalist class⁽³³⁾ and an economic foundation for the transformation of the principal monopoly capitalist relations of production. Collectively, these "foreign elements" in the total social capitalist production processes already function in the structural contradiction of "private" and "public" sectors which initiates the real historical process of the dissolution of capitalism. On the one hand, the interests of monopoly capitalist domination are extended onto the total national economy through the mobilisation of social capital in the state-monopoly sector⁽³⁴⁾. On the other, the inter-sector contradictions of private monopoly capitalism and state monopoly capitalism in the theory of over-accumulation/devaluation of capital create the objective foundations upon which anti-monopolist alliances are constructed.

Nevertheless, as anti-monopolist strategies are not defined against total capital relations, such economic programmes must demonstrate the comparative social planning superiority of democratic state capitalism under anti-monopolist alliances rather than the monopoly domination of these mechanisms. This conceptualisation of the materialist foundations of socialism is created in the capitalist contradiction of private property and the socialisation of production processes. Following the precedent of Lenin's analysis, the exacerbation of the contradiction of capitalism is formulated from capitalist reproduction processes and thereby does not establish a qualitative distinction between capitalist and socialist socialisations⁽³⁵⁾. As such, they represent the realisation of socialism through the general mechanisms of total social production

processes of state monopoly capitalism. On this basis, the anti-monopolist stage of transition to socialism interprets the capitalist state as an instrument for socialist construction through its capacity to regulate total social production and extend the means of subsistence of labour. The new forms and processes of the socio-economic functions of states and total social property relations in the extended reproduction of total social production processes are subsequently defined within the materialist foundations of socialism, and thereby the realisable historical interests of anti-monopolist alliances⁽³⁶⁾.

The status of the "public" and "state" forms of capital are also examined from the stand-point of the principal contradiction of the "power of monopoly groups ... in opposition to the interests of the people"⁽³⁷⁾, which shows that the appropriation of these transitional forms of capitalism is the object of public appropriation in democratic "anti-monopolist states". This characterisation of capitalism has led some theorists of state monopoly capitalism to consider that new relations of production are created in state property⁽³⁸⁾, and that the bourgeois state is "no longer ... (a) ... capitalist state in the classical sense"⁽³⁹⁾. As SED theorists contend, an

"anti-imperialist progressive democratic order demands at least that the might (Macht) of the most important powers (Kräfte) of monopoly capitalism are decisively limited. It is certainly not yet socialism, it also does not yet constitute socialist relations of property. It is however also no longer a possible stage or phase of capitalism"⁽⁴⁰⁾. The "destruction" of private capitalism leads to the understanding that state-property in the relations of production is the structure through which socialist production relations are introduced into bourgeois society. Nevertheless, while this explains the great significance given to nationalisations and state-property in the means of production, it does not demonstrate how state-capitalist economic planning praxis can

transform social relations of production when the system of capitalist wage-labour is maintained.

In practical terms, the revolutionary content of "anti-monopolist states" is contained in the appropriation of the "unified-mechanism" of social-management and the socialisation of the means of production through their democratic nationalisation. These features of anti-monopolist strategies enter into contradiction with the structure of private monopoly capitalism when they function for the social interests of the "entire people" in distinction to those of the monopoly capitalist class⁽⁴¹⁾. However, this transformation of the principal economic foundations of the capitalist mode of production through democratic nationalisations is both the expression and consequence of the management capacity of interventionist states in total social reproduction processes, and the harmonisation of total social development under state capitalist planning. It countenances the interpretation that the "proletariat is in principle for the nationalisation of the branches of the economy dominated by the monopolies"⁽⁴²⁾, in that the theory of "democratic nationalisations" of "private monopolies" through the state-sector have both a socialist potential in their "form-transformation of exploitation"⁽⁴³⁾, and an anti-monopolist structure through which the transition from capitalism to socialism is effective⁽⁴⁴⁾.

Democratic state capitalism accomplishes the complete destruction of capital logic and provides a rational solution to the expansion of production powers and the crises of capital accumulation under the "scientific-technical-revolution". It thereby "transforms" its essentially capitalist content into an "essentially democratic content"⁽⁴⁵⁾. Consequently, the "necessity to democratise (démocratiser) the state"⁽⁴⁶⁾ and convert it into an "instrument of the working-class and democratic and national forces"⁽⁴⁷⁾ unfolds within the political

conception of the attainment of "advanced democracy" (démocratie avancée). The state's economic capacity is consequently sufficient to generate "actual solutions" to the contradictions of capitalism in the social-forms of capital under "democratic" control. This is accomplished by popular participation in the political direction of the economy and the state and the conscious and systematic action upon the process of accumulation and reproduction of capitals⁽⁴⁸⁾.

The historical precedents of this analysis of social transformation are found not only with the theorists of "organised capitalism" but also with Engels. For Engels, state property provides a "formal means" for the "solution of conflicts" in the form of a "planned conscious organisation" under which the state takes possession of the "means of production in the name of society" (Produktionsmittel in Namen der Gesellschaft)⁽⁴⁹⁾. For contemporary theorists, this principle is actualised with a democratic state capitalist planning in distinction to state monopolist planning, defined as a "transition stage to socialist planning" (Übergangsstufe zur sozialistische planung) and an "intermediate stage" (Zwischenetappe) to socialism⁽⁵⁰⁾.

Such anti-monopolist programmatic demands are of a sufficient qualitatively distinct character from the quantitative transformation of capitalist systems to bring the total capitalist system into question. As Claudin argues:

"the political and economic defeat of monopoly capital would not have merely an anti-monopolist but also an anti-capitalist significance and would set in train a social process whose logic would be determined by the popular working-class nature of power which began to transform the state, by the existence of a large public sector of the economy, corresponding to the new power concentrating within it the basic means of production and other decisive aspects of the economy"⁽⁵¹⁾.

Thus, as the general programmatic demands of Communist Parties are formulated within the economic and political structure of democratic capitalist societies, the process of conquering political power for the construction of a socialist society engages the same politics which have been identified in the theory of "organised capitalism". Further, the struggle for the direct reproduction interests of labour through anti-monopolist strategies are conditioned by the post-war period of economic and political stability of Western European capitalist societies.

On the basis of the general theory of state monopoly capitalism, contemporary communist theorists re-state Lenin's interpretation of the proximity of state monopoly capitalism to socialism: "socialism is state monopoly capitalism put to the service of the entire people"⁽⁵²⁾, a "state of the whole people"⁽⁵³⁾. Here we see the class-neutral analysis of the materialist foundations of socialism in the socio-economic technical relations of capitalist production processes. As some theorists argue, the materialist foundations of socialism are formed "to the extent that state monopoly capitalism develops under the conditions of the scientific-technical-revolution"⁽⁵⁴⁾; and others that

"state monopoly capitalism creates the pre-conditions of socialism, its general foundations (allgemeinen Voraussetzungen); the formation (Herausbildung) of state monopoly capitalism ... (is) ... a proof of the proximity of socialist revolution"⁽⁵⁵⁾.

This presentation of anti-monopolist strategies may be continued with the examination of the salient features of the international character of capitalism which not only advances new propositions on the historical development of capitalism, but also contrasts with the classical Marxist-Leninist theory of imperialism as the "ultimate stage" of capitalism.

6.1.2 The internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism

The contemporary analysis of state monopoly capitalism develops from the opposed standpoints of the national capitalist accumulation processes and their reproduction under the internationalisation of capital, where the "system-contradiction" enters into the valuation conditions of capital and the reproduction of social classes⁽⁵⁶⁾.

It develops in the post-war reconstruction and stabilisation conditions of Western European capitalist systems in distinction to the Comintern's world historical collapse theory of capitalism. Consequently, the examination of the world relations of imperialist economy are no longer unilaterally governed by the imminence of imperialist wars and state war capitalism, but the theory of the world market movement of capitals. From this, the global conditions of the reproduction of state monopoly capitalism in the theory of the General Crisis of Capitalism are distinguished from the conceptualisation of anti-monopolist strategies from a purely national perspective. Therefore, while the constitution of anti-monopolist class alliances is derived from the domination of "national" capitalist economies under the economic and political power of monopoly capitals, the internationalisation of capital guarantees that the structure of production and circulation cannot be developed exclusively on the basis of national accumulation processes⁽⁵⁷⁾.

Subsequently, the interventionist functions of state economic planning praxis in total social reproduction processes which consolidate national capitals and form the materialist foundations utilised under Communist Party programmes are nevertheless confronted with the competition of capitals under the laws of unequal expansion of production powers and the disproportionalities between production branches from the world market connection of the internationalisation of capitalist economies⁽⁵⁸⁾. This compels the monopoly bourgeoisie to transcend the boundaries to

national state monopoly accumulation processes through the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism for the valuation of national monopoly capitals⁽⁵⁹⁾. Here, the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism⁽⁶⁰⁾ in its capacity as a "collective capitalist"⁽⁶¹⁾ has subsequently led to the theorisation of an "international superstructure" for the regulation of world capitalist systems⁽⁶²⁾.

The problem posed for anti-monopolist strategies is that the principal developmental dynamics of the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalist systems are ambiguously defined. On the one hand, the competition of national monopoly capitals on the world market unfolds through the intensification of the laws of uneven economic and political development⁽⁶³⁾, the limitations to the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism and the integration of national production powers on the world market under the "General Crisis of Capitalism". As Maier contends, the contradiction between the growing economic potential of imperialism and its "limited international influence as a world system intensifies the conflict between individual imperialist competitors ... (and) ... forms equally an important source of aggressive politics directed against the socialist system"⁽⁶⁴⁾. Here, the law of uneven development⁽⁶⁵⁾ remains the foundation for the critique of "organised capitalism"⁽⁶⁶⁾, the formation of a unified world state monopoly capitalism and an explanation of the continuing tendency of the reactionary politics of the monopoly bourgeoisie. On the other, the national and international economic and political reproduction conditions of monopoly capitalist systems create adaptation-mechanisms for the maintenance of the long-run system interests of state monopoly capitalism. These integration-tendencies foster the international unity of capitals and the internationalisation of both the materialist foundations of socialism and the political superstructures of state monopoly capitalism.

Here, "system-security" and the preservation of world capitalism take precedence over international contradictions of capitalist systems⁽⁶⁷⁾.

Despite the simultaneous action of these opposed tendencies on the formation of state monopoly capitalism, the economic "levelling" (Nivellierung) of capitalism is generally interpreted as the foundation for the renewed unequal development of capitalism on an extended scale⁽⁶⁸⁾. Further, the articulation of these national and world conditions of state monopoly capitalism⁽⁶⁹⁾ assumes that the impact of the international over-accumulation of capital is confined to the world centres of capitalism. The consequent "inner-weakness" (Labilität) of capitalist systems is now given expression in the Marxist-Leninist presuppositions on world "system competition" and the ascendancy of world socialism. This suggests that the tendency to political repression is a permanent feature of capitalist society which both opposes and promotes the anti-monopolist democratisation of state monopoly capitalism. Moreover, these tendencies are derived from the analysis of the dynamics of world capitalism under the laws of capitalist anarchy and the system-relations of capitalist adaptation-processes which modify the general laws of capital accumulation and the equalisation-tendencies of the world market movement of capitals.

In addition to our discussion of the "General Crisis of Capitalism", we now see that with the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism through the transcription of national accumulation processes onto the world market, the structural context in which anti-monopolist strategies are formulated cannot be confined to the national framework, nor respond exclusively to the analysis by which "monopolies" dominate national accumulation processes and determine the class character of political processes.

While the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism may only serve to complicate rather than contradict the analysis, it nonetheless

brings into question the components of the state capitalist planning competence of the "unified-mechanism" in the theory of state monopoly capitalism and the formulation of anti-monopolist strategies. The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism here expresses the problems of constructing a model of socialist transition based upon the national conditions of social production processes and the "management" of national economies under the politics of anti-monopolist alliances. In this respect, the theory of the over-accumulation/devaluation of capital is undermined when the competition of capitals on the world market is considered.

The general concept of an incremental transformation of state monopoly capitalism to socialism is formulated under the national and international political environment in which anti-monopolist strategies and the new "stage" in the periodisation of capitalism opposes the economic and political dynamics expressed in classical Marxism-Leninism. Formerly, the development of the total periodisation of capitalism had followed the historical progression of free competition capitalism, monopoly capitalism - the epoch of imperialist wars and world proletarian revolution and socialism. This opposed the social-democratic analysis of the historical progression of free competition capitalism, organised capitalism - the epoch of democratic transitions to socialism. However, the "stage" of state monopoly capitalism in the formalised "Third Stage of the General Crisis" and the world polycentrism of national socialist movements replaces the historical structure of world revolution and the international revolutionary proletarian politics with a third structure: that of the historical progression of free competition capitalism, monopoly capitalism and state monopoly capitalism - the

epoch of peaceful transition and "Socialism in One Country".

While this does not establish a supersession of the fundamental rationale of the collapse theory of capitalism, it nevertheless illustrates the proximity of state monopoly capitalism to the transitional model of "organised capitalism" and "state capitalism". In distinction to classical Leninism, the revolutionary transition to socialism is not through the collapse of the "weak links" of world imperialism but democratic anti-monopolist states founded upon the "strong links" of state monopoly capitalism⁽⁷⁰⁾. Here the principal interest of an "anti-monopolist stage" of class alliances concerns less the economic foundations of socialism than the general political conditions for their realisation⁽⁷¹⁾.

6.2 State monopoly capitalism and anti-monopolist strategies: (b) politics

The political structure under which anti-monopolist strategies are formulated is fundamental to the concept of a "general democratic stage of anti-imperialist social transformation"⁽⁷²⁾. It rests upon the delimitation of the complete validity of Marxism to the conditions of "free competition capitalism" and the epoch of bourgeois revolutions, with its continuation in the new theory and politics of Leninism. Their contemporary expression in the analysis of state monopoly capitalism forms the basis for the theorisation of a non-sectarian politics of the Western European communist movement in distinction to the tradition of Bolshevik politics. However, the historical precedents of these politics are contained in the Leninist analysis of revolutionary democratic states, the combination of democratic and socialist revolutionary principles⁽⁷³⁾, and the combination of "United Front" and "Popular Front" strategies⁽⁷⁴⁾ of the Comintern's anti-fascist politics. These features of communist politics were based upon the imminent international collapse of capitalism and proletarian revolution.

The formal dissolution of the "logic of capital" demonstrates the primacy of the political factors of transition in anti-monopolistic relations over the economic forms of capitalist production processes, and situates Lenin's concept of democracy and state monopoly capitalism in the contemporary theory and tactics of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties. As SED theorists argue:

"the deep antagonism of monopoly and democracy is not only the fundamental momentum of class struggles in state monopoly capitalism but simultaneously a key question for the determination of the strategy and tactics of working-class struggles"⁽⁷⁵⁾.

Nevertheless, while this contradiction between state monopoly capitalism and democracy is maintained in anti-monopolistic strategies, the new analysis of political systems in the "de-Stalinisation" period of Marxist-Leninist theory interprets bourgeois society under the opposed tendencies of the anti-monopolist movement to democratic state capitalism⁽⁷⁶⁾, juxtaposed to the negation of democratic republics in imperialist republics.

As Marxist-Leninist theorists contend, in the ascendent epoch of free competition capitalism, the bourgeoisie institute their general form of political power in the classical form of parliamentary democracies. Here, "bourgeois democracy sufficed (genügt) as the form of political power in pre-monopoly capitalism"⁽⁷⁷⁾. Conversely, in the epoch of monopoly capitalism, capitalism enters its "downward line" (abwärtgehenden Linie)⁽⁷⁸⁾ in which the bourgeoisie "respond" to the objective "undermining of the foundations of the capitalist mode of production" (Untergrabung der Grundlagen der kapitalistischen Produktionsweise)⁽⁷⁹⁾ by converting the forms of political power to their interests⁽⁸⁰⁾.

In the imperialist epoch, "capitalism can no longer secure its economic existence without the transfer of economic functions to the political organs of power (Macht), and the political organs of power cannot secure these functions without effecting the negation of bourgeois

democratic forms of power"⁽⁸¹⁾. These appear as actual or potential "open" forms of class despotism which confront the constitutional forms of political power⁽⁸²⁾.

The contemporary theorists of state monopoly capitalism employ citations from Lenin to argue that "as the domination of free competition in the economy corresponds to bourgeois freedom and democracy, so the essence of monopolies corresponds to the politics of domination and force, suppression and reaction all along the line ..."⁽⁸³⁾. This tendency to political authoritarian states in the terminal epoch of capitalist accumulation processes is sustained from the inner momentum of the laws of monopoly capitalism on the political power of bourgeois states. As some theorists have argued, the "tendency to fascism is unavoidable in many appearance-forms of monopoly capitalism"⁽⁸⁴⁾. Further, S.E.D. theorists contend that the "establishment of fascist regimes brings the political tendency that is characteristic of all countries which have entered the stage of state monopoly capitalism to expression in concretised (konkretiertester) form"⁽⁸⁵⁾.

The traditional concept of the "fascisation" (Faschisierung) of states also is examined from the simultaneous undermining of the world conditions of capitalism⁽⁸⁶⁾ and the "reaction to the formation of socialism as a means of securing the existence of capitalist systems"⁽⁸⁷⁾. The political impact on state monopoly capitalism is for the transformation of the separation of economy and political in class forms of bourgeois dictatorship, a corresponding usurpation of bourgeois-democratic Right⁽⁸⁸⁾ and the formation of a world anti-socialist strategy⁽⁸⁹⁾. Such a characterisation of state monopoly capitalism ratifies the traditional political evaluation of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties for the continuation of "defensive" anti-monopolist strategies for democracy against the reactionary politics of the monopoly.

Conversely, we have also established that the developed forms of anti-monopolist strategies in the "de-Stalinisation" period express the new propositions of state monopoly capitalism which concern the analysis of an epoch of the "peaceful transition" to socialism, the rejection of the inevitability of imperialist wars, and the transformation of the world relations of domination to the advantage of democratic and socialist struggles⁽⁹⁰⁾. Moreover, as Varga contends, parliamentary democracy is a "complicating factor" in the analysis of state politics⁽⁹¹⁾.

With these two tendencies, the theory expresses an ambivalent evaluation of the political tendencies of bourgeois society to both bourgeois dictatorship and the parliamentary form of democratic transition to socialism. This results in part from the characterisation of the instrumentalist theory of states under contrasting class politics. However, it does not establish the inter-connection of economy and political from the class foundations of society and thereby the explanation for the transformation of the "normal" form of democratic republic into an imperialist republic as a social movement. Moreover, since state monopoly capitalism creates the materialist foundations of socialism, but precludes a direct transition to socialism⁽⁹²⁾, the theory emphasises the political voluntarism which we have identified in the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the state.

The intermediate transition-stage from capitalism to socialism which we have discussed re-evaluates the political status of "defensive" democratic politics and considers their significance for the conquest of the economic and political positions of monopoly power⁽⁹³⁾. Nevertheless, this conceptualisation of the socio-theoretical relations of anti-monopolist strategies is derived from the "particularised" form of political power in the concept of the "fusion" which "excludes" the people (Volk) from the politics of democratic state-forms. As Soviet theorists argue, in "capitalism only a minority participate (jouit) in

democracy"⁽⁹⁴⁾. Conversely, the critique of the "instrumentalist" concept of democracy is only established through the extension of anti-monopolist democracy which attempts to re-appropriate the sphere of the "political" in a real-form of "community interest" under the "popular" direction of democratic state capitalism.

Because the theory facilitates a differential class assess to capitalist states, a new form of class anonymity is imputed to the democratic republic from which the transformation of bourgeois-democracy is assessed:

"bourgeois-democratic forms of power, with the formal equality of all before the law and proclamation of a catalogue of bourgeois-democratic Rights and freedoms offer relatively favourable conditions for the struggle of the working-class. In spite of their formal and limited character, constitutionally proclaimed bourgeois-democratic Rights and freedoms of the working-class are to be used as a weapon in the struggle against imperialism"⁽⁹⁵⁾.

Similarly, Tschepprakow argues that anti-monopolist democracy functions against the "whole power of monopoly capital ... (and) ... against the political power of the bourgeoisie"⁽⁹⁶⁾. Subsequently, in contemporary Marxist-Leninist analysis, the struggle for "anti-monopolist progressive democracy" is interpreted as a component of the struggle for socialism"⁽⁹⁷⁾.

Here the theory does not examine any contradiction between the political organisation of class alliances under bourgeois Right as the foundation of the anti-monopolist movement. However, the consequent confinement of class strategies to the political framework of parliamentary forms of class rule⁽⁹⁸⁾ both discounts their potential for the integration of the labour movement in democratic republics through its political socialisation, and the structural constraints on the political system from the social power of capital. While the theory rejects the

inevitability of the fascisation of bourgeois states as a necessary stage in which the transition of state monopoly capitalism to socialism passes from the modified collapse-theory of capitalism, it has not explained how the institutionalisation of the anti-monopolist movement in democratic "anti-monopolist states" abrogates the counter-revolutionary movement of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

This issue can be more sharply formulated by recalling that Marxism-Leninism has distinguished the formal conditions of political power in the "state-forms" of the political system from the "state-type". But since the distinction is suppressed in the Marxist-Leninist concept of anti-monopolist democratic state-forms, the assumption is made that the control of political power in parliamentary democracies is a sufficient condition for the control and subsequent transformation of state-power. Pradoxically, the transformation of the classical form of bourgeois political rule which maintained bourgeois society in the ascendant epoch of free competition capitalism, is now conceived of as both the principal political means with which to repress the monopoly bourgeoisie and to establish the political form of social emancipation. Nevertheless, this appears a difficult point to sustain when state monopoly capitalism is based upon the institutional connection which "fuses" the economic and political power of monopolies and the state in the mechanism by which the monopoly bourgeoisie circumvent parliamentary democracies.

Despite this, anti-monopolist strategies subsequently not only have the "aim to abolish the limits established by the power of monopoly capitals for the political, economic, social and cultural progress of society"⁽⁹⁹⁾, but also to realise the democratic republic through the political unification of class-alliances⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. The significance of these strategies from the historical perspective of class strategies resides in converting the defence of the democratic republic from

fascism into a transitional strategy for socialism. To a certain extent, this rests on the assumption that the social domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie is necessarily contradicted by the "inner logic of the struggles for democracy"⁽¹⁰¹⁾, and that democracy and socialism are proximate in state monopoly capitalism. As Soviet theorists contend, "under the conditions of state monopoly capitalism, the distance between democratic and socialist transformation is considerably smaller" because of the "approximation (Annäherung) of democratic and socialist tasks"⁽¹⁰²⁾.

But, in distinction to Lenin's revolutionary political concept of state monopoly capitalism, "anti-monopolist democracy" is now defined as the "central (Kern) question of revolutionary theory and politics"⁽¹⁰³⁾. However, despite the approximation of democracy and socialism through the economic and political prism of state monopoly capitalism, S.E.D. theorists also argue that it is "questionable to believe that ... the transition from state monopoly capitalism to socialism can be directly accomplished"⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. Rather, "anti-monopolist democracy" is defined as a "democratic alternative" to the imperialist republic which exists "for a long period in the centre of struggles"⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. Duly, anti-monopolist strategies are confined to a historical perspective of class strategies based upon the commitment to the realisation of an "intermediate democratic stage" in the transition from capitalism to socialism⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ and through the preliminary attainment of democratic Right⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. Here we may note that this "revolutionary" theory has not established how the struggle for democracy "leads the democratic masses unavoidably to struggle for the transformation of the class character of political power", nor how the "illusions on the state and its real power are transcended in the struggle for democracy itself"⁽¹⁰⁸⁾.

Despite the historically progressive character of the political form of bourgeois class power against feudal society, the Marxist critique of constitutional bourgeois states has already established that this political form of domination is a form of class rule which is historically limited. Thus, although Marxist-Leninist theorists explain how the "universality" of republican ideologies of bourgeois Rights, freedoms and equalities may contradict the class dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie in the epoch of imperialism, it is not established how this contradicts the general form of class rule in capitalism, and overcomes the mechanism of political socialisation which facilitates the integration of "bourgeois individuals" into the total social reproduction of class relations.

6.2.1 Ideology and the state

The analysis of the ideological and hegemonic relations of class domination in Western European capitalist societies follows from the "modified" "collapse"-theory of capitals and the political organisation of the labour movement in anti-monopolist strategies. In contemporary communist theory, they respond to the failure of a political collapse of capitalism through proletarian revolution based upon the determinism of the economic laws of imperialist economy, and the necessity to re-evaluate the generalisation of Bolshevik politics in an anti-monopolist democratic stage of social revolution. This expresses the recognition that the economic "collapse" of capitalism is not co-terminous with the political "collapse" of class domination on the terrain of the social legitimation of class power.

These constitution-conditions of ideology and class consciousness are also those which necessitate systematic state interventionism as an "anti-collapse" mechanism of capitals which expresses the dissolution

of "capital-logic" and the representation of the general interests of capital through the political superstructures of the classical parliamentary form of democracy⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. However, while the contradictions and "frictions" in capitalist reproduction processes to the mobility of capital and labour increasingly militate against the integration of total social relations through the categories of bourgeois property Rights, bourgeois class domination and the legitimation of class rule is not reduced to the theory of repressive state functions and unmediated state-power. Rather, the theory acknowledges that the dissolution of the circulation sphere of free exchange of individual capitals on the market through the equivalent exchanges of private commodity owners under monopolist class power compels the social mediation of class contradictions through their institutionalisation in the ideological state apparatuses of the bourgeois political system and the hegemonic functions of bourgeois "social states"⁽¹¹⁰⁾.

The newly formed materialist functions of "social states" are assessed as creating an ideological basis to the "retardation of consciousness" through the role they play in confronting the traditional "miseration" critique of capitalism, and therefore the process by which a revolutionary class consciousness is formed in state monopoly capitalism. This is examined through the crisis of the social foundations of state monopoly capitalism. Since capitalist systems enter their historical terminal stage of capital accumulation, it is argued that the "reproduction of the commodity labour-power to a considerable part is no longer possible inside the direct capital valuation connection alone - the relation of wage-profit of the valuation processes of capitals"⁽¹¹¹⁾. As wage-labour is forced below its subsistence level of reproduction in monopoly capitalism, the specific function of permanent state expenditures sustains a fraction of the value of labour-power in the reproduction of

labour⁽¹¹²⁾ through the circulation of the costs of commodity labour-power on total social capital⁽¹¹³⁾. Thus, the necessity of interventionist state functions for the reproduction of the special commodity labour-power have an additional significance for total reproduction processes. The reproduction of labour-power increasingly is only accomplished from the total social reproduction conditions which bring the total class of labour into direct relationship with the bourgeois state. On this basis, state interventionist functions for the total economic reproduction process enter into the class contradictions of capitalism and the constitution-conditions of class consciousness.

Two opposed tendencies in the examination of ideological state functions may be derived from these considerations.

On the one hand, the reproduction of capital and the commodity labour-power through the state's functioning as a "real total capitalist" is analysed under the illusory and mystifying characterisation of the "social state". These state functions are conceived of as "inner reform politics" from the connection of imperialism and opportunism⁽¹¹⁴⁾ which create integrating functions for the stabilisation of class antagonisms and the reproduction of total capitalist reproduction processes⁽¹¹⁵⁾. They ideologically conceal the existence of monopoly capitalist property in the means of production and contain the social formation of revolutionary class consciousness⁽¹¹⁶⁾. This develops the apparent refutation of the "miseration" theory of the proletariat and suggests that the labour means of subsistence are reproduced without the transformation of the capitalist mode of production and the abolition of the capitalist state⁽¹¹⁷⁾.

On the other hand, the objective interventionist functions of states promote the anti-monopolist demand for the realisation of the

historical total social labour needs (Bedürfnisse) from the existing state-monopoly economic mechanism freed from the domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie⁽¹¹⁸⁾. To this extent, the theory of state monopoly capitalism participates in social state "illusionism" despite the practical importance of these state functions for labour, because they are conceived of as social planning components of class production relations and therefore the reproduction of labour-power⁽¹¹⁹⁾. Consequently, since the general form of capitalist commodity production is "undermined", the specificity of the special commodity labour-power and the generalisation of commodity production is no longer a sufficient condition for the existence of the capitalist mode of production. Thus, the historical accumulation of capital through the centralisation of the proletariat in capitalist enterprises does not comply to the principles of the laws of value, the capitalist division of labour and the reproduction of labour in commodity-form, but extraneous principles of the conscious regulation of total social production processes under the bourgeois state.

The broader significance of the organisational and bureaucratic functions of economic state interventionist praxis for the concentration and centralisation of capitals and the legitimation problematic of bourgeois states follows from the apparent contradiction of the concept of the "neutrality" of autonomous bourgeois constitutional states with the usurption of the political efficacy of bourgeois parliamentary democracies in the new form and functions of state monopoly capitalism. The legitimation crises of capitalist systems follow for all the phases of the imperialist periodisation of capitalism and the Marxist-Leninist theory of political superstructures⁽¹²⁰⁾.

Despite this, the emphasis upon "repressive states" should be considered from the total legitimation problematic of bourgeois states. Here, the "undermining" of the traditional political structures of

bourgeois society does not diminish the importance of legitimation functions for the "integration" of social classes, but rather requires their reformation in the new class relations of the objective social conditions of the monopoly domination on the total reproduction processes of state monopoly capitalism. However, as the class character of bourgeois states emanates principally from the monopoly domination of the bourgeois system of political power and the consequent instrumentalisation of its functions, the legitimation of monopoly class power through the representation of monopoly interests as "social interests" is particularly difficult to articulate. Consequently, since the theory of state monopoly capitalism expresses the ideological functions of bourgeois states in the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie, they are not assessed from the total legitimation problematic of bourgeois constitutional states through the commodity connections of bourgeois society.

We will now consider some central issues of ideology from the "standpoint" of anti-monopolist alliances.

Since the periodisation of class relations has created objectively defined economic interests of non-monopoly classes in opposing the social domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the theory of ideology is confronted with several important problems: how are the mechanisms established by which the "people" (Volk) acquiesce to the economic and political conditions of monopoly domination and servitude; how does the monopoly bourgeoisie establish its ideological hegemony both within the total capitalist class and in the ideological state apparatuses; and what are the ideological conditions by which the anti-monopolist class consciousness of the "people" is raised^{(121)?}

The resolution of these issues in the theory of state monopoly capitalism has prompted the examination of the ideological domination of

monopoly capital on labour from the existence of a system of "planned consciousness"⁽¹²²⁾. With the dissolution of the traditional liberal ideology of bourgeois society, the mechanism by which the ideological hegemony of the monopoly bourgeoisie is exercised under the instrumentalist concept of the state is interpreted by S.E.D. theorists as an "artificial" means of "spiritual manipulation" (geistigen Manipulierung)⁽¹²³⁾ and the "fixing of the consciousness of the broad masses" (Fixierung des Bewusstseins der breiten Massen) of society⁽¹²⁴⁾. It follows that the hegemony of class rule and the ideological subordination of the non-monopolist classes is defined primarily as a superstructural phenomenon of state institutions on socio-economic relations. Thus, the monopoly bourgeoisie's institutional disposition of command on state apparatuses determines the "false consciousness" of the entire non-monopoly classes and the legitimation of their class power through the monopolisation of the means of communication by the ruling-class, intelligentsia and functionaries, in a "transmissions-theory" of consciousness. Nevertheless, with the permanent ideological crisis of capitalist society, the problem arises of creating an effective system of economic and political socialisation of classes in existing institutional structures when the normal form of ideological reproduction of bourgeois society under capital-logic is destroyed in the historical decline of the total imperialist system. As a result, the tendency to substitute ideological state apparatuses with the political tendency to authoritarian states remains imminent in state monopoly capitalism⁽¹²⁵⁾.

An important consideration for the examination of class consciousness in anti-monopolist strategies arises from the presupposition of the existence of the materialist foundations of socialism in contemporary state monopoly capitalism and the emphasis upon the creation of the subjective conditions for socialist revolution⁽¹²⁶⁾. This follows because

the importance of the "subjective factor" in alliance-theory is a product of the recognition that a revolutionary socialist movement has not emerged in Western European capitalist societies despite the advent of two "imperialist" World Wars under the "collapse" problematic of capitals. However, the postulation of the relationship of historical-materialism to social consciousness in these terms expresses the bifurcation of the materialist production relations of economy from social superstructures.

Lenin has already examined the concretisation of this distinction with the theory of "transitional capitalism" as an independent movement from the capital constitution of class consciousness and the social formation of classes. But, in the precedent this creates for state monopoly capitalism neither the connection between economic substructure and political superstructure, nor the derivation of the forms of class consciousness from the materialist production relations are established. What formerly appeared as a subordination of consciousness to the primacy of production powers in the Second International's conception of historical-materialism now follows the Third International and subordinates the social movement of capitals to the primacy of the ideological apparatuses of political superstructures. Moreover, when the monopoly domination of total social production processes is considered the "starting-point" for the analysis of ideology and consciousness from which anti-monopolist alliances are to be formulated, the economic substructure and political superstructures are not derived from the general laws and total class nature of capitalist production relations but their specificity under the monopoly structure of capitals.

As monopoly capitalism contradicts the logic of capitals and the natural forms of capital mystification, especially when bourgeois states are defined as objective components in the economic relations of social reproduction, some theorists have interpreted the historical formation

of state monopoly capitalism as a contributory factor to the generation of class consciousness and the conceptualisation of an automatic "politisation" of economic relations⁽¹²⁷⁾. Tschepprakow expresses this view when he contends that "state monopoly capitalism creates a new situation in which the class struggle of labour for their immediate interests raises (revet) by its logic a political character"⁽¹²⁸⁾. With such an analysis, the theory suggests the formation of an "anti-monopolist consciousness" and the unification of class alliances in political ideology from the "normal" reproduction conditions of classes in state monopoly capitalism⁽¹²⁹⁾.

In these conditions of the new stage-theory of state monopoly capitalism, Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties have two functions. They are to create the ideological unity of the labour movement through its traditional vanguard and centralised functions, while simultaneously creating the social basis for a mass political party to operate in the modern bourgeois state. These apparent contradictory functions express the resolution to the divisions within the labour movement from the two contrasting standpoints of the "United Front" and "Popular Front" strategies. In the former, the vanguard theory of Communist Parties stipulates the primacy of ideological factors in the agitational and propagandist combat against bourgeois and revisionist ideologies. This follows from the economic "collapse"-logic of capitals which establishes the historical maturity of capitalist contradictions for socialism in contradistinction to the political forms of repressive class power in capitalist society. Here, the failure of a revolutionary socialist movement to occur continues the analysis of the fragmentation of the labour movement primarily through a moralistic critique of the opportunistic and traitorous action of trade-union leaders, Social-Democratic Parties and labour aristocracies, which directs the labour

movement to class compromise rather than revolutionary politics. Conversely, in the latter, the functions of Communist Parties are articulated upon the new social relations of state monopoly capitalism which provide the socio-economic, in addition to the political rationale of anti-monopolist strategies. However, the new functions of Communist Parties in non-sectarian alliance-politics leads to the problem of creating an authentic Marxist-Leninist ideology and politics in distinction to the theory and practice of Social-Democratic Parties in bourgeois societies. From it results the dilemma of fusing contrasting functions which repond to the different economic and political conditions in which "state monopoly capitalism" is formed.

In both strategies, the essential problem of converting social-democratic into socialist strategies in the contemporary ideology and politics of the European Communist movement appears through the necessity to intensify ideological struggles for the creation of an "anti-monopolist consciousness"⁽¹³⁰⁾. Tschepprakow expresses this when he agrees that despite the "high level of the development of the objective economic and political foundations for the approach of the revolutionary transition to socialism ... nevertheless, a significant part of the working-class and their anti-monopolist allies (intellectuals, wage-earners, peasantry) are not yet ready for the direct destruction of capitalism"⁽¹³¹⁾. Thus, the "activation of subjective factors becomes absolutely necessary to direct the principal thrust (Hauptstoss) against monopoly capital" to "tear away" (entreissen) its political power and to subordinate the existing "economic mechanism of management (Leitung) through anti-monopolist democratic power with the working-class at the head"⁽¹³²⁾. Consequently, the promotion of the "activation of subjective factors"⁽¹³³⁾ takes the political structure of democratic anti-monopolist states as the preparatory basis for the transformation of democratic into socialist strategies⁽¹³⁴⁾. Here, the

theory and tactics of anti-monopolist alliances are concerned less with the examination of class strategies and the social functions of Communist Parties for the creation of a revolutionary proletarian class hegemony, than the more limited ideological and hegemonic requirements of a pre-stage of revolutionary socialist transformation based upon the "historical compromise" of classes⁽¹³⁵⁾.

However, in distinction to these constitution-conditions of ideology and class hegemony from which anti-monopolist strategies are formulated in the theory of state monopoly capitalism, we may note that for Marx the historical dynamic of bourgeois society and the materialist theory of class consciousness are established through the anatomy of bourgeois society in the economic structure of class production relations under the general laws of capitalist commodity production⁽¹³⁶⁾. On this basis, the production of class ideology is postulated through the total structure of bourgeois society, while the conditions of its dissolution in the process of social emancipation are suggested by the negation of the total social domination of capital. It contrasts with the identification of the constitution of class consciousness through the ideological state apparatuses of social superstructures in the theory of state monopoly capitalism. This consequently construes the appearance of the autonomisation of bourgeois states as the origin of ideological functions and thereby contributes to the evaluation that the ideological foundations of anti-capitalist class praxis are based upon the control of ideological state apparatuses. Therefore, the hegemonic component of the legitimation problematic of bourgeois states is not derived from the totality of social production relations in the general capital foundation of bourgeois society, but only its specific form under the domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

We will now assess the economic and political components of anti-monopolist strategies in relation to the theory of transition in Western European capitalist societies under the concept of "anti-monopolist states".

6.2.2 Transition and the state

The general laws of transition from state monopoly capitalism to socialism contain new propositions on the constitution of political power in transitional societies. These are derived from the conceptualisation of socialist transition upon the historical maturity of the materialist contradictions for socialism and the acceptance by Marxism-Leninism of the necessity to utilise some form of state-power. The specific problem they raise concerns the political conception of the anti-monopolist stage of transition which distinguishes the theory of democratic state capitalism from the classical Marxist-Leninist analysis of class power in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We have identified the origin of this distinction with the de facto abandonment of the theory of proletarian class dictatorship which follows from the combination of democratic and socialist stages of revolution initiated by the anti-fascist politics and "Popular Front" alliance-strategies in Western European capitalist countries. From this standpoint, the class theory of the proletarian dictatorship in the transition from capitalism to socialism has already been ambiguously formulated before the formal declaration of its abandonment with the theories of "popular democracy"⁽¹³⁷⁾. However, the defence of the democratic republic which we have discussed under both anti-fascist and anti-monopolist strategies does not necessarily contradict "Stalinism" in its post-war formulation, but rather expresses its consequences for the politics of the world communist movement. Duly, it is possible for the contemporary theorists of state monopoly capitalism to utilise citations from both Lenin, and Comintern theory on democracy

and socialism⁽¹³⁸⁾, so as to legitimate the form of socialist transition under a plurality of democratic state-forms in distinction to the classical theory of proletarian dictatorship. This is the context in which Spanish Communist Party theorist Carrillo cites Lenin to the effect that "all nations will arrive at socialism - this is inevitable, but not all will do so in exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own in one or another form of democracy, one or another variety of the dictatorship of the proleteriat"⁽¹³⁹⁾.

However, while we have critically assessed Lenin's conceptualisation of socialist transition under democracy, "state monopoly capitalism" and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the creation of socialism is not construed under bourgeois-democratic forms of class rule because of their incompatibility with the constitution of political power in the class rule of proletarian dictatorship. To obscure the distinction of Bolshevik politics denudes the political form of social emancipation of its revolutionary socialist contents. It is on such presuppositions of the equalisation of different forms of political power that French Communist Party theorist Althusser connects the class tactics of the labour movement to the contention that the "peaceful and democratic transition" to socialism in the "broadest possible alliance" has "always been part and parcel of the dictatorship of the proletariat"⁽¹⁴⁰⁾.

From these considerations we see that the general analysis of socialist transitions in the politics of "peaceful co-existence" and the "historical compromise" of classes obviates the practical and theoretical significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian internationalism in the communist movement. The contemporary Marxist-Leninist theory of the state consequently conceptualises the transitional anti-monopolist stages of economic and political power of democratic state capitalism⁽¹⁴¹⁾ in which "anti-monopolist states" possess a demonstrable socialist form, and can fulfil revolutionary

functions for socialist construction. As Tschepprakow argues on the basis of the "unified-mechanism" of state monopoly capitalism:

"democratic forces assign themselves the task of tearing away the mechanism of management and the levers of state regulation from the hands of the monopolies, and after having transformed them, to employ them against the monopolies"⁽¹⁴²⁾.

Following the de facto abandonment of proletarian dictatorship, the derivation of the class tactics of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties from the stage-theory of state monopoly capitalism introduces the formalisation of a de jure abandonment of proletarian dictatorship. This is rationalised not only upon the politics of anti-fascist strategies and the concrete struggles for democratic emancipation in Western parliamentary political systems - under which the articulation of the Euro-centric foundations of "Socialism in One Country" were first undertaken by Togliatti - but also the objective periodisation of European capitalism. Duly, expression is given to the delimitation and applicability of the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat to "certain circumstances of class struggles, in certain historical, social and economic conditions"⁽¹⁴³⁾. In turn, the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer conceived of as a constitutive component of Marxism-Leninism since its traditional economic and political functions are not necessary conditions of a transitional capitalism under which production processes are socialised, and the class contradiction of "monopolies" and the "people" constitutes the basis of non-sectarian alliance politics. The success of social transformation under class strategies now depends "essentially upon the struggle of working-class alliance with the large anti-monopolist sections (couches) and not only the proletarian peasantry ..."⁽¹⁴⁴⁾.

Moreover, continuing the politics of the "de-Stalinisation" period, Althusser states that the significance of the formal abandonment of proletarian dictatorship for socialist transition emphasises that the "whole strategy depends on democracy"⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. This proposition is qualitatively distinct from the combination of democratic and socialist stages of revolution under the Comintern, and the proximity of democratic state capitalism to socialism because it not only identifies the "symbolic sacrifice" which established a "break with the past" of Stalinism that brought the theory of proletarian dictatorship into disrepute, but also creates a "new strategy of democratic socialism"⁽¹⁴⁶⁾. Nevertheless, while Althusser suggests that the "theoretical" meaning of proletarian dictatorship cannot be rescinded by a political decision, since the social content of the concept has already been defined in terms analogous to "democratic socialism", the renunciation of the concept is regarded as having a purely tactical significance and being only a "symbolic sacrifice"⁽¹⁴⁷⁾.

Two propositions may be considered on the basis of this discussion regarding the concept of socialist transition and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Firstly, "socialism is the 'transition period' (the only one discussed by Marx and Lenin) between capitalism and communism, a contradictory period during which capitalist elements (e.g. wage-labour) and communist elements (e.g. new mass organisations) co-exist in a conflictual way". And secondly, "socialism is one with the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, new class rule in which the working-class fulfils the leading role over its allies in the broadest possible mass democracy"⁽¹⁴⁸⁾.

In addition to the range of economic and political problems already considered in Lenin's analysis of state monopoly capitalism and also the distinctions in the concept of socialist transition, we may further

note in the contemporary analysis that socialism embraces contradictory relations between capitalism and communism without establishing the preconditions which guarantee the inauguration of socialist transition. Thus, wage-labour can be defined as only an "element" of the capitalist mode of production rather than its foundation in generalised commodity production - a foundation which presupposes an epoch in world history. Consequently, a socialist transition-stage can be envisaged that maintains the autonomisation of the means of production as capital over labour in which the loss of proletarian class control over its conditions of existence is sustained. This further signifies that the economic power of the capitalist class and the general social conditions that create the class struggles of capital and labour have not been transformed.

Equally, the political forms of "mass organisation" under which social emancipation is initiated do not appear to have any necessary connection to the economic forms of production, especially as these are already interpreted as contradicting bourgeois class rule in "transitional capitalism". Consequently, the articulation of socialism upon the suppositions of a transitional mode of production does not establish the materialist bases of socialist transition which designate the hegemonic functions of the proletariat under the political organisation of Communist Parties. Rather, we see here that the constitution of the communist movement upon democracy abstracts from the traditional theoretical and political problems distinguished in the politics of "de-Stalinisation" in Chapter 4: those of the transformation of state monopoly capitalism into socialism; the definition of the relationship between reform and revolution; the constitution of socialist transition under parliamentary democratic systems; the organisation and spontaneity in the communist movement.

In addition, the theory of transition is led to express the perspective of a "socialism from above", based upon the economic and political structural transformations of state monopoly capitalism. This has given rise to the new concept of political power in the anti-monopolist stage of socialist transition which considers that the political power of bourgeois states is to be "transformed" rather than "destroyed"⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. The conversion of the Marxist-Leninist class theory of state-destruction into the new orthodoxy of the democratic utilisation of states is first undertaken by Togliatti's conceptualisation of socialist transition under a world polycentrism and political pluralism of republican democracies. Subsequently, the theory of state-destruction has been interpreted as a re-organisation of the state-apparatuses, to

"transform the forms of the division of labour between the repressive, political and ideological apparatuses; it is to revolutionise their methods of work and the bourgeois ideology that dominates their practices; it is to assure them new relations with the masses in reponse to mass initiatives, of the basis of a new proletarian ideology in order to prepare for the 'withering away of the state', that is, its replacement by mass organisations"⁽¹⁵⁰⁾.

However, this effectively limits the Marxist-Leninist theory of capitalist states to the theory of democratic state capitalism, and the political form of social emancipation to "democratic socialism".

Here we may identify a contradiction in the political organisation of the communist movement in the transition-period with the postulation of a proletarian class ideology and a vanguard role of the "working-class" on the basis of a "non-sectarian politics" with a republican ideology. It concerns the more general problem of creating a coherent theory and ideology of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties, when on the one hand they are defined as independent organisational instruments of the

proletarian class, and when on the other, they are engaged in the class-compromise politics of a common theoretical and ideological basis as Social-Democratic Parties. Moreover, the proposition of introducing socialism into capitalist society through the bourgeois state raises the problems and perspectives of establishing the political organisation of the labour movement under the Party-hegemony, when the process of social transition is defined through the economic and political structures of state monopoly capitalism.

In turn, the re-evaluation of the theory of the "destruction" (Zerstörung) of bourgeois states⁽¹⁵¹⁾ leads to the acceptance of the state economic planning praxis and the political forms of representative democratic power. While Varga claims that the "destruction" of states refers only to the "apparatus of coercion"⁽¹⁵²⁾, Herzog emphasises the class neutral connotation of the objective structures of state monopoly capitalism when he defines the state as a "technical instrument of great capitals"⁽¹⁵³⁾. The subsequent transformation of bourgeois states through the process of their "utilisation" is expressed in the democratisation of its non-repressive apparatuses:

"the actual destruction of the capitalist essence of state apparatuses signifies the democratisation of its mode of operation (Arbeitsweise) and management (Führung). The destruction of the nerve centres of bourgeois states through the acceptance of its management by the people (Volk) is the beginning of a transformation of state apparatuses whose capitalist essence must be destroyed"⁽¹⁵⁴⁾.

The principal conclusion to emerge from these considerations is that the political form of anti-monopolist strategies are derived from the "unified-mechanism" by which state monopoly capitalism is controlled under the political management and dispensation of bourgeois state

functions⁽¹⁵⁵⁾. Since the direct transfer of state functions between classes initiates the process of social emancipation, state monopoly capitalism is interpreted as possessing different class contents. Here, the class transformation of the form and functions of state monopoly capitalism is actualised in the political process of "democratisation" of state capitalism⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. Consequently, the transition from capitalism to socialism abandons the concept of socialist transformation through the revolutionary "collapse" of capitalism and "civil wars" in the "weak links" of the world imperialist chain of capitals for the peaceful transition to socialism through the "strong links" of democratic state capitalism⁽¹⁵⁷⁾.

The consequence of the acceptance of a democratic state capitalism and the capital structure of class relations is that the "vanguard" functions of Communist Parties⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ are engaged within the legitimation processes of bourgeois political systems. The theory and tactics of the non-sectarian politics of anti-monopolist strategies subsequently enter into direct relation with Social-Democratic Parties because anti-monopolist democracy is based upon a "democratic union" and "plurality of political parties"⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. This also expresses the problem of "organised capitalism" which interprets modern bourgeois states as "party-states"⁽¹⁶⁰⁾, and thereby attempts to control the mechanisms of state monopoly capitalism under a common basis of populist ideologies. As French Communist Party theorists argue, state monopoly capitalism is placed to the "service of the working-class, of the people and the nation",⁽¹⁶¹⁾ the "common interests of the people and the nation"⁽¹⁶²⁾.

In such conditions of contemporary Marxist-Leninist theory and tactics, Communist Parties are imbricated in the electoral politics of parliamentary democracies under the programmatic ideologies of "universal suffrage", "nation", "people", and the "democratisation of economy, politics and social-life"⁽¹⁶³⁾. It expresses the formal

attempt to establish the unification of the labour movement through parliamentary politics first occasioned by Chrushev at the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U.⁽¹⁶⁴⁾. However, this is particularly contentious when it is considered that class distinctions are obscured in parliamentary democracies. Since the political critique of state monopoly capitalism tends to be reduced to the failure to realise the formal relations of democratic republics⁽¹⁶⁵⁾, the redistribution of the political power of states is envisaged without confronting the "republican" character of communist ideology and theory⁽¹⁶⁶⁾. Here, the communist critique of republican democracy concerns less the ideology of the "people" than the class interests which they serve.

We may follow the rationale of this critique when it is argued that the "stage" of "advanced democracy signifies ... a regime which establishes the personal power and ... sovereignty of the people"⁽¹⁶⁷⁾, expressed by the "participation of workers and their representatives in the management of the affairs of society ... (which) ... constitutes the key problem of the struggle for socialism"⁽¹⁶⁸⁾. From this, the social-critique of the bourgeois political system also represents their proximate and compatible relationship to socialist democracy. Consequently, the democratic movement "proceeds from the principle that political transformations in the democratic sense cannot in the event eclipse or weaken the struggle for socialist revolution"⁽¹⁶⁹⁾, and that the "bourgeois parliamentary form gives the working-class a basis to organise for democratic and socialist aims"⁽¹⁷⁰⁾.

In the contemporary conditions of anti-monopolist strategies, the theoretical and ideological restructuring of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties corresponds to their formal acceptance of an intermediate stage of transition from capitalism to socialism. This formulates the revolutionary politics of Western European communist movement under the theory of "Socialism in One Country" and the form of social emancipation

through the accommodation of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties to the political structures of democratic republics. Here we have identified the proximate relationship of state monopoly capitalism in democratic anti-monopolist states to the transitional models of state organised capitalism, and the contradictory tendencies in the economic and political theory of state monopoly capitalism which follow from the "de-Stalinisation" of Marxism-Leninism. On the basis of the transformation of economy and political, the theory of anti-monopolist states represents a new concept of economic and political power in the transition from capitalism to socialism from which the theory and practice of democratic state capitalism opposes the traditional Marxist-Leninist concept of the class theory and practice of proletarian dictatorship.

This conceptualisation of social emancipation in an anti-monopolist stage of transition is based upon the economic and political assumptions of the monopoly domination of total social production processes and the class contradiction between the political domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie on the socialised production relations of transitional capitalism. Consequently, anti-monopolist strategies do not consider the full class character of state monopoly capitalism so that the theory is limited to a partial critique of the economic and political forms of bourgeois society upon which the alliance-politics of Communist Parties are constructed. From it, the theory examines the economic and political reproduction conditions of capitalist systems and the social class movement which functions for their socialist transformation from the structure of monopoly capitalism in distinction to the total social class relations of bourgeois society. In this respect, the formulation of anti-monopolist programmatic demands do not consider how the total social foundations of capitalist systems are transformed when the laws

of value still determine the anatomy of bourgeois society.

Since the social conditions of the class organisation of labour are given by the historically developed stage of the capitalist mode of production, the theory of state monopoly capitalism must examine how they confront capitalism and the reproduction of the social classes of capital and labour from the "natural forms" of capital reproduction. Therefore, it is not clear how the economic contents of "anti-monopolist states" are transformed under an "intermediate programme" by the subjugation of the "monopolies" to contradict the laws of the capitalist mode of production and express the general laws of transition from Western European capitalism to socialism.

The theory is equally faced with the problem of establishing the necessary and sufficient political conditions for the transformation of democratic into socialist revolutions, and the issues raised from the theorisation of an intermediate transitional stage within which the theory and politics of anti-monopolist strategies are constituted. Here we have noted the ambivalence of the functions of Communist Parties as essential proletarian class organisations in the conversion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, and the form and functions of state monopoly capitalism for the economic and political organisation of the social emancipation of the labour-movement. Further, we consider that these conclusions have a general applicability to the interpretations of state monopoly capitalism of both Western European Communist Parties and Soviet-bloc socialist states because, despite their differences, no fundamental dispute exists over the theory itself and the principal components with which it is formulated in: "anti-monopolist democracy"; "democratic state capitalism"; "alliance class politics"; the "politics of peaceful co-existence"; and the "peaceful transition to socialism".

CHAPTER 6REFERENCES

1. The general theory of state monopoly capitalism here forms a component of the concept of Eurocommunism which concerns not only the common culture and history of European capitalist societies but also a strategy of the European communist movement for a socialist Europe.
2. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 342, 130. See also B. Ponomarjow, 'Über einige Probleme der gegenwärtigen internationalen Arbeiterbewegung', MD, 2 (1972) 3-16. The distinction between "strategy" and "tactics" exists in the general Party-line for a "whole historical epoch" and the "political line for a relatively short period". See A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, pp. 402-3.
3. See: J. Moins, 'Demokratie und Sozialismus', MD, 2 (1972), 94-108 (p. 105); A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 567; L. Barca, 'Per lo sviluppo', (p. 62); A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 808; F. Muhri, "Sobre a contradicáo principal do capitalismo moderno", Seara Nova, 1553 (1975), 26-31 (p. 30); H. Jourdain, 'Le capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat'.
4. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, pp. 107-8, p. 124.
5. L. Maier, 'Dialektik der Anpassung', (p. 520).
6. A.K., Allgemeine Krise, pp. 44-5.
7. Here the revolutionary vanguard functions of world socialism enter the formation of an international anti-monopolist class strategy.
8. C. Schirmeister, 'Zum Monopol als Herrschaftsverhältnis-aktuelle Aspekte der Leninischen Analyse', MD, 7 (1971) 112-128 (p. 115).
9. P. Markowski, 'Die strategische', (p. 1235).
10. L. Maier, 'Lenins Imperialismus-Theorie', (p. 1246).
11. L. Kusminow, 'Die neue Etappe', (p. 51) (emphasis added).
12. S.L. Wygodski, 'Probleme des gegenwärtigen', (p. 452); see also P.T. Mania, De Lénine, pp. 175-6.
13. S.L. Wygodski, 'ibid.', (p. 450), (emphasis added).
14. P. Florin, 'Lenin und die friedliche', (p. 534); V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, p. 5, 444, 467.
15. See W. Paff, 'Fragen und Taktik des Kampfes der Arbeiterklasse gegen die Diktatur des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus' in Der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus, Edited by IMSF, pp. 39-52 (p. 43). Also see J. Kurzwell and A. Richmond, 'Staatsmonopolistischer Kapitalismus und anti-monopolistisches Bündnis', MD, 2 (1972), 109-121.
16. For example, see W. Ulbricht, Das Programme, p. 263.

17. See I. Sitzung des VI E.K.K.I. Plenums 25.5.26, cited in 'Zur Entwicklung', W. Petrowsky, (p. 152).
18. A.K., 'Imperialismus heute', (p.120); P. Boccara, Études, p. 57.
19. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 813; P. Herzog, 'Grundsätze und innerer Zusammenhang der Wirtschaftspolitik im Programm für eine demokratische Regierung der Volkseinheit', MD, 2 (1972) 30-56; E. Belinguer, 'Die gegenwärtige gesellschaftliche Situation in Italien und ihre Perspektiven', MD, 2 (1972) pp. 57-72 (p. 59); L. Barca, 'Per lo sviluppo', (pp. 62-3).
20. V. Tschepprakow, 'Ökonomische Probleme des antimonopolistischen Staates', MD, 2 (1972), 140-155 (p. 150). See also S. Carrillo, Eurocommunism and the State (London, 1974), p. 52, 13.
21. P. Boccara, 'Le capitalisme', (p. 14).
22. O. Reinhold, 'Die Widersprüche', (p. 877).
23. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 123, 144.
24. K-H. Röder, Klassenkampf und 'Staatsreform', p. 96.
25. A. Lemnitz, 'Lage Bewusstseinsentwicklung', (p. 1275).
26. P. Boccara, Études, p. 13, 283.
27. A. Lemnitz speaks of a "progressive democracy". See 'Die west-deutsche', (pp. 94-5).
28. J. Moins, 'Demokratie und Sozialismus', MD, 2 (1972), 94-108; H. Hesselbarth, 'Lenin und der Kampf um Demokratie und Sozialismus heute', MD, 2 (1972), 156-174.
29. O. Reinhold, 'Die Widersprüche', p. 883.
30. L. Barca, Conférence Internationale, EP (Choisy-Le-Roi, 1966), 13-16 (p. 13).
31. V. Tschepprakow, 'Ökonomische Probleme des antimonopolistischen Staates', SW, 3 (1971) 260-274 (p. 261); E. Belinguer, 'op. cit.', (p. 57); L. Barca, 'Per lo sviluppo', (p. 57,61).
32. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 267).
33. V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, pp. 123-4.
34. V. Tschepprakov, 'ibid.', pp. 16-7; C.A., Traité Marxiste d'Économie Politique. Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État (Paris, 1971), p. 811; P. Boccara, Études, p. 314.
35. See for example, E. Pletnew, 'Die Leninische', (p. 350); H. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität, p. 171; S. Wygodski, 'Die ökonomische Grundlage', (pp. 113-14).

36. This follows the communist prognosis on capitalism which sees state monopoly capitalism as the historical reality and foundation of socialism.
37. O. Reinhold, 'Die Widersprüche', (p. 877, 876), (emphasis added); A.K., 'Der Übergang von Kapitalismus zum Sozialismus. Der Entwicklung der Menschheit', Einheit, 11 (1961), 16-32 (p. 17).
38. J. Fabre, F. Hinker and L. Sève, Les Communistes et L'État (Paris, 1977), p. 161.
39. V. Tschepprakow, 'Ökonomische Probleme', (p. 264).
40. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 567.
41. For example, P. Boccara, Études, p. 23, 24.
42. E. Varga, Essais, p. 75; W. Fjodorow, 'Die staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus und einige Fragen des sozial-politischen Kampfes', in Der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus, (Frankfurt, 1973), pp. 138-142.
43. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 245; P. Boccara, Études, p. 36; E. Varga, Essais, p. 73, 76; V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, p. 460.
44. V. Tschepprakov, 'ibid.', p. 438.
45. H. Jourdain, 'Le capitalisme', (p. 219).
46. P. Boccara, Études, p. 124.
47. H. Jourdain, 'op. cit.', (p. 219).
48. V. Tschepprakow, 'Ökonomische Probleme', (p. 269).
49. F. Engels, 'Anti-Düring', MEW, 20, p. 260, 262, 264.
50. P. Herzog, 'Grundsätze', (p. 33); P. Boccara, Études, pp. 31-2.
51. F. Claudin, Eurocommunism and Socialism (London, 1977) p. 102, (emphasis added); V. Tschepprakow, 'op. cit.', (p. 262).
52. H. Jourdain, 'Le capitalisme', (p. 215); L. Maier, 'Zum Problem', (p. 257); J. Borko, 'Methodologische Fragen', (p. 1103).
53. V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, p. 466.
54. V. Tschepprakow, 'Ökonomische Probleme', (p. 261); G. Maurischat, 'Die wissenschaftliche-technische', (pp. 910-11).
55. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, pp. 564-5.
56. Compare with, Braunsdorff and L. Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, pp. 136-164; R. Gündel, 'ibid.', p. 6, 56.

57. A.K., Strukturveränderungen, p. 19. However, see G. Kohlmei, 'Karl Marx Aussenhandelstheorie und Probleme der aussenwirtschaftlichen Beziehungen zwischen sozialistischen Staaten', WW, 8 (1967), 1233-1259.
58. R. Gündel, Die Internationalisierung, p. 5.
59. H. Riedel, 'Die Beziehungen', (p. 2).
60. F. Thoraval, 'Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État et l'integration imperialiste', (Choisy-Le-Roi, 1966), (p. 176); P. Herzog, 'Nouveaux Développements de L'internationalisation du Capital', EP, (1971), 125-139 (p. 125); R. Gündel, 'op. cit.', p. 38.
61. H. Sonntag and R. Barthelmann, 'Zu speziellen Problemen der imperialistischen Integration', WZFSUJ, 12 (1963), 129-133.
62. See R. Gündel, 'op. cit.', p. 38.
63. S.L. Wygodski, 'Probleme', (p. 301).
64. L. Maier, 'Lenins Imperialismus-Theorie', (p. 1251).
65. A.K., Strukturveränderungen, p. 73. This substitutes for the cyclical laws of capitalism.
66. V. Tscheprow, 'Die Leninische Theorie von der ungleichmassigen', (p. 916)
67. See I. Lemin, 'Die ungleichmässige Entwicklung des Kapitalismus und die Verschärfung der Widersprüche zwischen den imperialistischen Ländern', SW, 7 (1966), 720-735 (p. 720).
68. A.K., Strukturveränderungen, p. 72, A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, pp. 509-10.
69. From this we can consider that the maturity of the materialist conditions of national socialist strategies are constituted in the world conditions of national state capitalisms in the totality of system relations of world capitalism and world socialism. The initial national socialist revolution in the Soviet Union is the first instance of a continual process of the revolutionary "collapse" and transition in world capitalism. See A.K., Grundlagen der marxistischen Philosophie, p. 530. However, in the "Second Stage of the General Crisis", the "transition of capitalism to socialism ... (is) ... not through a simultaneous "collapse" of capitalist systems in all countries but a fall of individual countries from this system". A.K., 'ibid.', pp. 531-2. This era confirms the non-simultaneity of world revolution and world "collapse" of capitals in which the "collapse" now develops under the impact of "system-competition". A corollary of this general proposition is that there is no automatic "collapse" of capitalism, A.K., Allgemeine Krise, p. 29; P. Heininger and P. Hess Die Aktualität, p. 171 but rather, the "epoch of the General Crisis is the epoch of the 'collapse' of capitalism and its dissolution through socialism, the epoch of socialist revolution and national freedom movements against imperialism". A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 303. This process confirms that world imperialism has lost its historical ascendancy A.K., Politische Ökonomie. Kapitalismus, p. 317, 326 for the world hegemony of socialism, and that world capitalism

(Continued ...)

69. (Continued)

enters an epoch of continuous decline to its consummating "total collapse". A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus, p. 339.

In distinction to the Comintern's concept of imminent world "collapse", the "General Crisis" and the existence of the world system of socialist states represents the actual "collapse" of capitalism as a world system. The transitional course of world capitalism is sustained conjointly by the dissolution of world capitalism as the hegemonic world system, and the transformation of international relations of domination in favour (Gunst) of the "absolute superiority" of world socialism. The socialist world system "increasingly determines the course of world history". A.K., 'ibid.', p. 521. The first instance of the world transition of capitals initiated by the October Revolution is the "turning-point" in world history, the "epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism". A.K., Grundlagen der marxistischen Philosophie, p. 529. Consequently, the post-war analysis of world capitalism acknowledges that the "epoch of the destruction (Absterbens) of capitalism is relatively long". V. Tschepprakow, 'Einige', (p. 426) and where both world systems exist "next to one another" (Nebenseinander) in a "world historical epoch of transition to socialism on the world scale". A.K., Grundlagen des marxistische, p. 532. The imminence of the "collapse" is replaced with the "growing weakness (Labilität) of total capitalist systems". See D. Klein, Labilität des heutigen, p. 5.

70. For the concept of "strong links" see A.D. Magaline, Lutte de classes, p.29.
71. This point can be seen from the theory of the creation of transitional economic bases in capitalist societies with the self-dissolution of capitalism. In particular, ICP theorist N. Badaloni distinguishes the "models" of revolution and reform in transitional capitalism. The one is for the direct revolutionary conditions of socialist strategy in Russia where the proletariat detain class power (Lenin) while the other, in Hilferding's analysis of finance capitalism, is concerned with the future objective conditions of revolution in different political conditions of Western European (Hilferding, Gramsci). See N. Badaloni, Pour le Communisme (Paris, 1976). The importance of Gramscian theory here is in the continuation of the examination of the political conditions of socialist revolution in the West and by the continuation of Leninist theory. See P. Togliatti, 'Il leninismo nel pensiero e nell'azione di A. Gramsci' in Studi Gramsci (Roma, 1973, first published in 1958). However, the voluntarism of communist theory is again expressed when Badaloni gives no critical distinction between the theories of "organised capitalism" and "finance-capitalism" but interprets the relationship politically in terms of different requirements of class struggle.
72. V. Tschepprakow, "Ökonomische Probleme",
73. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 140); W. Paff, 'Fragen der Strategie', (p. 41).
74. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 142). See also 'Le Front Populaire 1936 et L'Unité Aujourd'hui', Cahiers du Communisme, 9 (1966).

75. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 559.
76. Compare with K-H. Röder, Klassenkampf und "Staatsreform", p. 51.
77. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus-Leninismus, p. 295.
78. See E. Varga, 'Die Perspektive der Entwicklung', (p. 80). This concept has been shown to be fundamental to the Comintern's theory of the political forms of class power in capitalist society.
79. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 565.
80. A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus-Leninismus, p. 296.
81. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, pp. 545-6, (emphasis added).
82. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 205. See also J. Bischoff, 'Zu einigen Grundfragen revolutionäre Taktik', SP, 14-5 (1971), 103-143 (p. 139).
83. P. Heininger and P. Hess, Die Aktualität p. 35.
84. J. Klugmann, 'Die Revolutionären Vorstellung von Marx und ihre gegenwärtige Revolte', MD, 2 (1972), 73-93.
85. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 782.
86. See: A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 319, 781; A.K., Allgemeine Krise, p. 7.
87. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 94.
88. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 182.
89. C. Schirmeister, 'Zum Monopol', (p. 115).
90. D. Klein, 'Methodologische Probleme', (p. 212).
91. E. Varga, Essais, p. 62, 63.
92. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 460.
93. See C. Schirmeister, 'op. cit.', (p. 113).
94. V. Kelle and M. Kovalson, Le materialisme historique, p. 247.
95. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 208 (emphasis added).
96. V. Tschepprakow, 'Ökonomische Probleme', (p. 262).
97. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 262); A. Arsumanjan, 'Die neue Etappe', (p. 937).
98. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 618; P. Boccara, Études, p. 282.
99. A.K., Politische Ökonomie der heutigen, p. 784 (emphasis added).
100. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 563, 584, 562.

101. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 564.
102. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 810, 784, 795.
103. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 564 (emphasis added).
104. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 564 (emphasis added).
105. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 560, pp. 566-7; A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 809.
106. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 555, 567.
107. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 622, 626.
108. P. Herzog, 'Die Funktion', (p. 28).
109. K-H. Röder, Klassenkampf und "Staatsreform", p. 96.
110. For example see B. Rettig, 'Der Wert des "Sozialstaats" und "sozialen Rechts" für die Arbeiterklasse', in Wert und Recht, (1979); P. Hess, 'Wider den imperialistischen Ökonomismus', Facit, 35 (1974), 5-21 (p. 17).
111. P. Hess, 'Wider den imperialistischen', (p. 17).
112. P. Hess, 'Das Finanzkapital', (p. 1679).
113. P. Hess, 'ibid.', (p. 1680).
114. L. Maier, 'Zu einigen Fragen', (pp. 35-7).
115. K-H. Röder, Klassenkampf und "Staatsreform", p. 27; M. Schmidt, 'Zur Entwicklung', (p. 56).
116. E. Felfe, 'Zur Kritik der "Wohlfahrtsstaatstheorie"', MD, 17 (1974), 72-88 (p. 76).
117. E. Felfe, 'ibid', (p. 73).
118. E. Felfe, 'ibid.', (p. 73).
119. See V.N. Pospelova, 'Sergej Iwanowitsch Tjulpanow: Mensch und Werk', WZKMUL, 4 (1976), 309-337 (p. 327).
120. See: A.K., Allgemeine, p. 17 (emphasis added): "bourgeois freedoms are transcended and in a number of countries, fascist tyranny established; the politics and ideology of the bourgeoisie pass through a deep crisis"; P. Herzog, 'Die Funktion', (p. 19); A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 782; B. Ponomarjow, 'Über einige Probleme', (p. 99).
121. See for example, D. Klein, Labilität, p. 11, 13; D. Klein, 'Methodologische Probleme', p. 213, 210.
122. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, pp. 518-9. Here, questions of "class consciousness" are connected to the international relations of the "General Crisis".

123. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 542. Markowski argues that "state monopoly capitalism has produced an entire system of regulations and planning mechanisms for the management (Lenkung) of inner social-processes and the suppression and manipulation of the masses (Manipulierung der Massen)", 'Die Strategische Konzeption', (p. 1237).
124. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 506. Although, this does not consider the more general and important contributions to the theory of ideology. See: L. Althusser, 'Ideology and Ideological state apparatuses' in Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays (London, 1971); C. Buci-Glucksmann, Gramsci et L'État (Paris, 1975).
125. A.K., 'ibid.', pp. 520-34, p. 503, 506.
126. A.K., Allgemeine, p. 43.
127. See A. Lemnitz, 'Lage Bewusstseinsentwicklung'.
128. V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, p. 455.
129. See: A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 350; B. Ponamajow cited in D. Klein, 'Methodologische Probleme', (p. 213).
130. See for this term: J. Kurzweil and A. Richmond, 'Staatsmonopolistischer Kapitalismus und antimonopolistisches Bündnis', MD, 2 (1972), 109-121; V. Tschepprakov, Le capitalisme, pp. 452-3.
131. V. Tschepprakow, 'Ökonomische Probleme', (p. 262).
132. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 262).
133. A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen, p. 810.
134. A.K., 'ibid.', p. 810.
135. See here D. Grisoni on the reception of Gramscian theory in Western Communist Parties in 'Propositions pour une presentation', Pour le communisme, N. Badaloni.
136. See K. Marx and F. Engels, 'Die deutschen Ideologie' in MEW, 3: "bourgeois society (bürgerlichen Gesellschaft) is the true foundation (Hard) and show-place of all history".
137. See: S. Carrillo, Eurocommunism, p. 154; J. Fabre, 'et. al.', Les Communistes, p. 145.
138. See: H. Hesselbarth, 'op. cit.', pp. 157-164); V. Tschepprakow, 'op. cit.', MD, p. 140, 142.
139. V.I. Lenin cited by S. Carrillo in Eurocommunism, p. 154. However, L. Sève contends that the revolutionary political form of class power under which a peaceful transition to socialism is probable requires historical specification in the contemporary conditions of capitalism. 'Le XXII Congrès, développement léniniste de la stratégie de révolution pacifique', in Cahiers du Communisme, 6 (1976), 48-68 (p. 66).

140. L. Althusser, 'On the Twenty Second Congress of the French Communist Party', New Left Review, 104 (1977), 3-22 (p. 16).
141. V. Tschepprakow, 'Ökonomische Probleme', (p. 261); J. Fabre, 'et. al.', 'op. cit.', p. 160.
142. V. Tschepprakow, 'ibid.', (p. 460).
143. G. Haddad, 'A propos de la dictature du proletariat', in Sur la Dictature du Proletariat (Paris, 1976) pp. 169-170 (p. 169).
144. G. Haddad, 'ibid.', (p. 170).
145. L. Althusser, 'op. cit.', (p. 7).
146. L. Althusser, 'ibid.', (p. 10).
147. L. Althusser, 'ibid.', (p. 10).
148. L. Althusser, 'ibid.', (p. 15).
149. J. Fabre 'et. al.', Les Communistes, pp. 147-9. Togliatti introduces this concept into the post-war period.
150. J. Fabre 'et. al.', 'ibid.', (p. 17).
151. K-H. Röder, Klassenkampf und "Staatsreform", p. 97; J. Moins, 'Demokratie', (p. 104).
152. E. Varga, Essais, p. 149.
153. P. Herzog, 'Die Funktion', (p. 7).
154. P. Herzog, 'op. cit.', (p. 29), (emphasis added); P. Boccara, Études, p. 31. However, compare with C. Berger, 'Faut-il détruire l'État'.
155. V. Tschepprakov employs this concept of state monopoly capitalism. Le capitalisme, p. 460.
156. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p. 567.
157. P. Boccara, Études, p. 282; V. Tschepprakow, 'Ökonomische Probleme', (p. 261); K. Zieschang, 'Ursachen und Wesen', (p. 238).
158. Consider J. Fabre 'et. al.', 'op. cit.', p. 158.
159. See Manifeste du PCF pour une démocratie avancer pour une France socialiste (Paris), p. 87; P. Markowski, 'op. cit.', (p. 1241) states that "the fundamental element of an anti-monoplist United-Front remains the unity of the labour movement whose principal path (Hauptweg) accepts the 'action unity' between the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties". See also G. Marchais, 'Le Socialisme pour la France', 22^e Congres du P.C.F., Cahiers du Communisme, 2-3 (1976), 12-72.

160. Togliatti expresses this evaluation when he argues that the "parliament which in the past served to organise and consolidate the capitalist regime may today become an effective means in the hands of parties which strive for socialist transformation of society". Cited in Oppose Modern Revisionism (Tirana, 1964), p. 124.
161. C.A., Traité Marxiste, Tome II, p. 432.
162. J. Fabre, 'et. al.', Les Communistes, p. 155, 160.
163. G. Marchais, 'Pour faire avancer la démocratie jusqu'au socialisme' in Sur la Dictature, pp. 193-206 (p. 196).
164. A.K., Politische Ökonomie, p. 481.
165. See R. Garaudy, Pour un modèle français du socialisme (Paris, 1968) p. 112, 321.
166. J. Fabre 'et. al.', Les Communistes, p. 163.
167. See G. Marchais, XXIV Congrès PCF (Paris, 1968).
168. G. Marchais, 'ibid.', p. 196; F. Fabre 'et. al.', 'op. cit.', p. 162.
169. V. Tschepakov, Le capitalisme, p. 449.
170. M. Schmidt, 'Zur Entwicklung', (p. 155).

CHAPTER 7AN EVALUATION OF THE THEORY OF STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

In this Chapter we will critically examine the central theoretical issues which have been identified in the theory of state monopoly capitalism. The problems and perspectives they raise for Marxist theory will be assessed with particular reference to the analysis of economics, and state and class strategies.

7.1 Theoretical issues of economy

Here we will consider the principal categories associated with the theory of monopoly capitalism and their significance for the laws of value. The major theme of this discussion relates to the monopoly-periodisation of capitalism and its importance for the analysis of the developmental and "collapse"-features of capitalist society, the premises of which are located in Lenin's examination of capitalism and its subsequent theoretical development in Marxism-Leninism.

Free competition capitalism

The primary conclusion to emerge from Lenin's concept of "free competition capitalism" is that the analysis of political economy and the labour theory of value does not establish why social-labour develops in the mystified forms of commodity, money and capital. We will examine the importance of this conclusion for the conceptualisation of the class character and capital quality of social production relations.

From Lenin's methodological and theoretical analysis of capitalism based upon the reproduction schemata, the economic form of capitalist production processes ceases to express the material and value relations of capitalist commodity production. Thereupon, the full "capital constitution" of social reproduction is not derived from the value-form of labour in private capitalist commodity exchanges of labour products. Significantly,

it is precisely the specificity of the double character of labour in the value-form which distinguishes the Marxist critique of political economy from classical political economy, and determines the "specific socio-economic form of the production and reproduction process"⁽¹⁾.

Here we have examined the economic forms of social production as forms of social labour contained in the dialectical representation of the abstract-general categories of capital-logic to concrete-historical relations. These methodological and theoretical presuppositions of the historical movement of capitals are developed from the commodity as the most elemental category and "cell-form" (Zellform) of social production from which the subsequent system-representation of the anatomy of bourgeois society and the developed forms of capital are structured.

While the common requirement of all social production processes is the division of the total social labour fund between individual production branches for the generation of a total social surplus, the distinguishing feature of all social production processes is the "specific economic form in which this unpaid surplus labour is pumped out of the direct producers"⁽²⁾. This necessity is not transcended⁽³⁾ in different social production forms⁽⁴⁾, for whatever the character of labour processes, "labour contains a social form"⁽⁵⁾. However, since Lenin's model of "free competition capitalism" has not established this specific economic form-determination of capitalist production, the logical representation of the economic structure of production relations and the historical organisation of the material labour processes loses its structural unity under the laws of value.

Rather, the specificity of the commodity value-form is expressed quantitatively through the concrete labour process - the relation of the means of production (constant capital) to living-labour (variable capital) which combines to produce "use-values through useful labour"⁽⁶⁾;

and qualitatively in its general social form"⁽⁷⁾ (vergegenständlichter Arbeit in ihrer allgemeinen gesellschaftlichen Form) - the manner in which labour and the means of production are unified "distinguishes different epochs of the economic structure of society"⁽⁸⁾. Conjointly, the "quantitative determination of exchange-value is equal to a definite quantity of labour-time", while the qualitative relation develops individual labour as "abstract general social labour ... through its alienation"⁽⁹⁾. Duly, the reproduction of social relations under the general equivalents of commodity exchanges is the adequate mode of expression of the social character of labour wherein the use-value of concrete labour appears in its phenomenal-form of abstract human labour.

In the system of the critique of political economy, the examination of the real constitution of capitalist economic production-forms takes the value-form of labour: "the value of the labour product is the most abstract, but also the most general form of the bourgeois mode of production"⁽¹⁰⁾ which characterises the commodity-form in the production and exchange of the social product⁽¹¹⁾. When capital is the dominant social production relation, these relationships of the commodity-form of production are reproduced as the foundation of its own movement under the "self-valuation of capital" (selbstverwertung des Kapitals): "capital and its self-valuation as ... (the) ... starting-point (Ausgangspunkt) and the end-point (Endpunkt), as motive and purpose (Zweck) of production"⁽¹²⁾.

Here the general condition for the valuation of capitals requires that the exchange-value of labour-power be less than the cost of its specific use-value⁽¹³⁾. In surplus-value production, the value of labour-power and the value it creates in the labour process must be quantitatively unequal magnitudes⁽¹⁴⁾, in so far as it produces surplus-value⁽¹⁵⁾ and subordinates social production to this purpose⁽¹⁶⁾.

However, the inner-connection of the substance of capitalist production processes to their socio-economic form relates labour-power, as the "substance and imminent measure of value"⁽¹⁷⁾, to the determination of its commodity value by the quantity of labour-times expended in its production⁽¹⁸⁾, and this is regulated by the "average necessary or socially necessary labour-time"⁽¹⁹⁾ both in individual commodities and total production branches⁽²⁰⁾. Consequently from these schematic considerations, the laws of value regulate individual and total production branches from which the conditions of commodity production within the respective production branches are equalised to the social average, and the division of the total labour fund between production branches conforms to the requirements of capital accumulation. This mode of the regulation of total social production is accomplished by the circulation of commodities inside and between individual branches of production⁽²¹⁾.

From the quantitative and qualitative determinations of capital, we note a crucial distinction in the examination of the socialisation processes of capitalist production compared with Lenin's analysis. This has not given a sufficiently capital-theoretical analysis of the forms of capitalist "co-operation" in the total social division of labour. While the capitalist mode of production transforms the labour process into a social process, it nevertheless remains a "social form of labour processes as a method used by capital for raising its production powers through profitable exploitation"⁽²²⁾. The double-form of capitalist commodity production which we have examined creates an inherent contradiction in the commodity, which determines the "imminent opposition of the use-value and exchange-value, of private labour from particular concrete labour ... (which) ... must be equally represented as directly social labour ... (and) ... made valid (gilt)

only as abstract general labour"⁽²³⁾. Conversely, Lenin's model of capital accumulation denudes "socialisations" of this primary contradictory character contained in the continual necessity for capitals to exchange in commodity-form on the market⁽²⁴⁾.

In the commodity-form of exchange, the "capacities of labour" (Arbeitsvermogen) and the material elements of production are only developed in the unity of labour and value-processes for the production of "social needs" (gesellschaftliches Bedürfnis) under the valuation of capitals⁽²⁵⁾. However, these form-determined social production relations are conditional upon the separation of labour from the means of production and its proletarianisation in capitalist production processes. Thus, the "socialisation" of production does not contradict the capital-quality of social production relations, nor the ideological forms of consciousness of the social production-agents which they produce under general commodity fetishism. Rather, these "inverted appearance-forms" which the structure of social production relations assume conceals the objective character of the social product which confronts labour in its material capitalised form as both the "forms of socially developed labour" and the "forms of the development of capital"⁽²⁶⁾.

This important consideration leads the critique of political economy to examine the forms of class consciousness under the general concept of capital, through the inner-connections and specific "form-determinations" (Formbestimmungen) of labour in the external objectification of the fetishised forms of social production relations. Whereupon, the "products of labour become commodities ... (and) ... transcendental or social things"⁽²⁷⁾ under the money-form⁽²⁸⁾. Although Lenin's analysis acknowledges that "money masks, conceals the social character of individual labour ... (and) ... the social link between individual

products united on the market"⁽²⁹⁾, the examination of the value-form of the commodity precludes the apprehension of the double-form⁽³⁰⁾ of the commodity as commodity and money⁽³¹⁾.

From these preliminary considerations of the labour theory of value which underpin the critique of the theory of "free competition capitalism" and the process of its transformation into the "monopoly capitalism", we conclude that Lenin's categories have not established the materialist theory of commodity-fetishism from the historically specific character of capitalist production relations and the manner by which the total social reproduction conditions of bourgeois economy confront labour as a class relation of domination under the "self-valuation of capitals" (selbstverwertung des Kapitals).

The mystification of the commodity-form, as the natural form of labour products, conceals the fact that the social product already contains the "totality of circulation relations through which the product must pass ... wherein it receives its specific social character"⁽³²⁾, and we may add, mediates the specific mode of class domination in capitalist society through the totality of commodity-exchanges. The analysis of this class form of domination is conducted upon the system-critique of capitalist society through the capital-theoretical category of social-labour. It expresses the "capital-constitution" of social production relations in the value-form of private commodity exchanges, as a relationship which presupposes the separation of the direct producers from the material means of existence in the logically and historically most developed forms of commodity production. Since the reproduction of total social production through the automaticity of capitalist commodity exchanges in the general laws of capital accumulation contains the relations of "domination and servitude"

(Herrschafts-und Knechtschaftsverhältnisse), the value-form extends beyond a purely "economic" analysis of the structure of capitalist society to the class analysis of social production relations. While Lenin's analysis has interpreted the relations of "domination and servitude" in all class societies, the partial-analysis of the value-form does not establish their specific historical form in the capitalist mode of production.

Monopoly capitalism

The significance of these conclusions are related to Lenin's analysis of the transformation of the characteristic structure of "free competition capitalism" and the class relations of capitalist systems under the genesis of the monopoly-form of capital. The explanatory basis upon which the new conceptualisation of capitalism is expressed, inheres in: the new laws of capitalist anarchy; the disproportionalities of economic and political development in the imperialist epoch; and the initiation of a historically "transitional capitalism". Under the impact of the First World War and the Comintern's political assumptions of impending proletarian revolution in the world communist movement, monopoly capitalism is progressively characterised by the crisis-features of the "collapse" theory of capitals; imperialist war capitalism; the concept of imperialist rentier states on the world market; and the "immiseration" (Verelendungs) of the proletariat as the mechanism by which proletarian class consciousness is formed as a historical moment in the accumulation of capital.

The most dogmatic reception of this characterisation of capitalist systems coincides with Stalin's doctrinaire construction of Marxism-Leninism and its "creative further-development" (schöpferische Weiterentwicklung) under the "General Crisis of Capitalism" and the analysis of fascism. Moreover, even after 1945, the central proposition

of the intractable crisis-nature of capitalist systems is still maintained, and given clearest expression in the "Second stage of the General Crisis" with the contention that monopoly capitalism can only be reproduced through monopoly "maximum profits" under the social mechanisms of economic power and political repression.

Conversely, we have argued that the "self-valuation of capitals" (selbstverwertung des Kapitals) remains the governing principle by which the economic structure of capitalist society is reproduced under the logical and historical relations of capital. From this proposition, we may make a preliminary contrast between the theoretical components of Marx's analysis of the economic mechanism of profit with those expressed in Stalin's concept of monopoly capitalism. While the more extensive implications of this distinction will be examined subsequently, it is sufficient for our purposes to assess the characterisation of the permanent crisis-conditions of monopoly capitalism from the proposition of a unilateral rise in the total social organic composition of capitalism upon which a "maximum monopoly profit" is the necessary form of the reproduction of monopoly capitalism.

For Marx, the analytical "representation" of a general profit-rate formation in Das Kapital is only a "theoretical average" of a tendentially real process in the quantitative and qualitative relations of capital. This is neither a definitive theoretical "model" of the capitalist mode of production nor a normal historical form of capitalism, but establishes the theoretical basis of "capital in general" whereupon the possibility of "extra-profits" are derived from the economic mechanism by which the qualitative inequalities of individual capital valuation are realised through the reconversion of money capital into the accumulation processes of capital. Their actuality in historical relations of capital accumulation does not contradict the general concept of capital but

only becomes contentious when formulated as permanent attributes of the "monopolies" under the terminal crisis-nature of monopoly capitalism.

Here we suggest that while the cyclical crises of capital over-accumulation engender a fall in the general profit-rate, this disruption to the circuit of expanded capital reproduction (M-C-M¹) is not necessarily conceived of as a permanent incursion into the total social reproduction cycle of capital through an absolute historical limit to the valuation of capital at average profit rates on total social capital, but rather a periodic measure within the general laws of the cyclical crises of capital accumulation. Consequently, the rise in the total social organic composition of capital which expresses the fall in the general profit-rate is not a unilateral law of monopoly capitalism but - as we will argue when discussing the theory of "over-accumulation devaluation of capital" - a contradictory law of capital accumulation which embraces "counter-tendencies". Therefore we conclude that from the "pure-form" representation of the general laws of the average total social organic composition of capitals it is indeterminate as to whether capitalism has exhausted its historical function for social accumulation processes. That the "dogmatic" theory of monopoly capitalism should interpret it as such under the "collapse" is a problem generated by the political assumptions of Marxism-Leninism which Marxist-Leninists only later attempt to theoretically resolve in the de-Stalinisation-period.

Moreover, the importance of identifying the fetishised forms of capital as forms of social labour signifies that the reproduction of the total social capital formation is contingent upon the reproduction of the social classes of capitalists and wage-labourers. How this is historically accomplished cannot be generalised under the economic and political crisis-characteristics of the "model" of monopoly capitalist

systems, but depends upon the categorical unfolding of the general laws of capital accumulation in class struggles and the manner in which class contradictions are resolved by the political system.

We thereby consider that the analysis of the economic mechanism of monopoly capitalism is implausible, for while capitals may receive "extra-profits" - even as the general profit-rate falls from an expansion of total social capital at a faster rate than the levels of realisable surplus-value - all individual capitals, as capitals, must qualitatively participate in the produced total social surplus-value as a necessary moment of their reproduction. However, the specific relation of individual capitals to total social capital is, apriori, undefined because the necessary "form of existence" (Existenzform) of capital is as individual capital, and the general laws of capital are only accomplished "behind the backs of producers" (hinter dem Rücken von Produzenten) in the mystified forms of capital competition through which the mechanism of total social production functions. This signifies that it is a logical impossibility in the capitalist mode of production for monopoly capital to be reproduced exclusively from the monopolies' conscious "aim" and realisation of a "maximum profit". Taken literally, this would replace the value-regulation of the capitalist mode of production with the expropriation of total social profit by the monopoly bourgeoisie. Rather, the reproduction of individual capital through the individual capitalist's struggle for profits remains in the structural determination of competition as the total social connection of capitals under the formation of a general rate of profit.

Moreover, as capitalism and its general laws have not reached an ultimate monopoly crisis-stage, the new "open" form of class domination that emanates from the reproduction of capitals through monopoly "maximum profits" is an unwarranted premise upon which the

analysis of capitalist society is conducted. The subsequent generalisation of the economic and political crisis-features of capitalist societies through the reproduction of monopoly capitals under repressive systems of "state monopoly war capitalism" and the "fascisation" of Western European capitalist societies we interpret as a dogmatic analysis of capitalism after 1945.

An important result of the foregoing analysis is expressed with the inability of Marxist-Leninist theorists to anticipate the post-war reconstruction of Western European capitalist economies and the stabilisation of their political systems. This conclusion can be illustrated by reference to the retention of the "miseration" theory as a central component in the critique of capitalism and the mechanism of revolutionary class consciousness formation in the Communist Party programme of the Stalinist period⁽³³⁾.

The crisis-features of this theory are developed from the disproportionalities of total social production from the constraints to the expansion of production powers on national and world markets under the laws of uneven development of capitals and the "General Crisis of Capitalism". However, consideration to the "miseration" theory should be given with regard to the national accumulation conditions of relative surplus value production of the total social product in commodity-form. With this we see that the analysis of monopoly capitals does not theoretically connect the necessity to extend markets from the inner-transformation of the social conditions of capital accumulation. Here, the realisation of commodity value develops from the "specific forms of the reproduction process"⁽³⁴⁾. These do not affect the magnitude of total social commodity value even though its realisation reduces the consumption-powers of labour to a historical minimum in capitalism⁽³⁵⁾, because the physical subsistence level and normal social element of the commodity-value of labour-power

is only a quantitative determination. Thus, an increase in the real-wage does not contradict the laws of value but rather is established in the cyclical valuation of capitals which contain the value of labour-power in the average social conditions of total production.

Consequently, the absolute "immiseration-hypothesis" does not express a permanent disproportionality of the total social means of production and the means of consumption derived from the inability to capitalistically expand social wealth in commodity-form. This is an insufficient explanation of the experiential relation which unifies the class of labour through the destruction of commodity fetishism on the one hand, while on the other, creates its disunity through an "over-consumptionism" of a "labour aristocracy" paid out of monopoly profits and "tributes". Conversely, a new phase of capital expansion such as that subsequently examined in the laws of state monopoly capitalism demonstrates that the "immiseration" of labour is a "relative" condition in capital accumulation. In turn however, this also necessitates the formulation of new criteria for the critique of capitalism and the class theory of revolution.

Moreover, since market fluctuations are not constitutive relations in the value relations of capital production, the augmentation of "consumption goods" entering the reproduction wage of labour is not the result of market expansion, as its contraction is not the cause of capital crises, but the transformation of the social conditions of labour in the accumulation process of relative surplus value production⁽³⁶⁾.

Equally, the crisis of the uneven economic and political development of capitals on the world market does not abolish the cyclical laws of total accumulation processes and the derivation of a world market from the general laws of capital. In turn, the world conditions of the

general crisis of capitalism are not synonymous with the inevitability of imperialist wars and the characteristics of the militarisation of monopoly capitalist economies as permanent and irresoluble features of capitalism.

In distinction to what we have termed the "dogmatic" concept of monopoly capitalism, Marx's analysis of the capitalist mode of production is not a theory of the natural laws of capitalism but a theoretical representation of the general laws of capitalist commodity production. As Marx states, "the nature of capital remains the same in its underdeveloped and developed forms"⁽³⁷⁾. Conversely, the dogmatic model of monopoly capitalism continues the analysis of capital accumulation exclusively under the crisis-characteristics of capitalism, while the methodological and theoretical premises of its capital-analysis interprets conceptual elements of total social theory of capitalist development as representing a prognosis on the historical development of capitalist relations of accumulation in Western European societies.

In distinction to the traditional concept of monopoly capitalism, the contemporary theorists of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties reformulate the analysis of capitalism within the general reconstruction of Marxism-Leninism after the initial period of the "de-Stalinisation" of communism. This is undertaken with the re-examination of Lenin's theory of monopoly capitalism and the social-theoretical pertinence of the monopoly-category in the critique of political economy.

The issues raised in the post-Stalinist analysis may be considered under several principal features: the monopoly is substituted for the general concept of capital and the valuation-problematic⁽³⁸⁾; the monopoly-negation of competition transcends the general laws of capitalism⁽³⁹⁾; the general theory of capitals introduces a "stage"-theory of capitalism⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Here, Hess follows Lenin's analysis of market-capitalism and argues that monopoly-theory can only be understood on the basis of the objective conditions of profit-production which characterise capitalism in all its stages of development⁽⁴¹⁾. This suggests that the "inner-nature" and "aim" of capitalism is profit-production, if not the more extreme concept of "maximum monopoly profits"⁽⁴²⁾. However, such a "starting-point" for the analysis of capitalism is questionable because we have contested the propositions: that the monopoly constitutes a structural component in the critique of political economy from which the theoretical reconstruction of contemporary monopoly capitalism is undertaken; and that the general capitalist "form-determinations" of total social reproduction processes are historically transformed under the monopoly-structure of capitalist accumulation. As a result, a central problem to emerge in Marxist-Leninist analysis which we have identified is the designation of "profit-theory" as the theoretical and methodological foundation for the examination of capitalism. This analytical procedure incompletely establishes the critique of political economy through the theoretical reproduction of the economic structure of bourgeois society in the dialectical methodology of the abstract-concrete movement of capital categories to the historical forms of capitalist production processes. Rather, because the laws of value are not identical with the laws of profit, "profit production" is not the differentia specifica of capital⁽⁴³⁾. To consider them as such is to confuse juridical property relations with relations of exploitation, and the requirements of profit-production in the appropriation-relations of capitalist circulation processes with the value-problematic of capital⁽⁴⁴⁾. In distinction to these tendencies in monopoly-theory, Marx examines the general form-determination of capitalist commodity production from which the capitalist mechanism of surplus-value appropriation is reproduced as

a structural invariant of the capitalist mode of production. The juridical forms of capitalist property are not synonymous with the form of capitalist economic appropriation because they relate to the realisation-conditions of capital, and thereby the profit-striving of individual capitals in competition rather than a structural transformation of capitalism.

Conversely, for Hess, a monopoly-stage of capitalist appropriation not only transforms the realisation-conditions of capitalist profit-production but also has the connotation of a dissolution of capitalism in "joint-stock capital". This follows from the evaluation that Marx's concept of competition is both a logical and historical category⁽⁴⁵⁾. Since "free competition" is the most "adequate-form" of capital⁽⁴⁶⁾, an historical contradiction is subsequently created between the general concept of capital and the monopoly-form of competition⁽⁴⁷⁾. This suggests that with the dissolution of the "logic of capital"⁽⁴⁸⁾, the "form-transformation" of free competition - as the executor of the inner-laws of capitalism - in monopoly competition not only "modifies" the "modes of accomplishment", but contradicts the general laws of capitalism⁽⁴⁹⁾. For Hess, it is expressed by the conceptualisation of political power in the logical structure of capital under which monopoly-competition now executes economic laws⁽⁵⁰⁾. Consequently, we see that the concept of the historical dissolution of capitalism introduced into Marxism by Lenin's analysis of monopoly capitalism is still evident in the categories of the contemporary theory of monopoly capitalism.

Conversely, as a general proposition we hold that the "modes of accomplishment" of capitalist relations of competition express, but do not contradict the general laws of the capitalist mode of production⁽⁵¹⁾:

"conceptually, competition is nothing other than the inner nature of capitals (innre Natur des Kapitals), its essential determination appears

and is realised as the reciprocal exchange of the many capitals (vielen Kapitalien) amongst one another, the inner tendency as external necessity"⁽⁵²⁾. While Marx has argued that "competition historically appears as the negation of capital, proceeding beyond the characteristic boundaries and limits of the stages of production (Produktionsstufen)"⁽⁵³⁾, he also has stated that "competition is far from being merely this negation. Free competition is the relation (Beziehung) of capital to itself (auf sich selbst) as another capital, that is, the real content (Verhalten) of capital as capital"⁽⁵⁴⁾. In this respect, "free competition is ... the adequate form (adequate Form) of the production processes of capital"⁽⁵⁵⁾, while the "power of capital is the foundation of free competition"⁽⁵⁶⁾.

Although Marxist-Leninist theorists have also employed these citations from Marx, the interpretation of the general concept of capital limits its socio-theoretical validity to the epoch of "free competition capitalism" and leads the new general structure of monopoly capitalism into an historical contradiction with the logical presuppositions of the capitalist mode of production. Rather we conclude that the concept of "free competition" - as the most "adequate form" of the accomplishment of capital - is another expression for the level of theoretical abstraction in which the "pure movement of capitals" is conceptualised as the foundation for the "concretisation" of the categories of the general concept of capital.

There are two principal concepts of competition to be distinguished here in the theoretical analysis of Das Kapital for the purposes of our discussion⁽⁵⁷⁾. The first is a theoretical abstraction with which to represent the "inner nature of capital" independently from the historical limitations to the free movement of capitals⁽⁵⁸⁾. The second concerns the further "concretisation" of capital categories in the "abstract representation" (abstrakt Darstellung) of market values⁽⁵⁹⁾, but this

still does not express the real movements of capital in bourgeois society. Rather, these are both preliminary theoretical categories undertaken within the capital-methodology and system of "analytical abstractions" from which the historical form-determined relations of capital circulation are characterised. Here there are four features of competition connected to the inner dynamics of capital accumulation: competition - inside a production branch; between production branches; between independent forms of capital; and between capitals on the world market.

The concept of competition

Having argued that "modes of accomplishment" express the general laws of capital, we will now consider the functional determination of competition in the capitalist mode of production. This continues the evaluation of Lenin's model of "free competition capitalism" and the category of the "monopoly" in the critique of political economy.

From the foregoing discussion, we see that the "pure-forms" of the structure of capitalist production relations are not historically connected forms of total social production processes but "ideal averages" of "eternal fluctuations"⁽⁶⁰⁾. These real economic connections exist in the forms of competition which develop from the general structure of capital accumulation. In this respect, capital reproduces in competition the conditions of its production processes and consequently the form of social reproduction relations⁽⁶¹⁾. Here the realisation-process in the real development of capitals is the product of transcending the limits and "frictions" (Friktionen)⁽⁶²⁾ to the general reproduction of total social capital in the mechanism of capitalist competition.

In contradistinction, for the theorists of monopoly capitalism, these "limitations" and "frictions" to the free movement of capital establish the "negation of a series of fundamental characteristics of capitals"⁽⁶³⁾. The perception of these new features of capitalism subsequently replaces the theoretical and methodological primacy of the

value-form of the commodity as the "cell-form" (Zellform) of the economic relations of bourgeois society in the contemporary theory of monopoly capitalism. The permanence of this new structure of capitalism in a periodisation of capitalism through "monopolies" and/or the state contradicts the laws of capital accumulation and the formation of a general profit rate since it submits the social accumulation process to the primacy of circulation relations. With this, the tendency is for the monopoly-form of competition to determine profit-rates when in fact the "profit rate ... regulates competition"⁽⁶⁴⁾. Consequently, the representation of the inner-unity of production and circulation relations does not adequately connect the "appearance-forms" of capital to the internal dynamics of the capitalist mode of production based upon the commodity-form of labour. As a result, the "monopoly" is invested with the power to circumvent the exchange of commodities to production prices and the distribution of the total labour fund through the formation of a general profit-rate.

The premises of this problematical analysis have already been anticipated when Marx states that it "appears that the theory of value is here incompatible with the real appearance of production, and generally thereupon, must be renounced if the latter are to be conceived"⁽⁶⁵⁾. This apparent "contradiction" between the laws of value and the real appearances of capitalism is explained through the transformation of value laws into a general profit rate through the competition of capitals. We will show that the relation of the inner nature of capital to the "forms of accomplishment" in concrete exchanges unfolds through the dependence of individual capitals upon the form of the total social reproduction connection of capitals.

From the accumulation laws of capital, the expansion of total social value by the exploitation of total labour by total capital takes the form of an expanded mass of exchange-values⁽⁶⁶⁾. When commodities exchange

at their values, they are determined by the quantities of average social labour-times necessary for their production⁽⁶⁷⁾. Consequently, private commodity exchanges can only realise in circulation that which already exists in the produced commodity-value⁽⁶⁸⁾. An increase in the average production powers of labour reduces the total value of commodities in that relatively less labour-time is expended in their production, with the simultaneous expansion of the commodity mass produced in a given time period representing a relative reduction in the ratio of exchange-values to the use-values which they express. This divergence of commodity values is a result of the double determination of labour in the commodity-form of value production. Relative surplus value is thereby expanded through the contradictory relations of the total social organic composition of capital: the value relation of capital unifies the general conditions of social reproduction - the value of the means of production (constant capital) and labour-power (variable capital, the amount of labour set in motion by total capital)⁽⁶⁹⁾ and the material relations of the technical composition of capital - the relative mass of the means of production to the quantity of labour set in motion by them⁽⁷⁰⁾. However, since the "value composition of capital, in so far as it is determined by and reflects its technical composition, is called the organic composition of capital"⁽⁷¹⁾, the technical composition may be unequal in different production branches while the value composition remains the same as production conditions are transformed⁽⁷²⁾.

The formation of a general rate of profit signifies the same proportional relation of individual capital to total social capital, upon which the connection of the inner-organisation of the total capital formation expresses the dynamic relation of individual capitals in the total social reproduction structure of capital. On the assumptions of Das Kapital, this is examined through the organic composition of capital

in individual production branches with different profit rates, whereby the division of total capital in individual production branches expresses the relative magnitude of capital invested at the prevailing rates of profit⁽⁷³⁾. With different value relations of the organic composition of capital in individual production branches, different profit-rates correspond to different organic compositions of capital. However, these organic compositions of capital in different production branches are equalised when the average value composition of individual capitals equals the average value of total capital in all production branches. This average value expresses the organic composition of total social capital and constitutes the basis of the general laws of the capitalist mode of production upon which the organic composition of total social capital is transformed under the cyclical expansion and contraction of capital valuation. Thus, with the assumptions of equal rates of surplus value in individual production branches and different turnover times of capitals in all sectors of production, different profit rates in individual production branches are tendentially equalised to a general profit rate⁽⁷⁴⁾.

In distinction to the "price-profit-mechanism" we have criticised the "market relation" in that it has not been examined through the contradictory commodity-form of total social production and in turn, the general laws of movement of capital. The permanent metamorphosis of capital into new capital accumulation must continuously transform the capitalist mode of production through the extension of the market relation as a moment in the reconversion of the surplus-value mass into capital. In Das Kapital, the historical distribution mechanism of profit is not examined because the methodology concerns the abstract value analysis and logical representation of value-price transformations in the "essence"-"appearance-form" (Wesen - Erscheinungsform) relationship. As the social aggregate price is equivalent to total value and total profit, the examination of the

composition of these relations can be determined through the abstract representation of the relations of distribution in their "theoretical average" without recourse to their "real-form". Volumes I and II represent the value form of the commodity, while Volume III, the value of production prices as "applied" forms of value⁽⁷⁵⁾.

It is essential to consider the value-component and its modified form in production prices and average profits, without which, the historical equalisation-process cannot be effective. As Marx argues, "average profit as also cost-prices, become merely imaginary and contentless, unless the value-determination is accepted as their foundation"⁽⁷⁶⁾. Here, "profit is only ... surplus value calculated in relation to total social capital and the mass of profit, its absolute magnitude, is socially equal to the absolute magnitude of surplus-value"⁽⁷⁷⁾. In the historical relation however, the value of commodities are modified in exchange by their conversion into production prices by competition⁽⁷⁸⁾.

The "price of production" is a category of capital which connects values to the formation of an average profit rate and final market prices. Nevertheless, the determination of price by value, even with the limitations to the free movements of capital and labour, is theoretically derived by the mediations of capital categories in that commodities not only contain unequal quantities of labour-power but that production prices regulate the volume of production and the permanent inter-sectoral movement of capitals for the proportional-disproportional division of total social production. Moreover, it is precisely the price-form which gives the quantitative incongruity between commodities and values⁽⁷⁹⁾, and therefore the possibility of capitalist profit because the existence of production prices and the general profit rate to which they refer depends upon individual commodities not being exchanged at their values⁽⁸⁰⁾. Therefore, in turn,

the empirical examination of the market movements of commodity prices are integral to the value analysis⁽⁸¹⁾, and the concretisation of value-price transformations. These are not "deviations" from a theoretical average but the real mode of commodity exchanges under general laws of the capitalist mode of production.

The laws of value regulate production prices - even when individual commodity prices do not correspond to their embodied labour-times - as the explanatory principle that governs the distribution of total labour in the form of commodity exchanges to production prices under the long-run equalisation of profit rates. Competition inside a branch of production effects an equalisation of prices of similar commodities despite different individual magnitudes of value. It leads different individual commodity values to a general market value in so as the specific weight of average value in one sphere of the produced commodity, and individual commodity values become produced under the average social conditions of production branches⁽⁸²⁾. This enables individual capitals to receive an "extra-profit" contained in the concept of market-value. The sum of individual commodity value of a production branch in relation to its commodity mass is determined through the production of its commodities above the socially necessary average conditions of productivity, while capitals with under average productivity have the possibility of a deduction from individual surplus-value⁽⁸³⁾.

Given the limit to the equalisation of the average social conditions of production⁽⁸⁴⁾, this is accomplished primarily in circulation because production prices are specific while profit added is not. Thus, capitals achieve a qualitative advantage before commodity exchanges in circulation. This is why Marx and Grossman can derive the fall in the general profit rate from the valuational conditions of capital before competition. The competition between individual production branches leads competition inside a production branch to be dominated by the tendential equalisation of specific profit rates between production

branches to a general profit rate⁽⁸⁵⁾:

"what the competition between different production spheres ... and different compositions of capital masses strives for is a capitalist communism, namely that the capital-mass in these production spheres belongs in the proportion wherein it forms part of a total social capital and grasps (erhascht) an aliquot part of total surplus value"⁽⁸⁶⁾.

The "extra-profit" on capital with above average productivity or capital-mass represents the difference between individual and general production prices of commodities⁽⁸⁷⁾, as a quantitative difference, since it is drawn into the equalisation-conditions of individual capitals in the accumulation cycle⁽⁸⁸⁾. The differences in capital productivity and commodity value are the foundation for the "deviation" of profit rates from the social average which are tendentially equalised in the capitalist's struggle for the distribution of profit⁽⁸⁹⁾.

In distinction to the analysis of "profit-production", the "profit-price-mechanism" and the regulation of total social production through the reproduction schemas, the contradictory unity of capitalist production and circulation processes under the laws of value already contains the capital-fetishism under which class struggles unfold with the appearance of value in the profit-form⁽⁹⁰⁾. Since "surplus value now appears as profit"⁽⁹¹⁾, and "factually different from surplus-value"⁽⁹²⁾, the commodity consumed by part of capital "appears" to the capitalist's perception as the cost-price of the commodity so that the excess of the commodity's sale price above its cost-price "appears" as profit. The consequent circulation of commodities in the price-form of competition "appears" to both create and limit profits. Thereby under commodity fetishism, the capitalist mode of production "conceals" the relation of profit to unpaid labour, the value of labour-power (variable capital)

to the means of production (constant capital), and thereby the class connections of capitalist production relations in their "materialisation and autonomisation" (Verschlichung und Verselbständigung) against all production-agents⁽⁹³⁾.

Since the individual capitalist's struggle for profits is within the mechanism of the formation of a general profit rate under the cyclical valuation and devaluation of capital, the general conditions of production are imposed upon the inner-organisation of individual capitals and the division of the total labour fund. Thereby, the class of labour is subordinated to capital through the transformation of value to production prices and the equalisation of diverse profit rates to a general rate.

Moreover, because the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production is structurally limited by the exploitable mass of value from total social labour, its historical modes of competition are expressed in the forms by which individual capitals strive to maintain their relative share of total capital from the historical fall in the general profit-rate. From this we see that as "extra-profits" are procured through the realisation of capitalist commodities in "deviations" of concrete market prices above the production prices⁽⁹⁴⁾, the transformation of the distribution of profits between individual capitals are still determined within the mechanism of total social profit⁽⁹⁵⁾. Further, an inherent constraint to the profitability of all forms of individual capital is evident when the average profitability of total social capital must be increased to facilitate the realisation of an expanded mass of surplus-value. In these respects, "monopoly profits" are understood as the result of the "frictions" to the free movement of capitals within the equalisation-tendencies of profit-rates to a general profit-rate⁽⁹⁶⁾.

Conversely, for the theory of state monopoly capitalism to proceed from the "hindering" of equalisation movements as the explanatory foundation from which the monopoly category is generalised construes the

general concept of capital under the monopoly structure. Subsequently, the laws of value lose their full validity for the mediations of the social connections of capitalist commodity production when the new social structure and categories of capitalism functions with the monopolies and extra-economic power of capitalist states. Since this theory of "monopoly profits" contradicts the theory of the general profit-rate formation, the apparent dissolution of the social connection of individual capitals designates the "monopolies" outside the general laws of capitalism. Thus, in state monopoly capitalism, "monopoly profits" can appear as: permanent "tributes" of the "monopolies" and the finance-oligarchy on "non-monopoly capital"; "deviations" from the general profit-rate in either a two sector economy or "mixed-capitalism"; or the result of political power.

We will now consider the "frictions" to the general laws of capital accumulation through the emphasis which the theory of state monopoly capitalism gives to the concentration and centralisation of capital.

The concentration and centralisation of capital

The real "frictions" to the equalisation movements of capitals are contained within the general historical tendencies to the concentration and centralisation of individual capitals. For an evaluation of these tendencies of capital, it is important to consider the general contradictory laws of total social capital accumulation⁽⁹⁷⁾.

While the "monopolies" promote the tendency to the reproduction of individual capitals under the "combination of capital", this is not a linear tendency which abolishes capital mobility in the historical formation of "monopolies", the "general-cartel" or "state capitalist trusts". Rather, it is a necessary product of the general laws of capital accumulation as a response to the historical rise in the total social organic composition of capital and the limits to capital mobility⁽⁹⁸⁾. In this

respect the concentration of individual production would precipitate a "collapse" of capitalism if not for the permanent counter-acting tendencies to the centrifugal forces of centralisation⁽⁹⁹⁾.

This social organisation of production through the centralisation of the capital-mass is both a constitutive component of the general concept of capital and the historical unfolding of the inner limits of capital accumulation. Nevertheless, the hypothesis of the "collapse" of capitalism which was emphasised by Zieschang's preliminary formulation of state monopoly capitalism has interpreted this as a historical process while also abstracting from the contradictory tendencies to the centralisation of capital with the incessant process of the "splitting" of capitals⁽¹⁰⁰⁾.

This combined process of "centrifugal" and "centripetal" forces produces the inner-differentiation of the structure of total capital through the accumulation of "old" and "new" capitals. In distinction to concentration, the centralisation of capitals develops to transcend the "concentration of already formed capital". These combined aspects of the extension and limitation of competition are created by the structural transformation of the valuation-conditions of existing capitals. Here, fixed-capitals are periodically devalued with the exclusion of the least productive capitals from the reproduction process. Conversely, well placed capitals with above average productivity express the progressive concentration-tendencies in the re-organisation of the general conditions of capital valuation⁽¹⁰¹⁾.

The tendency to the accumulation of the means of production is formed through the attraction of capital from old production branches, while new capital is conditioned by the counter-tendencies of the repulsion of capitals from each other⁽¹⁰²⁾. Although concentration extends the production scale, develops production powers, cheapens

commodities and intensifies capitalist competition, it conversely raises the minimum capital necessary for accumulation and thereby creates an insufficiency of capital in production branches particularly where individual capitals are small or centralisation is incomplete⁽¹⁰³⁾.

This movement to the "self-expropriation" of capital is thereby confronted by the centrifugal forces of capitalist production, brought forward by competition and credit⁽¹⁰⁴⁾, which facilitate the expanded reproduction of capital through circumventing the limits to capital mobility.

The problem with the theory of "state monopoly capitalism" is that it expresses an historical tendency to abolish the "attraction" and "repulsion" of capitals in a "universal capital" or "general-cartel". Conversely, the general theory of capital accumulation is not contradicted by the fact that individual capitals "deviate" from the average social movements of capital and receive "extra-profits" within the long-run equalisation process. The valuational advantage which the centres of capital accumulation receive over increasingly large sections of total social production does not "negate" the general laws of capitalism, for this would fail to interpret both the expansion and contraction of individual capitals in the cyclical valuation and devaluation of capital which compels the competition of the existing capitals and new profit-distributions.

The "scientific-technical-revolution"

Because the concentration of capital has not precipitated an historical "collapse" of capitalism, the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism has also addressed itself to the expansion of production powers. In distinction to the unilateral emphasis of the limitations to capital accumulation under the "monopolies", the post-war reconstruction of Marxist-Leninist theory examines the expansion of production powers in a new "stage" of capitalism. However, since the inner-laws of

"monopoly capitalism" primarily express a "decaying" and "dying" capitalism, this can only be explained upon the basis of "foreign" elements and new categories in the logical structure of capitals: the "scientific-technical-revolution", "joint stock capital" and the "capitalist state".

By contrast, our analysis of capitalism suggests that the "expansion" and "retardation" of production powers are "appearance-forms" of the total social capital formation. In themselves they do not explain the dynamics of capital accumulation but only express the levels of capital competition from the reproduction cycle of capital accumulation on national and world markets⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. Therefore, to reproduce Lenin's arguments on the "stagnation" of production powers and technical development as a general theory of capitalism is a theoretically insufficient capital-analysis⁽¹⁰⁶⁾.

The assessment of this concept in the theory of the "scientific-technical-revolution" is situated within the general pre-requisites of all social production processes, of the distribution of total labour between production branches and the generation of a general social surplus-labour fund for an expanded reproduction. However, for Marxist-Leninist theorists to advance the "scientific-technical-revolution" as an analytical criterion for inter-system comparability is to abstract from the specific "form-determination" (Formbestimmung) of capitalist production and so to reduce capitalist and socialist modes of production to a common technical structure of "system relations"⁽¹⁰⁷⁾.

Conversely, we have argued that capitalist reproduction subordinates the total material reproduction conditions to the valuational processes of capital in distinction to an autonomous expansion and contraction of production powers. This can have no significance outside of the "social form" of capitalist production relations⁽¹⁰⁸⁾, just as capitalist

reproduction cannot be confined to the reproduction of material elements of production but extends to their value-form as class relations of production⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. As the capitalist production process reproduces the double character of labour in the capital relation, it reproduces the social conditions of the "capital constitution" of classes as necessary moments in the process of capital accumulation. Here we encounter the general problem already examined in the Second International's analysis of reproduction processes, and the subsequent displacement of class struggle from the centre of world accumulation processes for the categories of social technics.

Further, where the concept of the "scientific-technical-revolution" is developed through the value-problematic of capital⁽¹¹⁰⁾ and "objective conditions of capital reproduction ... (in) ... all its phases"⁽¹¹¹⁾, it either enters into contradiction with the general tenets of monopoly capitalism⁽¹¹²⁾ or is sustained under the primacy of the "scientific-technical-revolution" as the principal phenomenon⁽¹¹³⁾.

The class "neutralisation" of production processes in this theory has a double significance for the political conception of state monopoly capitalism. In the Soviet and D.D.R. analyses, it maintains the "Soviet model" of scientific socialist planning of labour processes for European state monopoly capitalism. While for the Western European Communist Parties, the dissolution of "capital-logic" represents the social division of labour in the liberating powers of social-technics. In both these examples, the model of the "scientific-technical-revolution" militates against the critique of contemporary social systems through the "humanist" perspectives of social alienation for that of system performance. Rather, the necessity to expand production powers in relative surplus value production situates the direct production process of capitals in the total social and technical conditions of

capital accumulation. With the historical fall in the general profit rate, capitalists are compelled to maintain the reproduction of individual capital through the transformation of necessary into surplus labour by extending the period of its duration in the production process. However, this process is confronted with the limits to the extraction of absolute surplus value through the forcing of the minimum reproduction wage of labour power below its social and physical subsistence level⁽¹¹⁴⁾. Thus capitalists are compelled to advance the superior development of production powers through transforming existing scientific and technical structures of the production process under the laws of relative surplus value production and the exploitation of labour in capitalist production relations⁽¹¹⁵⁾. This is because the expansion of relative surplus value through increasing the quantity of labour tends to require both an increase in the organic composition of capital, unless the social and technical conditions of the capitalist mode of production can be transformed to reduce existing reproduction time involved in converting necessary into surplus labour.

Here we see that the specificity of capitalist commodity production is not only a material labour process of use-value production from a combination of labour and means of production but a "form-determined" value-process⁽¹¹⁶⁾.

Because the transformation of technical and social conditions of capital reflect the material and value structure of capital, they are not planning instruments to facilitate the regulation of total social production by either class fractions or the total class of the monopoly bourgeoisie in state monopoly capitalism. Since individuals capitals are reproduced by the real forms of competition in the total capital formation, the re-organisation of the technical conditions of production are determined by the categorical unfolding of the reproduction laws of

total social capital in the "surface" (Oberfläche) of social reproduction processes⁽¹¹⁷⁾. Consequently, scientific-technical innovations and economic rationalisations respond to capitalist competition for profit, as the means by which the concentration processes of capital accumulation are maintained⁽¹¹⁸⁾.

We conclude that the characteristics of the "scientific-technical-revolution" express the primacy of the laws of surplus value production on total social reproduction processes rather than the "monopoly" or "system-competition". While the social division of labour unites the social power of labour through its collectivisation and organisation in capitalist enterprises, it nevertheless maintains the reversal of the social subject because the alienation of labour in the general production conditions of capitalist society is reproduced under the commodity-form⁽¹¹⁹⁾. Consequently, the organisation of labour in the "scientific-technical-revolution" does not establish a socio-economic nexus for the transition to a classless society because the logic of capitalist commodity production remains the dominant social production-form of social wealth.

Finance-capital and joint-stock capital

However, we have already seen that the "theory" has in fact precisely supposed the dissolution of capital-logic as a historical moment of total social capital development occasioned by finance-capital and the social forms of capital. To appraise these aspects of state monopoly capitalism we will consider the status of these categories and the connection of the juridical relations of "modern bourgeois property" to their "real form as relations of production"⁽¹²⁰⁾.

As economic property relations represent the form in which capitalists appropriate surplus-value, it relates to the capital function of the direct production process in distinction to the juridical categories

of its division in profit, interest and rent. Conversely, the importance which state monopoly capitalism affords to "social-property" leads the theory to examine capitalist property predominantly from the juridical relations of capitalism. This construes "joint-stock capital", "finance-capital" and "state-property" as defining components of capitalism rather than the social expression of the form in which the functional separation of capital and property is manifested. As Marx has stated, joint-stock capital is both "one of the last forms of bourgeois society"⁽¹²¹⁾, the "most extreme form in which the dissolution (Aufhebung) proceeds" while equally establishing the ultimate formation of capitals in their most adequate-form⁽¹²²⁾.

Since economic property derives from the value-form of capitalist commodity production, collective capitalist property and credit are subordinate to the valuation-process of capitals⁽¹²³⁾. In distinction to the Marxist-Leninist methodology, the Chapters II - IV Volume III of Das Kapital express only the abstract movements of a general profit rate-formation from the unity of production and circulation of total social reproduction processes, and thereby the analytical representation of total capitalist reproduction under joint-stock capital and credit beyond the inner structural constraints, to the reproduction of individual capitals. This is not the historical negation of the capitalist mode of production but the theoretical status of the objective reproduction conditions of capitalism.

The necessary formation of joint-stock companies and other types of collective capitalist property enables the "extension of the scale of production and enterprises that was impossible for individual capital"⁽¹²⁴⁾ given the existing total social structure of the capital formation. Although these property-forms arise from the functional separation of capital and ownership of the means of production and

surplus-value⁽¹²⁵⁾, they do not invalidate the capitalist division of labour since the "work of direction and supervision ... (is a) ... function arising out of the servitude (Knechtschaft) of the direct producers"⁽¹²⁶⁾. The formation of joint-stock capital extends the social division of labour under the laws of value, in that the supervision of social functionaries⁽¹²⁷⁾ "command in the name of capitals"⁽¹²⁸⁾. This aspect of the analytical representation of the capitalist organisation of social labour in the concept of "co-operation"⁽¹²⁹⁾ is a "special mode of the existence of capital"⁽¹³⁰⁾ for the most profitable exploitation of labour and the extension of production powers⁽¹³¹⁾ in "capitalist form"⁽¹³²⁾, whether as an "individual capitalist", "joint-stock capital" or a "combined capitalist" (kombinierter Kapitalist)⁽¹³³⁾.

So when the theorists of state monopoly capitalism interpret these citations as the real negation of capitalism in collective capitalist property they fail to identify the general concept of capital in its "appearance-forms". Rather, there is no proposition on the dissolution of capitalism contained in these categories but rather the re-organisation of social production relations which necessitate a transformation in the structure of the capitalist class as a condition of the reproduction of total social production and the continuation of the class power of capital. Conversely, since the theory has not established a comprehensive critique of capital fetishism, the production of the most abstract form of social wealth under interest bearing capital⁽¹³⁴⁾ is examined less from the valuation of capital than the "dissolution and decline-forms" (Auflösung - und Niedergangsformen) of capitalism⁽¹³⁵⁾ which were introduced into socialist theory by Hilferding and modified by Lenin.

By contrast, interest bearing capital is the most fetishised form of the concealment of labour exploitation in the direct production process and the most abstract form of the separation of use and exchange values. This contains the appearance of developed forms of "social-capital" (gesellschaftlichen Kapital) in the "alienated character of capital" (entfremdete Charakter des Kapitals) and "capital mystification in its most extreme form"⁽¹³⁶⁾. The division of social wealth in wages, profit, interest and rent free from value compulsion⁽¹³⁷⁾ typifies the separation of the appearance-forms of capital realisation from the value relations of surplus-value production. That the functional separation of capital and property appears to contradict the general laws of capital valuation obscures the fact that only "form-transformations" of the same value-mass are involved⁽¹³⁸⁾.

With the subsequent emphasis upon "appropriation", the categories of state monopoly capitalism express the dissolution-logic of capitalist systems in the general mechanisms and form-transformations of the economic and political domination of social reproduction processes. Rather, we interpret Marx's reference to "private production without the control of private property"⁽¹³⁹⁾ within the rubric of the general concept of capital. Conversely, "joint-stock capital", "scientific-technical-revolution", and capitalist states in the historical structure of capitalism only receive their capital-negating status in the theory of state monopoly capitalism when the historically specific private property structure of accumulation is interpreted as the definitive mode of the total social capital formation of capitalist systems. These are subordinate to the total conception of the contradictory nature and counter-tendencies of the general laws of capitalism rather than the accentuation of the

subjective categories of capitalism. In this respect, these categories are further socialisations within the over-accumulation of capital which necessitates the periodic re-organisation of the general social conditions of production. Consequently, as the discussion on "centralisation" showed, "social capital" advances the socialisation processes of "private" production beyond their existing scale and structure⁽¹⁴⁰⁾. These accumulation conditions in which "joint stock capital" and "state interventions" (Staatseinmischung)⁽¹⁴¹⁾ promote total social capital reproduction are both "correctives" to the disproportional distribution of labour⁽¹⁴²⁾ and expressions of the crises of capital accumulation.

In contradistinction to the theorists of state monopoly capitalism, the creation of social capital does not signify the transition of the capitalist mode of production but that "joint-stock capital" and credit are the "highest and last possible forms" (höchst und letztmöglichen Form) of its development⁽¹⁴³⁾. Given the social domination of capital, all economic conditions are successively subordinated to those of the capitalist mode of production⁽¹⁴⁴⁾. This is not contradicted by the fact that not all production is directly organised by productive capital because the dynamics of relative surplus value production also embrace the general conditions of production⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. Here, the functions of credit and joint-stock capital in the social reproduction process are to create new instruments of capital realisation for the valuation of individual capitals outside the direct production processes. However, those instruments develop through the total social mechanism of capitalist competition and the general laws of capital reproduction.

Within the capitalist mode of production, Marx examines the conditions that accelerate capital mobility⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ as a theoretical representation of the "form created by capitalist production"⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ for the valuation of capital and the facilitation of the equalisation-process⁽¹⁴⁸⁾. Since we have argued that Marx does not examine the

concrete forms of capitalist reproduction processes but their general theoretical form, in the statement that the "capitalist production process produces with the necessity of a natural process its own negation"⁽¹⁴⁹⁾, it follows that this is not an historical prognosis on the "collapse" and transition of capitalism. Rather it expresses the socialisation of capital through credit⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ and its contradictory relationship to private capitalism⁽¹⁵¹⁾. To interpret this as an actual dissolution of the capitalist mode of production is to remain within capital fetishism⁽¹⁵²⁾. Since the conceptualisation of the dissolution of "private capitalism" is within the "general concept of capital", this is not a demystification of the "illusions or the miraculous (wunderwirkende) power of credit and banking"⁽¹⁵³⁾ which arise from a "complete ignorance of the capitalist mode of production, and credit as one of its forms"⁽¹⁵⁴⁾. Rather, it is expressed in the "socialist sense", as "one element in connection with other great organic transformations of the mode of production itself"⁽¹⁵⁵⁾. How this is historically realised in the politics of social emancipation has no necessary specification.

The "General Crisis of Capitalism"

The evaluation of state monopoly capitalism which we have undertaken so far has considered the primacy of the monopoly-category in the capitalist mode of production. However, its significance for the "collapse" and "transition" of capitalism has also been considered under the formalisation of the theory of the "General Crisis of Capitalism". Several issues can be raised here which relate to the conceptualisation of the global conditions of capitalism on the inner-monopolisation processes of state monopoly capitalism.

The theory advances the concept of the "adaptation-forms" (Anpassungsformen) of capitalism produced from both the "internal" and "external" relations of contemporary capitalist systems. However, these

as much express the Marxist-Leninist prognostication on the historical development of European capitalism, first introduced into communist theory with the concept of the "collapse" of capitalism and the transition to socialist society, as the objective forms of capitalist systems. Moreover, this combination of theory and ideology incorporates new concepts and historical contents into the Marxist analysis of capitalist accumulation and the competition of capitals on the world market.

After 1945, these are expressed in the "Second Stage of the General Crisis". Here we consider that the concept of "system competition" receives its preliminary formulation from the Soviet Realpolitik for both the integration of Eastern European States into a Soviet controlled socialist world system and the direction of Western European Communist Parties under the Cominform. However, the theory upon which the politics of the "General Crisis of Capitalism" are based may be questioned.

Firstly, the successive "falling away" of sovereign national states from the capitalist world system through revolutionary national liberation movements or the dismantling of the European colonial system cannot be considered to automatically verify that world historical forces militate against world capitalism and promote world socialism. This general proposition follows Lenin's political concept of imperialism rather than the examination of the economic mechanism by which socio-economic systems are drawn into the system of imperialism. Consequently, the under-developed levels of national capital accumulation are reproduced under the dominant reproduction conditions of the economic mechanism of world capitalism. While "decolonisation" reflects genuine transformations in world economic and political systems, these relations must be differentiated at the level of social modes of production rather

than the nexus of "political imperialism".

Secondly, from the foregoing we see that the historical contents of the "General Crisis" tend to be interpreted through the primacy of the political process on the imperialist foundations of world capitalism, with the generalisation of Lenin's concept of state capitalism from the historical conditions of Russia to both the developed and under-developed centres of world capital accumulation. The consequent formulation of the revolutionary theory of the world anti-imperialist political alliances of the communist movement conceals the "real" historical socio-economic foundations of class movements. In this respect, the "theoretical dogma" of the crisis-periodisation of the total structure of the historical development of capitalism militates against the examination of the socio-economic conditions upon which the dissolution and reconstruction of the capitalist mode of production is possible.

Thirdly, the uncritical acceptance of the "General Crisis of Capitalism" effectively forecloses debate upon the character of Soviet socialism and the global conditions in which socialist transition becomes historically effective. This is nevertheless particularly contentious given the contradictions in the "world socialist system" occasioned by the Sino-Soviet split and the potential for socialist alternatives to Soviet socialism in Eastern Europe. Further, while we have argued that the significance of the "General Crisis" is connected to the construction of Soviet-Marxism, we have also considered the post-Stalinist concepts of state monopoly capitalism under the autonomy of Western European Communist Parties. The latter also promotes the possibility of democratic alternatives to the Soviet model of socialism.

Fourthly, the theory of the "General Crisis" develops the periodisation of capitalism as an historical chronology of capitals which fuses the general concept of capital with the real forms of its

accomplishment in the inter-connections of the economic forms of capitalist production relations. The initial point of distinction here from the traditional Marxist analysis of capitalism develops from the absolute law of uneven development of capitals and its significance for the cyclical movement of capitals. This was assessed as contradicting the logical conception of the general laws of the capitalist mode of production for the total epoch of capitalism, while also establishing the historical structure upon which the theory of "Socialism in One Country" is explicated in the capital foundations of international class relations.

The distinction between the respective schemas is continued with the concept of the "general contradiction" of capitalism as an extension of the "inner" class contradiction of capitalism on the world scale. The development and construction of these contradictions in "private property and the socialisation of the means of production", "monopoly and state", and "world capitalism and world socialism" express not only different analytical levels of general theory but also problems in the development of historical materialism. Rather, the "general contradiction" of world capitalism and world socialism cannot be based upon the same logical and historical conception of capitalism because world socialism impinges upon the circulation of national capitals rather than the categorical unfolding of the general laws. Conversely, if the "general contradiction" only refers to the analysis of the permanent crisis of monopoly capitalism, then the general laws of capitalism are transformed under a mixed-form of capitalist and socialist modes of production.

Nevertheless, as both the interpretations of the "General Crisis of Capitalism" express the intractable crisis-features of capitalism, the general laws of capital and their capacities for the stabilisation

and fructification of capitalism cease to articulate the social relations of capitalist society upon which the class strategies of Western European Communist Parties are formulated.

However, while the reconstruction of world capitalist markets after 1945 in the new forms of the internationalisation of capital are not identical with the "pure-form" competition of capitals on the world market, they still respond to the Marxist analysis on value laws and the concrete-historical development tendencies of the world capitalist economy. This establishes both the theoretical and methodological foundations for the analysis of national state interventionism and the socio-economic laws of Western European integration from the internationalisation of capital accumulation.

In contradistinction to the "General Crisis of Capitalism", we may advance that the "inner-contradiction" of the capitalist mode of production is examined in Das Kapital under the dialectical methodology of abstract-concrete movements of capital categories only to the extent that it is concerned with the limiting methodological and theoretical assumptions necessary for the reproduction of the economic forms of capitalist commodity production. Thereby, although the analysis of the capitalist commodity establishes the economic form-determination of social production relations, it does not however express the "absolute character of bourgeois production"⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ in the historical relations of capital accumulation. Consequently, there is no definitive historical analysis of the class contradictions of the total national capital formation as a typical "model" to be extended under world imperialism.

Nevertheless, the significance of Marxist analysis is not confined only to the "inner-contradictions" of capitalism because the theoretical and methodological premises upon which the analysis of world market movement of capitals is conducted are also contained within the general

concept of capital. Here it is already known that the competition of capitals on the world market "in general forms the basis and life-atmosphere (Lebensatmosphäre) of the capitalist mode of production. The concrete forms of capitalist production however can only become comprehensively represented after the general nature of capitals are conceived"⁽¹⁵⁷⁾. Thus, the logical and historical suppositions of the capitalist mode of production are not contradicted by imperialism - the competition of capitals on the world market - or the phenomena of the "General Crisis of Capitalism", and consequently do not necessitate a new conceptualisation of the fundamentals of the class relations of capitalism. Rather, the derivation of competition and the internationalisation of the monopolisation tendencies of capital on the world market follow the dialectical capital methodology from the commodity-form of universal social labour and the internationalisation of relative surplus-value production⁽¹⁵⁸⁾.

From the stand-point of the general laws of world reproduction processes of capital, the distinction between internal and external market relations has no capital - theoretical significance other than the "frictions" to the internationalisation of the competition of capitals. Conversely, as Lenin and subsequent theorists assume a completed capital foundation, the development of capitals on the world market either compensates or exacerbates the crises of capital accumulation⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. This points to the limits to the examination of state monopoly capitalism as a "national accumulation process" without considering the world market connection and its significance for the derivation and development of bourgeois states⁽¹⁶⁰⁾.

The real historical tendency to the formation of a world capital develops from the circulation of national capitals on the world market as the most adequate mode of existence of capital. Here, the

contradictory form of the capitalist commodity in exchange-value and use-value expresses the spatial-temporal separation of the produced relative surplus-value mass and the conditions of its realisation through the purchase and sale of commodities (use-values) with the permanent extension of circulation (exchange-values). The universality of this capitalist social relation is contained in the world reproduction of capital: as Marx states, "the abstract form of the general relation of bourgeois society ... (concentration of capital, division of labour, wage-labour) ... move (auftreten) in their most developed form in their world market form"⁽¹⁶¹⁾.

However, since "capital in general" does not correspond to its "ideal form" on the world market, the general laws of capital accumulation cannot be abstracted from their constitution as individual capitals⁽¹⁶²⁾ in the world accumulation processes and the internationalisation of relative surplus-value production. Here, the primacy of value laws establishes that the value at which commodities exchange is not according to their necessary labour-times but world social labour-times. The category of "universal labour" is expressed by the fact that:

"it is only with foreign trade that national markets develop to the world market, money to world money, and abstract labour to social labour. The abstract wealth, value, money - hence abstract labour develops in the proportion wherein concrete labour develops to a world market embracing the totality of different kinds of labour"⁽¹⁶³⁾.

With the formation of an international commodity value as the foundation of the exchange abstraction of universal labour, the average scale and exploitation of "national" production signifies that the value of the individual world commodity is the equivalent of all these commodities. Thereby, commodities with the same international value,

but different quantities of national labour, are based upon the respective average social production conditions of similar commodities⁽¹⁶⁴⁾. These tendentially equalised "national averages" are constituted in the world market connection of individual production-conditions with the consequent forcing of the total labour of national capitals to the average productivity and exploitation rates expressed in the valuation of the world commodity. It is exchanged according to its embodied universal labour time, with abstract human labour forming the substance of the commodity value of the average socially necessary labour times contained in the valuation of the commodities of individual capitals⁽¹⁶⁵⁾.

As these commodity exchanges exist within the world capitalist reproduction processes, they modify the value-determination of commodities through the socially necessary labour-time contained in their production⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ because the labour of developed fractions of national capitals represents greater value on the world market than in national exchange-processes. Here we may note that developed national capitals "receive more labour in exchange for less labour, although this difference, this surplus is pocketed (eingesackt) just as the exchange between labour and capital in general, by a certain class"⁽¹⁶⁷⁾. National capitals with superior average social conditions of productivity exchange less labour quantities for the same commodity mass than lesser developed national capitals, and receive "extra-profit"⁽¹⁶⁸⁾. This is not a "tribute" or "value-transfer"⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ either within or between national capitals through the "unequal exchange" of commodities on the world market by international capitalist monopolies as the theory of state monopoly capitalism suggests, but follows the laws of capital accumulation.

However, the corollary to be derived is that the tendential fall in the general profit rate is counter-acted with the modified action of value laws and the equalisation of different rates between branches of

production and nations through world market competition⁽¹⁷⁰⁾ - even though, the "frictions" to the circulation of national capitals on the world-market are themselves tendentially overcome with the internationalisation of capital and the accomplishment of the laws of value in the totality of world circulation processes. This nonetheless gives the possibility of an "extra-profit" for individual capitals of developed national capitals with an above average labour productivity of national capitals on the world market, such that the organic composition of production branches are modified, as individual capitals are not drawn directly into the equalisation conditions of capitals and the formation of a general profit-rate.

The theory of the nation state

We further consider that the Marxist-Leninist theory of the nation state in the general crisis of the world accumulation conditions of capital establishes the basis for the conversion of bourgeois states into imperialist states. This characterisation rests upon the acceptance of an historical epoch of "free competition capitalism" which interprets the world market as an external relation to the general concept capital, and the restriction of bourgeois state functions to the preservation of the general conditions of the capitalist mode of production. On these suppositions, the subsequent analysis of "imperialist wars" in the world "collapse"-conditions of capitals leads the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the nation state - and especially its "dogmatic" reception in Soviet Marxism - to interpret such specific appearances of bourgeois states as permanent structural features of imperialism in the "General Crisis of Capitalism".

Conversely, we evaluate the genesis of bourgeois state apparatuses from the period of European "original accumulation" and the Mercantilist state⁽¹⁷¹⁾, while the subsequent historical

constitution of the form and functions of bourgeois states as national states are developed from the formation of national capitalist modes of production through the nexus of world markets. Here we may distinguish the general form of national capitalist states, which are only fully determined in the relation of national capitals to the world capitalist reproduction processes from the "particularised" functions of national political organisations - and the historically specific crisis-features of capitalist systems in a particular phase of European accumulation and class struggles.

Moreover, the contradiction between the autonomy of national bourgeois states and the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism which we identified cannot be resolved with the theory and methodology employed by Marxism-Leninism. In particular, the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism only extends the problems discussed in the construction of state monopoly capitalism as an exclusively national process in contradiction to its reproduction in imperialism on a world scale.

Rather, we hold that on the one hand, the tendency to the internationalisation of social superstructures to a political world state cannot be assessed exclusively upon the basis of the theory of imperialism alone, but rather are dependent upon inter-state politics. While on the other, the factors which militate against a world political state are asserted through the necessary autonomisation of national bourgeois states. This follows (a), from the "frictions" to the free movement of capitals, the equalisation of national average production conditions and the differential impact of accumulation crises of capitals on the world market, and (b), the inability to "externalise" capitalist crises as a possible form of cyclical capital devaluation with the tendential equalisation of the average national conditions of

capital accumulation on the world market.

Conversely, we consider that the internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism expresses the "surface" relations of the internationalisation of surplus value production. Here, the real historical formation of the world market establishes the international social division of labour from the total social connection "behind the backs" of individual producers on the world market. Whichever tendencies predominate in the relation of nation states and world capital, the theory of state monopoly capitalism is led to interpret them from the "conscious" agencies of nation states and their instrumentalisation in the global strategies of the monopoly bourgeoisie. In contradistinction, we have approached these issues through the derivation of the competition of capitals on the world market from the general concept of capital.

In assessing these principal themes in the theory of monopoly capitalism, we have evaluated the monopoly-periodisation and "collapse" theory of capitals as having a fundamental importance to their conceptualisation and "further-development" in the theory of state monopoly capitalism. We will now consider their significance for the derivation of the political superstructures of bourgeois states in Marxism-Leninism.

7.2 Theoretical issues of the state

The general proposition to be established here is that the absence of a rigorous analysis of state and politics in Marxism-Leninism follows from the theoretical and historical presuppositions of the "collapse" theory of capitals under the monopoly domination of total social production processes and the political system. In addition, we consider that the examination of the class constitution bourgeois states in the "stage" of state monopoly capitalism is directly connected to

this proposition, since all forms of state interventionist activity are interpreted as either "foreign elements" or anti-"collapse" mechanisms to the normal total social reproduction processes of "free competition capitalism", whether in the "subordination" or "fusion" theories of the state.

The class character of bourgeois states

As a consequence of the substitution of the general concept of capital with the monopoly, the theory of state monopoly capitalism does not establish the class character of bourgeois states through their inner-connection to the capital foundation of social production relations. Here, the "form-determination" of economic and political relations establishes the social form in which social interaction is organised under generalised capitalist commodity production⁽¹⁷²⁾. This is based upon the specific economic mechanism of surplus-value appropriation in the value-form of the labour product which maintains the characteristic relations of "domination and servitude" and the political structure of bourgeois society⁽¹⁷³⁾. These are structural invariants of the mode of total social reproduction in capitalist systems.

The analysis of the economic and political form of bourgeois social relations in our interpretation are analytically represented under the logic of capital as reciprocal moments in the unity and separation of capitalist commodity production and circulation. Analogously, the duplication of society into society and state corresponds to the duplication of the class domination of capital on labour in both the direct production process and the social circulation relations. This relationship is important because the essential distinction between Marxist and bourgeois theory does not reside in the relation of economic substructure and political superstructure, economy and state, but the double character of the commodity

foundations of the capitalist mode of production. The cognitive primacy attributed to the commodity, expresses the elemental form of bourgeois social relations in the analytical abstraction of the dialectical representation of the real-form of social-connections in total capitalist reproduction processes.

From the foregoing, we consider that the social exchange of private commodity producers in the capitalist mode of production is only made possible through the circulation relations of commodity exchanges⁽¹⁷⁴⁾. These are derived from the duplication of the commodity in commodity and money which we discussed in the logical necessity of the money-form from the simple commodity circulation in Marx's capital-methodology, and subsequently developed into the general capital-form of social production relations. Since the "forms of false consciousness" (falsche Bewusstseinsformen) of social production-agents are determined through the metamorphosis in the "movement of things", commodities are money⁽¹⁷⁵⁾, the unequal exchange of capital and labour in the accumulation process "appear" (Erschein) in circulation as the exchange of commodity equivalents⁽¹⁷⁶⁾. This establishes the structure of production and circulation relations in the specific form of social-interaction by which class domination is maintained in the formally free and equal exchanges of commodity owners in the "surface" of total social circulation relations⁽¹⁷⁷⁾. The subsequent facilitation of total social reproduction processes under the property Rights of capitalist commodity production reproduces the class content of accumulation processes while simultaneously promoting the primary socialisation-process of "bourgeois individuals" in capitalist society.

However, the contradictions in the realisation-processes of the total social commodity value expresses the periodic crises of total

social accumulation processes from the inability to reproduce capitalist social relations from the totality of commodity exchanges. This necessitates the performance of social functions for the maintenance of the general production conditions of bourgeois society which can only be undertaken from an autonomous national political organisation, the bourgeois state. Thereby, the necessity to circulate capitals under class domination in the totality of private commodity exchanges requires the social-institutionalisation of economic and extra-economic functions in the political form of bourgeois states.

Here, the "autonomisation" of the state is superstructural in its political capacity as guarantor of total social commodity exchanges. It also signifies that the socialisation of "bourgeois individuals" through the reproduction of economic relations in the property-form of commodity connections requires active sanction in ideological and "suppression-functions" (Unterdrückungsfunktionen) of bourgeois states. This process of the "autonomisation" of the political establishes the social basis for the legitimation functions of bourgeois states from capitals own "surface" (Oberfläche), and thereupon, the "representation" (Darstellung) of the unification of the material and superstructural relations of social interaction in bourgeois society from the social-form of commodity-exchanges.

While the genesis of these state functions originate from the historical necessity to both create and defend the free exchange of capital and labour through "state-repression"⁽¹⁷⁸⁾, their subsequent institutionalisation in the constitutional bourgeois Rechtsstaat - when the capitalist mode of production is the historically dominant social production relation in the national and international accumulation processes of capital - promotes the reproduction of bourgeois society by the sanctioning of the private commodity exchanges and contractual

freedoms of commodity owners under the relations of bourgeois Right and law (Rechtsverhältnisse) . The consequent realisation of capitalist property simultaneously reproduces the capitalist organisation of class production relations and the political socialisation of classes⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ . Thereby, the maintenance of total social relations of Right and law indirectly constitutes bourgeois states as class states.

Moreover, as commodity fetishism "conceals" the class character of capitalist production relations, the "autonomisation" of bourgeois states also appears in the mystified forms of state-neutrality reproduced from the separation of economy and political. In this regard, bourgeois society creates a state from the spontaneity of capitalist commodity exchanges. Thereupon, we conclude that the Marxist-Leninist theory of the "transformation" or "fusion" of class power into political power in a new direct representation-process contradicts the analysis of the reproduction of class power from the social-theoretical categories of commodity mediations and the autonomisation of bourgeois states. The contradictions in the class theory of state monopoly capitalism duly express the methodological and theoretical limitations to the derivation of bourgeois states from "monopoly capitalism".

The class character to the subsequent performance of state-functions are determined neither through their appropriation by the monopoly bourgeoisie nor the "anti-monopolist alliance", but the primary form-determination of social relations. Further, the autonomy of the bourgeois state expresses neither the "revisionist" Kautskian theory of states established under Leninism, nor the liberal theory of states constructed from the epoch of "free competition of capitalism". Rather, our analysis establishes the separation of economy and political as a general historical condition for the reproduction of bourgeois society, analytically expressed in the theoretical relations of capital-logic.

Conversely, only in the mechanistic formulation of the relations of an integrated structure of economy and political can the theory of state monopoly capitalism interpret a "fusion" of economic monopoly interests with the political power of bourgeois states. This results from the proposition that the "monopolies" dominate both total social production processes and the political systems of bourgeois societies. In distinction, we will examine the economic constitution of class interests from the capitalist mode of production and their "representation" (Darstellung) in bourgeois states.

Class interests and the state

The economic community interests of the total capitalist class are conceptualised in the analytical representation of the general profit-formation which structures the social connection of the "average" (Durchschnitt) interests of individual capitals (einzelnen Kapitalien) to "capital in general" (Kapital in allgemeinen). Here, the exploitation of total social labour by total social capital in the necessary mode of existence of capital as individual capitals signifies that the value of the total mass of commodities is equal to the total value of individual commodities determined under average social production conditions⁽¹⁸⁰⁾, and that profit-rates on individual capitals are identical to their rates of surplus-value when commodities exchange at their values in the "pure-form" of circulation processes⁽¹⁸¹⁾. In these conditions, the "specific interest" (besondere Interesse) of capitals in individual production spheres is still to exploit the labour they directly employ in the capital relation⁽¹⁸²⁾, because an "extra-cut (Extraschnitt), one above and beyond the average profit ... (that) ... can be seized (übergreifender), either through exceptional overwork (Überarbeitung), or through a reduction of wages under the average, or through exceptional profitability of the applied (angewandten) labour"⁽¹⁸³⁾.

Nevertheless, as the "deviations" of "extra-cuts" from the cyclically formed social average are equalised through competition⁽¹⁸⁴⁾, the general profit-rate is seen to depend upon the average social conditions of total labour exploitation by total social capital⁽¹⁸⁵⁾. This supplies the general social basis for the unification of the interests of individual capitalists into a "community interest" of the total capitalist class as they are drawn into the equalisation of the average exploitation conditions of capital⁽¹⁸⁶⁾. Consequently, although individual capitalists have a "specific interest" (besondere Interesse) in exploiting labour, "every particular sphere of capital, and every individual capitalist has the same interest (dasselbe Interesse) in the productivity of social labour employed by total capital"⁽¹⁸⁷⁾. This "mutual" class interest⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ is consolidated with the concentration and centralisation of capitals through the world market connection as a constitutive relation in the formation of the interests of the total capitalist class⁽¹⁸⁹⁾.

However, since social production powers are only expanded through the competition of individual capitals the formation of a "general interest" is accomplished "behind the backs" of individual producers in the totality of individual production acts⁽¹⁹⁰⁾. Thus, the consequent contradiction of the general class interests of total social labour and capital is form-determined by the total social circulation processes. It is thereby subject to the same processes of capital mystification whereby the general interests of capital are reproduced as the general interests of bourgeois society.

Conversely, the theory of state monopoly capitalism "subjectivises" the analysis of class interests with the assumption that the monopoly bourgeoisie dominates both the economic and political processes of bourgeois society and secures their reproduction under "system-competition"⁽¹⁹¹⁾. To formulate the "common interests" of the monopoly bourgeoisie or the "system interests" of state monopoly capitalism on

such a basis, usurps the social mechanism by which the reproduction of the class connection of individual capitals takes the double-form of "specific" and "community" capitalist interests. However, as we have argued, bourgeois society is only reproduced with the bourgeois state because the total capitalist class is unable to organise the social conditions of its "general form" (allgemeine Form) in the "general interests" (Durchschnittsinteressen)⁽¹⁹²⁾. Consequently, the political organisation of class domination necessitates the political form (politische Form) of autonomous bourgeois states from which the entire bourgeoisie guarantee their "internal" (innen) and "external" (aussen) properties (Eigentums) in the "form of state interests" (Form des staats-interesses)⁽¹⁹³⁾ or "community interests as state" (gemeinschaftliche Interesse als Staat)⁽¹⁹⁴⁾.

In distinction to the "fusion" thesis, the bourgeois state is not an "instrument" of the "ruling monopoly capitalist class" but a necessary social institution by which the general class relations of "domination and servitude" are politically organised. To the extent that the political form of the bourgeois state guarantees bourgeois Right (Recht)⁽¹⁹⁵⁾, it does so under the "general interest" of the "illusory community" (illusorische Gemeinschaft)⁽¹⁹⁶⁾. Nevertheless, these "illusory" relations have an objective social validity without being reducible to a direct institutionalised form of class domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie. In turn, as the discharge of the "suppression-functions" of bourgeois states issues from the "illusory" form of political community, they thereby assume the appearances of class neutrality. Here, the preservation of the "general interest" both effaces the class connection of the interests of capital and state, and stands equally against all bourgeois individuals. This formulation of the "general interest" is never "real" because the "autonomisation"

of bourgeois states are construed from the circulation processes of total social production as the institutionalised expression of the class power of capital in ideal-form.

From the above, we conclude that the connection of class interests to the state is not through the direct "subordination" of the political system to monopoly class power but the system of social mediations which duplicates the capitalist class domination in the political form of bourgeois states. Consequently, bourgeois states have neither a "class essence", nor are they "derived" (Ableitung) from the "representation" process of the "general interest" because this already contains the proposition of the "universality" of bourgeois Rights of "freedom", "equality" and "property".

The legitimation functions of states

This conclusion is significant for the examination of ideology in the theory of state monopoly capitalism because the characterisation of bourgeois states as Rechtsstaaten signifies that the institutionalisation of bourgeois relations of Right and law are based upon the mystification of bourgeois social relations⁽¹⁹⁷⁾. Thereby, the "forms of false consciousness" and political socialisation of production agents are not reducible to the performance of new legitimation functions of ideological state apparatuses which are generated from the dissolution of the circulation sphere of "free competition capitalism" under the monopoly and state, because this would render the theory of ideology as a primarily superstructural phenomenon.

Conversely, the evaluation of capitalist systems functioning without the legitimation functions of bourgeois states follows from the assumptions of the normal ideological forms of reproduction of bourgeois society in the historical "free competition" periodisation of capitalism. In the theory of state monopoly capitalism, this "model"

is subsequently transformed when monopoly capitalism enters into its "collapse" and "transitional" epoch of development. Here, the hostility to the construction of the "social state" from the monopoly domination of political systems expressed in Bolshevik theory is generated by the legitimation functions it performs for the social system which oppose the "immiseration"-critique of capitalism and the theory of revolutionary class consciousness of the European proletariat. However, with the new stage-theory of contemporary state monopoly capitalism and the acceptance of the concept of "state utilisation" in the post-Stalinist politics of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties, the "social state" is interpreted as an inter-class social instrument of appropriation in democratic anti-monopolist alliances. This has resulted in the functional theory of the state as both an instrument of the social domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie and a socio-technical apparatus for the social liberation of anti-monopolist alliances through the organisation of total social production processes.

By contrast, we will argue that the legitimation functions of bourgeois states are to be considered from the total political conception of bourgeois states, and thereupon, the facilitation of total social reproduction under the "general interest".

Since the crises of capitalist commodity production appear in circulation, an essential condition for the reproduction of capital requires that labour is in a position to re-enter the accumulation process after its initial period of subsumption to capital. However, this becomes especially acute with the historical fall in the general profit rate from the laws of absolute surplus-value production. Here, the extraction of surplus-value in the direction production process is intensified as individual capitals are compelled to reduce the

necessary labour-time in a given labour-day to a minimum through increasing labour productivity and extending absolute labour-time to a maximum⁽¹⁹⁸⁾. Further, from the laws of commodity production, there is no natural limit to the extraction of surplus-value except the maximum duration of the working-day⁽¹⁹⁹⁾ as capital in absolute surplus-value production attempts to extend the working-day beyond the physical limits of labour⁽²⁰⁰⁾. As Marx contends, "capital cares nothing for the length of the life of labour power"⁽²⁰¹⁾. Thereby, the absolute "miseration" of labour precipitates both the imminent destruction of the special commodity of labour-power and the consequent class struggle for the reproduction of the labour means of subsistence under bourgeois property relations. While the capitalist maintains the Right as purchaser of labour-power⁽²⁰²⁾; and labour the Right as seller of labour-power to reduce the working-day to a "normal length"⁽²⁰³⁾, this exchange is enacted within the framework of the juridical forms of capitalist property⁽²⁰⁴⁾.

Nevertheless, because the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production is dependent upon the reproduction of the special commodity labour-power⁽²⁰⁵⁾, the capitalist must be able to purchase labour-power as a use-value for capital-⁽²⁰⁶⁾ which is circulated between capitalists in commodity-exchanges for a given time-period, the length of the working-day⁽²⁰⁷⁾ - as wage-labour must be reconstituted outside the direct production process for its subsequent incorporation into the accumulation process⁽²⁰⁸⁾. However, disruptions to these reproduction relations in absolute surplus production increase from the total social expenses for the reproduction of labour-power with the intensification of labour exploitation⁽²⁰⁹⁾. Duly, Marx argues that "it would seem that the interest of capital itself points in the direction of a normal working day"⁽²¹⁰⁾. Thereupon, the logical and historical necessity of

capitals to transform the general social conditions of total capitalist reproduction in relative surplus value production subsequently compels the re-organisation of the social division of labour in individual capitalist enterprises to increase labour productivity by reducing commodity values and extracting the highest possible rates of exploitation.

Nevertheless, the resulting limitation of the labour-day to a "normal length" requires political implementation⁽²¹¹⁾ because the class of capital is not capable of "consciously" organising the reproduction of total social production processes. This does not contradict the total social relation of class domination but rather expresses its logical completion in the class anonymity of bourgeois states. Since capital simultaneously destroys and reproduces its own conditions of existence through the exterior compulsion of the laws of capitals⁽²¹²⁾, the free movement of capitals appears as the self-limit to the permanent reproduction of capital. As it is evident that general commodity circulation does not of itself produce an equalisation of labour-times to a social average in a "normal working-day"⁽²¹³⁾, the preservation of capitalism necessitates state functions in the form of the "public sphere" against all private property owners. These politics of state interventions for labour reproduction acts as a cohesive factor in the circulation of capitals and a general law for the promotion of the proportional distribution of capital and labour⁽²¹⁴⁾. This is another expression of how the general structure of bourgeois society contains the general form of bourgeois state as an autonomous social institution⁽²¹⁵⁾.

In the Western European experience, with the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production through the protection of labour in social legislation - the "social state", the exterior limitation to the free exchange of property Rights in the "general interest" of capital confronts both the individual interests of capital and labour⁽²¹⁶⁾.

This promulgates the "illusions" that the state and not capital reproduces labour under the social relations of Right (Recht). The concept of "social states" thereby functions under the "illusory" expression of class neutrality by which the capitalist mode of production is reproduced under the "general interest". These legitimation functions of states are produced from the real movements of individual capitals in circulation relations of total capitalist reproduction processes in a double perspective⁽²¹⁷⁾.

Legitimation functions - I

The social domination of general commodity production establishes the mode of social interaction of individual commodity producers in the objective mechanism of total capital socialisations⁽²¹⁸⁾. This takes the form of the separation of labour and the means of production in the direct production process and their unity in the circulation-process which establishes the specific combination of the total class of labour - the non-property owners of the means of production, and the total class of capital - the private property owner of the means of production, in the general movement form of capitalist contradictions of labour and capital in total social reproduction processes. Thereby, when labour-power produces commodities in the capital-form, the reproduction of the commodity-value of constant capital, the value of variable capital and the production of surplus-value from the inner relations of value production appears under commodity fetishism in the external circulation of commodity equivalents. The unequal and unfree exchange of capital and labour in the direct production process takes the exterior representation to the seller of the commodity labour-power, in the dependence of wage-labour to the valuational conditions of capital as the purchaser of the means of subsistence, and to the purchaser of the commodity labour-power as a cost-factor of capital production, in equal and free exchange of commodity circulation.

This primary process of socialisation determines bourgeois property Rights in the logical and historical development of "capital in general" and the reconversion of produced surplus-value from the sphere of commodity circulation to production. While the analytical critique of commodity-fetishism is only theoretically represented in the Keim-form of capital in simple commodity circulation as the most abstract "surface" of bourgeois social production relations, its further concretisation in the social domination of generalised commodity production appears in the contradictory movements of the capitalist mode of production. Thus, the value regulation of total social production sustains the reversal of "subject-object" relations "behind the backs" of individual producers in the social form by which classes are reproduced. As the laws of capitals only take their historical movement in the consciousness of production agents⁽²¹⁹⁾, then the objective laws of capital in historical reproduction processes unfold through the class praxis of production agents from the surface of capitals. Under commodity fetishism, the "inverted form" (verdrehte Form)⁽²²⁰⁾ of the consciousness of production agents is expressed in the formal equality and freedom of commodity owners⁽²²¹⁾ constitutive of the totality of social reproduction acts.

Legitimation functions - II

However, disruptions to the total social reproduction mechanisms of capital in the contradictions of capital circulation confront the "natural" legitimation processes in the formal equalities of general commodity exchanges. The subsequent restitution of the equalisation movements of capitals through the institutionalisation of bourgeois property Rights in the social functions of bourgeois states reconstitutes the general social conditions by which wage-labour experiences the production of social-wealth in commodity-form. This sustains the

social connection of bourgeois society through the subjective-ideological relations of bourgeois Right.

However, we have shown that bourgeois states do not constitute the conditions of their own sovereignty except in the "illusory forms" of social connections as "self-legitimation" (Selbstlegitimation)⁽²²²⁾.

As Marx argues:

"the relations of law (Rechtsverhältnisse) as well as state-forms (Staatsformen) are to be conceived neither out of themselves nor out of the so-called general development of the human spirit, but rather have their roots in the material relations of life (Lebensverhältnissen)"⁽²²³⁾. In distinction to the theory of state monopoly capitalism, the critique of these relations is not established at the level of "self-legitimation" of capital mystification as the "fusion" of economy and political suggests, without first considering the form-determination of the "surface" relations and ideological forms of social reproduction processes. Thereby, the legitimation processes of bourgeois states receive their objective character from the totality of capitalist commodity exchanges rather than the assumptions that the monopoly bourgeoisie instrumentally control the ideological apparatuses of bourgeois states. Consequently, we see that crises in ideological state apparatuses occur when existing legitimation processes cease to facilitate the social institutionalisation of class conflicts. Nevertheless, unless these contradict the form-determination of bourgeois social relations, the subsequent discharge of the "suppression-functions" of states from the separation of economy and political do not signify the dissolution of bourgeois Rechtsstaaten. Rather, the negation of "democratic states" under the political tendency to "authoritarian states" are issues of the ideology and politics of class movements.

7.3 State monopoly capitalism and class strategies

The theory of state monopoly capitalism which we have assessed in this Chapter also provides the premises upon which anti-monopolist strategies are formulated. Two initial considerations will be discussed here: (a) the interpretation of state interventionism in the theory of state monopoly capitalism and (b) its significance for anti-monopolist strategies. For an evaluation of the theory and tactics of state monopoly capitalism, our first concern is to establish the limits to state interventionism.

State interventionism

As the theory of state monopoly capitalism "derives" bourgeois states from the monopoly-domination of the economic and political processes of bourgeois society, the form and limits to the state functions are not examined from the capital-theoretical concept of total social reproduction processes⁽²²⁴⁾. Consequently, the possibility arises of conceptualising the "fusion" (Verschmelzung) of economy and political under systematic state interventionism in the theoretical and historical form of a "total social capitalist". Duly, no structural limits can be established upon the monopoly transfer of economic functions to the state, and its capacity to resolve the contradictions between classes and the state because the theory interprets the "relative autonomy" of the state in an instrumental relation to the dominant fractions of monopoly capitals.

Collectively, these considerations render state monopoly capitalism as a new relation of domination when the political system and economic institutionalised structure of bourgeois society are integrated into the state system.

Conversely, we consider that as the general functions of bourgeois states are derived from the necessity to guarantee capitalist commodity

production exchanges, they are determined by the reproduction relations of capitalist anarchy. Here, the state reacts to the "mystified" forms and contradictions of capital in circulation processes, where the social forms of wealth are separated from their source of origin⁽²²⁵⁾ in the laws of relative surplus-value production⁽²²⁶⁾. From this, we conclude that bourgeois states have only a "quantitative" significance for the capitalist mode of production because they do not "directly" intervene in relative surplus value production: thereupon they neither contradict the laws of value nor express the dissolution of capitalism through the transformation of its relations of production.

The separation of economy and political guarantees that bourgeois state interventionist functions in the reproduction process of capitals are structured by the "surface" relations of the totality of social connections of production, distribution and exchange. With such constraints, we postulate that the "ideal" character of state functions respond to the fall in the general profit-rate, which may be conceptualised before competition as a logical necessity from the over-accumulation of capital, while the limitations and disruptions to the historical equalisation of capitals expresses the real character of state functions to maintain the total social connection of capital reproduction. However, the dispensation of state functions are made possible only by the "autonomisation" of states as "ideal total social capitalists" through the separation of the economy and political.

Conversely, for the "unified-mechanism" of state monopoly capitalism to dominate the economy in a total state-property in the means of production as an "independent" social property in state sectors of production, the state must control the production and circulation of commodities within and/or between these production branches. However, if the totality of capitalist production relations form a total social property in "state property", "nationalisations" or a "general-cartel",

then the proposition contradicts the total social reproduction laws of the capitalist mode of production through individual economic properties of the "many capitals" in the means of production. The subsequent dissolution of the private commodity exchanges of the individual capitals signifies that there is no exchange of the total social product under the duplication of the commodity in commodity and money, and this is impossible in the capitalist mode of production⁽²²⁷⁾.

Rather, we have argued that the general laws of capital accumulation which establish the external compulsion on individual capitals to quantitatively accumulate the exchange-value mass leads to the qualitative structural transformation of the material elements of capital valuation. The over-accumulation of capital and the fall in the general profit-rate is the economic mechanism by which absolute surplus-value production is transformed into relative surplus-value production; both these are surplus-value forms of capital production which govern the mechanism of labour exploitation and the socio-technical conditions of the subsumption of labour to capital in "socialised" production relations. These forms of "social property" are not new laws of the capitalist mode of production independent of the value regulation of total social production.

Conversely, if the theorists of state monopoly capitalism advance any proposition less than that of the state as a real total social capitalist, then state interventions assume only a "selective character"⁽²²⁸⁾ and thereby militate against the concept of a centralised planning mechanism of total social production. In either case, it is not clear whether the superiority of the democratic control of state monopoly capitalism in anti-monopolist states resides in the redistribution of the total social product through the transformation of social appropriation relations or whether social planning operates according to the "use" of the general laws of state monopoly capitalism.

Here we consider that "state monopoly capitalism" overestimates the ability of bourgeois states to facilitate the social reproduction of private commodity exchanges under juridical property relations in the means of production so as to: regulate capitalism; contain the social contradictions between capital and labour; and importantly, organise the contradictions within the entire capitalist class, without expressing their reproduction in the functioning of state apparatuses. This is because the state-monopoly mechanism assumes the compatibility of state economic planning praxis with monopoly domination without fully considering (a), that state interventions are structurally limited by their form-determination and that (b), their practical efficacy is conditional upon the general profitability of capitalism and its accumulation potential on national and world markets. Consequently, neither the conflicts between capital and state over the form of social accumulation processes in "private capitalism" and "state capitalism", nor the contradictions in the concrete cyclical reproduction of total social capitals are abrogated under capitalist state interventionism.

Since juridical property relations are produced from capitalist production relations, all forms of capitalist property rest upon the total class of dispossessed labour. Without this consideration, "reformist" anti-monopolist strategies of capital management in state property receive a capital-negating character. Thus, ambiguity exists over the "illusory" potential of the structural "reforms" of capitalist production relations under socialist alternatives through the socio-technical instruments of state capitalist planning. While measures which benefit the "anti-monopolist alliance" improve the distribution of commodities for "social use", they do not enhance the accumulation of capital nor remove the limits to the reproduction of labour in

commodity-form; they only transform the distribution of profits. These relative gains may be more than compensated for by the manner in which the value of the commodity value of labour and capital are devalued in the cyclical movement of capitals.

Relations of distribution cannot transform the manner in which surplus value is appropriated and realised because the totality of circulation relations are determined by the total accumulation process. This places an inner limit to the potential redistribution of social wealth through the bourgeois state since the structure of total commodity value in exchange and use-values occasions a specific demand structure for the realisation of the capitalist commodity. As the distribution of value in its profit-form cannot expand the magnitude of total social value from the direct labour process⁽²²⁹⁾, then "social exploitation" in state monopoly capitalism cannot augment the average profitability of total social capital⁽²³⁰⁾. This is not to disregard the significance of "nationalisations" and the "social state" for the maintenance and amelioration of the conditions of labour reproduction but to acknowledge that they only "reform" capitalist relations of production⁽²³¹⁾.

Such a conclusion follows because as the expansion of production powers are only realised through capitalist competition, the defence of the "living standards" in market relations expresses labour interests through the reproduction of capitals. This in turn neglects to consider the impact accumulation crises in the double mode of labour exploitation in the direct production process and the social domination of capital in circulation. Duly, the programmatic demands of Communist Parties when defined through the reproduction relations of capitalist domination cease to be a critical emancipatory politics because the organisation of social labour and the distribution of its products are formulated under the governance of capitalist markets. Moreover, the limitation

to the institutionalisation of class conflicts in the form of "wage-politics" is contained in the organisation of labour under the planning dictates of capitalist enterprises. Here, the means of subsistence in wage-form are calculated in capitalist enterprises as a cost-factor of production and the capitalist's profit. The subsequent profit-competition of capitals promotes the attempt to reduce the costs of labour-power within the command structure of capital on labour. Thereby, the defence of labour interests within the economic structure of capitalism are equally necessary moments in the general reproduction of capital.

Having considered these limitations to state interventionism, we will now evaluate the interpretation of economic laws in the concept of state planning.

State planning and the laws of capitalism

On the basis of our discussion, the concept of the "use" of economic laws in state monopoly capitalism contradicts the unity of the "essence and appearances" of capitalism because the forms in which value appears are not considered as "concrete forms which grow out of the valuational process of capitals as a whole"⁽²³²⁾. These express the social objectivity of the "form-determinations" of the capitalist mode of production⁽²³³⁾ in a specific unity of the laws of surplus-value production and relations of circulation⁽²³⁴⁾. However, as we have already argued, in the capitalist mode of production, the "essence" of capitalism is "inverted" (verkehrt) in the mystified "appearance-forms" of competition where the consciousness of the production-agents is formed⁽²³⁵⁾. From this structure, the "spontaneity" of capitalist commodity production does not signify in its most fundamental sense, the absence of conscious economic behaviour either in individual capitalist enterprises or collective forms of social capital, but that the general laws of capitalist social reproduction

are not amenable to apprehension in the economic practices of the agents of production.

Conversely, Marx does not examine the real economic processes of capitalist production, but only their "form-determination"⁽²³⁶⁾ in which the objective laws of historical materialism "appear" in the totality of the subjective acts of the class agents of production. This is a social relation which "individuals enter into independently from one another, but they enter into it only as commodity owners in their mutual (wechselseitiges) existence for one another through their commodities, and they thus appear in the act (Tat) as only conscious bearers (bewusste Träger) of exchange processes"⁽²³⁷⁾. When considered from the capitalist's standpoint, we see that the "practical capitalist (praktische Kapitalist) is incapable of penetrating the inner essence (innere Wesen) and inner structure (innere Gestalt) through appearances"⁽²³⁸⁾. Consequently, capitalists cannot "know" in this process the formation of the general laws of capitalism⁽²³⁹⁾.

From the foregoing, we interpret the "use" of economic laws in state-monopoly planning as a capitalist epistemology formulated from the appearances of value-laws in historical reproduction relations⁽²⁴⁰⁾. Duly, since capitalist states relate to the same "surface" structures of capitalist relations of production, the capital-methodology of "state monopoly capitalism" is led to approximate the standpoint of "vulgar economy"⁽²⁴¹⁾. Rather, we assess the institutionalisation of science and economic calculation in state planning apparatuses as a capitalist knowledge derived as a reactive capacity to the spontaneity of total social reproduction processes.

While monopoly capitalist and state capitalist property give greater planning competence to individual spheres of capital⁽²⁴²⁾, it exists within the general laws of capitalist reproduction⁽²⁴³⁾. We therefore consider that the theory of state monopoly capitalism has

attributed to bourgeois states, capacities and functions which are practically beyond its planning competence. Moreover, as the "antinomies" of "competition and monopoly", "spontaneity and planning" are thought to contradict the laws of value, no qualitatively distinct criteria is advanced to demarcate capitalist from socialist planning⁽²⁴⁴⁾. This in turn sanctions the view that socialist relations of production can be created through the central planning mechanisms of bourgeois states.

Having assessed the general structural limits to state intervention and the regulation of economic laws, we will now apply these conclusions to the theory of over-accumulation/devaluation of capital.

The theory of the over-accumulation/devaluation of capital

Since the perspective of the theory of state monopoly capitalism is formulated at the level of the social connection of class relations, it postulates the institutional reconciliation of class contradictions through bourgeois states. The result of this approach promotes the theory of an inner regulation of total social production through the formal relations of the over-accumulation/devaluation of capitals.

Conversely, we have argued that the modes of accomplishment of capitalism are "form-determined" by "capital in general" (Kapital im allgemeinen). This establishes the general theoretical connection between the laws of value and the over-accumulation of capital expressed in the fall of the general profit-rate. Moreover, it is conceived before competition because in the analytical mode of representation of the general laws of capitalism, the general profit-rate has the same social and theoretical validity as the laws of value. Here we consider that the dialectical development of "capital in general" presupposes the specific forms of capital⁽²⁴⁵⁾ so as to analytically represent the abstract movements of individual capitals as elements of total social capital. The subsequent analysis of the historical formation of

capitals, including "state capital" does not contradict this structure, nor the equalisation-tendencies of capitals.

Conversely, the theory of the over-accumulation of capital and its devaluation in "state-capital" can only be advanced with the dissolution of the logical structure of capital. In distinction, we consider that the "solution" to the over-accumulation of capital is a contradictory relation of social accumulation because the cyclical over-accumulation simultaneously expresses the devaluation of capital⁽²⁴⁶⁾. In this respect, "devaluation (Entwertung) forms a moment of the self-valuation process (Verwertungsprozesse)"⁽²⁴⁷⁾. Consequently, the factors which counteract the fall in the general profit-rate are inherent in its functioning because "the fall in the rate of profit and the acceleration of accumulation are only different expressions of the same processes in so far as both express the development of production powers"⁽²⁴⁸⁾. Here we note that the formation of the general profit-rate is accompanied by a growth of total capital and the produced mass of profit⁽²⁴⁹⁾. Nevertheless in the "surface" relations of capital, the expansion of production powers appear from the "same" causes of the "double-edged law" of the fall in the general profit-rate⁽²⁵⁰⁾ and the increase in the profit-mass⁽²⁵¹⁾. This mode of action of the "self-valuation of capitals" is represented by the "growth of total capitals in faster progression than that wherein the profit-rate falls"⁽²⁵²⁾. Therefore, the concept of an "over accumulation of capital" is regulated by the general laws which express the fall in the general profit-rate⁽²⁵³⁾.

Similarly, we consider that the concept of the "devaluation of capital"⁽²⁵⁴⁾ is derived from the general laws of total social reproduction⁽²⁵⁵⁾. Given an absolute over-production of capital in all capitalist sectors to establish the over-production on total social capital⁽²⁵⁶⁾, an augmented capital $C + C^1$ produces no more capital than the original capital, and leads to the devaluation of capital⁽²⁵⁷⁾.

As Marx argues, "it is ... clear that this actual devaluation of old capitals is found ... to be ... not without struggle, that ... an ... additional capital of C^1 is not able to act as capital without struggle"⁽²⁵⁸⁾. It follows that individual capitals are only elements of total social capital to the extent that they have withstood the competition of capital in which over-accumulation and devaluation occurs⁽²⁵⁹⁾. Moreover, we may analytically distinguish the "devaluation" (Entwertung) of capital from "capital in general"⁽²⁶⁰⁾, because the "non-valuation" (Nichtverwerten) of capital supposes its exclusion from the accumulation process as a "real element of production"⁽²⁶¹⁾.

Duly, the "solution" to the over-accumulation of capital is expressed in the devaluation of capital from the equalisation-mechanism of the general profit-rates. This is not a planning capacity of states to the extent that the "conscious use" of economic laws in the capital-methodology of state monopoly capitalism completes the concept of "capital in general". Rather, it cannot be known from the laws of the over-accumulation/devaluation of capital which fraction of total capital is to be excluded from accumulation as a "conscious" capital devaluation before competition⁽²⁶²⁾. In deference to this, "state capital" is unable to provide a planned "solution" to capitalist crises because they operate reactively to accumulation: the general profit-rate does not fall as a consequence of the over-production of capital but the "converse; because the fall in the profit-rate and the over-production of capital spring from the same circumstances and now step in competitive struggle"⁽²⁶³⁾. In addition, the competition of capitals on the world markets create further conditions beyond the planning-radius of capitalist states.

Rather, the typical "solution" to the over-accumulation of capital is contained within the cyclical valuation-devaluation of capital. Here, the proportionality of total social production branches is the

result of a permanent process of disproportionalities⁽²⁶⁴⁾. As Marx asks, "how does this conflict become equalised again and capitalist production's corresponding relations again made into a sound (gesunden) movement? The mode of equalisation is already contained in the mere expression of conflicts for whose equalisation they act"⁽²⁶⁵⁾.

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, the analysis of the socialisation of capital in the "centralisation of capital", "joint-stock capital" and "state-capital" arise from the contradictory movements of the general character of the capitalist mode of production. Therefore, it is questionable to refer to "state capital devaluations" in a programmatic sense as an independent sphere of capital with which to facilitate a social capital management. This is also evident when we consider that as the general laws of the capitalist mode of production are only made operative in the totality of social production acts, capital accumulation is dependent upon class relations. Consequently, the over-accumulation/devaluation of capital cannot be postulated as a theory of planned economy independently from the class conditions in which the capital relation is reproduced. The concept of a centrally directed planning apparatus thereby overestimates the possibilities of a transformation of capitalism through the structure of state monopoly capitalism. For this rests upon the "illusion" that a sector of capitalist production relations no longer function under the general laws of capitalism and the contradictory movement of capital accumulation⁽²⁶⁶⁾. Rather, the attempt to generate social instruments of state economic planning praxis for the administration of total reproduction processes of national economies is restricted to the sphere of distribution and realisation.

The contradiction between state monopoly capitalism and the "people"

In the foregoing discussion, we have argued the importance of examining capitalism from its general laws rather than the suppositions of the social domination of the economic and political processes by the "monopolies". Its significance for the contemporary theory of anti-monopolist strategies relates to the "populist" character of state monopoly capitalism which expresses the economic foundations of class alliances in the concept of the "interests of the entire people". Here, the class constitution of anti-monopolist alliances directly follows from the structural contradiction between the economic and political institutional framework of state monopoly capitalism and the "people". This argumentation is itself based upon the creation of the liberating functions of the materialist foundations of socialism in the socialisations of state monopoly capitalism and the objective mechanisms of social transition in the theory of the "fusion".

Two propositions can be distinguished for the concept of "anti-monopolist alliances" from the formation of finance-capital as a new category of capitalism and its political consequences for the dissolution of the unity of the total capitalist class. Firstly, the monopolies ruin individual producers, farmers, artisans, small and middle capitalists⁽²⁶⁷⁾, thereby compounding different classes into a single social unit whose interests can be defined unilaterally against the "monopolies". This intensifies the economic polarisation of the capitalist economy between the monopoly capitalist class and the "people". Secondly, the concept of the "people" supplies the objective social basis for the inter-class alliances, because both the working-class and the non-monopoly classes are reproduced in an economic relation of dependence to the "monopolies" which necessitates a political alliance under the leadership of the working-class⁽²⁶⁸⁾.

However, in the former proposition, since the concept of "social exploitation" serves as the foundation of the "class interests of the people", the socialisation of production processes predominates over their capital character. This conclusion follows from the transformation of the regulation of production under the "surface" specificity of the social connections of general capitalist commodity production in the "profit-price-mechanism". Consequently, these economic foundations of class alliances replace the social validity of the labour theory of value for the general laws of movement of bourgeois society, and follow Lenin's analysis of capitalism which has not distinguished the general social form in which the classes of capital and labour are reproduced.

Conversely, in the latter proposition, the "primacy of the political" overrides the social objectivity of class interests within anti-monopolist alliances, and thereby the capital-mechanism from which the interests of the total capitalist class are reproduced in the "general interest" of bourgeois society.

We may derive two conclusions when the contradiction of capital and labour is interpreted in the relation of "state monopoly capitalism and the people".

Firstly, the interests of classes are not defined from the objective conditions of total social reproduction conditions⁽²⁶⁹⁾. Because of this, the theory has not convincingly explained the economic rationale of class alliances: their necessity in the pre-revolutionary stage of anti-monopolist transition when the working-class remains the principal class and foundation of the capitalist mode of production; how the concept of "non-monopoly capital" supplies the social production conditions by which non-monopoly fractions of capital have interests

commensurate with those of labour; and how they qualitatively transform the proletarianisation of labour, the separation of the direct producers from the control of the means of production and so the capital quality of social production relations in the accumulation process.

Secondly, we see that the political form of the interest-representation of social classes receives a new structure in state monopoly capitalism. This is introduced into the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state under the monopoly-domination of the political process and the contradictions to which it gives rise in the capitalist class. Moreover, the contradiction between the monopoly and non-monopoly capitalist class is co-determined with the necessity to formulate "system interests" through the autonomy of the state against the interests of the entire capitalist class. In these conditions, the instrumental concept of state supplies the rationale for the social utilisation of its apparatuses under "anti-monopolist alliances".

From the foregoing considerations we conclude that the derivation of anti-monopolist class alliances from the contradiction of "monopolies and the people" provides an insufficient capital-theoretical basis of the analysis of class strategies. Rather, our discussion suggests that contemporary capitalism does not invalidate the examination of the principal class relations of the capitalist mode of production.

On the basis of the abstract representation of social accumulation in capital-form, we may define social classes as the position of production agents in the relations of production and distribution. This contrasts to the "historical" interpretation of Das Kapital characteristic of the theory of state monopoly capitalism which has omitted to distinguish productive and unproductive labour in the analytical and methodological representation of individual to total social capital⁽²⁷⁰⁾.

From the exchange of capital and labour in the direct production process, the structure of capitalist exploitation contains surplus-value producing labour. In this respect, "only wage-labour is productive, produces capital"⁽²⁷¹⁾, because the methodology of "capital in general" excludes the historical forms of capital circulation. However, it does not follow that from the standpoint of total social reproduction processes all wage-labour is productive labour, but rather that in the analysis of the formation and circulation of productive capital the further "form-determinations" of individual capitals - such as commercial and merchant capital - are not considered. Although they are capital, the labour they employ does not produce surplus-value but circulates total social commodity value in the exchange of capitals.

In this respect, our analysis of state monopoly capitalism has shown that the creation of "social capital" and "collective capitalist property" are necessary for the reproduction of individual surplus-value producing capitals, given the historical over-accumulation of capital with regard to the inner limit to the reproduction of capitals from the increasing total social organic composition of capital. However, capitalist production of this nature tends to be characterised by an inability to "value" its commodities because of the above social average turn-over times, given the necessary magnitude of capital advanced, and the period of social labour times involved in their production. Consequently, the reproduction of total social production requires the performance of a volume of social labour functions to produce the general conditions of capitalist commodity production. This extends the fraction of money capital and joint-stock capital which remains outside the direct production process, and has the double function of providing both a general consumption commodity while maintaining the valuation conditions of commodity-capital by

reducing the circulation-time (transport and communications) of commodity capital. This surplus-labour time is only indirectly productive, because while it contributes to the value of other commodities, it is paid out of the circulation costs of capital and is thereby not exchanged as a use-value of capital⁽²⁷²⁾. Moreover, as this labour is paid-out out of the produced mass of value from productive labour, it must comply to the long-run discipline of the inner-regulation of total social production by the laws of value.

From this we define the concept of the "working-class" as that labour which directly or indirectly contributes to the production and circulation of total social commodity value; it duly extends beyond the direct production process. Conversely, wage-labour is unproductive which exchanges with revenues and neither directly nor indirectly contributes to the valuation of capital.

Thus, the functions of the collective character of social labour, particularly in state capitalist production, do not contradict the concept of working-class with historical forms of capital nor "undermine" the laws of generalised commodity production, but rather express the proletarianisation of labour in the current stage of capital accumulation. Thereby, the principal economic foundation of social classes are not contradicted in state monopoly capitalism. In turn, it follows that the autonomisation of the means of production against labour exists in state and nationalised property in the means of production.

On this basis, we may further consider the contradiction between "monopolies and the people".

Firstly, "non-monopoly capital" and "monopoly capital", as individual capitals, are fractions of total social capital and form the social relation of the entire capitalist class. Therefore, since the socially dominant production conditions are imposed upon all individual capitals,

they are drawn into the equalisation process. So, the reproduction of individual capital is constrained not only by its own accumulation-cycle but also the general laws of total social reproduction processes. Moreover, with the internationalisation of the structure of capital, national accumulation is increasingly drawn into the world market movement of capitals. Thereupon, as national capitals are forced to correspond to the average production conditions of world capital, the accumulation and devaluation of capital demonstrates that national accumulation cycles are not autonomous but are only completely formed through the international economy. Consequently, the economic differentiation of classes into capital and labour, and fractions of capital, receive their objective interests from the general laws of capital accumulation in a more complicated social contradiction than that of "monopolies and the people".

Secondly, as "monopoly capital" and "state capital" are not excluded from the capital mechanism, they are therefore structurally limited by the internationalisation of capitalist accumulation and the world market competition of capitals in inter-imperialist contradictions. Moreover, since the "interests of the people" are defined against the monopolies nationally, they respond to the social potential for a superior democratic form of state capital management, while internationally they are drawn into the exploitation of the disparities between national capitals on the world market.

On the basis of our discussion, we conclude that: (a) the contradiction between "monopolies and the people" is not a capital-theoretical examination of the class relations upon which anti-monopolist programmatic demands are undertaken in "anti-monopolist states"; and (b) the attempt to manage national capitalist accumulation processes through the "primacy" of state-politics is structurally undermined by the competition of capitals. This component of anti-monopolist strategies is characterised by Lenin's concept of "social-imperialism".

Democratic state capitalism and anti-monopolist politics

The theory of anti-monopolist strategies which we have evaluated so far is also dependent upon the political concept of a democratic anti-monopolist stage of transition from state monopoly capitalism to socialism. This conceptualisation of the political form of social emancipation is formulated from the premises of monopoly capitalism which contradict the normal form of capitalist reproduction and initiate the historical usurpation of the general form of political power in bourgeois parliamentary democracies under the political system of imperialist republics. However, our analysis suggests alternative propositions on both the crisis nature of capitalist systems and their political forms of reproduction.

We consider that the formulation of the theory of democratic state capitalism is not independent from the manner in which the theory of state monopoly capitalism has interpreted the monopoly domination of political systems of class power. Principally, this analysis has conceptualised the political systems of class domination and the process of their transformation as primarily superstructural movements of bourgeois society. Consequently, the usurpation of the classical forms of bourgeois parliamentary democracy is not derived from the totality of bourgeois social relations. Conversely, as the assumptions of the conscious control of state power by the monopoly bourgeoisie separates the political superstructures from the general reproduction of society as society and state, class hegemony is represented in direct forms of political power. On this basis we concluded that Marxism-Leninism was neither theoretically nor practically in a position to anticipate fascist political systems nor the commitment of the labour movement to bourgeois democracy. This occurred because the ideology and theory of communist politics were shown to be constructed upon the premises of

the "collapse" of capitalism and the transition of bourgeois society to socialism through state monopoly capitalism.

Conversely, we have discussed the re-appraisal of bourgeois-democracy in Marxist-Leninist theory, especially after 1956, as the political form of organisation with which anti-monopolist alliances confront the perceived social causes of the crisis of capitalism and the creation of imperialist republics. However, the limitations of this analysis of democracy follow from the fact that state monopoly capitalism has not established the "form-determination" of the political superstructures of bourgeois society. Consequently, the theory does not examine the full implications of "anti-monopolist democracy" remaining a form of class domination within the legitimation problematic of the "illusory form" of political community and without contradicting the general form of the bourgeois state as a Rechtsstaat.

Further we consider that since the theory of anti-monopolist alliances postulates a pre-stage of socialist construction, the democratisation of the structures of state monopoly capitalism constitute necessary components in the conquest of political power and the realisation of anti-monopolist class objectives. The dilemma this creates for the theory and ideology of Marxism-Leninism is that of connecting revolutionary class politics to the anti-monopolist theory of democratic socialism, and of establishing the bases of socialist transformation in a democratic state capitalism through the popular sovereignty of the electoral politics of bourgeois parliamentary political systems. In this regard, the theory does not supply a comprehensive social-theoretical critique of the economic and political form of bourgeois social relations.

Rather, in contradistinction, from the Marxist general concept of capital the social connection between the reproduction of the economic

structure of bourgeois society in capitalist social formations and the political form of class domination is established from the "form-determined" separation of economy and political⁽²⁷³⁾. However, although capitalist accumulation governs the historical constitution of social classes in the general laws of capital accumulation, the manner by which the social contents of capitalist contradictions are resolved in bourgeois political systems is dependent upon the ideology and politics of class movements. It follows that as the transformation of bourgeois-democratic into authoritarian political systems results from the historical conditions in which bourgeois society is reproduced, these cannot be generalised as historical attributes of the economic and political systems of Western European capitalist societies. Consequently, state monopoly capitalism cannot constitute a "unified-mechanism" of economy and political in a "ready-made" social structure independent of the general reproduction conditions of capital and class.

From the foregoing discussion, it is questionable to formulate an anti-monopolist stage of democracy with which to confront the politics of the monopoly bourgeoisie within the social superstructure of the bourgeois state. This is because the "political" form of social relations in bourgeois society is reproduced as a moment of the social power of capital in the class anonymity of the bourgeois state. Moreover, in this regard we have also suggested that the political form of the bourgeois-capitalist state is not contradicted by the tendency to a politically authoritarian state. We therefore consider that the fundamental social mechanism by which the contradiction of social classes are represented in the bourgeois state has not been transformed. Since we have argued that the economic differentiations of social classes are reproduced in the competition of capitals, the objective interests to which they give rise must find expression in the ideological state apparatuses

and the interventionist functions of state economic planning.

Conversely, the paradox arises of contrasting the "powerlessness" of the social basis of "anti-monopolist alliances" to the political forms in which the power of the monopoly capitalist class is to be transformed in "anti-monopolist states" or "democratic state capitalism". This problem becomes especially acute in the theory of the peaceful transition to socialism through the structural reforms of bourgeois-democratic parliamentary systems.

State monopoly capitalism and the organisation of the labour movement

The social organisation of anti-monopolist strategies which we have discussed responds to the ideological and political forms of social emancipation which realise the socialised production relations of state monopoly capitalism. The problems generated here express the insufficiency of the analysis of capitalist society from the theory of "collapse" and its functions for the social critique of class domination. These are especially important for contemporary Marxism-Leninism because the history of "anti-monopolist strategies" in the European labour movement demonstrates that capitalist social relations neither autonomously "collapse" nor spontaneously create an anti-fascist or "progressive democratic" anti-monopolist alliance of social classes.

Rather, we consider that the traditional Marxist-Leninist theory of the "collapse" of capitalism has promoted a mechanistic class analysis of bourgeois society from the objective laws of historical materialism, with the consequent anticipation of the creation of a revolutionary proletarian class consciousness as a historical moment in the crises of capital accumulation. Because of this, the "subjective" dimension of Marxist philosophy and politics is fundamental to the rationale of the Leninist theory of the Party, and the formulation of its traditional vanguard functions for the promotion of socialist

revolution in Western European capitalist countries.

In the contemporary stage of state monopoly capitalism, this is interpreted in the direction of the functions of Communist Parties towards the formation of an "anti-monopolist consciousness" for the "utilisation" and transformation of bourgeois states. However, in the former respect, the Party organises anti-monopolist class alliances without confronting the total social mechanism of capitalist reproduction. This problem arises from the fact that Leninist theory has not established the full class character of bourgeois ideology from the totality of capitalist commodity production relations. In the latter, the strategy of the labour movement is accommodated to the institutional orders of bourgeois states to both democratise state apparatuses and control the ideological state apparatuses by which class hegemony is construed as a functional agency of the monopoly bourgeoisie's social domination. This is expressed in the explanation of the "retardation" of consciousness from the ideological and economic functions of modern "social states", in addition to the superstructural critique of the "reformist" and "opportunist" labour politics of Social-Democratic Parties and trade-unions.

Two propositions may be advanced here on the Marxist-Leninist analysis of anti-monopolist strategies in state monopoly capitalism.

Firstly, the theory of state monopoly capitalism does not invalidate the concept of the "collapse" of capitalism, but rather supplies a new formulation by which the objective laws of capitalism are transformed under the anti-crisis planning instruments of bourgeois states. Nevertheless, as the analysis of the transitional character of bourgeois society is still structured by the objective movements of production powers in the periodisation of capitalism, the theory of class strategies possesses an ideological character because of the prior assumptions it expresses on the general laws of movement of bourgeois society.

Secondly, the Marxist-Leninist Party contains the political form in which class struggle is organised in deference to its ideological functions which compensate for the absence of a spontaneous capital-negating politics in the Western European labour movement. Despite this, we consider that the identification of the spontaneity of class action in the "character masks" of the "surface" of capital does not contradict the theory that social classes are the real subjects of bourgeois social relations and the processes of their transformation. Moreover, we conclude that the attempt to create a mass Communist Party based upon non-sectarian politics in bourgeois parliamentary democracies enters into irresolvable contradictions with the Marxist-Leninist concept of the political organisation of the proletariat under vanguard Communist Parties. The issue here relates to the juxtaposition of the traditions of Marxism-Leninism with the political organisation of social emancipation in constitutional forms of representative parliamentary democracies.

Democratic state capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat

In turn, the attempt to resolve this contradiction under "democratic socialism" leads to the diminution of the distinction between bourgeois-democratic and socialist emancipation in contemporary Marxism-Leninism. This expresses the combinations of economy and political in state monopoly capitalism as the objective social foundations from which the new relation of revolutionary theory to the political form of social emancipation is articulated in anti-monopolist democracy. The subsequent abandonment of the theory and politics of proletarian dictatorship duly exhibits the renunciation of the revolutionary class politics associated with traditional Marxist-Leninist theory. Consequently, we see that contemporary Marxism-Leninism constructs the political form of social transition through the completion of democratic Right in the institutionalisation of a democratic state capitalism. However, in this regard we consider that

Communist Parties have not advanced an unambiguous socialist strategy for contemporary capitalism because both (a), the inner theoretical limits to the construction of socialism through the structures of state monopoly capitalism and (b), the formulation of social emancipation in anti-monopolist strategies politically precludes the composition of a definitively proletarian class theory and politics.

Conversely, we can illustrate the distance which the contemporary Marxist-Leninist theory of political power in the period of socialist transition has travelled from "classical Marxism". On the premises of the materialist conception of history, Marx advances that "class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat", and that this "dictatorship only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society"⁽²⁷⁴⁾. By contrast to the formulation of an anti-monopolist stage-theory of transition from capitalism to socialism, in the socialist stage of transition there "corresponds also a period of political transition (politische Übergangsperiode) wherein the state can be nothing other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat"⁽²⁷⁵⁾. As this constitution of the political form of social emancipation of labour is a "lower-stage" of communism, it is also inseparable from the dissolution of the economic forms of organisation and reproduction of classes in bourgeois society:

"what the proletariat has to do is to transform the present capitalist structure of organised labour and those centralised means of labour, to transform them from means of class rule and class exploitation into forms of free associated labour and social means of exploitation"⁽²⁷⁶⁾.

Although the theorists of state monopoly capitalism do not advance an uncritical theory of society and the state, it is limited to the

process of the transformation of social relations through their democratisation. Thus, we consider that the consequent "utilisation" of these social institutions are not political instruments with which the relations of generalised capitalist commodity production - which establish capital as the social subject, and labour the social object - are reversed, because the social superstructures of bourgeois society are themselves a product and condition of the separation of the economy and political in the capitalist mode of production. In this regard, the transformation of state monopoly capitalism is associated with a "revolution from above" by which socialism is introduced into bourgeois society through the capitalist state⁽²⁷⁷⁾. Rather, it appears that the theory has not unambiguously established democratic state capitalism as a liberating instrument of free associated labour from the re-organisation of the "inner-structure" of bourgeois society. Thereby, only a partial critique of economy and political is evident in the articulation of the new forms of organisation of the labour movement with which to secure the direct social appropriation of the materialist foundations of civil society.

CHAPTER 7REFERENCES

1. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 887.
2. K. Marx, Capital, Volume III, p. 791; Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 231.
3. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 57.
4. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 380.
5. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 86.
6. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 209.
7. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 209.
8. K. Marx, Capital, Volume II, p. 36.
9. K. Marx, Theories, Volume II, p. 504; 'Zur Kritik', p. 18.
10. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 95.
11. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 87.
12. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 354.
13. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 209.
14. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.1, pp. 373-5; Das Kapital, MEW, 23, pp. 209-10.
15. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 888-9.
16. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 152, p. 198.
17. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 559; MEW, 25, p. 13, 17.
18. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 53.
19. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 53 (emphasis added), p. 197.
20. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 25, p. 192.
21. See C. Neuss, Imperialismus, p. 100; D. Jordan, 'Der Monopolbegriff in System der politischen Ökonomie', in Monopol und Staat, pp. 137-172 (p. 146).
22. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 354 (emphasis added).
23. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.1, p. 366.
24. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 76.
25. K. Marx, Theories, Volume I, p. 391; Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p.201 .
26. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.1, p. 366.

27. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 23, p. 86.
28. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 90.
29. V.I. Lenin, Karl Marx, LSW, 1, p. 42.
30. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 23, p. 95 n. 32.
31. K. Marx, Capital, Volume III, p. 826 (emphasis added).
32. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 25, p. 887.
33. W. Wagner, Verelendungstheorie, p. 246.
34. K. Marx, 'op. cit.', p. 890 (emphasis added).
35. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 268.
36. A. Granou, 'La Nouvelle Crise du Capitalisme', Les Temps Modernes, 327-9 (1973), 998-1025 (p. 1001).
37. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 23, p. 304.
38. P. Hess, 'Fragen der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', BDIP, 8 (1974) 826-841 (p. 830); 'Wider den imperialistischen Ökonomismus', Facit, 35 (1974) 5-21 (p. 9); G. Krause, Monopoltheorie, p. 29.
39. P. Hess, 'Fragen', (p. 829); G. Krause, 'ibid.', pp. 24-5, p. 32.
40. P. Hess, 'Wider den imperialistischen', (p. 13); Braunsdorf und Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, Chapter 4, pp. 118-135.
41. P. Hess, 'ibid.', (pp. 8-11).
42. P. Hess, 'Fragen', (p. 831, p. 829).
43. K. Marx, *Theorien*, MEW, 26.2, p. 374.
44. P. Hess, 'Fragen', (p. 830). For example, despite Hess's attempt to situate monopoly theory in the general theory of capitalism, the argument is diminished when Hess argues that the forms of profit are modes of appropriation, and that the "stages of the development of capitalist property are necessary forms of capitalist appropriation processes". P. Hess, 'Wider den imperialistischen', (p. 10). For Hess, "stages" in the development of capitalist property are "stages" in the relations of capitalist exploitation and therefore the economic relations of production.
45. Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 67.
46. Braunsdorf and Löffler, 'ibid.', p. 68; P. Hess, 'Fragen', (p. 832); G. Krause, Monopoltheorie, p. 29.
47. See Braunsdorf and Löffler, p. 67. These relations are developed by Lenin in the "new connections" (Beziehungen) and forms (Formen) of capitalism in imperialism. As Krause argues, "in direct connection and in continuation of Marx's theory, (Lenin) concentrates his examination in the representation of the adequate mode of accomplishment of the economic laws of capital in the form of monopoly competition". G. Krause, 'op. cit.', p. 30.

48. Braunsdorf and Löffler, 'ibid.', p. 118.
49. G. Krause, 'op. cit.', p. 30.
50. P. Hess, 'Fragen', (p. 832).
51. See here, K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26,2, p. 100.
52. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 317.
53. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 452.
54. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 453 (emphasis added).
55. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 454.
56. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 544.
57. H. Reichelt, Zur logischen Struktur des Kapitalbegriffs bei Marx, p. 85.
58. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 206; K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.3, p. 437.
59. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 25, p. 194; K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 449.
60. These concepts are examined upon the basis of Marx's capital-methodology.
61. See K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 454.
62. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 184.
63. See A.K., Allgemeine Krise, pp. 23-4.
64. K. Marx, Capital, Volume III, p. 865.
65. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 162.
66. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 53.
67. As a social category, exchange value is a consequence of value. See K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 23, p. 53, p. 54.
68. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 52.
69. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 153.
70. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 640.
71. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 25, p. 155.
72. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 155. The converse also applies.
73. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 172. Here the general profit rate is determined through the : 1, the organic composition of capital in different spheres of production and the different profit rates in individual spheres; 2, the division of total social capitals in these different spheres, their relative size in each particular sphere and thus to a specific profit rate on invested capital, that is,

73. (Continued)

through the relative share of total social capital absorbed by each particular production sphere.

74. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 152. Note, Marx has excluded the factors of world market competition from this stage of the analysis by assessing equivalent national rates of surplus value in different countries and equivalent national exploitation rates of labour.
75. However, for a discussion on the problems in Mattick's value-analysis, see F. Eberle, 'Bemerkungen zum Erklärungsanspruch der Marxschen Theorie' in Aspekte der Marxschen Theorie (Frankfurt, 1973) pp. 363-386; V. Brandes, 'Über die Ursachen der Nachkriegsprosperität. Eine Kritik an Paul Mattick', in Krisen und Krisentheorien, pp. 189-203.
76. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.3, p. 187.
77. K. Marx, Capital, Volume III, p. 217.
78. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 218.
79. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 117.
80. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 25, p. 171 (emphasis added), p. 379.
81. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 255, p. 769.
82. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 187.
83. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 192.
84. P. Mattick, states that these are established primarily in circulation. See Marx and Keynes (New York, 1969), p. 41.
85. However, as Marx argues, "the general profit rate exists only as a permanent tendency and movement to the equalisation of particular profit rates". See Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 379.
86. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 23, p. 73.
87. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 255, p. 769.
88. More generally, extra profits on individual capitals are derived from the reproduction structure of national and international production relations.
89. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 24, p. 80, p. 71; Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 254.
90. Thereby we hold that the "price-profit-mechanism" is a social "appearance-form" under which the total labour fund is distributed by the market-mechanism.
91. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.3, p. 473.

92. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 474.
93. As Marx argues, in the "ready-made" (fertigen) capitals which appear as the unity of total production and circulation processes, surplus value is concealed. 'ibid.', p. 476.
94. K. Marx, 'ibid.', pp. 178-9.
95. Moreover, despite the ability of monopolies to raise "extra-profits" from the distribution of produced surplus-value (profit-mass), these may be associated with an increase in the organic composition of capital and therefore not necessarily with higher profit rates.
96. We consider that this conclusion can only be derived from the analysis of the value-problematic of capitalism.
97. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 23, p. 653; MEW, 25, p. 229.
98. K. Marx, 'ibid.', 25, p. 92.
99. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 256.
100. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 23, p. 654; MEW, 25, p. 655.
101. See J. Hirsch, Staatsapparat und Reproduktion des Kapitals, (Frankfurt, 1974), p. 174.
102. K. Marx, 'op. cit.', MEW, 25, p. 653.
103. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 651.
104. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 655. The opposed concepts of "stagnation" and "consumer society" must be examined from the realisation-conditions of total social capital and the subordination of the means of consumption to the means of production.
105. Duly, they are expressed in the contradictory character of the general laws of value on the world market.
106. P. Hess and H. Heininger, Aktualität, p. 95.
107. See R. Winkelmann, 'Grundzüge', (p. 59).
108. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 23, p. 54.
109. See A. D. Magaline, Lutte de classes, p. 59. This also accommodates the critique of the "contradiction" of the powers and relations of production: (a), "le développement des forces productives du travail associé s'effectue en tant que développement du capital, est approprié (réellement) par le capital-et donc par la class capitaliste.." and (b), "les rapports de production capitalistes se matérialisent dans des unités de production qui sont séparées les unes des autres et qui constituent des centres relativement autonomes d'appropriation 'réelle'; en mêmes temps, la matérialisation ces mêmes rapports articule ces unités entre elles et les rend réellement dépendantes les unes des autres (à travers un type de division du travail 'dans la société', une division entre branches de production, etc.)"..
A. D. Magaline, 'ibid.', p. 65.

110. P. Hess and K. Zieschang, 'Das Finanzkapital - Der Zusammenhang zwischen Kapitalverwertung und Kapitalmacht im heutigen Kapitalismus', WW, 11 (1972), (p. 1677).
111. O. Reinhold, Die Wirtschaftskrisen (Berlin, 1974), p. 60.
112. See K. Heuer, 'Der Marxismus-Leninismus über die Haupttriebkkräfte des wissenschaftliche-technischen Fortschritts im Imperialismus von heute'.
113. This is because the theory of state monopoly capitalism tends to express the empirical phenomena most prevalent at the particular phase of capital accumulation.
114. We will develop this below in relation to the "social state".
115. This follows Lenin's example which not only fails to recognise the form-determination of capitalist production but actually supports the appropriation of a "capitalist economic culture".
116. See H. Grossmann on this definition in Das Akkumulations, p. IX, p. 619.
117. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 336; also see the Grundrisse p. 662 where Marx argues, "das Hereinkommen der Maschinerie zu entwickeln aus der Konkurrenz und dem von ihr ausgelösten Gesetz der Produktion der Reduktionkosten, ist leicht. Es handelt sich hier darum, sie aus dem Verhältnis des Kapitals, zur lebendigen Arbeit, ohne Rücksicht auf andres Kapital zu entwickeln".
118. J. Hirsch, Staatsapparat, p. 175, p. 173; 'Thesen zu Funktion und zum Charakter des Staatsinterventionismus im technologiebereich', in Rahmenbedingungen, pp. 135-42.
119. J. Hirsch, Staatsapparat, 'ibid.', p. 174.
120. See 'Marx and P.V. Annenkov', MEW, 27, p. 456.
121. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 27.
122. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 550.
123. This is a long-run consideration under which the laws of value are reasserted.
124. K. Marx, 'Das Kapital', MEW, 25, p. 452.
125. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 452.
126. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 397, p. 399.
127. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 23, p. 351.
128. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 351.
129. See K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 344.
130. K. Marx, 'ibid.', pp. 352-3.

131. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 354.
132. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 354.
133. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 353.
134. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, pp. 404-12.
135. Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 100.
136. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.3, p. 485, pp. 458-9.
137. See K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 280, 287, 290, 291; Theorien, MEW, 26.3, pp. 472-3.
138. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 291.
139. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 454.
140. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 452.
141. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 454.
142. This interprets state interventionist functions in relation to the anarchy of capitals.
143. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 457, p. 620.
144. H. Scheler, 'Zu einem Problem', (p. 690).
145. This is why infrastructure is the initial object of joint-stock capital.
146. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 765; Theories, Volume III, p. 486.
147. K. Marx, Theories, Volume III, p. 518.
148. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 519.
149. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 23, p. 791.
150. As Marx argues, the "social character of capital is first by means of, and fully realised through, the full development of the credit and banking-system", Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 620.
151. This "abolishes (hebt) with it the private character of capitals and also contains in itself, however also only in itself, the dissolution (Aufhebung) of capitals themselves". See K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 606, 620.
152. As Marx contends "interest bearing capital, the self-reproducing character of capital, the self-valuation of value (sich verwertende Wert), the production of surplus-value ...(has)... a purely occult quality". Das Kapital, p. 622.
153. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 621.

154. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 621.
155. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 621.
156. K. Marx and Engels, 23 Juli, 1859, MEW, 29, p. 463.
157. K. Marx, 'ibid.', MEW, 25, p. 208, p. 120.
158. Although Lenin has noted the exclusion of foreign trade from the analysis of realisation in the reproduction schemas (The Development of Capitalism, p. 64), the general analysis remains within Lenin's capital-methodology and thereby of a real historical process. Conversely, the analysis of the world market competition of capitals which follows Marx's capital-methodology is not an apriorism of the logical unfolding of the general concept of capitals, but their historical accomplishment and specification in the social conditions and national particularities of the reproduction of capital. In its historical mode of existence, capital produces of itself the inner-momentum to transcend national limits to construct a world market. (K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 277; K. Busch, Die multinationalen, p. 97). In these respects, the theoretical "further-developments" of the capitalist mode of production in imperialism and the historical forms of the "accomplishment" of capitals in national and international capital relations do not constitute "periodisations" of capitalism, but are only fully examined on the foundation of capital. A world market is contained in the general concept of capital: "the starting-point for the explanation of all appearances of capitalist world markets is upon the basis of the general laws of movements to the unfolding laws of capital on the world market, while particular conditions determine historical stages of the capitalist mode of production, the tendency to monopolisation is only to be conceived as a specific and historically transitory appearance of these laws". (See K. Busch, 'ibid.', p. 266).
159. Compare with D. Goralczyk, 'Die Marxsche Theorie der Weltmarktbeziehung des Kapitals und die Rekonstruktion des Weltmarkts nach 1945', in Europäische Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft. Zur politischen Ökonomie der westeuropäischen Integration. (Hamburg, 1975), pp. 14-52.
160. C. v. Braunmühl, 'Die nationalstaatliche', (p. 275).
161. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 844.
162. K. Busch, 'op. cit.', p. 11.
163. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.3, p. 250.
164. D. Goralczyk, 'op. cit.', (p. 26).
165. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.3, p. 250; C. Neuss, B. Blanke, E. Altvater, 'Kapitalistischer Weltmarkt und Weltwährungskrise', Prokla I (1971), 5-116 (p. 17).
166. C. Neuss, B. Blanke, E. Altvater, 'ibid.', (p. 11); C. v. Braunmühl, 'Weltmarktbeziehung des Kapitals', (p. 44).

167. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 25, p. 248 (emphasis added).
168. As there is no direct expression of the inner value composition of national capitals to international value because of the absence of the free convertibility of national gold standard currency exchanges on the world market, there is only a tendential formation of international production prices. In this respect, the equalisation of international surplus-value production is accomplished through the comparative exploitation differences in the social conditions of labour productivity and the rates of profit between national capitals rather than the formation of international production prices. Consider K. Busch, 'op. cit.', p. 273. See also K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 23, p. 584.
169. D. Goralczyk, 'op. cit.', (p. 26). Compare this with W. Schoeller, Weltmarkt und Reproduktion des Kapitals (Frankfurt am Main-Köln, 1976).
170. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 25, p. 249 (emphasis added).
171. In this respect, the logical derivation of bourgeois state-forms from the general concept of capital are distinct from the historical particularities of their functions. While this gives the general theoretical condition of the separation of economy and political, the historical functions of bourgeois state interventionism are only sufficiently developed in the national accumulation processes and class relations of capitalist societies.
172. Consequently, the duplication of society as society and state is derived from the economic form of capitalist social relations.
173. This important relation states that the "specific economic form (ökonomischen Form) in which unpaid surplus labour is pumped out of the direct producers determines the relations of domination and servitude (Herrschafts- und Knechtschaftsverhältnisse) as they develop (hervorwächst) directly out of production itself, and for its part, reacts upon them as a determining (bestimmend) (relation). Thereupon, however, is based the entire foundation of the economic community which develops out of the relations of production themselves and thereby simultaneously its political structure". K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 25, pp. 799-800.
174. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 89.
175. K. Marx, *Theorien*, MEW, 26.3, p. 133, p. 290.
176. On this relation to the state see, D. Läßle, 'Zum Legitimationsproblem politischer Herrschaft in der kapitalistischen Gesellschaft', in R. Ebbighausen Herausgeber, Bürgerlicher Staat und politischer Legitimation (Frankfurt, 1976) pp. 106-170 (p. 135); also B. Blanke, 'Entscheidungsanarchie und Staatsfunktion: Zur Analyse der Legitimationsprozesse in politischen System des Spätkapitalismus', in 'ibid.', pp. 193-205.
177. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 23, pp. 609-14.
178. C. Neuss, Imperialismus, p. 129.

179. State economic and political interventionist action relates to the most general form of commodity circulation and the fetishisation of social production relations.
180. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 25, p. 192.
181. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 192; *Theorien*, MEW, 26.2, p. 493.
182. H. Grossmann, 'Die Wert-Price', (p. 204).
183. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 25, p. 207.
184. However, we have argued that the formation of a general profit-rate is a long-run tendency of the general laws of capitalism. This signifies that in actual capitalist reproduction where commodities do not exchange at their values, rates of surplus value do not equal rates of profit. Nevertheless, this does not invalidate the mechanism whereby competition circulates total social commodity value.
185. K. Marx, 'op. cit.', p. 207.
186. On this discussion see H. Neuendorf, Der Begriff des Interesses, (Frankfurt, 1973).
187. K. Marx, 'Das Kapital', MEW, 25, p. 208 (modified translation).
188. Marx speaks of a "general class sympathy" (Klassensympathie) 'ibid.', p. 207.
189. As Marx states, "the development of the interests of capital, the capitalist class and capitalist production becomes the basis of national power and national ascendancy (übergewicht) in modern society". 'ibid.', p. 793.
190. The "community interests (gemeinschaftliche Interesse) which appear as the motive of total acts ... is not the motive, but goes so to say, only behind the backs (hinter dem Rücken) of these self-reflected (selbstreflektierten) particular interests (Sonderinteressen) ..." K. Marx, Grundrisse, pp. 155-6.
191. This follows particularly from the assumptions of Lenin's theory of imperialism which has not derived world capitalist markets from the general concept of capital. Consequently, the world market competition of capitals appear under extra-economic agencies of bourgeois national states and monopoly class interests. Rather, the capital-mechanism which establishes the reproduction circuit of individual to total social capital is the important objective foundation for the theory of class interests. This follows because "every individual capital forms an individualised fraction of total social capital endowed, so to say, with individual life, as each individual capitalist is only an independent element of the capitalist class. The movement of social capital consists in the totality of movements of its individualised fractions". K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 24, p. 351.

192. Thus, from the "starting-point" of state activity, the "general interest" is a fetishised social relation from which the "illusions" on the "ideal" character of bourgeois states are derived.
193. K. Marx, *Die deutsche Ideologie*, MEW, 3, p. 33.
194. K. Marx, *Erster Entwurf zum "Bürgerkrieg in Frankreich"*, MEW, 17, p. 539.
195. Here the bourgeois state may be expressed as the "political form of total capitals which sanctions the economic connection (Beziehungen) of competing individual capitals as relations of Right (Rechtsverhältnisse)". C. Neuss, B. Blanke, E. Altvater, 'op. cit.', p. 15.
196. K. Marx, *Die deutsche Ideologie*, MEW, 3, p. 74.
197. Consequently, the "form-determination" of circulation by production relations is the basis for a theory of bourgeois Right, which develops at the level of capital mystification. See B. Tuschling, Rechtsform und Produktionsverhältnisse. Zur materialistischen Theorie des Rechtsstaates (Köln, 1976), p. 13.
198. K. Marx, Capital, Volume I, p. 315.
199. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 234.
200. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 265.
201. Marx argues that the "capitalist mode of production (essentially the production of surplus-value, the absorption of surplus labour), produces thus, with the extension of the working-day, not only the deterioration of human labour-power by robbing it of its normal, moral and physical condition of development and functions. It produces also the permanent exhaustion and death of this labour-power itself". Capital, 'ibid.', p. 265.
202. K. Marx, 'ibid.', pp. 234-5.
203. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 235. See also G. Schäfer, 'Einige Probleme des Verhältnisses von "ökonomischer" und "politischer" Herrschaft', in Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels: Staatstheorie, pp.XCIII - CXXXVII (pp. CXII - CXVI).
204. As Marx states, "there is here therefore an antinomy, Right against Right, both equally bearing the seal of the law of exchanges. Between equal Right, force decides. Hence it is that in the history of capitalist production, the determination of what is a working-day, presents itself as the result of a struggle, a struggle between collective capital, that is, the class of capitalists, and collective labour". (Capital, Volume I, p. 235). Further, "the creation of a normal working-day is therefore a product of a protracted civil war, more or less dissembled between the capitalist class and the working-class". K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 299. This is because the "content of these Rechts - oder Willensverhältnisses is given through the economic relation itself". K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 1, p. 99.

205. K. Marx, Capital, Volume I, p. 234.
206. However, the value determination of this transaction, as the specific form in which labour is manifested as a specific use-value for capital is fundamental because although the "form of wage-labour ... is ... decisive for the ... mode of production, wage-labour does not determine value". K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 889. Rather, in commodity circulation (M-C-M), both commodity and money function only as different modes of existence of value.
207. K. Marx, Capital, Volume I, p. 231, 232.
208. In these conditions, the social power of capital on the labour class is duplicated through the exploitation of labour in the direct production process and its reproduction through wage-labour under the money-form of the capitalist commodity. The significance of the wage-form here for labour establishes that the means of labour reproduction are acquired by the purchase of a fraction of the total social labour product in the relations of distribution.
209. These are expressed in the fall in the general profit.
210. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 266.
211. As Marx states, "the specific nature of the commodity sold (labour-power as a use-value of capital) receives the limitation of its consumption in the labour process and equally, labour is constrained as seller by infringing upon its own property Rights". Capital, Volume I, pp. 234-5.
212. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 270 (emphasis added).
213. Marx contends, that the "competition of labour cannot be equalised proves (beweist) the intervention (Einmischen) of states". Theorien, MEW, 26.2, p. 437.
214. On the latter point see K. Marx, Capital, Volume I, p. 256.
215. See H. Apel, on the derivation of the state in this context. 'Das Elend der neueren marxististischen Staatstheorie', in Beiträge zum wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus, 1 (1976), 31-80.
216. K. Marx, Capital, Volume I, p. 283. Moreover, the acts to "curb the passion of working-day by state regulation ... (are) ... made by a state that is ruled by capitalist and landlord". K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 239.
217. See R. Miliband, for this distinction in The State in Capitalist Society, p. 234, p. 163.
218. B. Tuschling, 'op. cit.', p. 11.
219. As Engels argues, "the economy acts not according to things, but from relations between persons, and in the last instance between classes. These relations are however always bound (gebunden) to things and appear as things (Dinge). 'Zur Kritik', p. 280.

220. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.3, p. 445, 504; Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 822.
221. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 545.
222. The materialist theory of bourgeois states establishes the social foundation of this critique.
223. 'Vorwort. Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie', MEW, 13, p. 8. See also Die deutschen Ideologie, p. 26.
224. The importance of the commodity-form which we have discussed is fundamental to this analysis.
225. As Marx states, "capital-profit (enterprise, profit and interest), land: ground-rent, labour; wage-labour, this is the trinity formula that includes the secret (Geheimnis) of the social production process". Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 822.
226. Marx further notes that here "profit, the specific characteristic form of surplus value in the capitalist mode of production is eliminated (beseitigt). 'ibid.', p. 822.
227. H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations, p. 608.
228. P. Herzog, 'Die Funktion des Staats in der gegenwärtigen Kapitalismus', MD, 1 (1974), 3-29.
229. We established this point in relation to commodity production and the subsequent analysis of the general formula of capital.
230. This general proposition expresses the limitations to state economic action.
231. See W. Müller and C. Neususs, 'Die Sozialstaatsillusion und der Widerspruch zwischen Lohnarbeit und Kapital', SP, 2 (1970), 4-67; F. Legros, 'Réformisme et réformes de structure', Contradictions, 7 (1975), 33-72 (p. 44).
232. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 33 (emphasis added).
233. See here H. Reichelt, 'Zur Staatstheorie im Frühwerk von Marx und Engels', (p. LVII); V. H-D. Kittsteiner, '"Logisch" und "historisch"', (p. 20).
234. However, of equal importance is the manner in which production and circulation are separated.
235. The "surface" (Oberfläche) does not represent the sphere of inverted appearances in the consciousness of production agents but the form of their derivation in the "economic character masks" (ökonomischen Charaktermasken) of production agents. Therefore, distinguish between "Oberfläche der Erscheinung" und "Erscheinung an der Oberflächung".

236. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 914. While commodity production establishes the form-determination of social production relations in Marx's capital-methodology (Das Kapital, MEW, 23, pp. 94-5), this is not a historical relation but simple commodity production inside the capitalist mode of production, as the most general sphere from which the general concept of capital (allgemeine Begriff des Kapitals) is conceived. Grundrisse, p. 945.
237. K. Marx, 'Zur Kritik', p. 28 (modified translation).
238. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 178, p. 219.
239. As Marx argues, "science becomes superfluous (überflüssig) if the appearance-form and the essence of the thing directly coincide (zusammenfielen)". Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 836, p. 825.
240. These are expressed in the categories of price, profit, etc. See H. Grossmann, 'Die Wert-Preis', (p. 208).
241. See K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.3, p. 440, p. 445. However, we should note that not all interpretations of state monopoly capitalism can be said to express this tendency.
242. J. Schubert, "Die Theorie", (p. 84).
243. See J. Hirsch, 'Elemente einer materialistischen Staatstheorie', in Probleme einer materialistischen, pp. 199-266 (pp. 233-36); 'Zum Problem einer Ableitung der Form- und Funktionsbestimmung des bürgerlichen Staates' in Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels: Staatstheorie, pp. CXXXIX - CLII, (pp. CLII - CLIII).
244. Compare with H. Scheler, 'Zu einem Problem', (p. 690).
245. For Marx, "capital in general" is the "embodiment of the determinations (inbegriff der Bestimmungen) which distinguish value as capital from value as mere value (blossen wert) or money. Value, money, circulation, etc. are presupposed just as labour etc. However, we are yet neither involved (zu tun) with a specific form of capital (besonderen Form des Kapitals) nor with an individual capital (einzelnen Kapital) as distinct from other individual capitals (einzelnen Kapitalien). (The) dialectical process of its genesis (Entstehungsprozess) is only the ideal expression of the real movements where capital comes into being. Later relations are to be considered as developing out of this Keim. However, it is necessary to establish the specific form (bestimmte Form) in which it is fixed (zu fixieren) at a certain point. Otherwise, confusion arises". Grundrisse, p. 217, p. 306. Consequently, the dialectical development of the "logical" relations of capital is not co-terminous with the historical genesis of capitals as a general proposition in Marx's methodology. Therefore, the historical relations of capital are neither opposed to, nor determined independently of, "capital in general".

246. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 319. Moreover, we consider that the contention as to whether state capital has the effect of a total social devaluation of capital or only a redistribution between capital can be omitted from the analysis of the concepts of monopoly and capital, is in fact a central issue. See Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff, p. 175, p. 177.
247. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 319.
248. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 251, p. 263. As Marx argues, the fall in the general profit rate is the result of "all the laws of capitalist production". Theorien, MEW, 26.3, p. 440.
249. H. Grossmann, Das Akkumulations, p. 118-20.
250. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 223. Marx states that the "progressive tendency of the general profit-rate to fall is thus a characteristic expression of the capitalist mode of production for the progressive development of the social production powers of labour". See also P.K., Stamokap in der Krise (West Berlin, 1975).
251. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 230.
252. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 233 (emphasis added).
253. As Marx argues in the Grundrisse, the "whole dispute as to whether over-production is possible and necessary from the standpoint of capitals ... revolves around whether the valuation process of capitals in production directly fixes its valuation in circulation", p. 313.
254. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 261; Grundrisse, p. 17.
255. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 254. As a unity of production and circulation, the capitalist mode of production extends the valuation of capital to the conditions of its realisation in the consumption-powers of society and antagonistic relations of distribution. In this respect, circulation is the movement whereby labour's product is fixed as an exchange value (money), as a social product, and the social product of labour, as individual use-values, as the object of individual consumption. Grundrisse, pp. 904-5.
256. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 261. This assumes (a), that the absolute labour-time of the population cannot be extended and (b), relative labour-time.
257. This expresses an absolute over-production on all sectors of production. If the assumptions are relaxed, then over-production is relative and not raised upon all sectors of production.
258. K. Marx, Das Kapital, MEW, 25, p. 262, (modified translation). See R. Andoche, 'La Théorie de la suraccumulation-dévalorisation', CEP, 6 (1972), 164-179 (p. 169).
259. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 224.

260. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 306. This is analogous to competition, as the "permanent (beständig) devaluation (Entwertung) of existing capitals" refers to the "concentration and competition of capital" in distinction from "capital in general".
261. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 306.
262. This is because the fall in the general profit rate precipitates the competition of capitals in which the general laws of capitalism appear in capitalist anarchy.
263. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, MEW, 25, pp. 262/3 (emphasis added).
264. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 267.
265. K. Marx, 'ibid.', p. 263.
266. See E. Altvater, J. Hoffmann, W. Semmler and W. Schöller, 'Staats, Akkumulation des Kapitals und soziale Bewegung', Rahmenbedingungen, pp. 89-114 (p. 94).
267. A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, p.377. See also R. Winkelmann, 'Grundzüge', (pp. 69-70).
268. Although we will argue that the vanguard role of the working-class is not established from these relations.
269. See A.K., Der Imperialismus der BRD, pp. 339-340, p. 355, p. 606; V. Tscheprikov, Le Capitalisme, p. 461; P. Boccara, Études, p. 325, p. 345, p. 364.
270. As Marx states, 'we are concerned only with productive capital, that is, capital employed in the direct production process. We come later to capital in the circulation process. And after this, to the specific structure which capital as mercantile capital takes, the question can be answered to what extent the labour it employs is productive or non-productive (nicht produktiv)'. Theorien, MEW, 26.1, p. 391.
271. K. Marx, Theorien, MEW, 26.1, p. 122.
272. See M. Cogoy, 'Werttheorie und Staatsausgaben', in Probleme einer materialistischen, pp. 129-198 (pp. 156-7). Moreover, if labour functions in the normal manner in "state capitalist production", then it is produced under the laws of value. Conversely, the production of the general conditions of capitalism cannot arrest the fall in the general profit-rate because only labour which contributes to the total social commodity value augments the total amount of abstract social labour times embodied in commodities.
273. However, in this respect, political systems are not derived from the general capital relation.
274. Marx and J. Weydemeyer, 5 März, 1852, MEW, 28, pp. 503-509.
275. K. Marx, Kritik des Gotha Programms (1875), MEW, 19, p. 28.

276. K. Marx, 'The First Draft of "The Civil Wars of France"', The First International and After (London, 1974), Introduction by D. Fernbach, p. 256.
277. This formally establishes the connection of the contemporary theory of "state monopoly capitalism" with the social-democratic tradition of "organised capitalism" and "state socialism".

CHAPTER 8CONCLUSION

In this Chapter we will summarise the principal themes which contribute to the formation of a general theory of "state monopoly capitalism" and the political functions it performs for the construction of the class strategies of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties.

The theory of state monopoly capitalism has its origins in Lenin's interpretation of Marx's analysis of capitalism and its transformation into "monopoly capitalism". But since this analysis is formulated from within the "Marxism of the Second International", it exhibits theoretical problems which are subsequently maintained in the Third International. In particular, they concern not only the Bolsheviks' analysis and critique of capitalism, but also their understanding of socialism. The far-reaching significance of the theory and practice of "state capitalism" is then expressed in the comparability of structural features of the socio-economic systems of Soviet Russia and capitalist Europe.

"State capitalism" in Russia

For the Bolsheviks, the objective process of social transformation is examined from the interaction of production powers and social relations of production. This historical dynamic not only creates the general social conditions of revolution when the development of production powers enter the monopoly stage of capitalism, but also the materialist foundations to be appropriated by the "proletarian masses" in socialism. Consequently, the interpretation of the laws of historical-materialism promotes the understanding that socialist construction presupposes the attainment of an historical stage of development of production powers. However, the acute dilemma which

these premises create for the Bolsheviks' conception of history is of twofold significance. Firstly, the Russian Revolution contradicts the expectation that proletarian revolution would first occur in the economically developed European capitalist countries. Secondly, and consequently, while the Russian Revolution establishes the political form of social emancipation under the "Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies", it does so in a country in which the "pre-history of capital" is absent.

The attempted resolution of this problem leads the Bolsheviks to undertake socialist construction - notwithstanding the theory of proletarian internationalism - upon the most advanced "socialisations" of production powers known in history under the capitalist system. However, it would be misleading to consider that this was a result of the political exigencies of the Russian Revolution alone, without acknowledging the fact that the Bolsheviks had never seriously questioned the socio-economic foundations of socialist transition from capitalism formulated in the Second International. Consequently, their examination of the socio-economic relations whereby European capitalist culture can be translated into Soviet Russia does not contradict the Marxist traditions upon which the theory is based. Rather, the structuring of socialist construction under the scientific knowledge, technology and organisation of labour developed in "large-scale" industrial production does no more than follow Lenin's analysis of capitalism.

For Lenin, the historically limited character of the capitalist system of production follows from the contradiction of the private class appropriation of socialised production foundations of bourgeois society. Here, the historical superiority of capitalism to expand production powers is subordinated to the perpetuation of capitalist class power and the reproduction of capitalism under the laws of

uneven development. The corollary of this disproportional development of capitalist systems is the impossibility of creating a rational system of total social planning because of the automaticity of individual production acts through the market relations of private "free competition capitalism". Nevertheless, Lenin has already identified the premises of socialism through the inner-laws of capitalism in that the free competition system of capital accumulation is contradicted by the "socialisations" of monopoly capitalist production. This integrates the total national economy under the new social relations "large-scale" production, and takes its most developed form in the "unification" of economy and state in "state capitalism". Here we see that the significance which the theory and practice of "state capitalism" offers for the understanding of socialism resides not only in the creation of the materialist foundations of socialism, but also the social mechanism by which they are produced and regulated.

However, the limitations of this "model" of capitalist social development have two essential features which relate to the analysis of socialism.

The first concerns Lenin's analysis of capitalism. Since this is methodologically constructed from the social connection of individual private production acts in the "surface" of bourgeois society, it follows that economic crises are interpreted as "disproportionalities", and the "socialisations" of production are not identified upon the value-form of social production relations. The class critique of capitalism is then conceived in terms of the class appropriation of its social products, rather than the historically specific socio-economic form-determinations of the inner structure of bourgeois society. Consequently, the social organisation of labour in "large-scale" capitalist enterprises is considered a "normal" form of the

labour process, and not a specific system of class exploitation in which the autonomisation of the means of production against labour are necessary conditions of total social reproduction. In turn, as Lenin's analysis of "socialisations" leads to the understanding that science and technology are class-neutral production powers, the social level of technological development is not determined by the capital-labour relation in the general laws of capital accumulation.

This leads to our second consideration that "state-capitalist" social production may be subordinated to the primacy of Bolshevik politics and the requirements of socialist construction. Thereupon, the transition from capitalism to socialism is conceived through a system of state-planned production.

The result of these theoretical problems in the analysis of capitalist transformation shows that the Bolsheviks do not possess a clearly defined concept of socialist relations of production independently of the theory and ideology of "large-scale" industrial production. As a result, it is a natural response for the Bolsheviks to attempt to resolve the dilemma of socialist construction in Russia through a system of "state capitalism".

However, the consequence of this analysis shows that the necessary and sufficient conditions of socialist revolution are not posed in the relations of "self-emancipation" but the organisational structures by which European capitalist culture is introduced into Soviet Russia through "state capitalism". Thus, the Bolsheviks attribute an "instrumental" character to Marxism as "scientific socialism", and render it a social knowledge expressed by the interpolation of the economic practice of "state capitalism" into the historical conditions of Russian economic under-development. This socio-economic apparatus is directed under the functions which Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties perform in relation to the organisation and

education of the proletarian masses. The subsequent development of socialist construction under the N.E.P. and the Stalinist programme of collectivisation do not contradict these premises of Bolshevik theory.

"State capitalism" in the West

Conversely in Europe, the concept of "state capitalism" expresses the contradictory form of bourgeois social relations which creates the materialist foundations of socialism in the "collapse" theory of monopoly capitalism. This dialectic of social development informs the Bolsheviks' prognosis of the "collapse" of European capitalism as the foundation for international proletarian revolution. Consequently, the theory is examined under the concept of "state capitalist tendencies" to demonstrate that it relates to the theory and politics of monopoly capitalism in the "imperialist republic". Not to do so would lead the theory to approximate socialism in a "post-collapse" stage of capitalist systems evident in Hilferding's "organised capitalism" and Bukharin's "state capitalism". In these respects, the Bolsheviks' analysis of "state capitalism" is interpreted "politically" as a mechanism of social domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie through the creation of new political superstructures on the transitional structure of socialised production relations.

This duly concentrates communist politics upon the destruction of the political forms of dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie. In contradistinction to "state capitalism" in Russia, for European capitalism the central issue becomes the political form of social emancipation rather than the creation of the materialist foundations of socialism. However, we consider that the "political voluntarism" associated with the theory, and expressed as the "primacy of the political", is a product of the "convergence" theory of the different socio-economic systems of Soviet Russia and European capitalism.

These limitations which the theory sustains in relation to socialism are also obvious in the Marxist-Leninist critique of "monopoly capitalism" and "organised capitalism" because they both originate in the Second International.

This is evident in the fact that the shared theory of "disproportionalities" gives all forms of planning a socialist character, whether under the "general cartel" or the "unified-mechanism" of monopolies and the state. Thus, Lenin, Bukharin and Varga in turn are led to consider the approximation of the concepts of "monopoly capitalism" and "organised capitalism". Although "monopoly capitalism" is distinguished by the theory of the "collapse" of capitalism and the categorical rejection of a new "stage" of capitalism, it nevertheless expresses the "transitional" character of socialised production analogous to "organised capitalism". Consequently, while the "primacy of the political" may suppress these common theoretical attributes, it does not alter the status of the theory. Thereby in an important respect, the principal distinguishing feature of the theories is identified by radically different concepts of the state and political parties.

For Lenin and the Bolsheviks, the theory of the state rests upon the significance which the theory of monopoly capitalism holds for the class character of political superstructures in bourgeois societies. At the level of political economy, the "undermining" of general capitalist commodity production signifies that the "normal" forms of socio-economic reproduction can no longer be maintained by the class mechanism of "free competition capitalism". The conclusions this carries is that the classical bourgeois parliamentary forms of political rule associated with the ascendant epoch of capitalism are transformed in the epoch of monopoly capitalism under the direct translation of the economic class power of the monopolies into the political power of

the state. This leads Lenin to anticipate a general tendency to substitute bourgeois democratic state forms with political authoritarian states as the historically prevalent state-form of the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie".

Lenin's theory of the state concentrates communist politics on overcoming the ideological and political divisions in the European labour movement through the political forms of social emancipation. Here the vanguard functions of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties are necessary revolutionising agents of the political organisation of the proletarian masses in the class "dictatorship of the proletariat", and as such, are incompatible with constitutional bourgeois political systems. The subsequent formalisation of the theory and tactics of "Leninism" in the Comintern distinguishes revolutionary communist politics from "revisionist" social-democratic theories of the European labour movement.

Conversely, in the social-democratic theory of "organised capitalism", the socialisation of production in the "general cartel" creates the possibility of the conscious regulation of capital accumulation under the economic and political structures of bourgeois society. Consequently, the transition to socialism is not through violent socialist revolution, but as Hilferding argues, through the socialist planning of bourgeois states. This planning competence of states is amenable to social control through the influence which the working-classes exercise in the bourgeois parliamentary system with the creation of new "mass" political parties. The political conclusions to be drawn from the theory of "organised capitalism" is that the peaceful democratic transition to socialism is a possible alternative to the "unsurrectionist" politics of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties.

However, the rejection of this alternative under the Third International must be seen in the structure of Leninist politics and

the historical development of European capitalist systems upon which they are based. Notwithstanding the principal role which the analysis of the "collapse" of capitalism assumes for social revolution and the formation of revolutionary class consciousness, the failure of revolution to occur is primarily a result of the ideological divisions within the world communist movement which lead to the politics of "class compromise" and the abandonment of revolutionary aims. This establishes the terrain upon which the political form of the organisational instrument of socialist revolution is defined in vanguard Communist Parties. Doubtless, the Bolsheviks' perception of the creation of revolution in the historical conditions of Russia and the "Bolshevisation" of Communist Parties under Soviet hegemony are significant factors in the theory and tactics of the Party. Nevertheless, they are only fully understood from the theory of the historical "collapse" of capitalism and its impact upon the transformation of the political superstructures of bourgeois society. The problem which this then creates is that the "collapse" of the economic substructure of capitalism is postulated independently of the social dynamic of class relations in the general laws of capital accumulation. Consequently, the class relations of bourgeois society are seen primarily as superstructural movements and only "mechanistically" connected to the social foundations upon which the counter-revolutionary "fascisation" of bourgeois states under the "dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie" is counterposed to the "dictatorship of the proletariat". In this structure, the political direction of the labour-movement under social-democratic "revisionism" appears as an ideological "deviation" from the objective laws of movement of bourgeois society.

It is precisely the continuation of the more "dogmatic" features of "Marxism-Leninism" after 1945 regarding the terminal character of

capitalism, the "inevitability" of imperialist wars and the generalisation of authoritarian states which underlay much of the doubt expressed by the theorists both in the "Soviet-bloc" (for example, Varga and Zieschang) and in Western Europe (for example, Togliatti and later Boccara) about the validity of "Stalinist" theory for Western European capitalist societies. Subsequently, the death of Stalin makes possible the first serious debate on this scepticism in ways which were formerly precluded either because of "Party discipline" or unquestioning acceptance of Comintern theory and tactics. With Chrushev's initiation of a period of "de-Stalinisation" and the gradual formation of a "polycentric" political structure of world communism after 1945, the conditions are created whereby the reconstruction of "Marxism-Leninism" can take place.

The contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism

The major theoretical development with which the liberalisation of communist theory is undertaken concerns the formation of a theory of "state monopoly capitalism". This confronts the traditional Marxist-Leninist analysis of the internationalisation of imperialist economy in the "General Crisis of Capitalism", the consequent threat of imperialist wars, and the class strategy of converting imperialist wars into "civil wars", with the prospect of a new historical "stage" of capitalism - state monopoly capitalism. What is significant about the reconstruction of Marxist-Leninist theory is that the new orthodoxy embraces the themes formerly associated with the theory of "organised capitalism".

This introduces two principal areas of scientific research into Marxism-Leninism which concerns the communist vision of the socialist transformation of bourgeois society. The first examines the new objective social relations of state monopoly capitalism with the recognition of the stabilisation of Western European capitalist

systems, while the second promotes the new strategy of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties in contemporary state monopoly capitalism.

The stabilisation of capitalism

The dilemma which the theory of state monopoly capitalism creates for Communist Parties is expressed by the juxtaposition of the "collapse"-theory of capitalism with the premises of a new "post-collapse" stage of capitalist development. This focuses attention upon the supersession of the Bolsheviks' rejection of "organised capitalism" and "state capitalism" as "normal" forms of capitalist systems. Its political impact demonstrably challenges the traditional prognosis upon the development of capitalism and its ideological import for the demarcation of "revolutionary" communist from "revisionist" social-democratic theory.

The most strikingly new proposition which the "stage" theory of state monopoly capitalism advances relates to the evaluation of the capitalist state. It contrasts the unilateral "subordination" of the state to the "monopolies" with the "fusion" of the economic and political power of the state with the "monopolies". However, this general concept of capitalist social relations now requires that the theorists of "state monopoly capitalism" investigate the post-war monopoly-structure of capitalist economies and their transformation under capitalist state interventionism. Its ideological significance follows from the apparent confirmation of the capability of post-war capitalism to satisfy the material needs of the working-classes under the new mechanisms of economy and state by which total social production is regulated.

Nevertheless, the relaxation of the "dogmatic" assumptions of the theory of state monopoly capitalism have not necessarily resolved its contradictions and enhanced its explanatory power. This is particularly evident in the 1960's where the theory leads to the

"subjectivisation" of the laws of capital accumulation under the "monopolies", and an "instrumentalist" conceptualisation of capitalist states. In addition, the limitations of the interpretation of "historical materialism" are expressed in the methodological derivation of the class character of the bourgeois state from the assumption of monopoly capitalism and its consequences for the insufficiently capital-theoretical critique of bourgeois social relations. From the foregoing, the theory underestimates the structural constraints to the functions of bourgeois states as total social planning instruments of capitalist production processes and the inherent limitations to their political appropriation by either classes of capital and labour.

In general, the ability of Marxist-Leninist theorists to convincingly undertake a comprehensive "liberalisation" of communist theory is diminished by the continued acceptance of an historical epoch of the "decline" of capitalism, even if co-determined with the global relations of the "General Crisis of Capitalism". This engages Communist Parties in the dilemma of examining the "stabilisation" of the "inner" relations of Western European capitalist systems and the reconstruction of the world imperialist economy under the "internationalisation of state monopoly capitalism" while simultaneously acknowledging the inability of monopoly capitalist systems to be reproduced under the laws of uneven economic development with state interventionism. However, it offers no long run reprieve to capitalist systems because: (a) the general laws of capital accumulation are undermined in monopoly capitalism; (b) capitalist state interventions are interpreted as further contributory factors to the dissolution of capitalism, as "foreign elements" in the logical and historical structure of capitals; and (c) the reproduction of "world socialism" in the structure of world economy guarantees the historical decline

of Western European capitalism.

Democratic state capitalism

The acceptance of a general theory of "state monopoly capitalism" as Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy constitutes the most developed form of the capitalist mode of production for the derivation of the new strategy and tactics of Western European Communist Parties. The key proposition upon which they are based concerns the adherence to a peaceful democratic transition to socialism by bourgeois parliamentary means. However, it does not originate the process whereby the working-classes enter bourgeois constitutional states, for this was first formulated under the "United Front" tactic in the international "stabilisation" of capitalism. Nevertheless, this was only a temporary "tactic", subsequently returned to in the "Popular Front" tactic, for the defence of democracy within a different conception of socialist transition based upon the "collapse" of capitalism and the revolutionary class dictatorship of the proletariat. Conversely, the significance of Chrushev's intervention in the "de-Stalinisation" period postulates for the first time the compatibility of the "aims" of socialist revolution with the "means" of democratic parliamentary systems, and thereby, the de jure legitimation of socialist transition through bourgeois constitutional states. Although even here, it is not based exclusively upon theoretical considerations, but undertaken with regard to the Soviet-perception of international class struggle under the politics of "peaceful co-existence" for the promotion of world peace and the defence of democracy.

With the accommodation of the socialist "aims" of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties to the constitutionalism of bourgeois states as acceptable political instruments of social emancipation, it follows that the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory of the "destruction" of bourgeois states is transformed into the "utilisation" of bourgeois

states. This expresses the formal abandonment of the "insurrectionist" politics of the Third International and the conversion of the defence of democracy in "anti-fascist strategies" into the offensive "anti-monopolist strategies" for socialism. In the contemporary "stage" of state monopoly capitalism, this leads to the analysis of socialist transition in Western European capitalist systems upon an anti-monopolist stage of "democratic state capitalism".

An acute problem to emerge here is that the renunciation of the class politics of "proletarian dictatorship" in the transformation of capitalist society abandons the theory and practice which demarcated "Marxism-Leninism" from the politics of "Marxist revisionism". As a result, contemporary Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties:

(a) minimise the revolutionary character of Leninist politics under the general laws of transition to socialism in democratic state capitalism; and (b) as a consequence, create an ideological crisis of establishing the "revolutionary authenticity" of Leninist politics. In turn, it then signifies that many of the themes on social transformation associated with "organised capitalism" have been incorporated into the Marxist-Leninist theory of state monopoly capitalism.

Paradoxically, Lenin's early theory of the state which he subsequently "rectified" with the political collapse of the Second International and the development of a theory of "state capitalism" now becomes a prominent feature of the contemporary reconstruction of the Marxist-Leninist theory of state monopoly capitalism.

Moreover, it follows that the "historical compromise" and "alliance-politics" associated with the "stage" theory of state monopoly capitalism creates a paradigm of economic and political structures through which socialist transformation takes place. The difficulties then to emerge reveals the contradiction of juxtaposing

the theory of "democratic state capitalism" with the general tendency to political authoritarian states. In turn, it remains unclear why the crisis of "monopoly" capital accumulation has necessarily invalidated the bourgeois parliamentary democratic political forms of class domination. Firstly, terminal economic crises are neither inevitable features of capitalism, and conjointly, nor are they automatically translated into political repression through the class mechanisms of state monopoly capitalism. Indeed, the double attributes of "bourgeois individuals" as economic and political subjects creates the possibility that the "production agents" of both classes of labour and capital may be equally committed to the "democratic republic". Secondly, the resolution of social contradictions produced by the general laws of capitalism in political systems remains historically contingent upon the class character of social movements and the diverse cultural and political traditions of bourgeois societies to which the general theory and tactics of state monopoly capitalism are applied.

From the foregoing, we question the tenability of a general theory and explanatory model of social development in state monopoly capitalism because of the underlying commitment to the "collapse" theory of capitalism and the "usurpation" of the traditional forms of class rule in bourgeois societies.

Leninism and Eurocommunism

The strength of the contemporary theory of state monopoly capitalism is that it supplies the most comprehensive analysis of the structural transformations of Western European capitalist societies in the "de-Stalinisation" period of "Marxism-Leninism". In so doing, it concentrates upon how these may contribute to the formation of class strategies for social reform upon the basis of existing economic

and political structures of bourgeois society.

However, the problems which this creates in the initial phase of "de-Stalinisation" are central to the ability of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties to formulate a coherent theory and politics which both unites the European labour movement and maintains the critique of "revisionism". They result not only from the "de-Stalinisation" of the politics of world communism but more fundamentally from the formation of the theory of state monopoly capitalism. This suggests that there is no "pure" theory of Leninism to be re-appropriated by contemporary Marxist-Leninist theorists independently from its construction in the Second and Third Internationals, and its formalisation under the theory and politics of the Comintern under Stalinism. In turn, it follows that the problems which confront Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties are not reducible to the theory and politics of "Stalinism" but originate in the "Marxism of the Second International".

This leads to the critical examination of the theory of state monopoly capitalism independently of its characterisation under either Soviet or "Eurocommunist" perspectives. The reason for this view is that to the extent that "Eurocommunism" is a political concept which expresses the autonomy of Western European Communist Parties from the Soviet Union, it has no special connection to "historical materialism" and "Marxism-Leninism". Consequently, for Marxist-Leninist theorists, the principal phenomena of state monopoly capitalism are expressed in the objective laws of social development, and therefore "Eurocommunism" does not necessarily contradict the precepts of "Marxism-Leninism". Indeed, the principal exponents of the theory of state monopoly capitalism - Lenin, Bukharin, Varga, Tscheprow, Zieschang and Hess have not been from Western European Communist Parties.

However, we do consider that a world "polycentrism" is introduced into the international communist movement particularly with Stalin's theory of "Socialism in One Country" in the "General Crisis of Capitalism". Nevertheless, its recognition remains only a latent factor within the structure of proletarian internationalism due to the perception of a fundamental congruence of Soviet and Comintern interests, of socialist construction in the Soviet Union with the performance of the preparatory vanguard hegemonic functions of world communist revolution, and the acquiescence of "Bolshevised" Communist Parties to the Comintern's directives. It duly comes to fruition with the formal autonomy of Western European Communist Parties from the political domination of the Soviet Union within world communism and the rejection of Soviet communism for Western Europe. Thereupon in an important respect, the subsequent conceptualisation of national paths of transition from capitalism to socialism in the Eurocentric, geo-political foundations of the theory and tactics of Western European Communist Parties only realises premises inherent in "Stalinism".

On the basis of these considerations, the politics of "Socialism in One Country" have not created an unambiguous socialist alternative to Stalinism. While the renunciation of the class theory of proletarian dictatorship is a major event which leads contemporary Western European Communist Parties to accept the political form of social emancipation in constitutional bourgeois democratic states, it nevertheless, only concerns the political structures under which national paths to socialism are undertaken through "state monopoly capitalism". Clearly, the de jure abandonment of the class theory of proletarian dictatorship then contains as a corollary the rejection of Lenin's theory of proletarian internationalism as the foundation of the politics of world communism.

The fundamental problem which underlies much of this discussion concerns the attempt by Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties to produce a coherent theory and politics when the functions they come to express have their origin in different theories on the transition from capitalism to socialism. The contradiction posed defines Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties: (a) as vanguard political instruments of the revolutionary class struggle based upon the theory of the "collapse" of capitalism and the political dissolution of the Second International; and (b) as mass-Parties which function within the bourgeois-democratic parliamentary system. Since the class theory and tactics of proletarian dictatorship can be neither articulated nor enacted within this political system, it follows that its abandonment becomes politically inevitable once "democratic socialism" is constructed in parliamentary democracy. To this extent, the ideology and politics of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties - however democratic their internal Party organisation - are structurally bound to its principles of operation as a "class-anonymous" form of political domination. An acute problem to emerge here for Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties concerns the attempt to transform "bourgeois-democracy" into "socialist democracy", to establish the political unity of the labour movement under parliamentary democracy, while simultaneously contributing to the legitimation of this political system. The class politics of vanguard Communist Parties have then to be reconciled with the electoral politics of the bourgeois-democratic parliamentary system. As a result, the attempt to re-structure internal Party organisation and make Communist Parties mass-Parties in the parliamentary system compels them to assume an analogous structure and Party-ideology to that of Social-Democratic Parties.

Here the theory uncritically accepts the separation of society

and state, and therefore the autonomisation of the political from the social relations of classes. In so doing, it does not acknowledge that it is precisely this separation of society into the objective social forms of economy and political, society and state which already contains the principles of the mystification of bourgeois social relations. Therefore, critical social theory must not only examine the class connections between society and state, but more fundamentally, why social relations are reproduced in the different social forms of economic substructure and political superstructure.

Although we have assigned to the "critique of political economy" a central role in the evaluation of "Marxist-Leninist" theory, we have not attempted to identify on its basis either a politics of "classical Marxism" which retains a permanent historical validity or a theory of Marxist politics. This is because we consider that the conceptual level at which the general laws of capitalism establish the form-determination of bourgeois society is not equivalent to that in which a Marxist theory of politics is formulated in the historical relations of society and state. Rather, we interpret the general laws of historical materialism under the "capital-methodology" of the theoretical representation of capitalist social relations of production in bourgeois society. Nevertheless, while this neither designates an historical prognosis on the development of capitalism nor a general theory of politics, it does advance necessary theoretical propositions on the dissolution of capitalist relations and the separation of society and state.

Conversely, the problems which emerge in the theory of state monopoly capitalism follow both from the methodological and theoretical distinctions introduced into the critique of political economy under the "further-development" of Marxism in "Leninism", and the process

of their translation into the politics of Marxist-Leninist Communist Parties. This leads to the analysis of the general laws of bourgeois society in a categorical historical form from which Leninist politics are formulated upon the dissolution of the system of social mediations which connects both "theory and history", and "capital and class".

Selected Bibliography

This is a selected bibliography in order to keep the list of source materials to a manageable length. It therefore neither includes all the literature consulted in the preparation of the thesis nor that contained in the references. Rather, only those texts are cited which most readily express the principal themes involved in the investigation of the theory of "state monopoly capitalism" and have contributed to their evaluation. These are classified respectively under the principal divisions of "primary" and "secondary" sources.

Primary Sources

Books

- A.K., Politische Ökonomie. Lehrbuch (Moskau-Berlin, 1959).
- A.K., Grundlagen des Marxismus-Leninismus. Lehrbuch (Moskau-Berlin, 1960).
- A.K., Grundlagen der marxistischen Philosophie (Moskau-Berlin, 1966).
- A.K., Der Imperialismus der B.R.D. (Berlin, 1967).
- A.K., Politische Ökonomie des heutigen Monopolkapitalismus (Moscow-Frankfurt, 1972).
- A.K., Der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus (Frankfurt, 1973).
- A.K., Politische Ökonomie des Kapitalismus und des Sozialismus. Lehrbuch für das marxistische-leninistische Grundlagenstadium (Berlin, 1977).
- Badaloni, N., Pour le communisme (Paris, 1976).
- Bernstein, E., Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie (Stuttgart, 1904).
- Boccaro, P., Études sur le capitalisme monopoliste d'État. Sa crise et son issue (Paris, 1974).
- Braunsdorf and Löffler, Kapitalbegriff und Monopol (Berlin, 1976).
- Bucharin, N., Imperialismus und die Akkumulation des Kapitals (Berlin-Wien, 1926).
- Bucharin, N., Ökonomik der Transformationsperiode (Hamburg, 1970).

- C.A., Gramsci e la cultura contemporanea, I and II (Roma, 1975).
- C.A., Traité marxiste d'Économie. Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État, I and II (Paris, 1971).
- Carrillo, S., Eurocommunism and the State (London, 1972).
- Claudin, F., Eurocommunism and Socialism (London, 1977).
- Fabre, J., Hincker, F. and Sève, L., Communistes et L'État (Paris, 1977).
- Garaudy, R., Die Freiheit als philosophische und historische Kategorie (Berlin, 1959). First published in Paris, 1955.
- Gramsci, A., Opere in Antonio Gramsci (Roma, 1949).
- Gündel, R., Heininger, H., Hess, P., and Zieschang, K., Zur Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus (Berlin, 1967).
- Gündel, R., Die Internationalisierung der Wirtschaft im staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus und ihre Widersprüche (Berlin, 1976).
- Heininger, H., and Hess, P., Die Aktualität der Leninischen Imperialismuskritik (Berlin, 1970).
- Hilferding, R., Das Finanzkapital (Wien, 1927).
- Hilferding, R., Die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie in der Republik, zu Kiel (Berlin, 1927).
- Klein, D., Labilität des heutigen Imperialismus und Kampf der Arbeiterklasse (Berlin, 1976).
- Krause, G., Monopoltheorie (Frankfurt, 1976).
- Lemnitz, A., Der historische Platz des Imperialismus (Berlin, 1977).
- Reinhold, O., Die Wirtschaftskrisen (Berlin, 1974).
- Röder, K-H., Klassenkampf und "Staatsreform" in Westdeutschland (Berlin, 1968).
- Stalin, J., Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. (Pekin, 1972). First published in 1952.
- Tscheprakov, V., Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État (Moscou-Paris, 1969).
- Varga, E., Essais sur l'économie politique du capitalisme (Paris, 1967).
- Varga, E., Die Krise des Kapitalismus und ihre politischen Folgen (Frankfurt, 1974). Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von E. Altvater.

Articles

- A.K., 'Imperialismus heute-der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus in Westdeutschland', Einheit, 1 (1965), 101-120.
- Albrecht, E., 'Staatsmonopolistische Regulierung und bewusste Ausnutzung ökonomischer Gesetze', DZP, 14 (1966), 946-962.
- Arsumanjan, A., 'Die neue Etappe der allgemeine Krise des Kapitalismus', SW, 15 (1961), 935-955.
- Barca, P., 'Per lo sviluppo dell' analisi teorica sul capitalismo monopolistico di stato', CM, (Settembre-December, 1966), 52-78.
- Boccarda, P., 'Aperçu sur la question du capitalisme monopoliste d'État', EP, (Janvier-Mai, 1966), 5-17.
- Boccarda, P., 'Définition de la question du capitalisme monopoliste d'État', Conference Internationale sur le capitalisme monopoliste d'État', EP, 26-29 (1966), 5-22.
- Borko, J., 'Methodologische Fragen der Analyse des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', SW, 10 (1973), 1089-1104.
- Bregel, E., 'Zu einigen strittigen Problemen der Theorie der allgemeinen Krise des Kapitalismus', SW, 3 (1972), 297-310.
- Chmel'nizkaja, J., 'Grundzüge des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus in Westdeutschland', SW, 4 (1959), 415-431.
- Chmel'nizkaja, J., 'Eine neue Etappe im Kampf um die friedliche Koexistenz', Deutsche Aussenpolitik, 1 (1960), 12-21.
- Delorme, H., 'Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État', EP, (1962), 54-80.
- Dimitroff, G., 'Arbeiterklasse gegen Faschismus', in Texte zur Faschismuskussion, 1, 57-68. Herausgegeben von R. Kühnl.
- Dragilew, M., 'Allgemeine Krise und staatsmonopolistischer Kapitalismus', SW, 12 (1971), 1292-1309.
- Florin, P., 'Lenin und die friedliche Koexistenz', Einheit, 4 (1960), 533-548.
- Garaudy, R., 'A-propos de la "voie Italienne vers le socialisme"', Cahiers du Communisme, 1 (1957), 33-55.
- Gerratana, V., 'Lénine critique de Staline', Dialectiques, 6 (Paris, 1974), 3-31.
- Gruppi, L., 'Le concept d'hégémonie chez A. Gramsci', in Dialectiques, 4-5 (Paris, 1974), 44-54.
- Handke, H., Lehmann, K. and Puchert, B., 'Einige Fragen des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus in sowjetischen Publikationen', JWG, 4 (1976), 127-148.

- Heinrichs, W., 'Aktuelle methodologische Fragen der marxistisch-leninistischen Reproduktionstheorie', WW, 2 (1980), 129-144.
- Heise, K-H., 'Gesetzes des Durchschnittsprofits und tendenzieller Fall der Profitrate', WW, 12 (1972), 1842-1851.
- Heise, K-H., 'Zur Entfaltung der Widersprüche des Gesetzes vom tendenziellen Fall der Profitrate unter staatsmonopolistischen Bedingungen (Thesen)', WW, 21 (1973), 865-877.
- Herzog, P., 'Die Funktion des Staates in der gegenwärtigen kapitalistischen Gesellschaft', MD, 1 (1974), 3-29.
- Hess, P., 'Der Kapitalismus und das Problem des gesellschaftlichen Fortschritt', WW, 6 (1967), 993-1008.
- Hess, P., 'Kapitalistisches Wachstum zwischen Gleichgewicht und Ungleichgewicht', WW, 5 (1969), 736-753.
- Hess, P., 'Zum staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', SP, 14-15, (1971), 211-214.
- Hess, P., 'Monopol, Rationalität und gleichgewichtiges Wachstum', MD, 3 (1971), 52-71.
- Hess, P., 'Das Finanz-kapital - Der Zusammenhang zwischen Kapitalverwertung und Kapitalmacht im Kapitalismus', WW, II (1972), 1673-1690.
- Hess, P., 'Ökonomische Grundlagen für Differenzierungsprozesse in der Monopolbourgeoisie', WW, 20 (1972), 390-406.
- Hess, P., 'Methodologische und theoretische Probleme der Imperialismusforschung', WW, 22 (1974), 187-206.
- Hess, P., 'Aktuelle Lehren aus der Entstehungsgeschichte der Leninischen Imperialismustheorie', JWG, 4 (1974), 13-25.
- Hess, P., 'Wider der imperialistischen Ökonomie. Die Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus und ihre Kritik', Facit, 35 (1974), 5-21.
- Heuer, K., 'Der Marxismus-Leninismus über die Haupttriebkkräfte des wissenschaftlich-technischen Fortschritts im Imperialismus von heute', WZHUB, 4 (1968), 517-527.
- Hilferding, R., 'Probleme der Zeit', Die Gesellschaft, 1 (1924), 1-17.
- Jahn, W., 'Die Hilflosigkeit der modernen bürgerlichen Ökonomien, gegenüber dem marxistisch-leninistischen Kapitalbegriff', Einheit, 5 (1965), 18-29.
- Jahn, W., 'Haupttendenzen der Verfälschung der Marxschen Mehrwerttheorie', Einheit, 7 (1967), 880-889.
- Joelson, M., 'Monopolistischer Kapitalismus oder "organisierter Kapitalismus"', UBM, 3 (1929), 807-833.
- Katzenstein, R., 'Zum Problem einer marxistischen "Staatsableitung"', BDIP, 4 (1975), 426-438.

- Katzenstein, R., 'Zur Frage des Monopols, des Monopolprofits und der Durchsetzung, des Wertgesetzes im Monopolkapitalismus', DA-S, 6 (1975), 93-128.
- Klein, D., 'Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Programmierung im staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', Einheit, 8 (1964), 102-115.
- Klein, D., 'Über die inneren Widersprüche des modernen Imperialismus', WW, 6 (1967).
- Klein, D., 'Über den Widerspruch zwischen Produktivkräften und Produktionsverhältnissen im gegenwärtigen Imperialismus', Einheit, 7 (1967), 890-902.
- Klein, D., 'Über den Widerspruch zwischen Konkurrenz und Planung', WZHUB, 14 (1968), 505-514.
- Klein, D., 'Methodologische Probleme der Behandlung des internationalen Klassenkampfes zwischen Sozialismus und Imperialismus', WW, 2 (1974), 208-235.
- Kohlmeier, G., 'Karl Marx' Aussenhandelstheorie und Probleme der aussenwirtschaftlichen Beziehungen zwischen sozialistischen Staaten', WW, 8 (1967), 1233-1259.
- Krause, G. and Scharping, H., 'Zum Monopolbegriff', WZWPUR, 18 (1969), 41-46.
- Kusminow, I., 'Die neue Etappe im Wettbewerb der Systeme', Einheit, 9 (1960), 1-5.
- Lapinski, P., 'Der "Sozialstaat". Etappen und Tendenzen seiner Entwicklung', UBM, 2 (1928), 377-418.
- Lemnitz, A., 'Die westdeutsche Bundesrepublik - ein Staat der Monopole', Einheit, 2 (1964), 87-98.
- Lemnitz, A., 'Lage, Bewusstseinsentwicklung und Kampf der Arbeiterklasse in Westdeutschland', WW, 8 (1967), 1260-1291.
- Lenin, V.I., 'The Economic Content of Narodnism and the Criticism of it in Mr. Struve's Book', LCW, 1 (Moscow, 1960).
- Lenin, V.I., 'What the Friends of the People Are', LCW, 1 (Moscow, 1960).
- Lenin, V.I., 'A Note once more on the Theory of Realisation', LCW, 4 (Moscow, 1960).
- Lenin, V.I., 'A Note on the Question of the Market Theory', LCW, 4 (Moscow, 1960).
- Lenin, V.I., 'What is to be Done', LCW, 5 (Moscow, 1961).
- Lenin, V.I., 'Marxism and Revisionism', LCW, 15 (Moscow, 1963).
- Lenin, V.I., 'On the Slogan for a United States of Europe', LCW, 12 (Moscow, 1964).
- Lenin, V.I., 'Socialism and War', LCW, 12 (Moscow, 1964).

- Lenin, V.I., 'Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism', LCW, 22 (Moscow, 1964).
- Lenin, V.I., 'A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism', LCW, 23 (Moscow, 1964).
- Lenin, V.I., 'Materials relating to the Revision of the Party Programme', LCW, 24 (Moscow, 1964).
- Lenin, V.I., 'State and Revolution', LCW, 25 (Moscow, 1964).
- Lenin, V.I., 'The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism', LSW, 1 (Moscow, 1960).
- Lenin, V.I., 'The Impending Catastrophy and How to Combat it', LSW, 2 (Moscow, 1970).
- Lenin, V.I., 'Bericht über das Parteiprogramm auf dem VIII Parteitag der K.P.R.(B.) am 19 März, 1919', LS, 2 (Frankfurt, 1970).
- Lenin, W.I., 'Aus dem Buch: Der "Linke Radikalismus", die Kinderkrankheit im Kommunismus', LS, 2 (Frankfurt, 1960).
- Leontjew, L., '"Organisierter Kapitalismus" und "Wirtschaftsdemokratie"', UBM, 3 (1929), 660-687.
- Maier, L., 'Zum Problem des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', WW, 2 (1958), 243-259.
- Maier, L., 'Lenin Imperialismus-Theorie und der gegenwärtige staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus', Einheit, 9-10 (1969), 1245-1257.
- Maier, L., 'Dialektik der Anpassung', Einheit, 4 (1972), 514-524.
- Markowski, P., 'Die strategische Konzeption des Imperialismus in der Gegenwart und die Strategie und Taktik der Kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien in antiimperialistischen Kampf', Einheit, 9-10 (1969), 1233-1243.
- Maurischat, G., 'Die wissenschaftliche-technische und die Perspektiv Entwicklung in Westdeutschland', Einheit, 7 (1967), 903-912.
- Merker, N., 'Metodo e storia nella teoria marxiste dello stato', CM, 2 (1976), 21-39.
- Milezkowski, A., 'Die Leninische Theorie und die neuen Erscheinungen in der kapitalistischen Wirtschaft', PFS, 13 (1970), 759-768.
- Milezkowski, A., 'Neue Tendenzen in der Entwicklung des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', SW, 10 (1980), 1062-1077.
- Muhri, F., 'Sobre a contradicao principal do capitalismo moderno', Seara Nova, 1553 (1975), 26-31.
- Nussbaum, H., 'Zur Diskussion um den historischen Platz des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus in der neuen marxistisch-leninistischen Literatur', JWG, 1 (1976), 69-93.

- Oelssner, F., 'Zur geschichtlichen Rolle und zum Begriff des Monopols', MD, 3 (1971), 3-22.
- Pletnew, E., 'Die Leninische Lehre vom Monopolkapitalismus und die heutigen imperialistischen Widersprüche', SW, 3-4 (1970), 349-362.
- Reinhold, O., 'Die Entwicklung des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', Einheit, 15 (1960), 890-905.
- Reinhold, O., 'Die Widersprüche des Imperialismus und die demokratische Alternative', Einheit, 7 (1966), 875-885.
- Reisin, I., 'Zur Diskussion neuer Probleme der Imperialismus-Analyse', SP, 19 (1972), 1-27.
- Richter, H-J., 'Zu den Ansichten Kurt Zieschang's über den staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', WW, 2 (1958), 270-281.
- Scheler, H., 'Zu einem Problem der philosophischen Imperialismus-Analyse', DZP, 14 (1966), 687-708.
- Schirmeister, C., 'Zum Monopol als Herrschaftsverhältnis-aktuelle Aspekte der Leninische Analyse', MD, 7 (1971), 112-128.
- Schmidt, J.L., 'Zur Problematik des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg', Einheit, 6 (1957), 715-726.
- Sereni, E., 'Fascismo, capitale finanziario e capitalismo monopolistico di Stato nelle analisi dei comunisti italiani', CM, (1972), 17-46.
- Sonntag, H., 'Die Klassiker des Marxismus-Leninismus zur Trennung von Kapitaleigentum und Kapitalfunktion', WZFSUJ, 1 (1970), 111-119.
- Sonntag, H., 'Eigentum als ökonomische Kategorie und die Kapitalverfügung', WZFSUJ, 2 (1974), 309-317.
- Spesso, R., 'Caratteri e modificazioni del capitalismo monopolistico di Stato', CM (1969), 57-71.
- Stalin, J., 'The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists', SCW, 6 (Moscow, 1953).
- Stalin, J., 'The Foundations of Leninism', SCW, 6 (Moscow, 1953).
- Stalin, J., 'Concerning the International Situation', SCW, 6 (Moscow, 1953).
- Stalin, J., 'The Results of the Work of the Fourteenth Conference of the R.C.P.(B.)', SCW, 7 (Moscow, 1954).
- Stalin, J., 'The Seventh Enlarged Plenum of the E.C.C.I.', SCW, 9 (Moscow, 1954).
- Stalin, J., 'The International Character of the October Revolution', Leninism (London, 1940).
- Stalin, J., 'Politischer Bericht des ZK auf dem 15 Parteitag der K.P.d.S.U.', PL, 5a (Leipzig, 1929).

- Stalin, J., 'Unterredung mit der ersten amerikanischen Arbeiter-Delegation', PL, 5a (Leipzig, 1929).
- Stalin, J., 'Über die Rechte Gefahr in der K.P.D. (Rede in der Sitzung des Präsidiums des E.K.K.I. - am 19 Dezember, 1928', PL, 5a (Leipzig, 1929).
- Stalin, J., 'Die Ergebnisse des Juli - Plenums des ZK. der K.P.d.S.U.', PL, 5A (Leipzig, 1929).
- Stiehler, G., 'Die Marxsche Analyse der Widersprüche des Kapitalismus im "Kapital" und der staatsmonopolistischer Kapitalismus', DZP, 15 (1967), 952-967.
- Tjulpanow, S., 'Der historische Platz des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', SW, 10 (1973), 1105-1115.
- Tomaschewski, D., 'Das Leninische Prinzip der friedlichen Koexistenz und der Klassenkampf', Einheit, 10 (1970), 1347-1354.
- Tscheprakow, V., 'Einige Fragen des modernen Kapitalismus', Die Press der Sowjetunion, 1 (1956), 421-428.
- Tscheprakow, V., 'Die bürgerlichen Ökonomen und der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus', SW, 3 (1956), 275-289.
- Tscheprakow, V., 'Die Leninische Theorie von der ungleichmässigen Entwicklung des Kapitalismus und der Zuspitzung der imperialistischen Gegensätze in der Nachkriegsperiode', SW, 4 (1956), 915-936.
- Tscheprakow, V., 'Ökonomische Probleme des antimonopolistischen Staates', MD, 2 (1972), 140-155.
- Wassiltschuk, J.A., 'Hauptgesetzmässigkeiten der sozialökonomischen Entwicklung der Arbeiterklasse im Kapitalismus', SW, (1971), 12-28.
- Wygodski, S.L., 'Probleme des gegenwärtigen Imperialismus im neuen Programm der K.P.d.S.U.', SW, 5 (1963), 449-476.
- Zanca, A., 'Parlamento borghese e rivoluzione socialista in Lenin', CM, 4 (1970), 107-113.
- Zangheri, R., 'Lenin: lo Stato e la teoria dell'imperialismo', Rinascinta 13 anno 27 (Mars, 1970), 15-16.
- Zieschang, K., 'Zu einigen theoretischen Problemen des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', WW, 5 (1956), 690-705.
- Zieschang, K., 'Ursachen und Wesen des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', WW, 2 (1973), 235-244.

Secondary SourcesBooks

- Agnoli, J., Überlegungen zum bürgerlichen Staat (Berlin, 1975).
- Balibar, E., Sur la Dictature du Proletariat (Paris, 1976).
- Basso, L., Gesellschaftsformation und Staatsform. Drei Aufsätze (Frankfurt, 1975).
- Bettelheim, C., Les Luttes des Classes en U.S.S.R. 1917-23 (Paris, 1974).
- Blanke, T., Funktionswandel des Streits im Spätkapitalismus (Frankfurt, 1972).
- Bottomore, T., Marxist Sociology (London, 1975).
- Bottomore, T. and Goode, P., Austro-Marxism (Oxford, 1978).
- Busch, K., Die multinationalen Konzerne. Zur Analyse der Weltmarktbe-
wegung des Kapitals (Frankfurt, 1974).
- Braunmühl, C.v., Funken, K., Cogoy, M. and Hirsch, J., Probleme einer
materialistischer Staatstheorie (Frankfurt, 1973).
- Claudin, C., Lénine et la révolution culturelle (Paris, 1974).
- Claudin, F., La Crise du Mouvement Communiste I, II (Paris, 1972).
- Colletti, L., Libertini, L., Maitan, I. and Magri, L., Über Lenins
"Staat und Revolution" - heute, IMD, 2 (Berlin, 1970)
- Deppe, F., (Herausgeber), Europäische Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft (EWG).
Zur politischen Ökonomie der westeuropäischen Integration
(Hamburg, 1975).
- Dobb, M., Études sur le développement du capitalisme (Paris, 1971).
- Ebbighausen, R., (Herausgegeben von), Monopol und Staat. Zur Marx-
Rezeption in der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus
(Frankfurt, 1974).
- Ebbighausen, R., (Herausgegeben von), Bürgerlicher Staat und politische
Legitimation (Frankfurt, 1976).
- Emenlauer, R., Grymer, H., Kramer-Badoni, T. and Rodenstein, M.,
Die Kommune in der Staatsorganisation (Frankfurt, 1974).
- Esser, J., Einführung in die materialistische Staatsanalyse (Frankfurt,
1975).
- Flechtheim, O.K., Le parti communiste allemand sous le république de
Weimar (Paris, 1972).
- Frerichs, J. and Kraiker, G., Konstitutionsbedingungen des bürgerlichen
Staates und der sozialen Revolution bei Marx und Engels. Eine
Einführung (Frankfurt, 1975).

- Grossmann, H., Das Akkumulations - und Zusammenbruchsgesetz des kapitalistischen Systems (Frankfurt, 1967).
- Grossmann, H., Marx, L'économie politique classique et la problem de la dynamique (Paris, 1975).
- Guggenberger, B., Wem nutzt der Staat? Kritik der neomarxistischen Staatstheorie (Berlin, 1974).
- Hennig, E., Bürgerliche Gesellschaft und Faschismus in Deutschland. Ein Forschungsbericht (Frankfurt, 1977).
- Hirsch, J., Staatsapparat und Reproduktion des Kapitals (Frankfurt, 1974).
- Jaeggi, U., Kapital und Arbeit in der Bundesrepublik (Frankfurt, 1973).
- Korsch, K., Mattick, P., Pannekoek, A., Ruhle, O. and Wagner, H., La counter-révolutionnaire bureaucratique (Paris, 1973).
- Kneiper, R., Weltmarkt, Wirtschaftsrecht und Nationstaat (Frankfurt, 1976).
- Krahl, H-J., Konstitution und Klassenkampf (Frankfurt, 1971).
- Kramm, L., Stamokap - eine kritische Abgrenzung - Zur Rolle des Staates in der demokratisch-kapitalistischen Gesellschaft (Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1974).
- Kuhnl, R., (Herausgegeben von), Texte zur Faschismuskussion - I (Hamburg, 1974).
- Lapple, D., Staat und allgemeine Produktionsbedingungen. Grundlagen zur Kritik der Infrastruktheorien (Berlin, 1973).
- Magaline, A.D., Lutte de classes et dévalorisation du travail (Paris, 1975).
- Mandel, E., Der Spätkapitalismus (Frankfurt, 1972).
- Mandel, E., From Stalinism to Eurocommunism (London, 1978).
- Mania, P.T., De Lenine au panzer - communisme (Paris, 1971).
- Marcou, L., Le Kominform (Paris, 1977).
- Marx, K., Grundrisse (Frankfurt, 1953).
- Marx, K., Capital Volumes 1-3 (Moscow, 1967).
- Marx, K., Das Kapital, MEW, 23-5 (Berlin, 1975).
- Marx, K., Theorien über den Mehrwert, MEW, 26.1; 26.2; 26.3 (Berlin, 1965).
- Marx, K., Theories of Surplus Value, Volumes 1-3 (London, 1972).
- Miliband, R., Parliamentary Socialism - A Study in the Politics of Labour (London, 1964).

- Miliband, R., The State in Capitalist Society (London, 1973).
- Miliband, R., Marxism and Politics (London, 1977).
- Negri, T., Zyklus und Krise bei Marx, IMD Publication, 26 (Berlin, 1972).
- Neuendorf, H., Der Begriff des Interesses. Eine Studie zu den Gesellschaftstheorien von Hobbes, Smith und Marx (Frankfurt, 1973).
- Neususs, C., Imperialismus und Weltmarktbeziehung des Kapitals (Erlangen, 1972).
- P.K., Leninismus - neue Stufe des wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus? (Berlin, 1972).
- P.K., Oberfläche und Staat (Berlin, 1974).
- P.K., Stamokap in der Krise (Berlin, 1975).
- Pozzoli, C., (Herausgegeben von), Rahmenbedingungen und Schranken staatlichen Handelns. Zehn Thesen (Frankfurt, 1976).
- Reichelt, H., Zur logischen Struktur des Kapitalbegriffs bei Karl Marx (Frankfurt, 1970).
- Rosdolsky, R., Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Marxschen "Kapital" (Frankfurt, 1974).
- Rubin, I., Essays on Marx's Theory of Value (New York, 1972). First published in 1928.
- Schmidt, A., Geschichte und Struktur. Fragen einer marxistischen Historik (München-Wien, 1977).
- Schmiede, R., Grundprobleme der Marx'schen Akkumulations - und Krisentheorie (Frankfurt, 1973).
- Scholler, W., Weltmarkt und Reproduktion des Kapitals (Frankfurt-Köln, 1976).
- Tuschling, B., Rechtsform und Produktionsverhältnisse. Zur materialistischen Theorie des Rechtsstaates (Frankfurt-Köln, 1976).
- Wagner, W., Verelendungstheorie - die hilflose Kapitalismuskritik (Frankfurt, 1976).
- Weber, H., Die Wandlung des deutschen Kommunismus, I and II (Frankfurt, 1969).
- Wetter, G. and Leonard, W., Sowjetideologie heute (Frankfurt, 1962).
- Wirth, M., Die Kapitalismustheorie in der DDR (Frankfurt, 1973).

Articles

- Abromheit, V.H., 'Zum Verhältnis von Staat und Wirtschaft im gegenwärtigen Kapitalismus', Politische Vierteljahresschrift, 1 (1976), 2-22.
- Altvater, E., 'Zu einigen Problemen des Staatsinterventionismus', Prokla, 3 (1972), 1-53.
- Altvater, E., 'Wertgesetz und Monopolmacht', DA-S, 6 (1975), 129-198.
- Andoche, R., 'La "Théorie" de la suraccumulation-dévalorisation', CEP, 6 (1972), 164-179.
- Apel, H., 'Das Elend der neueren marxistischen Staatstheorie', Beiträge zum wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus, 1 (1976), 31-80.
- Basso, L., 'Attualità di Lenin: "Stato e Rivoluzione" cinquant'anni dopo', PS, 26 (1968), 34-46.
- Berger, C., 'Faut-il détruire l'État', Politique Aujourd'hui, 5 (Paris, 1971), 63-80.
- Blanke, B., Jurgens, U. and Kastendiek, H., 'Zur neueren marxistischen Diskussion über die Analyse von Form und Funktion des bürgerlichen Staates. Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Politik und Ökonomie', Prokla, 14-15 (1974), 51-102.
- Bobbio, N., 'Gramsci e la concezione della società civile', in Gramsci e la cultura contemporanea (Roma, 1975), pp. 75-100.
- Braunmühl, C.v., 'Die nationalstaatliche Organisiertheit der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft', GBMT, 8-9 (Frankfurt, 1976), 273-333.
- Flatow, S.v., and Huisken, F., 'Zum Problem der Ableitung des bürgerlichen Staates', Prokla, 7 (1975), 83-153.
- Gerstenberger, H., 'Elemente einer historisch - materialistischen Staatstheorie', Kritische Justiz, (Frankfurt, 1972), 125-141.
- Gerstenberger, H., 'Klassenantagonismus, Konkurrenz und Staatsfunktion', GBMT, 3 (Frankfurt, 1975), 7-26.
- Granou, A., 'La Nouvelle Crise de Capitalisme', LTM, 328, (1973), 808-831; LTM, 329 (1973), 998-1025; LTM, 330-332 (1973), 1178-1210.
- Grossmann, H., 'Eine neue Theorie über Imperialismus und die Revolution', in Archiv, XII (Wien, 1966), pp. 141-192. First published in Leipzig, 1928.
- Grossmann, H., 'Die Wert-Preis-Transformation bei Marx und die Krisenproblem', in Aspekte der Marxschen Theorie, 1 (Frankfurt, 1973), pp. 195-227.
- Hirsch, J., 'Bemerkungen zum theoretischen Ansatz einer Analyse des bürgerlichen Staates', GBMT, 8-9 (1976), pp. 99-179.
- Kadritze, N., 'Faschismus als gesellschaftliche Realität und als unrealistischer Kampfbegriff', Prokla, 8-9 (1973), 103-143.

- Kissin, F., 'Communists: all revisionists now?', Fabian Research Series, 299 (January, 1972), pp. 1-36.
- Kittsteiner, v. H-D., '"Logisch" und "historisch". Über Differenzen des Marxschen und Engelsschen Systems der Wissenschaft', IWKGD, 1 (1977), 1-47.
- Korsch, K., 'Lenin and the Comintern', in Karl Korsch. Revolutionary Theory, edited by D. Kellner (University of Texas Press, 1977), pp. 149-157.
- Kostede, N., 'Die neuere marxistische Diskussion über den bürgerlichen Staat. Einführungskritik - Resultate', GBMT, 8-9 (1976), 150-195.
- Lennard, A., 'Lénine et la Théorie Marxiste des Crises', CEP, 11-12 (Paris, 1973), 25-65.
- Löwy, A., 'La théorie de l'imperialisme chez Boukharine', in Histoire du marxisme contemporain, 5 (Paris, 1979), pp. 179-202.
- Löwy, A., 'La théorie de la révolution chez Boukharine', in Histoire du marxisme contemporain, 5 (Paris, 1979), pp. 203-232.
- Luxemburg, R., 'Die Akkumulation des Kapitals. Ein Beitrag zur ökonomischen Erklärung des Imperialismus', in Rosa Luxemburg, Werke, 5 (Berlin, 1975).
- Magri, L., 'Il valore e il limite delle esperienze frontiste', CM, 4 (1965), 6-63.
- Magri, L., 'L'État et la révolution aujourd'hui', LTM, 266 (1968), 388-430.
- Mattick, P., 'Die Unvermeidbarkeit des Kommunismus', in Kritik der Neomarxisten und andere Aufsätze (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 13-71.
- Mattick, P., 'Krisen und Krisentheorien', in Krisen und Krisentheorien (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 7-156. Herausgeber C. Pozzoli.
- Mattick, P., 'Von der Notwendigkeit, den Marxismus mit Marx zu kritisieren. Ein Blick auf das Werk von Karl Korsch', in Spontaneität und Organisation. Vier Versuche über praktische und theoretische Probleme der Arbeiterbewegung (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 65-85.
- Mattick, P., 'Anti-Bolshevist Communism in Germany', Telos, 26 (1975-6), 57-69.
- Mattick, P., 'Anton Pannekoek et la révolution mondiale', in Histoire du marxisme contemporain, 2 (Paris, 1976), pp. 314-354.
- Miliband, R., 'Lenin's "The State and Revolution"', Socialist Register (1968), 309-319. Edited by R. Miliband and J. Saville.
- Miliband, R., 'Constitutionalism and Revolution: Notes on Eurocommunism', Socialist Register (1978), 158-171.
- Müller, W. and Neussus, C., 'Die Sozialstaatsillusion und der Widerspruch zwischen Lohnarbeit und Kapital', SP, 2 (1970), 4-67.

- Neugebauer, S., 'Kapitalismustheorie und Imperialismus - politische und methodologische Fragen an die westdeutsche Weltmarkt Diskussion', GBMT, 8-9 (1976), 197-246.
- Neususs, C., Blanke, B. and Alvater, E., 'Kapitalistischer Weltmarkt und Weltwährungskrise', Prokla, 1 (1971), 5-116.
- Olle, W., 'Zur Theorie des Staatskapitalismus - Probleme von Theorie und Geschichte in Theorien der Übergangsgesellschaft', Prokla, 11-12 (1974), 91-144.
- Petrowsky, W., 'Zur Entwicklung der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', Prokla, 1 (1974), 129-176.
- Pietranera, G., 'R. Hilferding und die ökonomische Theorie der Sozialdemokratie', IMD, 48 (1974), 5-72.
- Reichelt, H., 'Zur Staatstheorie im Frühwerk von Marx und Engels', in K. Marx/F. Engels: Staatstheorie Materialien zur Rekonstruktion der marxistischen Staatstheorie (Frankfurt, 1974), pp. 1-47.
- Riepert, W., 'Kapitalbewegung, Klassenverhältnisse und Staatsfunktion', DA-S, 16 (1977), 63-83.
- Santamaria, U. and Manville, A., 'Lenin and the Problem of Transition', Telos, 27 (Spring, 1976), 79-96.
- Schubert, J., 'Die Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus - Kritik der Zentralen Aussagen', Mehrwert, 4 (1973), 1-102.
- Schutte, H., 'Staatstheorie als Methodenproblem des historischen Materialismus', DA-S, 16 (1977), 6-34.
- Timmermann, B., 'Die Faschismus-Diskussion in der Kommunistischen Internationale 1920-35', (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Köln, 1977).
- Togliatti, P., 'Il Leninismo nel pensiero e nell'azione di A. Gramsci', in Studi Gramsciani (Roma, 1958), second edition 1977, pp. 13-36.
- Togliatti, P., 'Gramsci e la leninismo', in Studi Gramsciani (Roma, 1958), second edition, 1973, pp. 419-444.
- Tronti, M., 'Alcune questioni interno al marxismo di Gramsci', in Studi Gramsciani (Roma, 1958), second edition, 1973, pp. 305-322.
- Wirth, M., 'Zur Kritik der Theorie des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus', Prokla, 8-9 (1973), pp. 17-44.