

Marxism is the philosophy of the state, not the proletariat

Adel El-Emary

May 2010

We do not question the goodwill of the founders and thinkers of Marxism. However, their theory about the party and the role of masses in the revolutionary process and about the state apparatus has always been very dubious. They presented Marxism as the theory of the working class, which was frightful to the dominant classes and their state apparatus. This pushed dominant classes to fight against Marxism; however, -in the unconscious- we find something else.

Likewise, we assume the goodwill of many Marxists, who consider themselves representatives of the proletariat; sacrificing themselves for the salvation of the Marseillaise and –in that way- all humanity. However, we believe that the actual significance of Marxism differs from the stated purpose. The unconscious of its thinkers and supporters reveals their true motives and their deep aspirations, and therefore, what their apparent revolutionary ideas express. This can be revealed by analyzing philosophical ideas, political stances, and the practical results of Marxism.

Here we will analyze one issue: Marxism is not the philosophy of the proletariat, but rather of the modern state.

First: The Marxist theory of the state:

This terrible machine; the state, is not openly welcomed by any revolutionary. Therefore, Marxism heavily criticized it. However, something else is implied in the Marxist literature and practice.

It is a well-established Marxist idea that the state is the product of Irreconcilability of class antagonism; a result of the historically inevitable formation of classes. Engels took up the matter in an attempt to prove that the division of people into classes preceded the emergence of the state, and that this and that had occurred within the ancient communal societies, without providing convincing clues or evidences. He also rejected persistently the theory of violence as a mechanism of the emergence of classes, giving the economic factor a priority; however, he had failed to provide a reasonable presentation of the inevitability of the emergence of classes and the state. Later, Kautsky refuted Engels' ideas in detail.⁽¹⁾ The available information tells that the emergence of classes and the state occurred as a result of the invasions that were among the tribes, which ended either with the elimination of tribes or the control of one over the other, forming a ruling class and a state at the same time. There is no any inevitability of the emergence of classes and accordingly the state. All that can be monitored as factors are human greed and avarice, with a degree of advancement of productive forces that made it possible to produce an economic surplus that is worth seizing. However, the mere appearance of this surplus is not, per se, an explanation of aggression and robbery, as these are purely psychological inclinations. Thus, the emergence of the state was a result of the factors of greed, avarice, and aggressive

⁽¹⁾The Materialist Conception of History, part 3, section 2, chapter 2,

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zzWQwxcOyoxw4O0vfCWbPAmLka3zsiOx/view>

inclinations. It is one of the most important manifestations of “evil” in human society. Nevertheless, Marxism depicts the emergence of the state as if it was a historical inevitability, to confer a “scientific” character upon its view, As if statesmen are designated by history to achieve specific tasks. Just as it depicted the emergence of classes with the same logic, as if the exploiting classes – unfortunately - were obliged to rob and exploit others as a historical role doomed to them!

- While Marx described the capitalist state in his era as a parasitic body in society that impedes its free development, when he talked about the state of the proletariat, we found his words reversed.. Now the state becomes *“the proletariat organized as the ruling class,”* without mentioning to the parasitic body or to the impedance of the free societal development; now it became a progressive power. Actually we do not find what to add to Bakunin’s criticism of Marx in this issue: *“Every state power, every government, by its very nature places itself outside and over the people and inevitably subordinates them to an organization and to aims which are foreign to and opposed to the real needs and aspirations of the people.”*⁽²⁾

- The Communist Manifesto in 1848 stipulated: *“The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degree, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of*

Franz Oppenheimer also presented a large study that could undermine the conception of Engels,

The State- ITS History AND DEVELOPMENT VIEWED SOCIOLOGICALLY.

[https://mises-media.s3.amazonaws.com/The%20State%20Its%20History%20and%20Development%20Viewed%20Sociologically 2.pdf](https://mises-media.s3.amazonaws.com/The%20State%20Its%20History%20and%20Development%20Viewed%20Sociologically%202.pdf)

⁽²⁾Critique of the Marxist Theory of the State,

<https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bakunin/works/1873/statism-anarchy.htm#s1>

the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total productive forces as rapidly as possible ." However, it did not specify the form of this state; the bourgeoisie was also - at the time of the issuance of the Manifesto - "organized as the ruling class" in a sense, and its state was a repressive bureaucratic-military machine.

- In his Critique of the Gotha Program, Marx wrote: "*Freedom consists in converting the state from an organ superimposed upon society into one completely subordinate to it.*" This is indeed the form of the modern bourgeois state that appears to serve citizens! But is there any possibility that the military machine could actually be subject to society? This is just a bluff.

- But after the experience of the Paris Commune that actually destroyed the state apparatus, Marx and Engels' stance changed temporarily; both of them praised the commune that superseded the state apparatus, claiming that the Commune had established the dictatorship of the proletariat: "*Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.*" ⁽³⁾ It follows that Marx and Engels mentioned in the introduction to Manifesto of The Communist Party in the 1872 German edition that the Manifesto program has "*in some details been antiquated,*" adding a sentence from "The Civil War in France": "*One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., that 'the working class cannot simply lay hold of ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.'*"

This sentence can be understood in more than one sense: either the necessity of destroying the state apparatus only, or its substitution

⁽³⁾ Introduction to "The Civil War in France," 1891 edition.

by a different one. Importantly, this text was not added to the body of the Manifesto, although it was reprinted repeatedly later. We also wondered; if Marx and Engels had already decided to accept the anarchist plan; that is, what the Commune had done, so why is it not said so explicitly: the immediate abolition of the state? They had to add that the commune proved that the abolition of the state apparatus - which had already done - was the experience gained from the commune, but they did not.

After that, we find a retreat from the moment of endorsement of the commune:

“Between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.” ⁽⁴⁾ Once again, the word “state” is used in the manner of 1848.

Moreover, Engels said in 1875: *“Now, since the state is merely a transitional institution of which use is made in the struggle, in the revolution, to keep down one's enemies by force, it is utter nonsense to speak of a free people's state; so long as the proletariat still makes use of the state, it makes use of it, not for the purpose of freedom, but of keeping down its enemies and, as soon as there can be any question of freedom, the state as such ceases to exist. We would therefore suggest that Gemeinwesen ['commonalty'] be universally substituted for state; it is a good old German word that can very well do service for the French "Commune.”*⁽⁵⁾

⁽⁴⁾ Critique of the Gotha Program.

⁽⁵⁾ Engels to August Bebel, In Zwickau, 18 -28 March, 1875

Then he promises us: *"Marx's anti-Proudhon piece and after it the Communist Manifesto declare outright that, with the introduction of the socialist order of society, the state will dissolve of itself and disappear"*⁽⁶⁾ - our emphasis. The same was repeated elsewhere.⁽⁷⁾

Then in 1891 Engels said in his introduction to "The Civil War ..." in 1891:

"The state.. and at best an evil inherited by the proletariat after its victorious struggle for class supremacy, whose worst sides the proletariat, just like the Commune, cannot avoid having to lop off at the earliest possible moment, until such time as a new generation, reared in new and free social conditions, will be able to throw the entire lumber of the state on the scrap" (our emphasis).

This is a clear regression to 1848.

As for the explanation that Lenin invoked from Engels' book "Anti-Dühring" it is: *"The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production in the first instance into state property. But, in doing this, it abolishes itself as proletariat, abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, and abolishes also the state as*

⁽⁶⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁷⁾ *"The state was the official representative of society as a whole; the gathering of it together into a visible embodiment. But it was this only in so far as it was the state of that class which itself represented, for the time being, society as a whole: in ancient times, the state of slave-owning citizens; in the Middle Ages, the feudal lords; in our own time, the bourgeoisie. When at last it becomes the real representative of the whole of society, it renders itself unnecessary,"* Anti -Dühring, Part III: Socialism, Theoretical.

"State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies out of itself; the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of processes of production. The state is not "abolished." It dies out," Ibid.

state. “⁽⁸⁾ Then he (Engels then Lenin) mentioned that that state will be on the way to vanish.

Here Lenin quoted from Engels: “*the proletariat thereby abolishes the state as state.*” It is merely empty nonsense and deceit (unintended?). He also wanted to just change the name of the state as Engels has done. If he intended to abolish the state, he would have said so explicitly, but he differentiated his view clearly from the anarchist plan: “*revolution alone can abolish the bourgeois state. The state in general, i.e., the most complete democracy, can only with away ,*” “*according to Marx that state withers away — as distinct from the anarchist doctrine of the abolition of the state.*”⁽⁹⁾

The “promise” of the automatic state vanishing needs a lot of naivety to believe it. Can a tool of oppression and a bureaucracy automatically liquidate itself?

The founders of Marxism presented one prerequisite for vanishing of the state: the disappearance of classes that ends the necessity of the state. This is an overly simple perception, as if history did not witness states that were the dominant class itself, such as the eastern countries, like Egypt. Besides, the Marxists did not imagine that the state apparatus which they called workers’ state could become the ruling class, as it actually happened. So why does it dissolve itself, when and how?

Moreover, when the state discovers that it became “unnecessary,” will it dissolve itself with satisfaction and contentment?! First: Was the state ever necessary? Is it not just an apparatus of repression in the Marxist view? Is repression a necessity? Second: If the state can

⁽⁸⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁹⁾ All the quotes of Lenin are from his book: The state and revolution.

become aware that it is no longer necessary, does not it know that it is also unnecessary now, so, is it going to dissolve itself? Third: Do things work in the human life with this logic? Don't robbers, the parasitic capitalists and those alike know they are too unnecessary? So why not relieve the world of their faces and exploitation?

- The founders of Marxism emphasizes that a transitional stage between capitalism and communism is a necessity, where the social production is distributed to each according to his work, not according to his needs, and the most important is the role of a state apparatus to complete this stage. Then Lenin added -what means- that this stage is in fact the end of history: *"it has never entered the head of any socialist to promise that the higher phase of the development of communism will arrive; as for the greatest socialists' forecast that it will arrive, it presupposes not the present ordinary run of people, who, like the seminary students in Pomyalovsky's stories, are capable of damaging the stocks of public wealth 'just for fun,' and of demanding the impossible."*⁽¹⁰⁾ Does this mean other than the eternity of the aforementioned transitional period; the stage of state socialism? Moreover, the fierce battles between Marxists and anarchists, concerning the state cannot be ignored, as anarchists have always gone to the necessity of abolishing the state with a few exceptions, who have not however accepted that the state has any necessity or role in building socialism.⁽¹¹⁾, while Marxists continued to dwell on the subject, claiming wisdom.

⁽¹⁰⁾ The State and Revolution, 4. The Higher Phase of Communist Society.

⁽¹¹⁾ Some anarchists (including William Godwin) argued that the widespread use of reason by the masses would ultimately cause the state (he called it: government) to dissolve as an unnecessary force. He was against using revolutionary methods to abolish the state apparatus. Instead, he called for a process of gradual peaceful development, so that it could disappear on its own. He also viewed that the minimal State could be accepted as a necessary evil at present, which would become

- Later on, the Marxist intellectuals did not give up their fascination with the terrifying state apparatus. For example, shortly before the outbreak of the First World War, Marxist parties in Europe supported their states by approving the war credits under the slogan: Defense of Homeland. Lenin's intense anger and the declaration of his war against those parties were not because he wanted to dissolve the state apparatus, but because the war hindered the revolution of the proletariat, the project of Marxism in establishing state socialism. In order to achieve this project, Lenin and his party fought bloody battles after October Revolution, against the left Marxist opposition, trade unions, anarchist groups, that included mass murder, artillery shelling, arrests and extrajudicial physical liquidation, for everyone who dared and demanded that the role of the Marxist state should be restrained.

That state initially resembled the repressive medieval states. Consequently, most of the Marxist left opposition advocated slogans and ideas that included transforming that state into a modern, “democratic” one with delicate hands but never advocated its abolition. Rather, they continued to proclaim that it is a socialist state. However, the leftist opposition contended that it is as capitalist state, calling for a more flexible state like those of Western Europe, with maintaining its control over the economy and the central market. Indeed, some modernization of the “socialist” state took place gradually.

increasingly irrelevant and crippled, through a gradual spread of knowledge among the citizens.

An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice,

<https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/godwin-an-enquiry-concerning-political-justice-in-2-vols>

We still find the Marxist left standing in the camp of advocating the state, and worried about it in various countries. In the West, that left is clinging with the welfare state that has declined since the end of the Cold War, with which he allied before, calling for its continuation and the restoration of the social roles that it abandoned. In the Middle East, the majority of the Marxist left allied with the authoritarian states against the attempts of imperialism to dismantle the totalitarian regimes that it had established before, while calling for some democracy. In addition, we still find the Marxists markedly anxious about “terrorism” and the possible revolutions of the hungry, for fear of something they call “the fall of the state,” considering this a precursor to massive and destructive chaos. The nationalist trend of many Marxists is added; manifested in slogans such as: the homeland army - defending the country - protecting the state. Rather than the struggle against “terrorism” and the states of the middle east, among others (almost always pro-imperialist), most Marxists line up with it, under slogans such as “Axis of Resistance” or “The Steadfastness and Confrontation”..

- For a long time, a certain concept of socialism has been established in the Marxists mind; that is: socialism = nationalization (or confiscation) + central planning before anything else; ⁽¹²⁾ state's total control of the civil society. Marx and Engels clearly said: “*The Communists can summarize their theory with one single phrase: the abolition of private property.*”⁽¹³⁾ Thereafter the Communist Manifesto went on to promise with: “*the conversion of the function*

⁽¹²⁾ The writer (and other) has presented this issue in an article titled: Beyond the Soviet bureaucracy,

https://modernization-adil.blogspot.com/2010/11/blog-post_6161.html

⁽¹³⁾ Manifesto of the Communist Party, Proletarians and Communists

of the state into a more superintendence of production” This, of course, equals the state's control of social capital, which Engels explained in a booklet entitled: *The Principles of Communism*, which was a draft of the Communist Manifesto. This clearly indicates the interests of the state bureaucracy. However, with the fall of the totalitarian systems in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe, some groups added proposals such as: public control - participatory democracy - deliberative democracy.. etc up to nationalization and planning, of course without any mentioning to the need to dismantle the state. Therefore, what they are looking to is a “democratic” state with delicate hands; this is the practical meaning of public control.

- At the end, we summarize the issue as follows: the conception of a state socialist system which includes nationalization, planning and a central market = a system governed by the state, whether is it authoritarian or with delicate hands. Nevertheless, pretending that that what is meant is a workers' state, is just hypocrisy and deception. Actually, there is no such thing called workers' state. The state is an apparatus specialized in repression and management. Would all workers be free to play this role?! The most straightforward - if desired - is to say: Abolition of the state apparatus entirely for an alternative in the form of direct democracy, government of popular councils without a standing army, professional police, judiciary, or bureaucracy. Claiming that this is difficult to achieve, cannot justify welcoming that demon called the state, unless the devil is the real goal, at least in the unconscious. Here we remember that the slogan “*All power to the soviets*” (or councils) was used by the Bolsheviks before their victory and they did not consider its implementation an impossibility at that time, then they confiscated the soviets themselves in the context of

building their state after they used it as a Trojan horse to seize power.

This is what we meant by "Marxism is the philosophy of the state." As Marxism objectively expresses the interests of the bureaucracy of the modern state, which has abandoned the authoritarian nature of the brutal feudal system and has become more dependent on soft power and hidden control... This is what we deduce from such words as: "worst sides ..to lop off " and "*the state as such ceases to exist .*".. "substitute the word commune with the word state."

Of course, it is not necessary for the state to make its philosophy, as is the case of all other social powers. The bourgeoisie - for example - did not philosophize by itself, even though it was aware of its interests.

Second: We find the roots of what we mentioned in the theories of Marxist of the party, with the exception of the views of small groups such as that of Rosa Luxemburg, Gramsci, and other minorities:

* The Communist Party for the Marxist currents in general is distinguished from the working class as the bearer of the revolutionary theory; the political consciousness of the proletariat; as the Communists "*have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the lines of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement .*" ⁽¹⁴⁾ The founders of this idea are Marx and Engels. However, we find later mentions of Marx countering those words: "*the function of a*

⁽¹⁴⁾ Ibid.

party was to lead and serve the proletariat in its battles and not to ‘set up any sectarian principles of their own by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement,’ ‘the emancipation of the working class must be conquered by the workers themselves,’ ‘Trade unions are the schools of socialism. It is in trade unions that workers educate themselves and become socialists because under their very eyes and every day the struggle with capital is taking place.’ ‘The political movement of the working class has as its ultimate object, of course, the conquest of political power for this class, and this naturally requires a previous organization of the working class developed up to a certain point and arising from its economic struggles.’⁽¹⁵⁾ This is what Engels later criticized (1890): ‘Marx and I are partly to blame for the fact that the younger people sometimes lay more stress on the economic side than is due to it. We had to emphasize the main principle vis-à-vis our adversaries, who denied it, and we had not always the time, the place, or the opportunity to give their due to the other elements involved in the interaction.’⁽¹⁶⁾ However, all of this is nonsense. It is not enough to call things by false names in order to change them. The idea of a party composed of intellectuals representing the workers is the point; it is the embryo of a system in which the state dominates. This was mentioned by Bakunin decades before the emergence of the Soviet Union (1873): ‘Let us ask, if the proletariat is to be the ruling class, over whom it to rule is? In short, there will remain another proletariat which will be subdued to this new rule, to this new state.’⁽¹⁷⁾ This argument reminds us of the slave revolts in

⁽¹⁵⁾ John Molyneux, *Marxism and the Party*,

<https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/writers/molyneux/1978/party/>

⁽¹⁶⁾ Engels to Bloch, 21–22 September 1890, from John Molyneux

. Op. cit.

⁽¹⁷⁾ *Statism and Anarchy*,

the past, that when had been ended by establishing new states, slave leaders became rulers who also oppressed a class of slaves.

Lenin discarded the idea of the broad party in favor of the idea of a party based on cadres of revolutionary professionals. His rationale is summarized in the following: Because revolutionary theory can only be assimilated by highly cultural persons, the party relies mainly on these persons. In addition, because the workers social circumstances do not allow them to acquire Marxist theory, the party relies on intellectuals of bourgeois origin, plus a workers' vanguard, which is more capable to assimilate scientific socialism than the rest of the workers. Thus, we become in front of a conscious class and a party; the vanguard of this class, leading the workers and bringing consciousness to them, and at the same time learns from their spontaneity and initiatives;⁽¹⁸⁾ This spontaneity that Lenin described as “*consciousness in an embryonic form.*” Since there is a well-recognized hypothesis in the Leninist theory; that the masses are able to develop only trade union consciousness, not political consciousness, unlike the educated and “conscious” leaders. Therefore, the mass spontaneity - despite its importance - needs the guidance of the intellectual leaders. Therefore, the political class-consciousness of the workers can be provided from without, i.e. from outside the economic struggle; from outside the periphery of relations between workers and employees; from outside the working class, especially by the bourgeois intellectuals. This is a life sentence for the masses that they are always less conscious than the party members and less able to understand (they do not comprehend dialectics and historical materialism as Ernest Mandel said!).

<https://libcom.org/files/statismandanarchy.pdf>

⁽¹⁸⁾What is to be done? PDF file, p. 18 -20

Something similar to Gustave Le Bon's condescending view of the masses (his book: *Discourse on Voluntary Servitude*). So now, Marx's principle, "*the emancipation of the working class must be conquered by the workers themselves*," has turned into its opposite. The most important role now belongs to the bourgeois intellectuals who are having a revolutionary theory. Thus, the division between manual work and mental work, and the maintenance of hierarchy within the revolutionary camp (class and party) are performed. Now the determination of the interests and fate of the working class also became the task of intellectuals. Finally thought became independent of reality and not the product of it, and the party became "representative" of the class regardless of what it wants; it has the task of penetrating into its ranks, convincing it with its ideas, and charting its way. The party is now having the proletarian political consciousness, especially its hard core, and one becomes more revolutionary and socialist as they approach that core. Consequently, the number of Marxist organizations claiming to represent workers multiplied; no matter how small in size, and regardless of their ability and political effect, because all has – from the point of view of each - the "correct" theory that should be brought to the proletariat from without. One egregious example of what we say is that the Fourth Trotskyist International was formed from a very little number of small, meager organizations that are weakly related to workers, although they are supposed to represent the world's working class.⁽¹⁹⁾

⁽¹⁹⁾ The situation was described by Ernest Mandel, quoting from Trotsky himself: "His followers were few, and the organizations they hardly established severely lacked material means, and were shattered by the divisions and cleavages that were due to their own weakness and isolation from the working class public."

Lenin changed his stance about spontaneity after the revolution of 1905 in Russia: *“There is not the slightest doubt that the revolution will teach social-democratism to the masses of the workers in Russia,”*⁽²⁰⁾ but nothing was accordingly changed in the hierarchical nature of his party.

- Marxism, in its various "versions," theorized the special role of intellectuals in expressing the proletariat: for instance, the Trotskyist Ernest Mandel wrote: *“The category of the revolutionary party stems from the fact that Marxian socialism is a science which, in the final analysis, can be completely assimilated only in an individual and not in a collective manner. Marxism constitutes the culmination (and in part also the dissolution) of at least three classical social sciences: classical German philosophy, classical political economy, and classical French political science (French socialism and historiography). Its assimilation presupposes at least an understanding of the materialist dialectic, historical materialism, Marxian economic theory and the critical history of modern revolutions and of the modern labor movement.”*⁽²¹⁾

It was never a coincidence that Marxism attracted ambitious middle-class intellectuals, who always aspired to achieve an important status. It was not surprising that most members of the Russian Workers' Party were intellectuals until 1905. However, Lenin and the violent revolution broke out at that time, could - after

⁽²⁰⁾ John Molyneux, Op. cit., quoted from: Lenin, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution.

⁽²¹⁾ Ernest Mandel, the Leninist Theory of Organization, II. Bourgeois ideology and proletarian class consciousness,

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/mandel/196x/leninism/index.htm>

marked resistance of the party leaders- admit the workers into the party organizations. Moreover, the majority of the leaders of Marxist parties in Europe were always from the middle class and the majority of members of Marxist organizations (and not only leaders) in the East as a whole were middle-class intellectuals. In addition, Marxist parties were formed in countries almost without workers. If we believe that those parties had bore the philosophy of the proletariat; then whom they exactly represented politically in a country with no workers? The world proletariat?! Is it possible to imagine that a local party in a city or a country represents the world proletariat politically?!

-The ultimate goal of the revolutionary Marxist parties (excluding the reformists) is to seize the state and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat (or “its” party - allegedly - no difference). Those parties had imagined that once this goal is achieved all human problems would be ended. In order to achieve that goal, anything could be sacrificed except the party, the bearer of torch of truth. From a practical point of view, the ultimate goal is to establish a statist system, thus realizing bureaucratic interests in the first place. Whatever the state apparatus be destroyed, it would be rebuilt again to accommodate Marxist elites and be more modernized.

In all cases, when Marxist parties seized power, they established an authoritarian state ruled by a group of tyrannies, the vast majority of them were thieves. We did not find, at the moment of truth, the middle-class intellectuals, those bearers of dialectics (!) sacrificing their power and interests for the eyes of the proletariat. Even, the former state bureaucracy benefited from the socialist revolutions; many of its members joined the new bureaucracy in various countries, and became Marxists! We have an example of the

Tsar's men and officers, whose majority escaped at the beginning of the Russian revolution, but later on, when they became certain of the victory of the workers and soldiers uprising, tens of thousands of them joined the winning horse, then the Red Army, and some of them later became part of the ruling bureaucracy.

- Certainly, it is possible for intellectuals of any class to create a philosophy of the proletariat or other classes, as there is some distance between thought and the reality it expresses. But in the realm of politics and practice, no one can act on behalf of a class or monopolize its class-consciousness. However, the socialist anarchist intellectuals were more consistent: they presented theories that actually reflected only the interests of workers and the poor in general, but they, or most of them, at the same time, have presented a truly public political project, which only paves the way for a system of autonomy for the public, regardless of the possibility of its success or realism.

Marxism exploited workers, peasants, and social conflict in general to extend the hegemony of the bureaucracy and rejuvenate it. It is the philosophy of the modern state, and a political party of middle-class sectors that are looking for rulership.

Third: Marxism had already become the official philosophy of the state in various socialist countries ruled by a Communist Party. Its notion had finally been “realized” - if we borrow Hegel's language. It had become the official ideology that is taught in schools, its bearers occupied the highest positions of the state, and the party that was bearing the theory was the core of the state and its privileged elite. This obvious fact found its roots in the theory of

Marxism about the state; its historical role and its emergence for pure economic factors. Plus the role of the party; as the bearer of the consciousness of the proletariat; which transforms it from a class “in itself” to a class “for itself.” Finally in the project of building socialism by a state, called Dictatorship of the Proletariat, with discarding communism and the contentment with the socialist stage, where the state dominates and the distribution of production is according to work, as Lenin contended.

Fourthly: it would be expected that capitalism and its state, and even – somewhat- petty-bourgeoisie, would resist the socialist movement. But with the changes the world witnessed, among which was the transformation of the modern state into an octopus with private interests apart from that of capitalism, and even became the vanguard of the existing social systems, that state has had a drive for expanding its economic influence and increasing its privileges. So the security services no longer arrest anyone who calls to nationalizing the private sector or abolishing market freedom. There became also many supporters of the Keynesian theory; a modified version of socialism, and the welfare state in Europe nationalized many private enterprises. Likewise, the official hostility towards Marxism has diminished; even the German state recently celebrated the memory of Marx with official European participation and a lot of people became tolerate the phrase: Marx was right.⁽²²⁾ It

⁽²²⁾ Why Marx was right, a book written by Terry Eagleton,

<http://www.sooqkaz.com/index.php/component/edocman/%D9%84%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B0%D8%A7-%D9%83%D8%A7%D9%86-%D9%83%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%84-%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%83%D8%B3-%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%89-%D8%AD%D9%82-%D8%9F-%D8%AA%D9%8A%D8%B1%D9%8A-%D8%A5%D9%8A%D8%BA%D9%84%D8%AA%D9%88%D9%86?Itemid=2018>

became clear after the implementation of socialism, that it had consolidated the state power after its reconstruction, and there was no reason for its rejection by the bourgeois state.

It can be added with confidence that the Marxist movements and parties, beside the alike, in terms of Keynesian perspectives and others, may become a strategic reserve for the existing systems, especially with the anticipated expansion of the state after the end of Coronavirus pandemic; the state may become an alternative to capitalism or present itself as such.

In conclusion, the philosophy of the professional party and the “socialist” state is necessarily the philosophy of the state.

Bakunin considered the bureaucracy a social class,⁽²³⁾ rather it was better - in our opinion - to say: a stratum. We add that this stratum had the interest to embrace Marxism from the beginning, which clearly advocated the nationalization of private property for the benefit of the state, but that it bore the bourgeois ideologies.

What is to be done?

If you, hey militant, really want to liberate the workers or the people, then call for the dissolution of this infernal machine called the state, offering libertarian alternatives, including the popular councils and direct democracy, without professional suppression tools. You also have to call the masses themselves to make their own

⁽²³⁾Felipe Corrêa, “Social Classes and Bureaucracy in Bakunin,”

<https://ithanarquista.wordpress.com/2016/11/02/felipe-correa-social-classes-and-bureaucracy-in-bakunin/>

revolution and establish the system that suits them, without the state. It is possible to form a popular government, but there can be no such thing as a popular state, so what drives armed violence apparatus - even if its members are originally from workers - to work for the sake of society as a whole? Really, the monopoly of power by any group immediately leads to its excellence and monopoly of privileges.