



Publication details, information for authors and referees and full contents available at: <http://global-discourse.com/>

ISSN: 2043-7897

Suggested citation:

Martinez Delgado, A. (2011) 'Eliminate Capitalism and Distrust Socialism: What Remains of Marxism', *Global Discourse* [Online], 2: 1, available from: <<http://global-discourse.com/contents>>.

All copyrights of this article are held by the author/s.

## **Eliminate Capitalism and Distrust Socialism: What Remains of Marxism**

*Alberto Martinez Delgado*

### **Introduction**

Marxism claims to have two main characteristics: to be a scientific knowledge of social reality based on economics and to indicate a way to achieve the liberation of the working class and of the whole of mankind, thus entering a new era in human history. Both of these features, repeatedly proclaimed in Marxist writings, –from Marx and Engels to Stalin and other leaders and Marxist ideologues– are deeply problematic. The liberation of the working class is denied by the historic experiences of the countries and situations where *Marxist organisations* have got any kind of power. The scientific character of Marxism, on the other hand, clashes with some a priori ideas of Marxist theory, in particular with the doctrinarian imposition of dialectic thought.

Independently of the theoretical constitution of Marxism, which must, in any case also be considered, the socio-historic reality makes evident the disparity between hopes which are in some way a result of the ideological power of the socialist – Marxist theory itself, and the real social situation. While Marxism has been a great hope for millions of people for about a century and a half, Marxist-socialist reality has caused a profound disappointment in many socialist supporters, a disappointment delayed but not avoided by widely trumpeted propaganda slogans.

This situation, a sound suspicion of not being as proletarian nor as scientific as proclaimed, requires an analysis of the reality of capitalism and of Marxist ideology according to a scientific and materialist view, without being subject to the dialectical idealistic standpoint increasingly dominant within Marxism.

The subordination of reality to the development of dialectical categories and the strict bipolarity of contradiction, including the class struggle, are two especially revealing manifestations of the dialectical dogmatism and idealism that have permanently pervaded Marxism from its first moments and hinder even the study of basic material production and the capitalist class structure.

From a materialistic point of view, the root of this idealism must be analysed according to a view of social classes that goes beyond the duality *capitalist class-working class*; at least we ought also to take into account the presence in capitalist society of the fundamental class of cadres or managers.

Besides the dialectical bipolar view of social classes, a unitary conception of each of the social classes in a national sphere and beyond that in the international realm also seems theoretically untenable. The national character of the dominant

classes and their struggle is an undeniable historical fact – whose more acute manifestation is the war between the ruling classes of different States – that deserves to be incorporated into social theory over and above any aim of establishing general and universal categories which could possess the capacity for self-development.

### Marxist Idealism

Although with some oscillations and irregularities, idealism is an essential component of Marx's thought in all its stages. This idealism has two main features, the idealisation of materialism by incorporating it into the Hegelian dialectic and, closely linked with this integration, the analysis of capitalist society and of socialist prospects for its future according to the action of autonomous socio-philosophical categories, absolute determinants of empirical reality<sup>1</sup>.

The idealisation of capitalism by Marx himself, sometimes confused with the process of scientific abstraction, is reflected in key aspects of his doctrine as in the conception of the market – considered as a realm of genuine free exchange of equivalents – the theory of value and the strictly bipolar conception of social classes.

The idea of a capitalist free market is accepted by Marx as a decisive and characteristic category of economic behaviour and changes within capitalism, without raising any critical comment that might be compared to the critical equivalence established by Marx, in the context of *18 Brumaire*, of the classic bourgeois banners of *freedom, equality and fraternity* and the less utopian reality of “Cavalry, Infantry and Artillery.”

Despite the general critique of the fetishism of commodities by Marx, often seen as a core idea in Marx's theory, we can find some kind of fetishism in the thought of Marx himself. The fetishist and mysterious character of commodity, wrote Marx, is produced “simply because in it the social character of men's labour appears to them as an objective character stamped upon the product of that labour because the relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labour is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labour” (Marx, K., 1974, 77). This fetishism of the commodity is shown itself “by the dull and tedious quarrel over the part played by Nature in the formation of exchange-value” (Marx, K., 1974, 86). Besides the problem of how far society, from the Marxian theory, is a manifestation of nature – where each production system is an inexorable consequence of the development of productive forces, to the extent that the intention to skip any stage is deemed utopian, wrong and misleading -, it is important to underline the fact that the idea from classical liberalism and Marx that the exchange of goods is essentially an exchange of equivalents also involves, in our view, a fetishist idealisation of commodity and is not a mere scientific abstraction. This idealisation is reinforced by the definition of values based on the work embodied in

---

<sup>1</sup> Orwell, G. (1981, 160) pointed out the arbitrariness of mental constructions in some doctrinal realms as religion or philosophy and the need to take account of the *physical facts* when one is not dealing with mere speculative, or *ideal-interest* matters: “Physical facts could not be ignored. In philosophy, or religion, or ethics, or politics, two and two might make five, but when one was designing a gun or an aeroplane they had to make four.”

the goods. With this vision of fairness and free trade, claimed as a universal law, remain hidden relations of unequal exchange of goods between dominant and dominated nations that are a fundamental part of history and which are the basis of imperial dominion and inter-imperialist wars – flagrant violations of proclaimed commercial freedom and equality.

The concept of commodity becomes a dialectical category whose development, independent of material contingencies, determines history until its own *dialectical negation* and *dialectical sublation*, a consequence of the *internal contradictions* of the category itself (exchange value and use value). Work, really a key factor in production and exchange, becomes another category of independent development over the complexities of the different forms of work, subsuming in particular the work of organising production, a characteristic of the manager or cadre class.

The very concept of social class, especially relevant in understanding social phenomena, becomes a rigid dialectical category which prevents the taking into account of such important facts of social reality as the emergence of a new class of cadres or managers. The consideration of this third relevant social class, gives way to a basically tri-classist theory of social structure of capitalist society (not just a bi-classist one), a theoretical approach which allows greater conceptual enrichment in line with social reality. Michels, R. (1959, 390-391) stated that the consideration of more than two social classes in a society is not contradictory with social or historical materialism:

The principle that one dominant class inevitably succeeds to another, and the law deduced from that principle that oligarchy is, as it were, a preordained form of the common life of great social aggregates, far from conflicting with or replacing the materialist conception of history, completes that conception and reinforces it. There is no essential contradiction between the doctrine that history is the record of a continued series of class struggles and the doctrine that class struggles invariably culminate in the creation of new oligarchies which undergo fusion with the old. The existence of a political class does not conflict with the essential content of Marxism, considered not as an economic dogma but as a philosophy of history ... Thus the social revolution would not effect any real modification of the internal structure of the mass. The socialists might conquer, but not socialism, which would perish in the moment of its adherents' triumph.

The idealisation of materialism, its *placement on its head*, is parallel and correlates with the intention of *placing the dialectic on its feet*. As Kautsky said, for the materialist application of dialectic, to eliminate idealism from dialectic, it is not enough merely to turn it off its head and place it upon its feet (Kautsky, K., 1988, p. 38); on the contrary, dialectic pulls materialism towards idealism<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Arthur, C. J. (2002, p. 10) points out:

It is my belief that Marx himself was not clear about the answer to this question ... When Marx acknowledged the influence of Hegel's dialectic on his *Capital* he failed to explain how an idealistic logic could assist a materialist science.

The dialectical categories show their inherent idealism in their strict bipolarity, in their self-development independent of the facts, issues to which we have already referred to, and in the ascent towards *perfection* of this self-development of dialectical categories –the latter an idealistic aspect also mentioned by Kautsky, K. (1988, p. 37)<sup>3</sup>:

In Engels' illustrations of the dialectic, we find, aside from self-movement, an element of an idealist rather than materialist nature, that of the steady perfection of the world through the dialectical process... H e g e l c o u l d discover in the world steady progress toward growing perfection, because he saw a world-reason at work in it setting purposes. But where can materialist thinking find a world-purpose? And if there is none, what is the origin of the striving for steady perfection through the dialectical process? Man can set purposes for himself in nature and can adapt particular phenomena of his environment to his purposes, and he can see this as perfection from *his* point of view. But it would be anthropocentric thinking to regard this as a perfection of the *world*".

The idealism of Marx and Marxism has its main application in the idealisation of socialism, often dialectically linked to the idealisation of capitalism itself as we have noted in the case of the market and of the underestimation of the use of war to subjugate other countries and to impose the kind of *free market* that interests a nation that aspires to become a dominant power (interests that can be identified with those of the dominant class controlling the state and, in particular of its superior layers and sectors).

The presentation of the capitalist class as a defender of various kinds of freedom, including the free market, implies a subordination of Marxism to liberal ideology, and a unified, universal and totalising vision of the capitalist class, in a clear contradiction with reality, past and present, of clashes within and between each national bourgeoisie and all their bellicose manifestations.

The idealisation of the capitalist class by Marxism –in spite of the condemnation of capitalist exploitation, resulting from a double exchange of equivalents (of the work embodied in commodities on the one hand, and of the power of labour on the other), but not a *robbery* as Proudhon called private property and Marx criticized- is accompanied by a similar idealisation of the *proletariat* –which is also a universalising and totalising idealisation- within which is masked the class of the cadres, the new emergent social class which contends with the bourgeoisie for economic and political power.

Although the ideologies developed within capitalism, liberalism and socialism-Marxism, highlight universality as a capitalist characteristic, it seems that the national component of capitalism should not be forgotten, even in the present epoch of

---

<sup>3</sup> We can observe, nevertheless, that Kautsky's objection to the Marxist teleology does not exclude the possibility of considering a social teleology -not accepted in nature- which supports the idealist exaltation of the *purposes and conscious functions (scientific and technical functions)* claimed by the cadres class.

globalisation.. The importance of wars, the acute manifestation of the clash between different national dominant classes and a consequence of the stubborn aim embodied in the upper classes to dominate other peoples and nations, ought not to be neglected. The relationship between the main socialist revolutions (Paris Commune, Russian, Chinese and East European) and the three important wars (Franco-German War, World War I, and World War II) is very significant in this sense.

The uniform and universalising vision of the ideal categories, the linear process upward of the historical process<sup>4</sup>, is linked to the predominance of a temporal dialectic over the spatial reality of the societies and their changes. Balibar, E. (2010, 3) asserts the predominance of temporality over spatiality in Marx:

My general idea is that there is, in Marx and in his Marxist followers, a clear prevalence of temporal patterns over spatial patterns, resulting in much serious consequences on how to design policy and in particular on how to address issues as the revolutionary perspective, the opposition to reformism, the relationship to rebellion and resistance, the inclusion in social contexts that are both national and non-nationals, the modes of organization and generalization, etc.. This prevalence comes from Hegel, and even further: in fact it shows how Marx belongs to a tradition, in which he is also a giant, that of the philosophy of history (perhaps it might be specified: the philosophy of Western history), and more precisely in the tradition of historicist idealism, whose heart is the identification of questions of temporality and historicity

According to the prevalence of this essentially temporary vision of societies at the expense of their spatial aspects, the differences between nations and regions are reduced to different paces of growth, which tend to be reabsorbed in temporal development. Qualifying materialism as “historic” highlights the temporal focus rather than the spatial view, thus avoiding the prosaic aspects of material experience, in opposition to which time seems more appropriate to *spiritual* development.

Historical materialism is, from our point of view, but one aspect of social materialism. The dialectic, inseparable from idealist teleology and dogmatism can not be considered an essence or a method (even a method of exposition) of social materialism, nor as “a synonym for ‘scientific’ as Marx uses it (Bhaskar, R., 1993, 97), following Hegel.

### **Social Classes, Class of the Cadres and Nationalism**

The social roots of the idealist trend of Marx and Marxism are connected, in our analysis, with the problem of the polarity of the class structure of society and

---

<sup>4</sup> Russell, B. (1979, 754) emphasizes the unscientific character of the Hegelian idealism inherited by Marx, in relation to atheism, the dialectic and *cosmic optimism*:

Marx professed himself an atheist, but retained a cosmic optimism which only theism could justify. Broadly speaking, all the elements in Marx's philosophy which are derived from Hegel are unscientific, in the sense that there is no reason whatever to suppose them true... It is easy to restate the most important part of what he had to say without any reference to the dialectic.

especially with the existence of the class of the cadres, aspiring to an increasing role and control over the whole of society. This class, lurking inside Marxism as a part of the proletariat in a more or less disguised manner, has expressed its revolutionary interest in removing the capitalist class through socialist and Marxist thought.

Unveiling the managerial or *cadrist* class nature of Marxism, and of the organisational structures (political parties and trade unions mainly) that have claimed to be representative of the working class, it is necessary not to support repetitions of socialist experiences so harmful to workers as those experienced in the 20th century, to brake the advance of idealism (Marxist, or directly Hegelian) and to raise the possibility of confrontation with capitalism, perhaps inevitably in a socialist-managerial perspective, avoiding simultaneously a harsh dictatorship of the managerial class. The current academic Marxist trend to underpin the utopian side of Marxism and to promote its idealist component are factors of mysticism which obstruct the possibility of real criticism of both capitalism and *bureaucratic* socialism.

The existence of the cadre class in capitalist society has been recognised by several authors (Makhaïski, 1979; Lozinsky, 1907; Burnham, 1942; Duménil and Lévy, 1998, 2011, ...) and the ideological and political importance of this managerial class has also been emphasized, with particular reference to the connection of this class (or significant sections of it) with Nazism and Stalinism.

The emergence of the class of the cadres or managers has been seen as a relevant factor produced “at the turn of the twentieth century”, and particularly from the so called *managerial revolution* linked to the 1930s *Great Depression* (Duménil, G., Lévy, D., 2011, pp. 94, 15). However there is evidence enough to support the existence and relevance of the cadre class from the very beginning of capitalism as well as the connection between the class of the cadres, mainly of their revolutionary sectors, and the early nineteenth century socialist formulations (particularly in the case of Saint-Simon) and Marxism, as already pointed out by Makhaïski, J. W. (1979) and Lozinsky, E. (1907) in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The view of Marxism as an ideology of the class of the cadres (Martinez Delgado, A. 2010) contrasts greatly with the almost permanent Marxist claim to be the ideology of the proletariat; nevertheless it seems legitimate to search for a non proletarian character of class in Marxism, given the reality of socialist social relations, inspired by Marxism, in different historical periods, some important contain of Marxian an Marxist thinking and even some significant pre-Marxist socialist theories.

According to this *materialist* view, Marxist ideology is mainly a consequence of the existence and development of the cadre class in a capitalist society and not conversely; the cadre class is not a result of a degenerative process in socialist countries but a class conceived within the capitalist system itself, prior to any socialist revolution to which the revolutionary sectors of the cadre class aspires. The socialist class, although not a product of socialist regimes, is boosted and strengthened inside socialist societies.

Much criticism of Marxism tries to explain the contradiction between the more overt discourse of Marxism and the reality of the systems where Marxist ideology has become dominant (at least in declarative terms) pointing out the existence of a degenerative process of Marxist theory, especially intense in certain historical situations and dependent on the great leaders of the moment: the views of Engels

(who would have not been loyal enough to the positions of Marx), the Second International bureaucratization, the theories of Lenin which would have overestimated the role of professional revolutionary cadres, or the theoretical and practical aberrations of Stalinism (particularly for Trotskyism, the defence of socialism in one country) and subsequent consequences. To these explanations, focused on the theoretical errors of a degenerative evolution of Marxism, are frequently added the influence of some material factors that trigger the degenerative process or accentuate it, such as the fact that socialist revolutions have occurred in underdeveloped capitalist countries, or the blockade, sabotage and attack on socialism by the capitalist-imperialist states.

Femia, J. V. (1993, p. 146) holds that “there have broadly been three ways of explaining the “genetic” link between Marxism and authoritarianism. Each claims to find a fatal flaw in the doctrine: either its economic dogma, or its sequentialism, or its supposed messianism ...”. To these three standpoints Femia adds his “own explanation which holds that Marxism’s Achilles’ heel, the underlying cause of its deformity in practice, is its holistic conception of man” (ibidem), the “Marxist sacrifice” of “the autonomous dimensions of personhood to the communal aspects of species being” (ibid p. 162). Although we can not deny the influence of each of the above-mentioned factors in the development of the particularly striking despotic features of *real socialism* (the theoretical ideological deformations as well as the practical circumstances of socialist experiments) we give an explanatory primacy to the socio-economic structure of capitalist society, in particular to the rise of a new social class in capitalism: the cadre class. The reference to ideological features as the primary determinant of social evolution of the class structure of a society seems to us an idealistic perspective more than a scientific one. The theoretical critiques of many authors, some of them of great reputation such as Lukács, Gramsci, or the members of the Frankfurt School, of course have contributed hugely to elucidate the deep nature of Marxism, even if some of their positions could be considered *idealistic* or *socialist-cadrist* along the same lines as the Marxist main stream, and did not accomplish a real materialist analysis of Marxism.

When we have referred to the dialectic as a theoretical flaw of Marxism and when we associate this idealistic component of Marxism to its cadre class character, although our position could be deemed as fundamentally theoretical and therefore dealing with *ideas*, we tackle the problem giving priority to the *material* structure of society.

The primacy of interests over *ideas commitments* can be verified frequently by observing the shifting of ideas, sometimes through apparently little nuances in their expressions, according to modifications in the concrete situations.

Ideological conglomerates correspond to stable structural elements of the socioeconomic situation of the class or group, but are also affected, sometimes decisively, by circumstantial conditions of economic and social relations in which the class or group is involved. In some ways, from our own point of view, some of the *flaws* of the Marxist theory could be deemed successes, rather than failures, if we take into account the partial class interest of the *socialist* class.

The negative experience of the reality of socialist-Marxist ideological dominance, apparently affected more *real socialist* regimes but is also manifest in the

inner life of communist parties, particularly in the idealisation of the central leadership and the response to discrepancy, and in the life of mass organisations like trade unions, even where they distance themselves from the ideology of Marxism but retain their claim to represent the working class. For a time considered a socialist alternative but soon dismissed by orthodox Marxism, the fate of cooperatives is illustrative of the forms of deception endured by the working class.

If the fit and deep link between Marxism and the new rising class (the cadres or socialist class) is supported by further studies, the critique of some events (Stalinism, bureaucracy, ...) should be directed to the whole Marxist ideology and take more radical forms, directed chiefly toward its idealism -and *interested* utopianism- whether dialectical or not.

Although idealism and the cadre class character of Marxism are not separate aspects of Marxist ideology, they do not imply each other. The interests of the cadre class can manifest themselves through different ideologies, including fascist ideologies, and even materialist ideologies. On the other hand, idealism is not privative of Marxism but is an ideological paradigm supported by different social classes (slavers, nobility, capitalist, socialist, ...). Nevertheless, once accepted these different possibilities, we can find a close accordance between idealism and the cadre class character of Marxism at least in four respects: a) the *idealization* of socialism (and even of capitalism) we have already mentioned, useful as a lure for the workers and the people; b) the dialectical oversimplification of social reality, analyzed as a strict bipolar contradiction, which helps in promoting an anti-capitalist front under the nominal leadership of the proletariat and the hidden hegemony of the cadre class; c) the view of society's development as a steady process of perfection, in a clearly teleological idealism which develops confidence in the socialist future and puts a stop to possible critical attitudes towards concrete socialist activities, in socialist countries or in the fight for socialism; and d) the veneer of science and technology, viewed idealistically, which gives to Marxism an apparent *deep foundation* for the predominance of the cadre class in a future non-capitalist society and in the fight for socialism, even making it possible to veil some contradictions with social reality.

Much of the negative effects of the socialist-Marxist experience are accentuated by the persistence of the power of leading sectors and layers of the cadres class, as revealed in the revolutions in Russia, China and Cuba; this effect raises sociological aspects beyond the particular ideology (Marxist or other) taken by the cadres, as the problem of the tendency towards despotism of managers at different levels of business or public administration, especially developed as they maintain their power.

The classist concept of society, be it bipolar, tripolar or more complex, ought not, from a scientific perspective, attribute to each of the social classes a categorical universality that erases their national characteristics, whose extreme manifestation, as already mentioned, is war between States and the fighting within each of the classes in each country. This national character has been strongly manifested in the case of the capitalist class but also in the case of the class of the cadres.

The study of social reality, both in the basic social class structure and in its ideological aspects, ought not to be based on the self-development of philosophical or ideological categories, whether liberal or Marxist, nor to be compelled by utopian-

programmatic formulae. Both liberalism and Marxism are not wholly some kind of exciting dream or hope, from one author or another, but what social and historical reality reveals in practice. The discussion of personal intentions or of the existence of a fair and pure doctrine, betrayed by their practical experiences, lacks a scientific basis.

### **The Working Class: Socialism, Workers and Ideology**

If the practice of Marxism and socialism is revealed as not representing the interests of the working class and its liberation, Marxist ideology can hardly be portrayed as being the representation of the working class.

A materialist analysis of Marxist ideology, not subject to the outward appearances of its declarations, seems to support the idea that Marxism (and socialism) is not an ideology of the working class, but of the class of the cadres, a class that, according to this ideological link could also be called a socialist class.

Assuming that there is no identification between the proletariat and Marxist ideology, we may wonder what is then the ideological position of the working class? Is this a class without its own ideology? The answer to these questions must be the result of research on the same thesis from which these questions come from, and on different historical situations, revolutionary and non-revolutionary, as lived in different countries. Provisionally we argue, as an additional hypothesis, that the working class lacks its own ideology of dominion within society or of seizing economical or political power –in this sense the dictatorship of the proletariat, claimed by Marxism, really corresponds to the dictatorship of the class of the cadres. Nevertheless we can detect some ideological elements of the working class, but they are essentially of a defensive nature, when facing so much economic exploitation and political oppression.

The fact that perhaps the more exploited and oppressed working classes in history -slaves in the classical era, peasants in the feudal system and once again slaves in modern American society- were deprived of their own ideology with a view to establishing a new kind of society, in which these classes could have exercised their domination or hegemony, does not seem surprising. Nor should it be surprising that a similar situation is repeated in the case of the working class in a capitalist or socialist society.

Marx himself has analysed how bourgeois ideology managed to lead the working class, or at least a part of it, towards bourgeois goals, even employing some *workers'* phraseology. Something similar seems to happen with socialist ideology which, additionally, has more possibilities to mobilize the proletariat against capitalism because there are some common elements that unite the class of the cadres and the working class.

A particularly significant case of ideological dependence, and often also of organisational dependence, is the struggle of the slaves in America against the modern system of slavery. If in some social class Marx's words at the end of *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* "... nothing to lose but their chains" can be taken literally, that is the case of the enslaved class, particularly developed in America. However, the history of the breaking of these chains, for which the struggles of the slaves

themselves had a fundamental role, was produced under ideological and national agencies that can not be considered ideologies proper to the class of the slaves. The Haitian revolution was a very revealing case of lack of a proper ideology of slaves which could lead to a certain new model of society.

An ideological variant, close to socialism, which has raised some hopes of an independent organisation of the working class in pursuit of genuine workers' interests is trade-unionism. However, even in cases of formal rupture with the idea of a *transmission belt* practiced by the so-called workers' parties, the consideration of the trade union as an independent organisational form of the working class does not seem to be supported by facts. The organisational principles and forms of trade unions also manifest their suitable structure for the dominion of the cadres. Trade unions history reproduces to some extent the history of workers' cooperatives.

The acceptance of the thesis that rejects the proletarian nature of Marxism and states the managerial class character of Marxism and socialism, does not mean that the class struggle, for the type of society that best suits their respective interests, is fictional and does not deserve consideration or even intervention by the workers or *weakly encadred* social sectors. Despite the current dominance of neo-liberal thinking, even within large sections of the class of the cadres, capitalism is ever more clearly an economic system opposed to the *objective* interests of the majority of the population, whose only relevant and consistently structured alternative is socialism. The question arises then, even in terms of necessity and inevitability, of the construction of socialist systems, although it establishes a new dictatorship of the socialist class and does not entail the emancipation of the working class.

## Conclusion and Open Questions

The capitalist system is becoming increasingly threatening for different populations and for economic viability; at the same time the traditional socialist alternative bears evidence of being an ideology that agrees with the deep interests of the class of the cadres and thus favourable to a new form of exploitation and domination over the majority of the population, and not to any kind of proletarian or social liberation. This twofold situation opens the possibility of new theoretical approaches and practical orientations on social reality and its development. This anti-utopian view implies that, to achieve a new kind of progressive society, people must reject blind submission to ideologies and organisations waving the banners of *total* liberation, as do Marxist ideology, the political parties and the trade unions that call themselves representatives of the working class.

From this perspective of accepting the necessity of rejecting the capitalist system and of doing so under the threat that the new system replacing it may entail, even tend towards producing a new danger for most of the population, we propose the following conclusions and open problems:

1st. It is necessary to fight the idealistic component of Marxism, now in a dominant position and with increasing influence, and promote a materialist analysis of societies. The current insistent invocation of utopia is an important sign of the idealistic tendencies in fashion.

2nd. Materialism, contrary to Marxist orthodoxy, is incompatible with the Hegelian dialectic, in all of its variants.

3rd. The analysis of the class structure of societies is a basic principle of social and historical materialism.

4th. Class analysis of societies should not be subjected to the bipolarity of dialectical formulations. Strict bipolarity, among other misinterpretations of reality, veils the emergence of a new class aspiring to dominate the rest of society.

5th. The historical experience of Marxism, fundamental for the understanding of this ideology beyond the mobilizing proclamations, shows the reality of the new class of the cadres and the fact of their domination over the rest of the population in every situation where this class attains some power.

6th. The materialist theoretical analysis of Marxist theory, demonstrates the case that the dominance of the new socialist class is not a fortuitous social fact nor the result of a degenerative process but, on the contrary, this dominance of the class of the cadres consistently agrees with essential elements of Marxist theory that, therefore, can be considered an ideology of the class of the cadres.

7th. A feature of socialist practice, with clear theoretical and doctrinal connections, is the cult of the inner working of the capitalist factory, of industrial structure and discipline (socially planned under the direct responsibility of the cadres), and even of military discipline. This type of social domination relationship is a model for the party organisation (socialist, communist, *workers*) and for mass organizations like trade unions.

8th. The elimination of the great capitalist ownership of the means of production and finance is a goal of a socialist nature fully justified by the economic system itself and its dangers, the enormous private appropriation of concentrated wealth it brings, and its destructive aspects particularly shown in times of crisis as at the present. The situation of capitalist property is comparable to that of the great feudal property, which led to the bourgeois revolution.

9th. The relevance of socialism and its Marxist version depends on the possibilities of leaving a destructive capitalist situation and of avoiding the danger of introducing another social model with similar characteristics. From this dual approach a radical socialist perspective could be proposed, demystified (in its class character, in its utopianism and its dialectic and idealistic theorisation) and under a continuous attitude of suspicion and materialist criticism.

10th. The rejection of the idealistic component of dialectical Marxism, and of its claims of liberating the working class, emphasizing its representation, on a deep level, of the class of the cadres, raises a question of identity: can this materialist critique of Marxism be considered Marxist? Can the critique of Marxism stated in this paper be seen as a Marxist one?

11th. Beyond the analysis of ideologies, particularly Marxism, there arises the question of the viability of the proposal for a socialist society compensated by the deepening of democratic relations and the continued warning against the domination of the new ruling class and against its excesses: Is there any hope that the organizational structures created within the current socio-economic system, even with the goal of changing the system (including promoting assembly-based methods of fighting) could not be fated, inevitably, by the very nature of capitalist and socialist

systems, to reproduce capitalist or socialist forms of domination, with little chance of destabilizing the domination of the capitalist class or of the class of the cadres or, at least, of compensating the *excesses* of this domination?

## References

- Arthur, C. J. (2002). *The New Dialectic and Marx's Capital*. Brill, Leiden-Boston-Köln.
- Balibar, E. (2010). "Onze thèses sur Marx et le Marxisme, extraits: Thèse 6: sur les révolutions et les bifurcations (Histoire, I: le temps); Thèse 7: sur la mondialisation: "monde" et "planète" (Histoire, II: l'espace)". Congrès Marx International VI, Paris.
- Bhaskar, R. (1993). *Dialectic. The Pulse of Freedom*. Verso, London/New York.
- Burnham, J. (1942). *The managerial Revolution*. Putnam, London.
- Duménil, G. y Lévy, D. (1998). *Au-delà du capitalisme*. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Duménil, G. y Lévy, D. (2011). *The Crisis of Neoliberalism*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London.
- Femia, J. V. (1993). *Marxism and Democracy*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Kautsky, K. (1988). *The Materialist Conception of History*. Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
- Lozinsky, E. (1907). *Contra la corriente [Protiv téceníe]*, n1 1, 20 de febrero, San Petersburgo.
- Makhaïski, J. W. (1979). *Le socialisme des intellectuels*. Seuil, Paris.
- Martinez Delgado, A. (2009). *Exploración del carácter de clase de la concepción marxista del Derecho*. Ph. D. Universidad de Huelva. Free edition, <http://hdl.handle.net/10272/2710>, or <http://columbus.uhu.es/record=b1545614>.
- Marx, K. (1974). *Capital*. Vol 1. Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- Michels, R. (1959). *Political Parties*. Dover Publication, Inc., New York, 1959.
- Orwell, G. (1981). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Penguin Books, Middlesex, New York.
- Russell, B. (1979). *History of Western Philosophy*. Unwin Paperbacks, London.